### 2AC T – Production

**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

**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.

**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.

**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.

**We meet the counter interpretation: the solar panels on the UAVs transform solar energy**

**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**

**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 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.

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.

**Hegemony is sustainable and solves global war – there is no alternative**

Robert Knowles (Assistant Professor – New York University School of Law) 2009 “american hegemony and the foreign affairs constitution” Arizona State Law Journal, Vol. 41 Lexis

First, the "hybrid" hegemonic model assumes that the goal of U.S. foreign affairs should be the preservation of American hegemony, which is more stable, more peaceful, and better for America's security and prosperity, than the alternatives. If the United States were to withdraw from its global leadership role, no other nation would be capable of taking its place. 378 The result would be radical instability and a greater risk of major war. 379 In addition, the United States would no longer benefit from the public goods it had formerly produced; as the largest consumer, it would suffer the most. Second, the hegemonic model assumes that American hegemony is unusually stable and durable. 380 As noted above, other nations have many incentives to continue to tolerate the current order. 381 And although other nations or groups of nations - China, the European Union, and India are often mentioned - may eventually overtake the United States in certain areas, such as manufacturing, the U.S. will remain dominant in most measures of capability for decades. According to 2007 estimates, the U.S. economy was projected to be twice the size of China's in 2025. 382 The U.S. accounted for half of the world's military spending in 2007 and holds enormous advantages in defense technology that far outstrip would-be competitors. 383 Predictions of American decline are not new, and they have thus far proved premature. 384

### **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 by so much**

Chambers 9/13 (Dean, 9/13/12, Mitt Romney possible landslide indicated by polling data released today, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-possible-landslide-indicated-by-polling-data-released-today?cid=PROD-redesign-right-next, RBatra)



The latest Rasmussen Reports Daily Presidential Tracking Poll released today shows Mitt Romney back in the lead over President Obama by a 47 percent to 46 percent margin and three percent preferring another candidate. When voters leaning to one of the candidates are included, Romney has a 49 percent to 47 percent lead over the president. The poll also finds the president having a 49 percent approval rating while being disapproved by 51 percent. This is where Barack Obama has been in this poll for months, with the exception of briefly having an approval rating at or above 50 percent for a few days earlier this month that appears to have been a “bounce” after the Democratic National Convention.

The Rasmussen poll also found that 49 percent of Republican voters are following the race on a daily basis while just 42 percent are doing so. Likewise, other national surveys of the presidential race have, including the Washington Post/ABC News poll released earlier this week, found a higher “enthusiasm” factor about the race among Republican voters than that of Democratic voters.

The map above is an alternative analysis of the electoral vote standing for this presidential race done for QstarNews.com by the author of this article. The methodology for this particular map is quite simple. For each state, the polling data listed for that state at Real Clear Politics is viewed, and when obviously skewed media polls are removed, the remaining credible polls are averaged. If that average shows Obama at 50.1 percent or better, that state is shaded blue for Obama. Any result below that for Obama, and the state is shaded red for Romney. This reflects just about all the undecided vote going to Romney by the time voters cast their ballots in the actual election.

The remaining key events left during this campaign are the three presidential debates between President Obama and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. Even among most polls that are skewed, such as the Washington Post/ABC News poll released earlier this week that show Obama with a 49 percent to 48 percent lead, the race is at best tied or within the margin of error of the polls. A strong performance by Romney in that first debate could easily lead to Romney having a four to seven percent lead in most credible polls.

Strong performances in the other two debates could easily double that lead for Romney. Additionally, Romney is expected to have a strong advantage in available money for purchasing advertisement buys both nationally and in the key swing states. This advantage could move enough percentage points in the polls to win many or all of the states that are still in play by mid to late October.

Given what the current polls are showing, even a 54 percent to 40 percent margin among independents for Romney in that heavily skewed CNN/ORC poll, it is reasonable to predict that Romney could very well win among independent voters by a margin of 55 percent to 45 percent. Democrats could support President Obama by a 85 percent to 15 percent margin while Republicans show support for Romney by a margin of 90 percent to 10 percent. With Romney closing the sale for his candidacy with strong performances in the debates, the enthusiasm factor among the Republican based, and the lesser of such a factor among the Democratic base, leads to Democrats voting 10 percent less and Republicans voting 10 percent more. These factors, and the electorate resembling the partisan trends measured by Rasmussen Reports in interviewing tens of thousands voters, which shows the electorate this year made up of 37.6 percent Republican voters, 33.3 percent Democratic voters and 29.2 percent independent voters.

Calculations using those numbers and parameters described above suggest a popular vote projection of Romney winning 58.3 percent to Obama's 41.7 percent. That is comparable to the popular vote majority received by Ronald Reagan in 1984. If Romney's popular vote percentage is anywhere between 55 percent to 58 percent, some of those blue states on the map above are likely to have turned red on election night. Put simply, given that Obama's continued disapproval by the majority of likely voters, and the possibility that Romney could finally close the sale for his candidacy with stronger performances in the three debates with Barack Obama, the swinging of just about all the undecided voters to Romney along with a strong turnout by the Republican base could lead to a Romney landslide.

**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%).

**Plan uses** low-temperature **and clean power convergence, cuts major costs**

**Howell 09** (Katie, July 15, 2009, “Research on Solar-Powered Air Force Drones Takes Off,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2009/07/15/15greenwire-research-on-solar-powered-air-force-drones-tak-41887.html>)

A scientific team led by the University of Washington is developing solar cells that use a flexible film and thin glass coating mounted on aircraft wings. These dye-sensitized solar cells power sensors and actuators in the wings to eliminate electric wires and lighten the drone's load.¶ "These kinds of solar cells have more specific power convergence efficiency, very clean energy and easy scalability to a larger skin area of the craft, as well as low-temperature processing, which leads to lower costs overall," said Minoru Taya, a mechanical engineer who is leading the research.¶ The dye-sensitized cells differ from other solar cells, Taya said, because of their "more nature-oriented design." The design, he explained, is inspired by photosynthesis done by natural dyes, a process "inherent in biological species, leaves, bacteria."¶ "Thus, the cost of processing is much cheaper than that of the current silicon-based solar cells, which require high temperature clean-room handling," Taya added.

**Romney will win – economic modeli*n*g**

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**

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.

-- Alt Cause: Georgia

Pickering ‘8 (Thomas, Former U.S. Diplomat, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Ambassador to the UN, Ambassador to Russia, 8-22, “How the Georgia Conflict Impacts US-Russia Relations,” http://thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-the-georgia-conflict-impacts-us-russian-relations)

So far, Russia is moving slowly--if at all; the United States is talking about punishment, but acting to get the Georgia issue settled as a first priority. The EU and NATO are supporting that effort by curbing short-term interest in more excessive actions against Russia. U.S.-Russia relations will center around Georgia and the next steps for the immediate future. Other activities will go into frozen animation for a while. How fast this phase moves ahead and how succinctly it meets its objectives on both sides will influence whether future stages will open up soon to broader activities. Russia will delay in part to demonstrate that it can do so--that it has arrived again as a great power and is not subservient to the West's will, in part because too hasty a retreat from Georgia--where it has extensively justified its military moves at home as defense of the country and its interests-­would be seen domestically as a failure and retreat. And this week's signing of the Polish missile defense site arrangement between Washington and Warsaw will be seen in Moscow as an attempt at rubbing salt into a wound and make Russian compliance with the Georgia deal even more difficult and strung out. Hopefully, but we don't yet know, high-priority issues of interest to both countries will still be dealt with--loose nukes, inadvertent confrontation, and serious accidents. Let us hope even in the present difficult period that the two sides would treat such issues with respect and common concern. The second set of questions, business as usual before Georgia, will probably be allowed to slide into a holding pattern for a while and not garner much attention. These include the 123 nuclear agreement, further trade activities around World Trade Organization membership, and the like. A third set of approaches--designed to bring about a new, changed, and hopefully, rejuvenated U.S.-Russian relationship--will probably not be addressable until after the Georgia situation settles down.

### 2AC 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**

**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**

**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**

**Exclusive focus on method causes endless paradigm wars – good is good enough**

Wendt, professor of international security – Ohio State University, ‘98

(Alexander, “On Constitution and Causation in International Relations,” British International Studies Association)

As a community, we in the academic study of international politics spend too much time worrying about the kind of issues addressed in this essay. The central point of IR scholarship is to increase our knowledge of how the world works, not to worry about how (or whether) we can know how the world works. What matters for IR is ontology, not epistemology. This doesn’t mean that there are no interesting epistemological questions in IR, and even less does it mean that there are no important political or sociological aspects to those questions. Indeed there are, as I have suggested above, and as a discipline IR should have more awareness of these aspects. At the same time, however, these are questions best addressed by philosophers and sociologists of knowledge, not political scientists. Let’s face it: most IR scholars, including this one, have little or no proper training in epistemology, and as such the attempt to solve epistemological problems anyway will inevitably lead to confusion (after all, after 2000 years, even the specialists are still having a hard time). Moreover, as long as we let our research be driven in an open-minded fashion by substantive questions and problems rather than by epistemologies and methods, there is little need to answer epistemological questions either. It is simply not the case that we have to undertake an epistemological analysis of how we can know something before we can know it, a fact amply attested to by the success of the natural sciences, whose practitioners are only rarely forced by the results of their inquiries to consider epistemological questions. In important respects we do know how international politics works, and it doesn’t much matter how we came to that knowledge. In that light, going into the epistemology business will distract us from the real business of IR, which is international politics. Our great debates should be about first-order issues of substance, like the ‘first debate’ between Realists and Idealists, not second-order issues of method. Unfortunately, it is no longer a simple matter for IR scholars to ‘just say no’ to epistemological discourse. The problem is that this discourse has already contamin- ated our thinking about international politics, helping to polarize the discipline into ‘paradigm wars’

. Although the resurgence of these wars in the 1980s and 90s is due in large part to the rise of post-positivism, its roots lie in the epistemological anxiety of positivists, who since the 1950s have been very concerned to establish the authority of their work as Science. This is an important goal, one that I share, but its implementation has been marred by an overly narrow conception of science as being concerned only with causal questions that can be answered using the methods of natural science. The effect has been to marginalize historical and interpretive work that does not fit this mould, and to encourage scholars interested in that kind of work to see themselves as somehow not engaged in science. One has to wonder whether the two sides should be happy with the result. Do positivists really mean to suggest that it is not part of science to ask questions about how things are constituted, questions which if those things happen to be made of ideas might only be answerable by interpretive methods? If so, then they seem to be saying that the double-helix model of DNA, and perhaps much of rational choice theory, is not science. And do post-positivists really mean to suggest that students of social life should not ask causal questions or attempt to test their claims against empirical evidence? If so, then it is not clear by what criteria their work should be judged, or how it differs from art or revelation. On both sides, in other words, the result of the Third Debate’s sparring over epistemology is often one-sided, intolerant caricatures of science.

**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**

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.

**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.