### 2AC T – In the US

**1. We meet --- the plan provides incentives to companies within the US --- it’s just used in tactical situations**

**USFI,** No Date, http://www.usifi.com/index.php?option=displaypage&Itemid=56&op=page&SubMenu=

The Berry Amendment requires the U.S. Defense Department (DOD) to buy certain **products – judged essential to our military readiness – with 100% U.S. content and labor**. These products include clothing and other textile items, specialty steel, and food. AMTAC’s objective for the 2006 Defense Authorization bill was to preserve the existing Berry Amendment provisions from any weakening amendments by going on the offensive with strengthening provisions of our own. AMTAC targeted improving the notification process of waivers to the Berry Amendment. All too often the DOD waives the Berry Amendment even though there is a domestic manufacturer capable of producing the item. Furthermore, there is no way for interested parties to find out when waivers are granted. AMTAC worked with Representative Robin Hayes (R-NC) to draft the legislation (H.R. 1239) and have it incorporated into the House version of the FY 2006 DoD Authorization bill. The Hayes language was included in the final Authorization bill passed by the House. AMTAC also supported language offered by Senator Elizabeth Dole (R NC) to ensure that DOD procurement officers are fully educated on the Berry Amendment requirements. This language was included in the Senate version of the bill. Status: Both Provisions Accepted in Final Defense Bill A conference committee of Senators and Prepresentatives worked out the differences in the versions of the bill that each chamber approved. Both the Hayes and Dole provisions were retained in the conference report. The House of Representatives passed the bill (H.R. 1815) on December 19th by a vote of 374 - 41. The Senate approved the bill by voice vote on December 21st. The specific language included in the conference report reads as follows: (a) Notice -- Section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection: “(k) Notification Required Within 7 Days After Contract Award If Certain Exceptions Applied -- In the case of any contract for the procurement of an item described in subparagraph (B), (C), (D), or (E) of subsection (b)(1), if the Secretary of Defense or of the military department concerned applies an exception set forth in subsection (c) or (e) with respect to that contract, the Secretary shall, not later than 7 days after the award of the contract, post a notification that the exception has been applied on the Internet site maintained by the General Services Administration known as FedBizOps.gov (or any successor site).” (b) Clothing Materials and Components Covered -- Subsection (b) of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (1)(B) by inserting before the semicolon the following: “and the materials and components thereof, other than sensors, electronics, or other items added to, and not normally associated with, clothing (and the materials and components thereof)”. SEC. 832. TRAINING FOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE ON THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE BERRY AMENDMENT. (a) Training During Fiscal Year 2006.--The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each member of the defense acquisition workforce who participates personally and substantially in the acquisition of textiles on a regular basis receives training during fiscal year 2006 on the requirements of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ``Berry Amendment''), and the regulations implementing that section. (b) Inclusion of Information in New Training Programs.--The Secretary shall ensure that any training program developed or implemented after the date of the enactment of this Act for members of the defense acquisition workforce who participate personally and substantially in the acquisition of textiles on a regular basis includes comprehensive information on the requirements described in subsection (a). Final passage of the Hayes notification language and Dole training directives represents a victory for the U.S. industrial base and supporters of the Berry Amendment. Spending by Department of Defense procurement officers on textile and apparel products totaled $2.6 billion in FY 2004. AMTAC will continue to work to expand the Berry Amendment to cover furniture products and extend these critical buy-American requirements to the Department of Homeland Security. More explanation about Berry and Buy America: Amendment The Berry Amendment (10 U.S.C. §2533a) applies only to the Department of Defense procurement of: [a] any of the following items, either as end products or components, unless the items have been grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States – (1) Food; (2) Clothing; (3) Tents, tarpaulins, or covers; (4) Cotton and other natural fiber products; (5) Woven silk or woven silk blends; (6) Spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth; (7) Synthetic fabric or coated synthetic fabric, including all textile fibers and yarns that are for use in such fabrics; (8) Canvas products; (9) Wool (whether in the form of fiber or yarn or contained in fabrics, materials, or manufactured articles; (10) Any item of individual equipment (Federal Supply Class 8465) manufactured from or containing any of the fibers, yarns, fabrics, or materials listed in this paragraph (a). [b] Specialty metals, including stainless steel flatware, unless the metals were melted in steel manufacturing facilities located within the United States. [c] Hand or measuring tools, unless the tools were produced in the United States. The Berry Amendment requires 100% U.S. content, but this rule is waivable at the OSD level. Previous to 2002 it was waivable at the DLA level. There is an attempt this year to tighten the waiver process by requiring 15 day prior notification to the Congress and the public by posting it on GSA’s FEDBIZOPPS.GOV website before a waiver is exercised. There is a long list of exceptions to the requirement of the Berry Amendment beginning with - (a) Procurement contract worth less than $100,000; (b) products not available in satisfactory quality and sufficient quality at U.S. market prices; acquisitions outside the U.S. in support of combat operations; emergency acquisitions by activities outside the United States for personnel of those activities; etc, etc, etc. Buy American Act **The Buy American A**ct (41 U.S.C. §§ 10a through **10d) is the major domestic preference statute governing procurement by the entire federal government For the Defense Department it covers items not covered by the Berry Amendment.** It was enacted in 1933 and has only been substantively amended twice in the succeeding 60 years. In determining what are American goods, the place of mining, growing, producing or manufacturing is controlling. The nationality of the company owner or contractor is not considered when determining if a product is of domestic origin.

**3. Counter interpretation --- United States means all areas under US jurisdiction or authority**

**Rainey, 95** - US District Judge (John, DONALD RAY LOOPER, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF HIS FIRM'S CLIENTS, Plaintiff, v. WILLIAM C. MORGAN, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE, AND ALL UNKNOWN INDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES INVOLVED IN THE SEARCH OF A BRIEFCASE AT INTER-CONTINENTAL AIRPORT IN HOUSTON, TEXAS, Defendants.

1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10241, lexis)

The term "United States" means the United States and all areas under the jurisdiction or authority thereof.

**4. We meet the counter interpretation --- provide incentives to companies in US jurisdiction and provide systems to troops under US authority**

**5. Prefer ---**

**A. No ground loss --- we’ll defend all your links to drone-based das**

**B. Limits --- still affect areas under US jurisdiction --- their interpretation makes any aff with the potential to affect international affairs untopical**

**6. Reasonability ---- competing interpretations forces a race to the bottom that arbitrarily excludes the aff**

### 2AC T – Production

1. **We meet – solar power is primary production**

**Eurostat 4/2** (April 2, 2012, “Renewable energy primary production: biomass, hydro, geothermal, wind and solar energy,” <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=ten00082>)

[ten00082] - Renewable energy primary production: biomass, hydro, geothermal, wind and solar energy - 1 000 tonnes of oil equivalent¶ Short Description: Primary production: biomass (heat content of the produced biofuels or biogas; heat produced after combustion during incineration of renewable wastes); hydropower covers potential and kinetic energy of water converted into electricity in hydroelectric plants (the electricity generated in pumped storage plants is not included); geothermal energy comprises energy available as heat emitted from within the earth's crust, usually in the form of hot water or steam; wind energy covers the kinetic energy of wind converted into electricity in wind turbines; solar energy covers the solar radiation exploited for solar heat (hot water) and electricity production

1. **Counter interpretation:** **the only way to get energy from solar power is to install solar panels**

Batelle (the world’s largest nonprofit research and development organization, specializing in global science and technology) 1980 “An Analysis of Federal Incentives Used to Stimulate Energy Production” p 22 http://www.scribd.com/doc/67538352/Federal-Incentives-for-Energy-Production-1980

Discussing governmental actions in a field that lacks consistent Policy is difficult, since boundaries defining energy actions are unclear. All governmental actions probably have at least some indirect relevance to energy. if a consistent Policy did exist, the discussion could focus on those actions that are part of the planned and consistent program. For this analysis, however, boundaries must be somewhat arbitrarily defined. First, this discussion will include only those actions taken by the Federal Government; relevant actions of state and local governments are not considered. Second, the discussion covers only those Federal Government actions In which major causes include to influence energy or major effects included some Influence on energy. Within those limits, the discussion considers actions related to both production arid consumption, although production receives the most emphasis. It also includes actions relating to both increases and decreases in energy consumption or production. Energy production is defined as the transformation of natural resources into commonly used forms of energy such as heat, light, and electricity. By this definition, the shining of the sun or the running of a river are not examples of energy production, but the installation of solar panels or the construction of a hydroelectric dam are. Energy consumption is defined is the use of one of these common, manufactured forms of energy. Under this definition sunbathing Is not energy consumption, but heating water by means of a solar panel is In both definitions, the crucial ingredient is the application of technology and resources to change a natural resource into a useful energy form.

1. **We meet the counter interpretation: the solar panels on the UAVs transform solar energy**
2. **Prefer our interpretation :**
	1. **Key to ground – installing solar panels is the ONLY way to produce solar energy – their interpretation limits out an entire third of the topic.**
	2. **Limits – overlimiting is comparatively worse- kills all aff innovation and creates stale debates**
	3. **Substantially, literature, and the case list checks small affs**
3. **Reasonability - competing interpretations forces a race to the bottom that arbitrarily excludes the aff**

\*\*We’re not extra topical – we incentivize solar power production for the military; that’s done through developing solar power on UAVs, that’s Atwood.

### 2AC Generic 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. **Hegemony is high and sustainable**

Bisk 5/4/12 (Tsvi, Independent Israeli/American Futurist, Social Researcher and Strategy Planning Consultant, “The Second American Century”, The Future Society, <http://www.wfs.org/blogs/tsvi-bisk/second-american-century>)

Crisis is not decline. The GDP of the United States in 2010 was still larger than Japan, China and Germany COMBINED. The American debt to GDP ratio is lower than the Euro Zone and much lower than Japan. Direct foreign investment in the United States in 2010 was equivalent to the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China) combined.¶ America's demographic picture is healthier than all its potential major competitors. The European Union has a negative population growth and is facing a demographic winter of declining and aging population figures. The same is true of Japan. The working age population of both is in freefall, putting tremendous unsustainable pressures on the welfare state. Russia is in a state of general demographic freefall – its population decreasing by 750,000 a year (more people are dying than are being born and it is the only country in the world with a declining life expectancy). China is on the verge of demographic collapse – especially in its available working age population, which is expected to peak in 2012. This is already threatening its cheap labor competitiveness as workers have begun to demand better conditions and higher pay.¶ All of these countries have, to one degree or another, more significant cultural barriers to immigration than the United States. America is still the easiest country in the world in which to be an immigrant. In a world where highly mobile global tribes of professionals are looking for the most amenable country in which to realize their optimal self-fulfillment, this gives the United States a tremendous competitive advantage as we move deeper into the 21st century. The United States also has a higher birth rate (above the replacement level of 2.1 children per woman) than any of these other countries.¶ The consequence of all this is that within several decades, the United States will have a higher percentage of working age population than China, Japan, the EU and Russia. India and Brazil will probably still have a higher percentage of working age population but given that America's GDP is currently ten times larger than either one of these countries there doesn't seem to be any foreseeable threat to the primacy of the size or vitality of the American economy.¶ America's cultural openness, its ease in absorbing immigrants, and its "freedom to fail" start up environment will continue to give it an innovation edge. Over 50% of the PhDs in Silicon Valley are foreign born and over 30% of startups in recent decades were begun by individuals born in China or India.

### **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**

### **Laser Powered Drones CP**

**Doesn’t solve the aff –**

1. **Hegemony – only the DoD has the expertise and experience in surveillance, reconnaissance, and intelligence gathering necessary to do the plan**
2. **Terrorism – the DoD is only agency that has the necessary experience in terrorist fighting, drone usage, and renewable energy adaptation necessary to do the plan**

Tech doesn’t exist now

**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.**

**CP links to politics**

**Plan key to Mars colonization**

**Klesh and Kabamba 07** – department of aerospace engineering at the University of Michigan(Andrew, Pierre, “Solar-Powered Unmanned Aerial Vehicles on Mars: Perpetual Endurance,” 58th International Astronautical Congress 2007, <http://www.umich.edu/~arclab/max/media/IAC-07-A5.I.-A3.I.B.01-3.pdf>)

Future exploration of Mars, laid out by the Vision¶ for Space Exploration, requires long endurance un~~manned~~ aerial vehicles (UAVs) that use resources¶ that are plentiful on Mars. One possible way of¶ achieving these objectives is to have solar-powered¶ UAVs that ﬂy perpetually. This motivates the¶ problem solved in this paper. The aircraft discussed here are equipped with solar cells on the¶ upper surface of the wings as well as onboard energy storage.¶ This paper quantiﬁes the requirement for perpetual endurance in solar-powered ﬂight. Perpetual¶ endurance is the ability of a UAV to collect more¶ energy from the sun than it loses in ﬂying over the¶ duration of a solar day. This problem features the¶ interaction between three subsystems: energy collection, energy loss and solar elevation. While the¶ current literature discusses methods to optimize¶ UAV aerodynamic design for energy usage, there is¶ no approach that speciﬁcally quantiﬁes the requirement for perpetual solar-powered ﬂight in terms of¶ aircraft and environmental parameters. The purpose of this paper is to identify this requirement and show its applicability to solar-powered aircraft¶ design.¶ Although the current literature on solar-powered¶ UAVs does not consider perpetual ﬂight requirements, a substantial body of work is available on¶ the design and analysis of solar-powered aircraft. A¶ brief review of this literature is as follows. The feasibility of solar-powered ﬂight is reviewed in Refs.¶ 1-2 with a reference to Dr. A. Raspet’s pioneering¶ proposal of solar-powered ﬂight in 1954. Hence,¶ solar-powered aircraft have only appeared recently¶ and their history is discussed in Refs. 6, 9, and 26.¶ The general history and methods for design and¶ analysis of solar-powered aircraft are discussed in¶ Refs. 3-27. References 12, 15 and 25 are unique in¶ that they use an optimization procedure to design¶ the aircraft based upon expected maneuvers and¶ sunlight availability.¶ Optimal path planning for solar-powered aircraft¶ is qualitatively discussed in the literature. Mission design is found in Refs. 27-30 with particular emphasis on where and when to ﬂy. In most¶ references, eﬃciency through preliminary design is¶ emphasized. Alternative methods to increase eﬃ-¶ ciency for solar-powered aircraft are discussed in¶ Refs. 43-45. Reference 45 is of particular importance as it achieves a 30% increase in eﬃciency by improving the cooling of solar cells. However,¶ nowhere in the literature is there a study quantifying the requirement for perpetual ﬂight.¶ Solar-powered aircraft have many potential uses in¶ exploration and civilian applications. References¶ 31-35 propose innovative designs for the use of solar¶ powered aircraft on Mars and Venus. In Refs. 36-¶ 41, additional proposals are made for high altitude¶ wireless communication platforms and other uses.¶ The work in Ref. 57 does compare ﬂight on Mars to¶ ﬂight on Earth, but does not take into account parasitic drag. Moreover, it does not give an analytic¶ solution to the perpetual ﬂight problem

**Space colonization will check government tyranny and ensure the survival of civilization by checking corrupt governmental power**

**Ust**, author and writer for The Thought, **2004** (Daniel, “Freedom Above or Tyranny Below,” http://mars.superlink.net/~neptune/SpaceFreedom.html)

The Future on Earth Some might look at this from the angle of the potential for freedom in space alone. This is, after all, my main point – that freedom will be greater in space. However, the other side of this is that freedom on Earth is very limited. The more transportation and monitoring technology progresses on Earth, the more limited freedom will be barring no outlet into space or no other checks on centralized power. Over time, even cultural and constitutional checks erode. Absent any external shocks to the world-system on Earth or off world expansion, there seem to be only two paths that will be taken. Either the level of freedom will rise and fall as governments rise and fall or it will reach a steady state. In either case, the total amount of freedom is likely to be a lot less than even now – and now is hardly ideal. This is because there are no checks on governmental power save for the stark ones that governmental power must not be abused to the point that people either openly rebel or to the point where society generally declines. (Even rebellion or a general decline and collapse only amount to a temporary period of decentralization of the worst sort before centralization gets back on track.) 3

Settling space solves this problem because it will not only allow people to move away from power centers, but will also provide an external shock to the system. This shock will likely not topple existing governments, but it will act to check their power. Why? Those governments that are less exploitative, less controlling will likely have better economies, more immigrants, more talented people and this translates into stability and stronger militaries. Absent an external shock of this sort, the disaffected have nowhere to turn to and there’s no competition.

The space frontier, too, unlike any terrestrial one is inexhaustible. It will be the ultimate edge society, since the edge is highly mobile and practically infinite. Once settlements are established in Earth orbit, people will eventually migrate beyond there out into the solar system, then out into the galaxy and beyond. There is no physical limit to movement, save the need for energy and time.

Looked at this way, the option to settle space is not some pie in the sky dream, but likely the best option for the future of humanity and the future of civilization. In other words, those interested in freedom in the long-range, in the survival of humanity, and in the survival of civilization should think seriously about space migration and settlement.

### 2AC Capitalism

**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**

**The alt creates a political void filled by elites – locking in oppression**

Cook 92 (Anthony, Associate Professor – Georgetown Law, New England Law Review, Spring, 26 New Eng.L. Rev. 751, Lexis)

The effect of deconstructing the power of the author to impose a fixed meaning on the text or offer a continuous narrative is both debilitating and liberating. It is debilitating in that any attempt to say what should be done within even our insular Foucaultian preoccupations may be oppositionalized and deconstructed as an illegitimate privileging of one term, value, perspective or narrative over another. The struggle over meaning might continue ad infinitum. That is, if a deconstructionist is theoretically consistent and sees deconstruction not as a political tool but as a philosophical orientation, political action is impossible, because such action requires a degree of closure that deconstruction, as a theoretical matter, does not permit. Moreover, the approach is debilitating because deconstruction without material rootedness, without goals and vision, **creates a political** and spiritual **void** into which the socially real power we theoretically deconstruct steps and **steps on** the disempowered and dispossessed.  [\*762]  To those dying from AIDS, stifled by poverty, dehumanized by sexism and racism, crippled by drugs and brutalized by the many forms of physical, political and economic violence that characterizes our narcissistic culture, power hardly seems a matter of illegitimate theoretical privileging. When vision, social theory and political struggle do not accompany critique, the **void will be filled** by the rich, the powerful and the charismatic, those who influence us through their eloquence, prestige, wealth and power.

**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**

**Case is a d/a to the k:**

1. **Hegemony prevents great power wars**
2. **Nuclear terrorist attacks guarantee**

**Market innovation will outpace scarcity --- their authors incorrectly that demand and supply are static.**

**Norberg**, 0**3** (Johan Norberg, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “In Defense of Global Capitalism”, p. 223)

It is a mistake, then, to believe that growth automatically ruins the environment. And claims that we would need this or that number of planets for the whole world to attain a Western standard of consumption—those “ecological footprint” calculations—are equally untruthful. Such a claim is usually made by environmentalists, and it is concerned, not so much with emissions and pollution, as with resources running out if everyone were to live as we do in the affluent world. Clearly, certain of the raw materials we use today, in present day quantities, would not suffice for the whole world if everyone consumed the same things. But that information is just about as interesting as if a prosperous Stone Age man were to say that, if everyone attained his level of consumption, there would not be enough stone, salt, and furs to go around. Raw material consumption is not static. With more and more people achieving a high level of prosperity, we start looking for ways of using other raw materials. Humanity is constantly improving technology so as to get at raw materials that were previously inaccessible, and we are attaining a level of prosperity that makes this possible. New innovations make it possible for old raw materials to be put to better use and for garbage to be turned into new raw materials. A century and a half ago, oil was just something black and sticky that people preferred not to step in and definitely did not want to find beneath their land. But our interest in finding better energy sources led to methods being devised for using oil, and today it is one of our prime resources. Sand has never been all that exciting or precious, but today it is a vital raw material in the most powerful technology of our age, the computer. In the form of silicon—which makes up a quarter of the earth's crust— it is a key component in computer chips. There is a simple market mechanism that averts shortages. If a certain raw material comes to be in short supply, its price goes up. This makes everyone more interested ¶ in economizing on that resource, in finding more of it, in reusing it, and in trying to find substitutes for it.

**Perm: prioritize questions of epistemology and capitalism 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.**

**Alt fails to dislodge capitalism – no clear agenda**

Grossberg 92 – Professor of Communication Studies @ UNC-Chapel Hill and Chair of the Executive Committee of the University Program in Cultural Studies (Lawrence, We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture, p. 388-389)

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be **tempered by** the **realities** of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnation of the evil of capitalism were sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression), is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, "the masses" are not waiting to be led into revolution, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide-rather undemocratically, I might add-to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain "civility" in the world. The world system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is **simply too weak** in the current context to effectively organize people, and **too vague** to provide any direction.

**Transition wars resulting from a collapse of capitalism causes omnicide**

Attempts at global economic reform could also lead to a world racked by increasing turbulence, a greater sense of insecurity among the major centres of power -- and hence to a further tightening of the structures of domination and domestic repression – producing in their wake an intensification of the old arms race and militarization of regimes, encouraging regional conflagrations and setting the stage for **eventual global holocaust**.

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

**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.**

### **China DA**

**Case outweighs:**

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

No unique – says China doesn’t dominate market

**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 internal link- China won’t shut off production, author has no quals

No internal lx to extinction

No impact

### **2AC Elections – Obama Bad**

**Case outweighs:**

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

**Obama will win but it will be close and is reversible**

**Bouie, 9/10**/12 - staff writer at [The American Prospect](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/post/the-fundamentals-still-favor-obama/2012/09/10/d67db19e-fb6d-11e1-98c6-ec0a0a93f8eb_blog.html) (Jamelle, “The fundamentals still favor Obama,” Washington Post,

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/post/the-fundamentals-still-favor-obama/2012/09/10/d67db19e-fb6d-11e1-98c6-ec0a0a93f8eb_blog.html>

Since the Democratic National Convention ended, there has been clear movement in the polls, and President Obama is winning. Nate Silver, who usually urges caution when reading poll results, made this point earlier today, when he [wondered if observers were understating the degree to which there’s been clear movement in the presidential race](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/10/sept-9-call-it-as-you-see-it/):

[T]he polling movement that we have seen over the past three days represents the most substantial shift that we’ve seen in the race all year, with the polls moving toward Mr. Obama since his convention.

How far will Mr. Obama’s numbers rise, and how long will his bounce last? We don’t know that, of course. But the range of possible outcomes reads pretty favorably for him.

None of this is to say that Obama will win in November, but it’s increasingly clear that he’s winning. And while it may not seem like it — given the ups and downs of the campaign season — this has been true for most of the year. Yes, the race has been close since April, when Mitt Romney wrapped up the Republican presidential primary and consolidated the bulk of GOP voters. But since then, Obama has maintained a small but persistent lead over the former Massachusetts governor. Indeed, Romney has never held a lead in the averages calculated by [Pollster](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/2012-general-election-romney-vs-obama#!mindate=2012-04-01&amp;smoothing=more&amp;hiddenpollsters=rasmussen,zogby-internet) or [Real Clear Politics](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2012/president/us/general_election_romney_vs_obama-1171.html). It’s possible that this will change — Obama’s convention bounce could dissipate and voters could finally move to Romney — but given the contours of the race, that seems unlikely.

As [Greg has been pointing out](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/post/why-wont-obama-voters-break-up-with-him/2012/09/06/e4831e06-f84c-11e1-8398-0327ab83ab91_blog.html), it’s clear that the Romney campaign is governed by a crude economic determinism — “as long as the economy is bad, all we have to do is show up, and voters will reward us with the presidency.” Hence Romney pollster Neil Newhouse’s [declaration](http://www.mittromney.com/news/press/2012/09/memorandum-state-race1) that “the basic structure of the race hasn’t changed.” This is true, but not in a way that helps Romney. Simply put, the “basic structure of the race” still favors President Obama. The economy is poor and job creation is sluggish, but growth is on an upward trajectory, and according to most election models, this makes Obama a slight favorite for reelection. That the Romney campaign fails to see this explains everything from Romney’s refusal to provide policy detail to his team’s inexplicable decision to cede summer advertising to the Obama campaign.

**Doesn’t matter – jobs outweigh**

Mike **Shedlock**, 7-31-20**12**; registered investment advisor representative for SitkaPacific Capital Management, “Is global trade about to collapse? Where are oil prices headed? A chat with Mish Shedlock by James Stafford” http://energybulletin.net/stories/2012-07-31/global-trade-about-collapse-where-are-oil-prices-headed-chat-mish-shedlock

Oilprice.com: You just mentioned that we don’t know who the next president is going to be and sticking to this topic how big an impact do you see energy prices having on this year's presidential elections? Mish**: I don’t think energy prices are what's on people's minds. What's on people's minds right now are jobs. Oil prices have kind of stabilized and in the very short-term they are likely to stay stable** **unless there are some dramatic results** in the Mid-East or a dramatic slowdown in the US economy. Both are possible, but a major US slowdown is arguably more likely. Regardless, I think **energy prices are going to be a minor election issue.**

Solar power unpopular

Cornwall 8/10 (“Support for solar power is waning,” August 10, 2012, <http://www.thisiscornwall.co.uk/Support-solar-power-waning/story-16686544-detail/story.html>)

Public "goodwill" towards large-scale solar farms will eventually run out as more massive applications are lodged in the Westcountry, an expert has predicted.¶ Companies are currently competing in a "dash" to secure the best sites for photovoltaic (PV) panels in Cornwall, where solar radiation levels are higher than anywhere else in the country, with Devon close behind.¶ It has put the South West at the forefront of a renewables "gold rush", with solar PV applications increasing by 600 per cent in just one year, and talks in progress over applications as big as 224 acres – nearly six times the size of London's Olympic Stadium island.¶ Andrew Rowson, assistant research fellow at Exeter University's Centre for Energy and the Environment, said a solar farm which produced five megawatts of energy, and would measure around 37 acres, was "easy to hide" in the right landscape.¶ Solar applications are currently seen as less controversial than wind farms, which often swiftly provoke a well-organised protest campaign.¶ Wind farms produce around 2.5 times as much electricity as well-placed solar farms. But solar is lower maintenance and more constant, and it is currently easier to find sites.¶ But Mr Rowson predicted: "I think we'll see the tide change. Already, protest groups are getting pretty mobile and the goodwill towards PV applications on this scale will eventually run out. It's just a question of whether there are other limiting factors before then. The cost of grid connection is what will ultimately limit the possibilities."

**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.

Lack of readiness causes North Korean conflict
Carpenter 1/9/08 (Ted Galen, vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, [http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16622)](http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16622%29)

At the same time, U.S. officials must stop letting hope triumph over experience when it comes to dealing with North Korea on the nuclear issue. Those officials also need to consider a fall-back plan if the six-party talks fail to produce an effective and worthwhile solution. Relying on deterrence supplemented by a regional missile defense program may be the most feasible option. Another possibility is to induce China to remove the current ruling elite in its troublesome client state and replace it with a more pliable regime, in exchange for a U.S. promise to end its military presence on the peninsula.

North Korean war means extinction
Africa News 99 (October 25, LN)

If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or build-up in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.