### AT: Cow Farts/Methane

**Cows are NOT a significant factor in Global Warming**

**Wheat, 8–** Ph.D. Biology and Consultant

(Dr. David, http://sxxz.blogspot.com/2008/01/do-cow-farts-cause-global-warming.html)

Cows can digest things we can't, especially including the cellulose in grass and grain. They do this by maintaining cultures of microorganisms in their complicated series of "stomachs" that can break down cellulose. The cows then digest the microbes and the sugars and fatty acids they produce. (Brief overview of ruminant digestion here. If you are interested in delving into the digestive physiology of ruminants in more detail, start here.) Some of these microbes produce methane (CH4). Some of the other microbes can use that methane as food, but a certain amount of it escapes as belches or farts (mostly belches). (Some people have microbes in their guts which produce methane, and thus their farts also contain methane--but nothing compared to the amount cows produce.) The publication Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 2006 (pdf) summarizes the total greenhouse gas output of the US: Of the 605 million metric tonnes CO2 equivalent of methane shown in the graph, about 115 million tonnes CO2e is from "livestock enteric fermentation"--mostly cow burps and farts. That is less than 20% of the methane load, and less than 2% of the 7 billion tonne CO2e total. Of course raising cattle causes other greenhouse gas emissions. \* There are about 56 million tonnes CO2e of methane and 55 million tonnes CO2e of nitrogen oxides released from cattle wastes as they decompose. (Some of that methane can be captured and used to generate electricity or heat, while releasing carbon dioxide, a much less potent greenhouse gas.) \* About 227 million tonnes CO2e of nitrous oxide is released from nitrogen fertilization of soils (30% of it from nitrogen fixed by the crops themselves, not from industrially produced fertilizers). \* Most of the nitrogen fertilizer used on crops (89%) is used on corn (maize). About half of the corn produced in the US is fed to livestock, a large fraction to cattle, especially dairy cows. So about 50 million tonnes CO2e emissions associated with fertilizer use should be indirectly blamed on cows. \* (Another large fraction of corn is used to make ethanol as a motor fuel, indirectly causing the release of significant amounts of greenhouse gases in the corn production. But that's another story.) So cattle are responsible for about 3.5% of US greenhouse gas emissions, on a CO2 equivalent basis. To keep this in perspective: \* 2% of greenhouse gas production is in the form of methane from garbage decomposing in landfills. \* Roughly 2% is chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) from air conditioners, refrigerators and industrial processes. \* Other industrial processes (especially cement manufacture) produce about 2%. \* Burning jet fuel accounts for more than 3%. \* 12% of greenhouse gas emissions are CO2 emitted generating electricity which is used in residential applications like lighting, TVs, computers, and refrigerators. \* 17% came from burning gasoline in cars and trucks. **So cow farts and burps do contribute some to greenhouse gases, and thus to global climate change. But they are not a major cause**. Nonetheless, improvements in fertilizer use and waste management in agriculture could reduce the cow-related burden on our atmosphere.

### XT: Modeling

#### CO2 emissions will run away in the status quo—shale natural gas is the only effective alternative to coal—U.S. development is modeled globally and prevents extinction

**Riley 8/13**—BA, LL.M., PhD, professor of energy law at The City Law School at City University London (Alan, 8/13/12, “Shale Gas to the Climate Rescue,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/14/opinion/shale-gas-to-the-climate-rescue.html, RBatra)

The battle against runaway climate change is being lost. The green movement and the energy industry — while engaged in a furious debate on issues from nuclear power to oil sands — are missing the bigger picture. There is little recognition by either side that current policies to reduce carbon dioxide emissions are inadequate for dealing with the threat that they pose. It is the coal-fueled growth of countries like China and India that generates much of these emissions. Unless a cheap, rapidly deployable substitute fuel is found for coal, then it will be **next to impossible** to safely rein in rising carbon dioxide levels around the world. Although the green movement might at first see shale gas as an enemy in this fight, it may in fact turn out to be a friend. Broad development of shale gas resources — with proper ecological safeguards — could be the best way to achieve the quick cuts in carbon dioxide emissions that we need **to maintain a habitable environment** on Earth. The International Energy Agency has made it clear that, under current energy policies, the door is closing on our attempts to contain the carbon-driven rise in global temperatures to within 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 Fahrenheit) by the middle of the century. In fact, worldwide carbon dioxide emissions from burning fossil fuels reached a record high of 31.6 gigatons in 2011. With emissions rising by one gigaton per year, it appears the temperature-increase target will most likely be missed. The shale gas revolution could be the means of blunting the rise of carbon dioxide emissions and give new hope for staying within the 2 degrees Celsius scenario. This resource is widely dispersed across the planet, cheap to develop and offers many of the same energy benefits as coal. If exploited properly, it could replace coal within a couple of decades as a primary fuel. By developing shale gas as a replacement fuel for coal we retrieve the prospect of blunting — and possibly reversing — the upward climb of carbon dioxide emissions. Shale gas emits 50 percent less carbon dioxide than coal, and so if countries like China and India made the switch on a large scale, then we have a chance to reset the trajectory of global carbon dioxide emissions. A widespread turn to the use of shale gas would give the planet precious time to develop other, renewable solutions to further lower our output of carbon dioxide. Current renewable energy sources cannot in any way deliver the same savings in carbon emissions that we can achieve by replacing coal with shale gas. One only has to look to China to see the strong potential of this solution. With the world’s largest shale gas resources, the country has set out a vast gas development program in its latest five-year economic plan. Output would rise from 6.5 billion cubic meters of shale gas by 2015 to 100 billion cubic meters by 2020. And if China can produce that much by 2020, is there any reason to think it cannot pump out 800 billion cubic meters by 2030? Such a development program would be similar in scale to that undertaken in the United States, which has seen shale gas rise from 1 percent of gas production in 2001 to 37 percent last year. China can surely achieve these goals, especially given all the new technology available to the shale gas industry, along with abundant state capital. That the government is focusing its efforts in this direction is another reason to believe that China can reach these production levels. An output of 800 billion cubic meters a year — combined with far-higher levels of energy efficiency — would allow China to slow, and then terminate, its coal-expansion plans and ultimately end its reliance on coal-fired energy altogether. The United States could play **a key role** in encouraging China and other developing nations to switch from coal to shale gas. The State Department has launched a Global Shale Gas Initiative to facilitate the transfer of technical expertise to other countries to ensure safe development of this new resource. The United States could also **lead the way** in creating a **credible, alternative climate change strategy** in which the use of shale gas becomes the driver of **radical cuts in carbon dioxide emissions** over the short and medium term.

### XT: Transition

#### Natural gas transition solves renewables

**Huber, ’11** Energy Analyst at Energy Delta Institute (Jacob Huber, Energy Delta Institute, June 2011, “A Role for Natural Gas in the Pragmatic Transition to a Sustainable Energy System,” [www.energydelta.org/uploads/bestanden/c21f508d-b71c-40f3-a403-d082ec51ce93)//CC](http://www.energydelta.org/uploads/bestanden/c21f508d-b71c-40f3-a403-d082ec51ce93)//CC)

Renewables, despite recent rapid growth and development, still require time to scale from their current levels to a leading role in the provision of energy for humanity. They currently lack the flexibility necessary to optimize energy system efficiency in the near-term and scale to account for significant portion of primary energy in the medium-term. Natural gas is already well developed and integrated into the contemporary energy system but will additionally support the transition to a more efficient system in its new role. This role comes in the form of a flexible, clean, and reliable energy carrier in the supporting a sustainable energy transition based on renewables, energy efficiency, and clean fossil generation technology. Thus, although its function will evolve, natural gas has an increasing role to play in the provision of a sustainable energy supply for the continued advancement of humanity. inquiry

### AT: Methane Leakage

#### Leakage irrelevant – newest data proves

**Chronicle, 7/11** (Chronicle Online, Cornell University, “Natural gas is much-needed tool in battle to slow global warming, researcher says,” http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/July12/cathlesGas.html)//CC

▪ Although some critics of natural gas as a transition fuel have cited leakage rates as high as 8 percent or more of total production during drilling -- particularly hydraulic fracturing extraction -- more recent industry data and a critical examination of Environmental Protection Agency data supports leakage rates closer to 1.5 percent for both conventional and hydrofractured wells. § Marked 11:54 § ▪ Even at higher leakage rates, using natural gas as a transition to low-carbon energy sources is still a better policy than "business as usual" with coal and oil, due to the different rates of decay (and hence long-term global warming effect) of carbon dioxide released in greater amounts by burning coal and oil and any methane released during natural gas extraction.

### 2AC ASPEC

#### 1. No rez basis – rez just says USFG – any greater requirement is unpredictable and arbitrary and is not a T argument

#### 2. We meet their definition – the USFG is a government with 3 branches and we fiat the action of the actor

**Black’s Law Dictionary, 1990 (p. 695)**

In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to

administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.

#### 3. Infinite regression - Impossible to meet their interpretation of ASPEC – no agency is a unitary actor

#### 4. Cross ex checks - we’d specify then – that preserves negative ground

#### 5. You get all implementation and disad links – strategic cost – we can ultimately never specify in the 2AC which means we can’t spike links to the disad

#### 6. Not every important policy question is debatable – the debates distract the focus from core topic literature and hurts education even if implementation is important – agent counterplans are the worst form of debate

### 2AC T – Energy Production

#### We meet – the plan text says “production” – proves any definitions of this word are just solvency questions, not topicality ones

#### C/I – “restrictions on the production of natural gas” means land resctrictions

**NaturalGas.org, no date** (NaturalGas.org, no date given [website registered 2004], “Natural Gas Supply,” http://www.naturalgas.org/business/analysis.asp)//CC

In addition to the short term impediments to increasing natural gas supply, there exist other more general barriers to the increased supply of natural gas in the United States. These include: Land Access - The U.S. government owns more than 29 percent of all the land in the country, and an estimated 40 percent of undiscovered natural gas exists on this land. In several areas, the government has restricted access to federal lands. 59 percent of undiscovered gas resources are on federal lands and offshore waters. Outside of the western Gulf of Mexico, production companies are prohibited access to virtually all federal lands offshore the Lower 48 states. About 9 percent of resource-bearing land in the Rockies is also off limits, and access to another 32 percent is significantly restricted. The National Petroleum Council in 1999 estimated that 213 Tcf of natural gas exists in areas under federal access restrictions. This restriction is the result of presidential and congressional leasing moratoria, and affects the amount of natural gas resources that may be extracted to increase supply.

#### Counter-interpretation—primary energy includes extraction and reprocessing

Sara Øvergaard (Senior Executive Officer in the Department on Energy Statistics at Statistics Norway) September 2008 “Issue paper: Definition of primary and secondary energy” <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/londongroup/meeting13/LG13_12a.pdf>

In this paper we argue that a definition of primary and secondary energy should be founded on the laws of physics and be operational. The most important characteristics that distinguish primary from secondary energy are related to the processes undertaken to make use of the energy in the source or commodity. These processes are collection and extraction for primary energy and transformation for secondary energy. Other important aspects include that these processes are initiated by humans, and that they are undertaken for energy-purposes. For primary energy, as a staring point for discussion, we have a proposal for a new definition: “Primary energy is energy embodied in sources which involve human induced extraction or capture, that may include separation from contiguous matrial, cleaning or grading, to make the energy available for trade, use or transformation” and for secondary energy: “Secondary energy is energy embodied in commodities that comes from human induced energy transformation”

#### Solves limits

Kim Woodard (Research Assistant at the Resource Systems Institute of the East-West Center, Chairman and CEO of Javelin Investments) 1980 “The International Energy Relations of China” p. 457

Secondary energy production can most easily be defined as the conversion of one energy fuel to another. As such, it is a catch-all category that can be used to provide a cluster of statistical energy production series that do not easily fall into either primary production or energy consumption categories. The number and variety of secondary energy production statistics could be multiplied indefinitely by an ever sharper differentiation of substages in the flow of energy commodities through society. I have chosen co include just a few forms of secondary energy production in this analysis—coke production, thermal electric power generation, total electric power generation, total refined petroleum production, the differentiated production of petroleum fuels, plant use of energy in energy production, and the use of hydrocarbons in the production of petrochemical and fertilizer feedstocks. These were statistics that were available for the Chinese case or could be generated by inference from primary energy data and a few oversimplified assumptions. All the secondary energy production statistics presented in this section were generated by the computer and then rounded to a reasonable level of approximation. All the statistics presented for various forms of secondary energy production are general estimates, and none have been tested directly against whatever data exist in the Chinese press. Validation of the statistics would require separate in-depth analysis of each secondary energy production industry—a task far beyond the means of this book. These statistics, therefore, should be taken as a point of reference, not the final word.

#### Prefer our interpretation –

#### 1) They overlimit – production is impossible without locating a form of energy – drilling is inclusive in the overall process of transforming natural resources into energy sources – their interp limits out all natural gas affs, which gets rid of a major part of the resolution key to topic education

#### 2) Ground – the neg gets disads to stages of production – no ground loss, we fiat production

#### Their interp is arbitrary—transformation of natural resources is topical

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.

#### Not a voting issue – competing interpretations creates an incentive for the neg to arbitrarily exclude the aff – trades off with substantive debate

### 2AC Obama Good

#### Romney win – voter suppression

**Levine, 10/3**/12 – contributing editor of the Washington Monthly, (Art, Three Ways Romney Can Still Win the Election, Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/art-levine/can-democratic-convention_b_1860015.html>)

Even if these assorted voter intimidation and purging plans are just bluster or don't get fully implemented, they can still stoke fears among minority groups and drive down turnout: Mission Accomplished.

In Florida, the alleged GOP-paid registration scheme to, in part, submit erroneous, forged Democratic forms is a yet another sign of how eager Republican operatives are to force eligible voters off the rolls. Failing that, they'll settle for dubious challenges that will force Democratic-leaning voters to cast provisional ballots if their IDs don't match the information on the voting rolls. There's a good reason such ballots are also known as "placebo" ballots. In the 2008 election, only half of provisional ballots were counted in Florida, and with all the new change in Florida laws and rulings, nearly ten times as many provisional ballots -- 300,000 -- are expected to be cast, with similar potential for "chaos" and delays in such vital states as Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Virginia because of changed laws, elections experts say.

"It's a possibility of a complete meltdown for the election," Daniel Smith, a political scientist at the University of Florida, told the AP.

All these signs indicate that the relatively narrow margins favoring Obama in most national and battleground state polls don't seem to reflect the real-world conditions that could potentially lead to a surprise Romney victory. Even with some brand new polls showing President Obama widening his apparent lead in Ohio and Florida, Obama faces what investigative reporters Harvey Wasserman and Robert Fitrakis in their new book call a "gentleman's handicap" of five to ten percent. That's due to assorted fair voting barriers -- from new photo ID requirements and extensive voters purges to restricted early voting and flawed paperless voting machines and procedures --in most of the critical battleground states.

#### Eurozone action will outweigh the plan

**Weisenthal, 9/26**/12 - Prior to joining Business Insider in October 2008, Joe was a correspondent for paidContent.org, as well as the Opening Bell editor at Dealbreaker.com. He previously was a writer and analyst for Techdirt.com, and before that worked as an analyst for money management firm Prentiss Smith & Co (Joe, “We're Getting A Glimpse Of Barack Obama's Worst Nightmare” Business Insider, http://www.businessinsider.com/obamas-worst-nightmare-2012-9#ixzz289W0KygN)

This doesn't necessarily seem likely, but the latest turns and twists of the global economy open up a scenario whereby markets could get really ugly between now and the election.

Basically, we present a plausible scenario in which things get bad on two fronts. The scenario is based on developments over the last several days.

Here's how it could go:

First, Europe really stalls out.

Thanks to the political crisis in Spain, suddenly it's not clear if the ECB's powerful bond buying program will ever get off the ground.

Remember, the ECB has announced a plan to backstop government bonds, but it needs the countries to request aid and submit to outside fiscal supervision. Because of mass protests, and a burgeoning secession movement in Catalonia, Spanish PM Mariano Rajoy is very reluctant to ask for a bailout unless it's absolutely necessary. He'd like to delay the request as long as possible.

In addition, you have heightening squabbles over what will be done with Greece (raising the specter that it will leave the Eurozone). There are more and more reports about HUGE holds in the government's budget, and the various creditor parties are fighting about who will take the hit. The specter of Greece leaving the Eurozone is rising.

This could then start hitting markets in the US. Actually that already seems to be happening. The market's dropping. And now we no longer have an implied "put" from the Fed, since it's already blown its wad (or so it seems) with the announcement of open-ended QE.

Already, the market has been weak since QE3 was announced, and in particular, the oil & gas/basic materials stocks that people associate with reflation have been weak.

Those two sectors, which are supposed to rise on successful reflation, make up 2 out of 3 of the worst performing S&P sectors today.

This could be a nothing blip, but a series of weeks like this one (riots in Europe, which inevitably remind people about government debt) and markets in the US reacting badly could be the "October Surprise" that Romney needs to win.

#### There aren’t enough undecided voters to matter and they aren’t paying attention

**Silver, 10/4/12** – statistician (Nate, “Polls Show a Strong Debate for Romney” <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/04/polls-show-a-strong-debate-for-romney/?utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter>)

Second, head-to-head polls throughout the election cycle have been hard to influence for any reason. There are few undecided voters remaining — and undecided voters may be less likely than others to have actually watched the debates.

#### Link turn – polls prove the plan is overwhelmingly popular and is a major election issue – Gulf Spill irrelevant

**Dlouhy, 8/14** staff writer (Jennifer A Dlouhy, FuelFix, 14 August 2012, “Survey says voters back offshore drilling,” http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/08/14/survey-says-voters-back-offshore-drilling/)//CC

Roughly seven out of 10 voters support changing U.S. policy to allow more oil and natural gas development along the nation’s coastline, according to a new Harris Interactive poll released today. That matches the level of support for offshore drilling that was documented by other polls conducted before the Deepwater Horizon disaster two years ago briefly turned some Americans off to the idea. In the wake of the 2010 oil spill, support for offshore drilling declined slightly, according to some surveys. For instance, Rasmussen Reports found that 56 percent of U.S. voters it surveyed in July 2010 backed offshore oil drilling. The new survey of 1,016 registered voters, conducted Aug. 9-12, was commissioned by the American Petroleum Institute to broadly assess views about energy policy less than three months before the presidential election. Not surprisingly, 92 percent of the voters surveyed in the poll said “energy security and producing more oil and natural gas here at home” was somewhat or very important to them as they looked ahead to the election in November. Jack Gerard, president of API, told reporters in a conference call Tuesday that the poll shows “the vast majority” of Americans support boosting access to domestic oil and natural gas resources.

#### No link – expanding drilling gives Obama election cover

**Broder and Krauss, 5/23** political and business correspondents covering energy (John M. Broder and Clifford Krauss, The New York Times, 23 May 2012, “New and Frozen Frontier Awaits Offshore Drilling,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/science/earth/shell-arctic-ocean-drilling-stands-to-open-new-oil-frontier.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1&hp)//CC

But the president concluded that the reward was worth the risk, and created an unusual interagency group, overseen by Heather Zichal, who was an environmental adviser to the Obama campaign, to clear Shell’s path through the often fractious federal regulatory bureaucracy. Mr. Obama has long viewed offshore oil resources as insurance against global supply disruption as well as a component of an energy strategy that includes renewable sources, conservation and innovative technologies. ¶ The move also provides the president a measure of political cover. “Alaska tends to be a litmus test for the energy debate,” said Amy Myers Jaffe, director of energy policy research at Rice University. “When Romney says the president is anti-drilling and causes high gas prices, Obama can turn around and say, ‘I approved drilling in Alaska.’ ”

#### Obama support for natural gas now – new executive order

**Pentland, 8/30/12** – Contributor to Forbes (William, Forbes, “Obama's Energy Policy: 'All of the Above' Means 'All of the Above'”

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/williampentland/2012/08/30/obamas-energy-policy-all-of-the-above-means-all-of-the-above/>

Say what you will about the Democratic Party, President Obama is walking the chalk on his promise to pursue an “all of the above” energy policy for the United States.¶ In an Executive Order signed today, Obama ramped up federal support for combined heat and power (CHP) by calling for a “national goal of deploying 40 gigawatts of new, cost effective industrial CHP in the United States by the end of 2020.”¶ Amen to that.¶ CHP, also known as cogeneration, is a specific genre of distributed generation, which is sited at or near the point of consumption. Unlike other forms of DG, CHP is not a single technology but a suite of technologies that produce electricity and heat in an integrated process. The result of combining these processes in a single system is higher efficiency, lower emissions and greater productivity.¶ The vast majority of CHP systems rely on natural gas. This has created enormous political resistance to CHP amongst orthodox environmentalists and ideologically-deluded advocates of renewable energy. Despite strong support from groups like the American Council on An Energy Efficient Economy, the Obama administration has tended to treat CHP like the necessary evil of clean energy. Too compelling to ignore and too explosive to engage.

#### Fiat should be determined by the least restrictive means – currently congress is holding ‘pro forma’ sessions until the lame duck – NO legislative business can occur in them

Ramsey Cox (writer for The Hill) September 24, 2012 “Congress to hold pro forma sessions until November” http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/251313-congress-to-hold-pro-forma-sessions-until-november

Rather than being in recess for more than five weeks, both the Senate and the House decided to hold pro forma sessions until after the November elections. Both chambers will gavel in Tuesday morning for a brief session; typically, legislative business doesn't take place in pro forma sessions. At most members ask to be recognized for a speech, but rarely do. It is unclear if the legislative branch was afraid of recess appointments by the White House, yet both sides took a formal recess in August. The Senate will hold a pro forma session every Tuesday and Friday until Nov. 13 at 2 p.m. when they’ll continue work on S. 3525, the Sportsmen Act, which would increase access to federal land for hunters and fishers while also supporting conservation measures.

#### Israel cannot attack Iran

**PanArmenian 2/16** (2/16/12, “Armenian expert says Israel can’t strike Iran alone,” http://www.panarmenian.net/eng/news/94108/Armenian\_expert\_says\_Israel\_cant\_strike\_Iran\_alone, RBatra)

The European Union has not officially confirmed yet the information regarding suspension of Iranian oil export to 6 countries, according to Armenian political analyst.

“Iran is certain about sanctions against the Iranian oil import to harm the EU first. Iran has already started searching for new markets. For instance, oil supplies to India increased by 37%,” Roman Smbatyan told PanARMENIAN.Net

Dwelling on Israel’s stance on Iran issue and statements on possible strike on Iran, the expert noted that Iran has no potential for launch of hostilities by itself.

“Israel can’t attack Iran alone, without the U.S. assistance which currently faces complex situation as to forthcoming presidential elections and international financial crisis,” Mr. Smbatyan said.

#### Their authors have been wrong before

**Friedman 1/25**—associate editor at Foreign Policy (Uri, 1/25/12, <http://blog.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/25/whats_new_in_the_latest_speculation_over_whether_israel_will_attack_iran>, RBatra)

The New York Times Magazine is out today with a 7,585-word piece by Ronen Bergman on whether Israel will attack Iran. After speaking with top Israeli civilian, military, and intelligence leaders, the Israeli journalist arrives at a frightening conclusion: "Israel will indeed strike Iran in 2012."

Of course, we've heard this claim before. In August 2009, Micah Zenko warned at the Los Angeles Times that if Iran failed to respond to international proposals on its nuclear program by September, the "world should be prepared for an Israeli attack on Iran's suspected nuclear weapons facilities." In September 2010, the Atlantic's Jeffrey Goldberg noted that "one day next spring," Israeli officials might very well inform their U.S. counterparts that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu had dispatched fighter jets to strike Iranian nuclear facilities. John Bolton, the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, has repeatedly issued timelines regarding an Israeli strike on Iran. Anshel Pfeffer predicts an attack this spring.

#### Both candidates have same Iran policy

Aaron David Miller 12, scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center, “Barack O'Romney”, May 23, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/05/23/barack\_oromney

It's not only on these core assumptions that the candidates share a broad agreement. These principles translate into specific policies where it would be tough to tell the difference between a Romney and an Obama presidency: Iran: Sorry, I just don't see any significant difference between the way Obama is handling Iran's nuclear program and the way Romney might as president. § Marked 11:58 § And that's because there's seems to be an inexorable arc to the Iranian nuclear problem. If by 2013 sanctions and negotiations don't produce a sustainable deal and Iran continues its quest for a nuclear weapon, one of two things is going to happen: Israel is likely to strike, or we will. If it's the former, both Obama and Romney would be there to defend the Israelis and manage the mess that would follow. Both would be prepared to intercede on Israel's behalf if and when it came to that. As for a U.S. strike, it's becoming a bipartisan article of faith that the United States will not permit Iran to acquire a nuclear weapon. And both men are prepared to use military strikes against Iran's nuclear sites as a last resort, even if it only means a delay (and that's what it would mean) in Iran's quest for nukes.

### 2AC Heidegger

#### Plan focus best and no prior questions—focus on ontology makes it impossible to describe the world and act

David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitme

nts. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

#### Death precedes all other impacts – it ontologically destroys the subject and prevents any alternative way of knowing the world

**Paterson, 03** - Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, http://sce.sagepub.com)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unin- tentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81

In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### Turn—calculation’s inevitable – rejecting it just causes ideological fillin

**Fitzsimmons, 07** (Michael, Washington DC defense analyst, “The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning”, Survival, Winter 06-07, online)

But handling even this weaker form of uncertainty is still quite challeng- ing. If not sufficiently bounded, a high degree of variability in planning factors can exact a significant price on planning. The complexity presented by great variability strains the cognitive abilities of even the most sophisticated decisionmakers.15 And even a robust decision-making process sensitive to cognitive limitations necessarily sacrifices depth of analysis for breadth as variability and complexity grows. It should follow, then, that in planning under conditions of risk, variability in strategic calculation should be carefully tailored to available analytic and decision processes. Why is this important? What harm can an imbalance between complexity and cognitive or analytic capacity in strategic planning bring? Stated simply, where analysis is silent or inadequate, **the personal beliefs of decision-makers** **fill the void**. As political scientist Richard Betts found in a study of strategic sur- prise, in ‘an environment that lacks clarity, abounds with conflicting data, and allows no time for rigorous assessment of sources and validity, ambiguity allows intuition or wishfulness to drive interpretation ... The greater the ambiguity, the greater the impact of preconceptions.’16 The decision-making environment that Betts describes here is one of political-military crisis, not long-term strategic planning. But a strategist who sees uncertainty as the central fact of his environ- ment brings upon himself some of the pathologies of crisis decision-making. He invites ambiguity, takes conflicting data for granted and **substitutes a priori scepticism about the validity of prediction** for time pressure as a rationale for discounting the importance of analytic rigour. It is important not to exaggerate the extent to which data and ‘rigorous assessment’ can illuminate strategic choices. Ambiguity is a fact of life, and scepticism of analysis is necessary. Accordingly, the intuition and judgement of decision-makers will always be vital to strategy, and attempting to subordinate those factors to some formulaic, deterministic decision-making model would be both undesirable and unrealistic. All the same, there is danger in the opposite extreme as well. Without careful analysis of what is relatively likely and what is relatively unlikely, what will be the possible bases for strategic choices? A decision-maker with no faith in prediction is left with little more than a set of worst-case scenarios and his existing beliefs about the world to confront the choices before him. Those beliefs may be more or less well founded, but if they are not made explicit and subject to analysis and debate regarding their application to particular strategic contexts, they remain only beliefs and premises, rather than rational judgements. Even at their best, such decisions are likely to be poorly understood by the organisations charged with their implementation. At their worst, such decisions may be poorly understood by the decision-makers themselves.

#### Ontology is useless hocus pocus, cedes political

**Graham 99**- School of Communication Queensland University of Technology (Philip, Heidegger’s Hippies Sep 15 1999 http://www.geocities.com/SunsetStrip/Palms/8314/index.html)

To state their positions more succinctly: ‘Heraclitus maintained that everything changes: Parmenides retorted that nothing changes’ (Russell 1946: 66). Between them, they delineated the dialectical extremes within which the “problem of the subject” has become manifest: in the extremes of questions about ontology, the nature of “Being”, or existence, or ‘Existenz’ (Adorno 1973: 110-25). Historically, such arguments tend towards internalist hocus pocus:

The popular success of ontology feeds on an illusion: that the state of the intentio recta might simply be chosen by a consciousness full of nominalist and subjective sediments, a consciousness which self-reflection alone has made what it is. But Heidegger, of course, saw through this illusion … beyond subject and object, beyond concept and entity. Being is the supreme concept –for on the lips of him who says “Being” is the word, not Being itself –and yet it is said to be privileged above all conceptuality, by virtue of moments which the thinker thinks along with the word “Being” and which the abstractly obtained significative unity of the concept does not exhaust. (Adorno 1973: 69)

Adorno’s (1973) thoroughgoing critique of Heidegger’s ontological metaphysics plays itself out back and forth through the Heideggerian concept of a universalised identity –an essentialist, universalised being and becoming of consciousness, elided from the constraints of the social world. Adorno’s argument can be summed up thus: there can be no universal theory of “being” in and of itself because what such a theory posits is, precisely, non-identity. It obscures the role of the social and promotes a specific kind of politics –identity politics (cf. also Kennedy 1998):

Devoid of its otherness, of what it renders extraneous, an existence which thus proclaims itself the criterion of thought will validate its decrees in authoritarian style, as in political practice a dictator validates the ideology of the day. The reduction of thought to the thinkers halts the progress of thought; it brings to a standstill would thought would need to be thought, and what subjectivity would need to live in. As the solid ground of truth, subjectivity is reified … Thinking becomes what the thinker has been from the start. It becomes tautology, a regressive form of consciousness. (Adorno 1973: 128). Identity politics - the ontological imperative - is inherently authoritarian precisely because it promotes regression, internalism, subjectivism, and, most importantly, because it negates the role of society. It is simplistic because it focuses on the thingliness of people: race, gender, ethnicity. It tries to resolve the tension of the social-individual by smashing the problem into two irreconcilable parts. Identity politics’ current popularity in sociological thought, most well-evidenced by its use and popularity in “Third Way” politics, can be traced back to a cohort I have called Heidegger’s Hippies –the failed, half-hearted, would-be “revolutionaries” of the 60s, an incoherent collection of middle-class, neo-liberal malcontents who got caught up in their own hyperbole, and who are now the administrators of a ‘totally administered’ society in which hyperbole has become both lingua franca and world currency (Adorno 1964/1973 1973).

#### Extinction

Boggs ’97 (Carl Boggs, 1997 (National University, Los Angeles, The Great Retreat: Decline of the Public Sphere in Late Twentieth-Century America, http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/international.olde/mias/readings07/10.pdf.)

The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved - perhaps even unrecognized - only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases, technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impo-tence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites - an already familiar dynamic in many lesser-developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise - or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec-tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75

### 2AC CP

#### d) it’s predictable, individual agencies are legally treated as “the federal government”

**Words and Phrases, 2004** (Cummulative Supplementary Pamphlet, v. 16A, p. 42)

N.D.Ga. 1986. Action against the Postal Service, although an independent establishment of the executive branch of the federal government, is an action against the “Federal Government” for purposes of rule that plaintiff in action against government has right to jury trial only where right is one of terms of government’s consent to be sued; declining to follow Algernon Blair Industrial Contractors, Inc. v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 552 F.Supp. 972 (M.D.Ala.). 39 U.S.C.A. 201; U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 7.—Griffin v. U.S. Postal Service, 635 F.Supp. 190.—Jury 12(1.2).