### **Heg**

1. **Even with flaws in US heg, it is preferable to the alternative: Zhang and Shi make a few key arguments**

**a. There are no challengers to hegemony in the status quo, means nobody would be able fill the position and regional wars would ensure**

**b. Nations scrambling to gain the hegemon title resulting in nuclear transition wars.**

**c. Heg is the most sustainable system- 60 years of peace in Europe proves**

1. **Social science proves that the alternative to hegemony is great power war—no peaceful transition**

**Wohlforth, 09** – professor of government at Dartmouth (William, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” World Affairs, January, project muse)

The upshot is a near scholarly consensus that unpolarity’s consequences for great power conflict are indeterminate and that a power shift resulting in a return to bipolarity or multipolarity will not raise the specter of great power war. This article questions the consensus on two counts. First, I show that it depends crucially on a dubious assumption about human motivation. Prominent theories of war are based on the assumption that people are mainly motivated by the instrumental pursuit of tangible ends such as physical security and material prosperity. This is why such theories seem irrelevant to interactions among great powers in an international environment that diminishes the utility of war for the pursuit of such ends. Yet we know that people are motivated by a great many noninstrumental motives, not least by concerns regarding their social status. 3 As John Harsanyi noted, “Apart from economic payoffs, social status (social rank) seems to be the most important incentive and motivating force of social behavior.”4 This proposition rests on much firmer scientific ground now than when Harsanyi expressed it a generation ago, as cumulating research shows that humans appear to be hardwired for sensitivity to status and that relative standing is a powerful and independent motivator of behavior.5 [End Page 29] Second, I question the dominant view that status quo evaluations are relatively independent of the distribution of capabilities. If the status of states depends in some measure on their relative capabilities, and if states derive utility from status, then different distributions of capabilities may affect levels of satisfaction, just as different income distributions may affect levels of status competition in domestic settings. 6 Building on research in psychology and sociology, I argue that even capabilities distributions among major powers foster ambiguous status hierarchies, which generate more dissatisfaction and clashes over the status quo. And the more stratified the distribution of capabilities, the less likely such status competition is. Unipolarity thus generates far fewer incentives than either bipolarity or multipolarity for direct great power positional competition over status. Elites in the other major powers continue to prefer higher status, but in a unipolar system they face comparatively weak incentives to translate that preference into costly action. And the absence of such incentives matters because social status is a positional good—something whose value depends on how much one has in relation to others.7 “If everyone has high status,” Randall Schweller notes, “no one does.”8 While one actor might increase its status, all cannot simultaneously do so. High status is thus inherently scarce, and competitions for status tend to be zero sum.9

1. Multipolarity Bad – E.U. proves

Prato 09 (Marine Corps University, “The Need For American Hegemony”, February 20th, 2009, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA508040&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf>) NA

While multilateralists strive to replace state sovereignty with international charters, they fail to recognize the infeasibility of a multipolar world. No other nation is currently capable or willing to assume equal responsibility for maintaining global peace and prosperity. This became apparent as European allies slashed their defense budgets and failed to take the lead in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, Africa, and Bosnia. Such was also the case at the end of the Cold War when European nations cut military spending to below two percent of their GDPs while they “cashed in on a sizeable peace dividend” paid in full by America. Europe cannot maintain peace and prosperity with an underfunded military force. Still, Europe demands “multilateral action through the U.N.” and insists on equal say in solving global issues without providing equal funding. Alas, these are typical tactics of weaker nations unwilling to carry their weight on the international stage, though they are eager to be “free riders” on a global “American pax.” They beg for U.S. aid and security during crisis only to resume their usual criticisms thereafter. Frankly, most nations do not desire multipolarity. The reluctance of foreign powers to increase their world presence speaks to this end. Consider the limited European contribution to the Global War on Terror. Europe’s lack of participation creates a global need for American hegemony since the U.S. is willing to provide a last line of defense for many countries. In fact, American “unipolarity, managed benignly, is far more likely to keep the peace.” Of course, the concept of benignity is subjective.

1. **Even if they win collapse inevitable – we should retain hegemony as long as possible**

**Thayer, 07** – Associate Professor in the Department of Defense and Strategic Studies, Missouri State University (Bradley A., American Empire, Routledge, page 105)

Knowing that American hegemony will end someday does not mean that we should welcome or facilitate its demise; rather the reverse. The United States should labor to maintain hegemony as long as possible—just as know-ing that you will die someday does not keep you from planning your future and living today. You strive to live as long as possible although you realize that it is inevitable that you will die. Like good health, Americans and most of the world should welcome American primacy and work to preserve it as long as possible.

**Even if they win uniqueness—better to try and maintain**

**Glosserman and Cossa 2010** – \*executive director at Pacific Forum CSIS and co-editor of Comparative Connections, \*\*President of the Pacific Forum CSIS (Brad and Ralph, ed: Carl Baker, CSIS, 12.1, “Regional Overview: They’re (Not Quite) Baaaack!”, <http://csis.org/files/publication/1001q.pdf>, WEA)

For some years now, there has been talk of the “changing balance of power in Asia.” Recently, the murmurs have become more pronounced. Blame a global recession that is widely seen as “made in the USA” along with China’s economic resilience and its newfound confidence; mix in US “distractions” – Afghanistan, health care, a poisonous political atmosphere in Washington DC, and precarious finances – and Asia’s strategic dynamics appear to be shifting. Financial Times foreign policy analyst Gideon Rachman made the case most explicitly in a March 8 column, but there are echoes of this thinking throughout the region, typically heard when trying to explain the seemingly new boldness in Chinese foreign policy. More subtly, it is implicit in calls for greater US engagement with the region by many Southeast Asian analysts and governments. This isn’t new – China’s rise has been “an ominous development” for nearly a decade. But the latest piece of the strategic puzzle is the new government in Japan: Prime Minister Hatoyama Yukio and his desire to “rebalance” relations with his ally and forge a new relationship with Asia. Rising tensions with Washington, triggered by delays in the Futenma relocation and the uncovering of the “secret nuclear pacts,” and the visit of Democratic Party of Japan kingpin Ozawa Ichiro to Beijing with several hundred businessmen and politicians in tow are manifestations of new thinking in Tokyo. Forget the rhetorical bows noting that the US-Japan alliance is the cornerstone of Japanese foreign policy. According to this logic, Hatoyama’s call for an East Asian community that excludes the US is proof of his real thinking and the final piece of evidence in the case for a shift in the balance of power. This is an overly simplistic and alarmist assessment of regional dynamics. China is rising, but there are real limits to its influence, strength, and allure. China is a big presence in the region, but Asian governments have little faith or confidence in Beijing. The current Japanese government, like each of its predecessors, is debating its place in the region and the world. Rapprochement between Tokyo and Beijing is a good thing, but the issues that have long divided those two countries will remain powerful obstacles to an intimate relationship. Both governments – and all others in the region – still see the US role as integral. No other nation can, and is ready to, provide regional security and stability. Washington’s power may be diminished, but it remains an integral part of the Asian order.

### **2AC Terrorism Real**

**AT: Defense**

**Ext Jaspal 12: nuclear terrorism is likely, and the biggest impact**

**-this evidence cites multiple peer-reviewed studies as well as terrorist group statements**

**-answers defense based on means – there’s a significant amout of unsafe material around the world and many providers**

**-answers defense based on motives – terrorists have an incentive to spur retaliation because it create chaos**

**Nuclear terrorism is a real threat – consensus among experts**

**Bunn, Morozov, Mowatt-Larssen et al May 2011** – Matt, Associate Professor of Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School and CoPrincipal Investigator of Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs., Colonel Yuri Morozov, (retired Russian Armed Forces). Professor of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences and senior fellow at the U.S.A and Canada Studies Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, chief of department at the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces, 1995–2000., Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, Senior fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, director of Intelligence and Counterintelligence at the U.S. Department of Energy, 2005–2008, Simon Saradzhyan. Fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Moscow-based defense and security expert and writer, 1993–2008., William Tobey. Senior fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and director of the U.S.-Russia Initiative to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism, deputy administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation at the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration, 2006–2009.. Colonel General Viktor I. Yesin (retired Russian Armed Forces). Senior fellow at the U.S.A and Canada Studies Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences and advisor to commander of the Strategic Missile Forces of Russia, chief of staff of the Strategic Missile Forces, 1994–1996., Major General Pavel S. Zolotarev (retired Russian Armed Forces). Deputy director of the U.S.A and Canada Studies Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences and head of the Information and Analysis Center of the Russian Ministry of Defense, 1993–1997, deputy chief of staff of the Defense Council of Russia, 1997–1998. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs – Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies (The U.S.-Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism, May 2011, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Joint-Threat-Assessment%20ENG%2027%20May%202011.pdf>)

Abstract

Nuclear terrorism is a real and urgent threat. Given the potentially catastrophic consequences, even a small probability of terrorists getting and detonating a nuclear bomb is enough to justify urgent action to reduce the risk. Al-Qaeda and North Caucasus terrorist groups have both made statements indicating that they seek nuclear weapons and have attempted to acquire them; these groups are presented together as a case study to assess nuclear terrorism as a present and future threat. (The only other terrorist group known to have systematically sought to get nuclear weapons was the Japanese cult group Aum Shinrikyo.) This study makes the case that it is plausible that a technically sophisticated group could make, deliver, and detonate a crude nuclear bomb if it could obtain sufficient fissile material. The study offers recommendations for actions to reduce this danger.

**Nuclear terror threat high now – insecure fissile material**

**The Hill 11** [“Congress must get serious about the threat of nuclear terrorism”, Sarah Williams and Alexandra Toma, program director at the Connect U.S. Fund, 01/18/11]

The fight to prevent nuclear terrorism will be lost without a serious commitment to the goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear material around the globe. Currently, more than 30 countries possess significant amounts of material that could be used to make a nuclear weapon, and much of it is stored in less-than-secure facilities. Enough material exists to create tens of thousands of new nuclear weapons, and the only way to ensure terrorist groups do not obtain even an ounce of it is to reduce the number of places.

### **2AC Elections – Obama Good**

**Case outweighs:**

1. **Hegemony is necessary to prevent great power wars**
2. **Terrorist attacks lead to escalatory nuclear wars**

**Romney will win – independent voters will decide the outcome for him**

**Ferrechio, 9/11**/12 – Chief Congressional Correspondent for the Washington Examiner (Susan, The Washington Examiner, “Polls show Romney soars with independent voters”, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/polls-show-romney-soars-with-independent-voters/article/2507679#.UFKaqo1mR9s>)

Recent polls show President Obama enjoying a bounce in the polls following last week's Democratic convention in Charlotte, N.C., but buried in those data is good news for Mitt Romney about voter enthusiasm and the preferences of independents, who could decide the election.

The CNN/ORC International poll of registered and likely voters released Tuesday shows likely voters favoring Obama by 52 percent to 46 percent over Romney -- evidence, pundits said, of a post-convention bump for the president.

But a figure buried in the report shows Romney leading Obama among likely independent voters, 54 percent to 40 percent.

Both Democrats and Republicans believe independents will be critical to deciding the outcome of the election, in part because they make up a growing part of the electorate and are considered up for grabs because they fluctuate in their political preferences from one election to the next.

"That's a significant lead," said pollster Ron Faucheux.

It was the independent vote that helped Obama win the 2008 election. He won 52 percent of independents, compared with 44 percent for McCain. Independents comprised about 33 percent of the overall vote in 2008.

"If Romney can beat Obama among independents this time, he can win the election."

A poll conducted two weeks ago by Democracy Corps showed Romney with a 15-point lead among independents, 53 percent to 38 percent.

**Massive public support for solar power**

**SI Staff 11** (November 1, 2011, “Public Support for Solar Power Is Nearly Universal in U.S.” Solar Industry, <http://www.solarindustrymag.com/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.9045>)

U.S. residents overwhelmingly support the use of solar energy and federal investments for solar, according to the 2011 SCHOTT Solar Barometer, a nationally representative survey conducted annually by independent polling firm Kelton Research.¶ For the fourth consecutive year, the survey found that about nine out of 10 Americans (89%) think it is important for the U.S. to develop and use solar energy. Support for solar is strong across the political spectrum, with 80% of Republicans, 90% of Independents and 94% of Democrats agreeing that it is important for the U.S. to develop and use solar.¶ The survey also found that Americans want federal incentives for solar power. More than eight out of 10 Americans (82%) support federal tax credits and grants for the solar market - similar to those that traditional sources of energy like oil, natural gas and coal have received for decades.¶ Furthermore, when asked to select an energy source they would financially support if they were in charge of U.S. energy policy, 39% of Americans chose solar over other sources, such as natural gas (21%), wind (12%), nuclear (9%) and coal (3%). Among Independents, solar is more than twice as popular as any other energy source (43% for solar compared to 20% for natural gas).¶ Despite extensive news coverage about the bankruptcy of solar panel manufacturer Solyndra, the survey shows that the vast majority of Americans support solar manufacturing in the U.S. Eight out of 10 (82%) think it is important for the federal government to support U.S. solar manufacturing, and a majority of Independent voters (51%) think it is "extremely important."¶ The poll also found that a majority (51%) would be more likely to purchase a product if they knew it was made using solar energy. Consumers in the key age demographic of 18 to 44 years old are even more likely to buy such products (61%).

**Romney will win – economic modeling**

James Rainey 8-22-2012; LA Times writer citing University of Colorado professors, Academics predict economy will drive a Romney victoryhttp://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-academics-predict-economy-will-drive-a-romney-victory-20120822,0,2662095.storyAcademics predict economy will drive a Romney victory

Campaign 2012 may have spent weeks stuck on discussions of Mitt Romney’s taxes, Joe Biden’s rant on putting “y’all in chains” and “legitimate rape” and abortion, but a pair of Colorado political scientists believe the struggling economy will still be the dominant issue and will pave the way for a Romney victory. Using a state-by-state analysis of unemployment and per-capita income, academics Kenneth Bickers and Michael Berry of the University of Colorado project that Romney will win 52.9% of the popular vote and 320 electoral votes. The political scientists discuss their findings here. Their forecast suggests that President Obama will lose in almost all of the swing states, including North Carolina, Virginia, New Hampshire, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Florida.

**No political perception – DoD will shield the plan from the public and Congress**

**Guardiano 9** (John, Former Marine and Consultant – U.S. Military, “End Obama’s secret DOD budget tribunals”, San Francisco Examiner, 3-29, http://www.sfexaminer.com/opinion/columns/oped\_contributors/End-Obamas-secret-DOD-budget-tribunals-42106912.html)

When then-First Lady Hillary Clinton convened a secret task force in 1993 to redesign and nationalize the American healthcare system, policymakers and the public were rightly outraged. They demanded, and ultimately got, a more open and transparent decision-making process that comported with the American political tradition of self-rule by the people and not elite rule by an anointed oligarchy. “This country has learned, over two centuries, that a free and unfettered exchange in public is the best medicine for any of our nation’s problems,” said the late Rep. Gerald B. H. Solomon, R-NY. Solomon, a former Marine, added that “in the end, as the First Lady will soon learn, the truth will out.” Compare that to what is now transpiring within the Department of Defense (DOD). There, uniformed military officers and civilian government employees have been forced to sign a secrecy oath while they meet privately, behind closed doors, to decide the fate of nation’s defense budget. “Everybody who’s participating in this process - these are the highest-ranking people in this department - were asked to sign… an agreement in which they would agree not to speak to any of the matters that they are working on as part of the budget process,” Pentagon spokesman Geoff Morrell told reporters Feb. 25. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Morrell added, “wants to keep [that process] out of the limelight. He wants to keep it secret because ultimately it needs to be judged on the whole and not bits and pieces which may leak out.” The problem with information being “leaked out” or shared with the public is obvious: The public may disagree with what these uniformed military officers and government civilians are deciding and that in turn may alter or disrupt their decision-making process. After all, that’s how democracy works. Democracy can be messy and untidy, noisy and boisterous; it can disrupt the work of the ruling class, who think they know better than we the people. That’s why media blackouts and censorship are, sadly, the norm in human history. The ruling class - the self-anointed “experts” - don’t want their perfectly laid plans disrupted. After all, they know best. Indeed, as Morell explained to reporters, Gates “wants people to participate in this with the confidence of knowing that what they are saying is not being leaked, it’s not being disseminated, and therefore we can work together perhaps in a more collegial and honest way and come up with a better product.” Of course. It’s all for the greater good, don’t you see? The secrecy oaths are being imposed on uniformed military officers and government civilians for the public’s own good, so that we can get a “better product,” a better defense budget. Dictators and tyrants, oligarchs and bureaucrats have always used such self-serving rationales to deny the public its right to participate in the democratic decision-making process. That’s not new. What is new is the slavish obedience of our elected public officials, who have raised nary a word of objection to these secret proceedings. The media’s blind acceptance of this media blackout also is startling, though perhaps not surprising, given the media’s strong ideological predilections and bias. Most reporters and editors are liberals and leftists. They like the secret proceedings because Gates has clearly intimated that he intends to use these secret proceedings to cut the defense procurement budget and perhaps even cancel key weapon systems. Indeed, the media have reported on Gates’ efforts with unabashed admiration and portrayed him as a hero for supposedly standing athwart the dreaded “military-industrial complex.” Gates, they report, is fighting for what is militarily right and just, while narrow-minded parochial interests within Congress and the defense industry try to derail his noble reform efforts. For example, the Boston Globe’s Bryan Bender reported that the DOD head is “girding for a showdown with Congress,” and so “took the unusual step of making the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other participants in budget deliberations sign nondisclosure agreements to prevent leaks.” “But already,” Bender breathlessly continued, “lawmakers and defense contractors are preparing to fight back. Lockheed, maker of the F-22 jet, recently launched an ad campaign to protect its fighter. Northrop Grumman, which could face cutbacks to its ship-building programs, has hired consultants to write op-eds. Unions are raising alarms about job losses. “Even his closest friends acknowledge Gates is in the bureaucratic fight of his life,” Bender concluded. Now, Gates may well be right. Key weapon systems perhaps should be scaled back or eliminated. However, Gates and his team might also mistakenly cut crucial weapon systems. Defense Department personnel, remember, are the same geniuses who gave us defense budgets without up-armored Humvees and inadequate body armor. Soldiers and Marines were needlessly killed as a result. But whether Gates is right or wrong is irrelevant. Defense Department budgetary decisions should not be made in secret; they should be made in public. America is not the Soviet Union or China; America is a democratic republic. Here the people rule. What makes the secret deliberations even more unconscionable is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other senior military leaders will be forced to pledge allegiance to Gates’ ultimate decisions. The American people, consequently, will never know whether and why senior military leaders disagreed with specific defense cuts.

**No impact – Romney will copy Obama on foreign policy**

Aaron David Miller, 5-23-2012; distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Barack O'Romney http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/05/23/barack\_oromney

And that brings up an extraordinary fact. What has emerged in the second decade after 9/11 is a remarkable consensus among Democrats and Republicans on a core approach to the nation's foreign policy. It's certainly not a perfect alignment. But rarely since the end of the Cold War has there been this level of consensus. Indeed, while Americans may be divided, polarized and dysfunctional about issues closer to home, we are really quite united in how we see the world and what we should do about it. Ever wondered why foreign policy hasn't figured all that prominently in the 2012 election campaign? Sure, the country is focused on the economy and domestic priorities. And yes, Obama has so far avoided the kind of foreign-policy disasters that would give the Republicans easy free shots. But there's more to it than that: Romney has had a hard time identifying Obama's foreign-policy vulnerabilities because there's just not that much difference between the two. A post 9/11 consensus is emerging that has bridged the ideological divide of the Bush 43 years. And it's going to be pretty durable. Paradoxically, both George W. Bush's successes and failures helped to create this new consensus. His tough and largely successful approach to counterterrorism -- specifically, keeping the homeland safe and keeping al Qaeda and its affiliates at bay through use of special forces, drone attacks, aggressive use of intelligence, and more effective cooperation among agencies now forms a virtually unassailable bipartisan consensus. As shown through his stepped-up drone campaign, Barack Obama has become George W. Bush on steroids. And Bush 43's failed policies -- a discretionary war in Iraq and a mismanaged one in Afghanistan -- have had an equally profound effect. These adventures created a counter-reaction against ill-advised military campaigns that is now bipartisan theology as well. To be sure, there are some differences between Romney and Obama. But with the exception of Republicans taking a softer line on Israel and a tougher one on Russia -- both stances that are unlikely to matter much in terms of actual policy implementation -- there's a much greater convergence.

**Multiple alt causes to relations collapse**

Sestanovich, ‘7 (Stephen, George F. Kennan Senior Fellow for Russian and Eurasian Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, May 17th, “Russian-American Relations: Problems and Prospects,” http://www.cfr.org/publication/13354/russianamerican\_relations.html

At the same time, it is essential to recognize that Russian-American frictions—both specific disagreements and a more general tension—are also growing. It was only last week, after all, that President Putin, implicitly but unmistakably, compared the United States to the Third Reich. (Please pay no attention to the pro forma denials: Mr. Putin clearly wanted to make the comparison and to be able to deny that he had done so.) And it was only a week earlier that an angry and sometimes violent mob in Moscow was allowed to mount a multi-day siege of the embassy of Estonia, a treaty ally of the United States, while the police stood idly by. Unfortunately, the negative developments of this month do not stand alone. In April, President Putin announced that Russia would suspend its observance of the treaty on conventional forces in Europe, negotiated in 1990, and revised in 1999, under American leadership. He also continued a campaign of—to my mind, spurious—charges that, in planning the thinnest imaginable shield to protect Europe against a future Iranian missile capability, the U.S. is threatening Russian security. Other Russian officials have suggested that they may want to pull out of the treaty on intermediate-range nuclear missiles signed in 1987 by Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev.

### **2AC Oil DA**

**Case outweighs:**

1. **Hegemony is necessary to prevent great power wars**
2. **Terrorist attacks lead to escalatory nuclear wars**

**Oil prices will collapse – geopolitical tensions are ending and economies are curbing demand**

Derek Brower, July 2012; editor of Petroleum Economist; Petroleum Economist July 2012 Inside the Opec oil-price bubble LENGTH: 853 words, Lexis

It doesn't really matter. For all the importance Opec ministers attach to their market views, the group's internal debate is happening in a bubble. It's a bubble in which people think the recent drop in the oil price means crude is now affordable for a global economy teetering on the edge of collapse. Yet political and macro-economic forces outside the bubble are likely to have a far bigger impact on the direction of crude markets. Iran and the West are inching closer to a nuclear deal ahead of a summit in Moscow next week, believe oil-market watchers. They see recent US sanctions exemptions for a host of Iranian-oil importers as a de facto concession to keep the talks alive. Both sides are talking a good game. The EU insists that sanctions are going ahead on 1 July. Iran's oil minister, Rostam Qasemi, denies that they have had any impact on his country's oil sector. (Opec says Iran's oil output fell to just over 3.1 million b/d in May. Iran says it was almost 3.8 million b/d.) But if the sanctions bite as the West intends, Qasemi warned an audience in Vienna, they will derail the global economy. The global economy, though, is derailing on its own. The Eurozone is sinking. Greece's vote on 17 June could send the bloc into a death spiral. Bond markets have already rumbled last week's so-called bail-out of Spain's economy. Its borrowing costs have soared. Illusions of super-strength in the Chinese economy and a recovery in the American one have been shattered by recent manufacturing and jobs data. India's economic growth is faltering. In short, Opec's main markets are in deep trouble. As the group's net export income has soared above $1 trillion, household spending by consumers, such as those in the EU, rose by about 20% between 2009 and 2011, according to the IEA. That's a colossal drain on consumer spending and liquidity.

**Non-unique – the military is switching to renewables now**

**Link nonunique – DoD investing 7 billion in renewables now**

**Peixe 8/12** (Joao, August 12, 2012, “The US Army has $7 billion to spend on renewable energy,” <http://oilprice.com/Latest-Energy-News/World-News/The-US-Army-has-7-Billion-to-Spend-on-Renewable-Energy.html>)

In order to achieve the Department of Defence’s initiative to generate 25 percent of all energy demanded on its bases from renewable energy sources by 2025, the US Army has announced that it will invest $7 billion in new renewable energy projects. The Army won’t actually fund the projects, but rather will sign contracts to buy the electricity produced by any solar, wind, geothermal, or biomass installations for up to 30 years. The renewable energy companies must finance, install and operate the installations. So rather than paying utility companies for the electricity, they will pay renewable energy companies such as SolarCity or Sungevity.

**No link ---**

**A. The entirety of the DoD uses less than 2% -- cannot drive the market**

Thomas D. **Crowley**, et. al., President, L. E. Peabody & Associates, Inc., “Transforming the Way DOD Looks at Energy,” LMI Research Institute Report Commissioned by the Pentagon, April 200**7** (http://www.oft.osd.mil/library/library\_files/document\_404\_FT602T1\_Transforming%20the%20Way%20DoD%20Looks%20at%20Energy\_Final%20Report.pdf)

In FY05, the United States consumed about 20 million barrels per day. Although the **entire federal government** consumed a **mere 1.9 percent** of the total U.S. demand, DoD, the largest government user of oil in the world, consumed more than 90 percent of all the government’s petroleum (liquid fuel) use.12 Although DoD is highly dependent on petroleum and is the largest single petroleum user, it **cannot by itself, drive the market**. However, because DoD’s operations (the capabilities, costs, and the strategy that define them) rely so heavily on the petroleum market, they are vulnerable to the price and supply fluctuations affecting the petroleum market. Examining the impact of the future energy environment on DoD, and the options available to react to this environment, requires an understanding of the DoD energy consumption profile (how and where is energy being consumed).13 Energy consumption falls into two categories: facility energy use and mobility energy use.

1. **Any spillover would be long-term**

**Boland, 7** (Rita, Signal Magazine’s News Editor, “Services Transition to New Energy Sources,” Signal, February)

Echoing Aimone, Holcomb says the Defense Department needs to **start examining energy alternatives now** and that efforts are underway to make changes. He adds that the military is a juggernaut that will not adapt quickly. However, modifications in the way the services approach and use energy, and new technologies they develop to conserve and produce energy, will have a **ripple effect** that will impact the U.S. public. Experts suggest several reasons for the **slow pace** at which energy use trends change. One is technology. Another is that energy facts are not provided objectively and openly. Dr. Paul Sullivan, professor of economics at the National Defense University and adjunct professor of security studies at Georgetown University, says that most people work from emotions and politics when it comes to energy debates. According to Sullivan, the real security threat facing the United States is transportation. "About 99 percent of transportation is oil based," he explains. For other energy needs, the United States relies on a mix of sources including coal, natural gas and nuclear power. He believes that **the services can be a vanguard in energy change**. As with Holcomb, Sullivan asserts that the cost of oil dependency is measured not only in dollars but also in the lives required to protect and transport oil. He claims that the country would have fewer global problems if the United States and the military services could find different fuels and different ways to transport them and could form more reliable fuel alliances. "This transition will change our national security strategies in some ways," he states. "We won't have to focus on the oil states if we can produce our own transportation fuels."

**Reducing U.S. demand does nothing to affect global oil prices**

**Nordhaus 10/27**—Sterling Professor of Economics; Cowles Foundation, Yale University (William D., 27 October 2011, “Energy: Friend or Enemy?,” http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2011/oct/27/energy-friend-or-enemy/?pagination=false, RBatra)

If we look at both the rhetoric and substance of oil policy, particularly oil dependency, much thinking is misguided because of misconceptions about the nature of oil dependency. We can usefully think of the oil market as a single integrated world market—like a giant bathtub of oil. In the bathtub view, there are spigots from Saudi Arabia, Russia, and other producers that introduce oil into the inventory. And there are drains from which the United States, China, and other consumers draw oil. Nevertheless, **the dynamics of the price and quantity are determined by the sum of these demands and supplies, and are independent of whether the faucets and drains are labeled “US,” “Russia,” or “China.”** In other words, **prices are determined by global supply and demand, and the composition of supply and demand is irrelevant**.7

Why is crude oil an integrated world market? The reasons are that the costs of transporting oil are low, different crude oils are largely interchangeable, and the different crudes can be blended. This means that crude oil is fungible, like dollar bills. A shortfall in one region can be made up by shipping a similar oil there from elsewhere in the world. US oil policies make no more sense than trying to lower the water level in one end of the bathtub by taking a few cups of water from that end.

We know that the world oil market is unified because there is a single price of crude oil that holds no matter what the source. For example, we can look at whether prices (with corrections for gravity and sulfur) in fact move together. A good test of this view would be to ask whether a benchmark crude price predicts the movement of other prices. Looking at crude oil from twenty-eight different regions around the world from 1977 to 2009, I found that a 10.00 percent change in the price of the “Brent” crude oil—a blend of crude often used as a benchmark for price—led to a 9.99 percent change in the price of other crude oils. These correlations among crude oil prices are markedly higher than are observed for virtually any other traded good or service.

The implication of the bathtub view is profound. It means that virtually no important oil issue involves US dependency on foreign oil. Whether we consider pollution, macroeconomic impacts, price volatility, supply interruptions, or Middle East politics, our vulnerability depends upon the global market. It does not depend upon the fraction of our consumption that is imported.

I will use two examples to illustrate this point. A first hardy perennial is the idea that we should limit our consumption to oil from “secure sources.” This might mean concentrating on Canada and Mexico, or perhaps relying only on our own output, or we might even exclude Alaska lest it someday decide to secede.

These policies make no sense in an integrated world oil market. Suppose that the United States limited its imports to completely reliable sources—ones that would never, ever cut off supplies—and specifically prohibited imports from unreliable country A. This would lead country A to send its oil to other countries. In an integrated world market, the result would be simply to reallocate production from non-A countries to the United States to make up the shortfall here and eliminate the excess there. Unless a country actually changes its flow into the world bathtub, there will be no impact on the United States of sourcing imports from secure regions only.

**Sustained high prices ensure the collapse of producers --- causes shift away from fossil fuels**

**Solman, 5** (Paul, Business and economic correspondent for the NewsHour, “Price for Oil,” Jan 24, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/economy/jan-june05/oil\_1-24.html)

We ended with the surprise set of losers, oil and gas producers. In the short run, of course, those who own oil and gas deposits, those who invest in them, those in the business of drilling for them, they all benefit from a price rise. But if prices remain high, as markets are suggesting they now will, **producers could be in big trouble,** because a high long- term price will **assuredly lead to a switch away** from fossil fuels, conceivably even to the decline and **fall of the petroleum empire**.

### **2AC DoD Tradeoff DA**

**Case outweighs:**

1. **Hegemony is necessary to prevent great power wars**
2. **Terrorist attacks lead to escalatory nuclear wars**

**No link- don’t spill over**

**Turn – energy burdens currently prevent the military from investing new operational innovations – shifting to alternative energy sources makes money available for investment in these programs.**

**Buchanan** - Strategist in the Department of Defense Office of Force Transformation - **2006** (Scott C., “Energy and Force Transformation,” Joint Forces Quarterly, Summer http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Press/jfq\_pages/editions/i42/17-JFQ42%20Buchanan%20Pg%2051-54.pdf)

The DOD energy burden is **so significant** that it may prevent the execution of new and still evolving operational concepts, which require the rapid and constant transport of resources without regard for the energy costs.5 These energy burdens will increase as new operational concepts demand a lighter, more agile and dispersed force, with the attendant increase in logistical sustainment. As increasing portions of the budget are set aside for fuel purchases to account for the volatility in fuel prices, increased capability will need to be built into new platforms to mitigate likely impacts on force shape and composition. It is crucial, therefore, that DOD develops an energy strategy that reduces the energy burdens of our operational concepts. Decoupling traditional energy sources from systems and platforms may radically alter both operational requirements and capabilities, as well as alter strategic realities. The use of technologies that no longer rely on the current energy infrastructure is the wave of the future. For instance, one estimate suggests that a third of DOD resources are focused on one small area of the world—the Middle East. The annual investment in securing this region currently exceeds $150 billion per year.6 Reducing our dependency on oil should make these **resources available for investment in future force and infrastructure needs**.

**Aff saves money**

**Fox 7/16** (Stuart, July 16, 2012, “Weeks On End,” Tech News Daily, <http://www.technewsdaily.com/780-solar-powered-uav-stays-aloft-for-weeks-on-end-.html>)

60,000 feet above the Arizona desert, a UAV has been slowly circling the U.S. military’s Yuma Proving Grounds facility. Normally, that wouldn’t be that strange. But this UAV has been up there for an entire week, breaking previous drone flight records by orders of magnitude.¶ The UAV, manufactured by QinetiQ and named the Zephyr, has already doubled the previous record for longest flight time by a UAV. Additionally, since the Zephyr is also solar powered, it doesn’t need to land any time soon, and could conceivably stay aloft indefinitely .¶ “In theory, it can fly forever, and it's range is unlimited,” said John Saltmarsh, the program director for QinetiQ’s Zephyr project. “In practice, we’re only going for 2 weeks here, and staying in a 40 mile box.”¶ The secret to the Zephyr’s success lies in its construction. An ultra light carbon fiber frame cuts down on weight, paper-thin solar panels provide energy and lithium-sulfur batteries store energy for flying at night . Additionally, by soaring at such a high altitude, the Zephyr avoids powerful headwinds caused by the jet stream, Saltmarsh said.¶ In fact, the aircraft is so light that for take off, a half dozen people lift up the Zephyr and run into the wind, like a hang glider, until the plane catches an updraft.¶ The Zephyr cruises at around 40 knots (46 mph), and its camera or electronic payload can cover a 154 square mile (400 square km) area. With its nearly unlimited flight time, that means the Zephyr can fulfill the same communications or observation role as a spy satellite, but at a fraction of the cost.

Earmarks secure funding for other programs

Still 9 (Tom, president of the Wisconsin Technology Council ,3/18/9, http://www.wisconsintechnologycouncil.com/newsroom/inside-wi/?Id=720) JPG

Myth: Earmarks always represent additional spending. Fact: Earmarks are usually spending carved out of general-purpose money federal agencies receive through the normal budget process. They’re a small portion of the total amount lawmakers agree to spend during a given year. Instead of being part of the general “pot” available for agency priorities, earmarks are a slice set aside by congressional request. “If earmarks go, the amount of money stays the same,” said Charles Konigsberg, chief budget counsel at the independent Concord Coalition, in a CNNMoney.com interview. “It’s more about who decides how the money will be spent.” Myth: Earmarks are a new way for members of Congress to play mischief with the budget. Fact: Earmarks have been around almost as long as Congress itself. The Government Accountability Office found one example dating to 1791, when Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton requested that $50,756.53 be spent on “several objects.” But the use of earmarks has grown in the past 15 years – along with the federal budget itself. Myth: Earmarks are a way to defy the president’s budget priorities. Fact: Presidents use earmarks, too, to get what they want. But they’re mainly a tool used by members of Congress to advance ideas that don’t make it into a presidential budget. Some members of Congress view earmarks as a necessary check-and-balance against the powers of the executive branch. “The last time we looked at the Constitution, it gave Congress the power of the purse,” said U.S. Rep. David Obey, the Wisconsin Democrat who chairs the House Appropriations Committee. Obey, speaking last fall at the dedication of the Marshfield Clinic’s Laird Center for Medical Research, noted that no Congress has ever changed a president’s budget by more than 3 percent. “This is a democracy, not a monarchy, and we shouldn’t … throw out the baby with the bathwater because of the abuse of the process by a few people on Capitol Hill.” By the way, the core funding for the clinic’s research center came from an earmark. Now it is home to the Wisconsin Genomics Initiative, one of the most innovative projects of its kind in the world. Myth: Democrats use earmarks far more than Republicans. Fact: Earmarks are pretty much a bipartisan sport. It’s more about which party is in power. Watchdog groups say about 60 percent of earmarks come from the majority party and 40 percent from the minority party. Myth: Earmarks are always used to fund wasteful projects. Fact:  Sure, there’s the “Bridge to Nowhere” in Alaska and some other notable abuses, but most earmarks pay for projects deemed useful by someone. Most UW System campuses, for example, benefit from earmarks that help support research, training or other activities. While federal agencies don’t generally like earmarks because the money comes from their overall budgets, those agencies have the ability to strictly manage and audit projects they believe are truly wasteful. Earmarks are the well-publicized tip of a much bigger iceberg. Federal spending has grown because of problems imbedded in the other 99 percent of the budget, including major entitlement programs such as Medicare and Medicaid and the accumulation of service payments on the national debt. These days, earmarks are the public-opinion equivalent of an AIG bonus check. But if citizens are really worried about federal spending, as they should be, there are far bigger places to look for savings.

Tradeoffs good- force us to cut excess programs which deescalate arms races.

Adams and Leatherman 11 (1/23, Gordon and Matthew, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, “5 myths that keep U.S. from a disciplined defense budget”, Lexis) NYan

Excessive defense spending can make us less secure, not more. Countries feel threatened when rivals ramp up their defenses; this was true in the Cold War, and now it may happen with China. It's how arms races are born. We spend more, inspiring competitors to do the same --- without making anyone safer.

For example, Gates observed in May that no other country has a single ship comparable to our 11 aircraft carriers. Based on the perceived threat that this fleet poses, the Chinese are pursuing an anti-ship ballistic missile program. U.S. military officials have decried this "carrier-killer" effort, and in response we are diversifying our capabilities to strike China, including a new long-range bomber program, and modernizing our carrier fleet at a cost of about $10 billion per ship.

### 2AC Heidegger K

**Framework: aff should win the debate if the plan is better than the status quo or a competitive policy option—anything else moots the 1AC which is the most predictable locus of offense.**

**Debate should be policy relevant – we have an obligation as scholars to be attentive to real world concerns and evidentiary claims – this is critical to correct policy errors and to create peace**

**Rosato and Schuessler 11** –Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame AND Assistant Professor of Strategy and International Security at the Air War College

(Sebastian and John, “A Realist Foreign Policy for the United States”, Perspectives on Politics December 2011 Vol. 9 No. 4, dml)

One reason for this attitude is that political scientists tend to **shy away from policy relevant work**. According to Joseph Nye, “scholars are **paying less attention** to questions about how their work relates to the policy world.” 6 Why academics have withdrawn to the ivory tower is an open question, but the profession’s attitude toward policy work—ranging from indifference to hostility—is at least partially to blame. “In many departments,” notes Nye, “a focus on policy **can hurt one’s career**.” 7 Walt reaches the same conclusion: “Policy relevance is simply not a criterion that the academy values. Indeed, **there is a** clear bias **against it**.” 8 Similarly, Bruce Jentleson and Ely Ratner declare that “academia’s dominant organizational culture . . . devalues **policy relevance**.” 9 Our own position is that **political scientists** can **and** should **contribute to policy debates**. The reason that political scientists can make a valuable contribution is simple, but cannot be repeated enough: **theory and policy are** inextricably linked. Although they may not be self-conscious in their use of theory, policy makers ﬁgure out what events or factors to focus on and what policies to pursue based on the theories they ﬁnd most convincing. As Walt points out, theory is **indispensable to policy**—to the extent that it helps decision makers to diagnose their problems, to anticipate events, to formulate prescriptions for action, and to evaluate the results of their policies. 10 Thus, **we have a** responsibility as scholars **to** **foster a robust debate** **about our preferred theories** and their competitors. After all, wise policy choices depend on a vigorous marketplace of ideas. 11 Political scientists should contribute to these debates as scholars, which is to say that **they must be attentive to** logic and evidence. As PatrickThaddeus Jackson and Stuart Kaufman explain, if we want to remain “on the scientiﬁc side of the thin line separating science from politics,” the key issue is “whether, given our assumptions, our conclusions follow rigorously **from the** evidence **and** logic **we provide**.” 12 In the case at hand, this involves two tasks. First, we must take a handful of plausible assumptions and logically deduce **a set of foreign policy prescriptions**. Second, we must show— through a detailed examination of the historical record— that had states adhered to these prescriptions, they would likely have enhanced their security **without going to** **war** and, conversely, that their embrace of **alternative theories of action** led them down the path to war.

**Calculus: plan should be assessed on its efficacy in preventing the destruction of life**

**Case outweighs: human extinction outweighs and includes any impact of human suffering, violence or exclusion—suffering is inevitable but extinction is forever and survival is a precondition to any possibility of meaningful existence**

**Only Evaluate Unique Impacts: Impact claims which lack a trigger element, brink, and specified causal probability are non-falsifiable, and thus shouldn’t be evaluated because are in principle impossible to disprove.**

**Their impact is a theoretical fabrication**

Jarvis 00 (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128)

Perhaps more alarming though is the outright violence Ashley recommends in response to what at best seem trite, if not imagined, injustices. Inculpating modernity, positivism, technical rationality, or realism with violence, racism, war, and countless other crimes not only smacks of anthropomorphism but, as demonstrated by Ashley’s torturous prose and reasoning, requires a dubious logic to make such connections in the first place. Are we really to believe that ethereal entities like positivism, modernism, or realism emanate a “violence” that marginalizes dissidents? Indeed, where is this violence, repression, and marginalization? As self-professed dissidents supposedly exiled from the discipline, Ashley and Walker appear remarkably well integrated into the academy—vocal, published, and at the center of the Third Debate and the forefront of theoretical research. Likewise, is Ashley seriously suggesting that, on the basis of this largely imaged violence, global transformation (perhaps even revolutionary violence) is a necessary, let alone desirable, response? Has the rationale for emancipation or the fight for justice been reduced to such vacuous revolutionary slogans as “Down with positivism and rationality”? The point is surely trite. Apart from members of the academy, who has heard of positivism and who for a moment imagines that they need to be emancipated from it, or from modernity, rationality, or realism for that matter? In an era of unprecedented change and turmoil, of new political and military configurations, of war in the Balkans and ethnic cleansing, is Ashley really suggesting that some of the greatest threats facing humankind or some of the great moments of history rest on such **innocuous** and largely unknown **nonrealities** like positivism and realism? These are **imagined and fictitious enemies**, **theoretical fabrications** that represent arcane, self-serving debates superfluous to the lives of most people and, arguably, to most issues of importance in international relations.

**Permutation -- plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative**

**Plan in a vacuum: rhetoric focus is infinitely regressive-- proves their kritik is incoherent within our framework—sever our advantage rhetoric and the permutation solves all their offense**

**Ontological hierarchies devalue life and engender genocide**

**Faye 6 ­--** Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Paris X-Nanterre [Emmanuel Faye, South Central Review, "Nazi Foundations in Heidegger's Work," Issue 21.3, p 55-56, Muse]

What Heidegger wants to say is that the victims of the concentration camps could not be dead because they were not, in their essence, mortal: they did not sufficiently love death, they were **not "in custody of Being**." Behind this, there is the entire Nazi conception of death as Opfer, as sacrifice of the individual for the community, that we find already stated in Being and Time, with the notion of self-sacrifice, and celebrated by Heidegger on 26 May 1933, in his speech praising Albert-Leo Schlageter, gunned down in 1926 and designated as a hero by the Nazis. "To die for the German people and for one's Reich," for Heidegger, is the strongest and most noble death (GA 16, 759–760). But those who perished in the concentration camps, they are, he says, grausig ungestorben: "horribly un-dead" (GA 79, 56). They are not dead, they cannot even die, they were not mortal. This is why I spoke of an ontological negationism, which calls into question the very being of the victims. This judgment coincides with the profoundly pertinent analyses of Adorno on the so-called "authentic" conception of death in Being and Time, and **the way in which he shows that with Heidegger, death itself took on a racial meaning**."4 In conclusion, recall that philosophy has as its vocation to serve the fulfillment of man and not his destruction. But Heidegger, through the völkisch and racist principle which is explicitly his starting point, **destroys man in his very being**. And in a profoundly perverse manner, he [End Page 65] imputes to philosophy itself the responsibility for the totalitarian aberrations of the modern age. The radically discriminatory and racist principles upon which Heidegger's work rests demand a complete re-evaluation of the status of that work. It is not, in its foundations, a philosophy, but rather an attempt to destroy philosophy. Therefore, it is the role of philosophy to explore, through further research, the real significance of his writings. This is an essential task for contemporary thought.

**Our ontology is good – deterrence as ontology breaks from cycles of violence and solves ontological security**

**Lupovici 8 –** Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Munk Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto

(Amir, “Why the Cold War Practices of Deterrence are Still Prevalent: Physical Security, Ontological Security and Strategic Discourse”, paper presented at the Canadian Political Science Association annual conference, Vancouver June 4-6, 2008, <http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2008/Lupovici.pdf>, dml)

Since deterrence can become part of the actors’ identity, it is also involved in the actors’ will to achieve ontological security, securing the actors’ identity and routines. As McSweeney explains, ontological security is “the acquisition of confidence in the routines of daily life—the essential predictability of interaction through which we feel confident in knowing what is going on and that we have the practical skill to go on in this context.” These routines become part of the social structure that enables and constrains the actors’ possibilities (McSweeney, 1999: 50-1, 154-5; Wendt, 1999: 131, 229-30). Thus, through the emergence of the deterrence norm and the construction of deterrence identities, the actors create an intersubjective context and intersubjective understandings that in turn affect their interests and routines. In this context, deterrence strategy and deterrence practices are better understood by the actors, and therefore the continuous avoidance of violence is more easily achieved. Furthermore, within such a context of deterrence relations, rationality is (re)defined, clarifying the appropriate practices for a rational actor, and this, in turn, reproduces this context and the actors’ identities. Therefore, the internalization of deterrence ideas helps to explain how actors may create more cooperative practices and break away from the spiral of hostility that is forced and maintained by the identities that are attached to the security dilemma, and which lead to mutual perception of the other as an aggressive enemy. As Wendt for example suggests, in situations where states are restrained from using violence—such as MAD (mutual assured destruction)—states not only avoid violence, but “ironically, may be willing to trust each other enough to take on collective identity”. In such cases if actors believe that others have no desire to engulf them, then it will be easier to trust them and to identify with their own needs (Wendt, 1999: 358-9). In this respect, the norm of deterrence, the trust that is being built between the opponents, and the (mutual) constitution of their role identities may all lead to the creation of long term influences that preserve the practices of deterrence as well as the avoidance of violence. Since a basic level of trust is needed to attain ontological security, 21 the existence of it may further strengthen the practices of deterrence and the actors’ identities of deterrer and deterred actors. In this respect, I argue that for the reasons mentioned earlier, the practices of deterrence should be understood as providing both physical and ontological security, thus refuting that there is necessarily tension between them. Exactly for this reason I argue that Rasmussen’s (2002: 331-2) assertion—according to which MAD was about enhancing ontological over physical security—is only partly correct. Certainly, MAD should be understood as providing ontological security; but it also allowed for physical security, since, compared to previous strategies and doctrines, it was all about decreasing the physical threat of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the ability to increase one dimension of security helped to enhance the other, since it strengthened the actors’ identities and created more stable expectations of avoiding violence.

**Perm: prioritize questions of epistemology and technology but also develop solar powered UAVs – checks back erroneous parts of the 1AC b/c the alt overwhelms any link to our advantages and is theoretically legit b/c links aren’t based on plan text along so we have reciprocal rights to test links with perms not solely based off alt text.**

**Extinction outweighs – pre-requisite to Being**

Zimmerman 93 (Michael E., Professor of Philosophy – University of Tulane, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.” This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing ones relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity’s one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material happiness for everyone by reducing nature into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. **But most** of them **could not agree that the loss of humanity’s relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide**, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never “disclosed” by humanity.

**Alienation, reification and the objectification of transcendence are necessary to human survival**

Joaquin **Trujillo,** PhD Philosophy Florida International University in Janus Head Vol. 6 No. 1 Spring, 20**03**

http://www.janushead.org/6-1/Trujillo.pdf

At the same time, alienation, reification, and, to a certain extent, rapture are not foreign to daily life and should not necessarily be decried as existentials. Simply because the terrorist is alienated to his truth does not necessarily indicate that it is a problem that begs solution. Although his acts and statements warrant condemnation, the situation of the Islamic terrorist should not necessarily be disparaged in a time that is increasingly defined by relativism, arbitrariness and ideological non-sense. The terrorist’s approach to truth may be fundamentally flawed, but it also seems to provide certain existential rewards found lacking in other cultures. Alienation, reification and rapture are “de facto characteristics of the human condition” that facilitate the species’ survival (Berger & Ullberg, 1965, p. 201). Because of its pre-conceptual concern for Being and incessant need to deal with the exigencies of daily life, There-being typically responds to the World as a reality that exists independently of its transcendence (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 61). Said differently, we typically facilitate our engagement with beings when we objectify transcendence.

**Conditionality creates a skew b/c neg can kick it whenever and there’s no in-depth education. C/I – 1 dispo CP. Voter for fairness and education.**

**Alt fails – ‘letting be’ and waiting for metaphysical transformation dooms us to extinction**

Santoni 85 (Ronald E., Professor of Philosophy – Denison, Nuclear War, Ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to **omnicide**. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we **simultaneously act** to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about our disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be **too permissive** in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be **an early accomplice to** the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its **annihilation**.

**Perm do the plan and reject in all other instances**

**Turn - their ethics have no criteria for assessing truth – this causes extreme judgmental errors that result in genocide**

Wolin 90 (Richard, Distinguished Professor of History – City University of New York Graduate Center, The Politics of Being, p. 121-122)

Ultimately Heidegger's theory of truth succumbs to the same **problem of criterionlessness** that was at issue in the decisionistic approach to human action in Being and Time. On the one hand, Heidegger seems at first to be claiming that unconcealment is merely an ontological precondition of truth-which is, as far as it goes, certainly a plausible and valuable insight. In point of fact, however, the nature of truth is conceptualized in terms of the dialectic of concealment and unconcealment that occurs within the phenomenological horizon that has been opened up by a work, a world, etc. In the end, his thoroughgoing antisubjectivism, which is radicalized in the "Turn," results in a type of ineffectual positivism: objects (beings) are no longer to be "judged" (for this would be to subject them to subjective criteria, or, worse still, to "values"), but "disclosed" or "unveiled." Yet, once the lines between truth and error become **blurred**, the distinction between authentic and inauthentic unveiling **essentially evaporates**: both are victimized by error in an unspecifiable way. Heidegger could conceivably redeem his theory of truth by an attempt, however minimal, to distinguish a true from an untrue act of unconcealment. A true unconcealment would thus unveil a being "essentially" or as it is "in itself." But no such distinction between genuine and non-genuine unveiling is forthcoming in his work. Instead, error (Irrnis) is paradoxically deemed a mode of unconcealment that is valid in its own right and thus "equiprimordial" with truth. Or again, Heidegger might have claimed that unconcealment presents a type of privileged or exemplary disclosure of beings; and judgments of truth, in turn, could have been predicated on this exemplary mode of disclosure. But no such claim is made. Instead, all we are left with is an unexalted, positivistic affirmation of "givenness," "beings in their immediacy," "disclosure as such." In this respect, Heidegger's theory of Seinsgeschichte regresses behind both the Husserlian and the ancient Greek conceptions of truth. For in both cases, truth resides not in the "givenness" of beings as such, but in a supramundane or superior mode of givenness?\* As a result of his obsession with providing a "topography" of truth-with defining the clearing or openness as a sufficient condition for the appearance of truth as "untruth"-to the wholesale exclusion of all traditional predicative considerations, Heidegger lays himself open to **extreme judgmental incapacities**. And it was this **philosophically induced lack of discernment** that would lead to his **fatal misapprehension** of the intellectual as well as the political essence of National Socialism.

1. **Their “Object”, “Management”, and Tech Thought K is wrong and *has no impact* – assumes space.**

Ashworth ‘10

Stephen Ashworth is a long-standing Fellow of the British Interplanetary Society. He works in academic publishing in the Voltaire Foundation, part of Oxford University – Towards the Sociology of the Universe, part 1 – “A Review of Dickens and Ormrod, Cosmic Society – 18 December 2010 – http://www.astronist.demon.co.uk/space-age/essays/Sociology1.html

Another example of the tendentious style of reasoning employed by Dickens and Ormrod is found in their repeated claim that outer space is “being made an object rather than a subject by some classes of people” (p.142). By the cosmos as “subject” they mean “a force dominating and controlling affairs on Earth”, through religious dogma or astrological superstition. But since the Enlightenment it has been increasingly envisaged as an “object, something to be constrained, managed and used towards human ends”. To the dominant modern social orders the heavens now “exist to be used, to be lived in, to be worked on and to be domesticated and dominated by society” (p.143); the universe is “something to be conquered, controlled and consumed as a reflection of the powers of the self” (p.76). Apparently this is supposed to be a bad thing. This psychological just-so story is presented as a damning argument against the modern world-view: the condemnatory tone of voice is unmistakable. But the argument, such as it is – based on the authors’ weak plea that the modern view is “intrinsically unsatisfying” (p.76) – is quite irrelevant; what matters for the study of society is how different cultural attitudes affect the survival and growth prospects of a civilisation in its interplanetary environment.

1. **No impact – its theoretical fabrication**

Jarvis 00 (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128)

Perhaps more alarming though is the outright violence Ashley recommends in response to what at best seem trite, if not imagined, injustices. Inculpating modernity, positivism, technical rationality, or realism with violence, racism, war, and countless other crimes not only smacks of anthropomorphism but, as demonstrated by Ashley’s torturous prose and reasoning, requires a dubious logic to make such connections in the first place. Are we really to believe that ethereal entities like positivism, modernism, or realism emanate a “violence” that marginalizes dissidents? Indeed, where is this violence, repression, and marginalization? As self-professed dissidents supposedly exiled from the discipline, Ashley and Walker appear remarkably well integrated into the academy—vocal, published, and at the center of the Third Debate and the forefront of theoretical research. Likewise, is Ashley seriously suggesting that, on the basis of this largely imaged violence, global transformation (perhaps even revolutionary violence) is a necessary, let alone desirable, response? Has the rationale for emancipation or the fight for justice been reduced to such vacuous revolutionary slogans as “Down with positivism and rationality”? The point is surely trite. Apart from members of the academy, who has heard of positivism and who for a moment imagines that they need to be emancipated from it, or from modernity, rationality, or realism for that matter? In an era of unprecedented change and turmoil, of new political and military configurations, of war in the Balkans and ethnic cleansing, is Ashley really suggesting that some of the greatest threats facing humankind or some of the great moments of history rest on such **innocuous** and largely unknown **nonrealities** like positivism and realism? These are **imagined and fictitious enemies**, **theoretical fabrications** that represent arcane, self-serving debates superfluous to the lives of most people and, arguably, to most issues of importance in international relations.

**Reality Shapes Discourse– Our impacts are a worst-case scenario for all of their link arguments; war produces problematic discourse about war. If the kritik would link harder to representations and structural violence produced in a world absent the plan, then voting aff is still preferable even in their framework; the discursive effects of the plan action outweigh the discursive effects of the plan justification**