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#### The aff is not a financial incentive for energy production

Book 11 [Managing Director, ClearView Energy Partners, LLC]

Kevin, Testimony before U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

SUBCOMMITTEES ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES AND OVERSIGHT, SEPTEMBER 22, http://waysandmeans.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Booktestimony922.pdf

Incentive cost ratios, implied abatement costs and implied displacement costs offer three possible ways to measure the performance of **federal financial incentives for energy production** and consumption. Metrics of this sort could be used to prioritize spending – dynamically, perhaps through a reverse auction – or through legislated formulas **that balance incentives for high-yield, low-cost sources with high-potential, emerging sources.** Fuels or technologies that consistently fall short of established benchmarks may require a different type of government financial intervention (e**.g. manufacturing assistance or pre-competitive R&D** in place of production **tax credits**) or a different mode of financial support (e.g. loan guaranteesinstead of tax credits **or deductions)**.

#### Procurement is not a financial incentive

Czinkota 2009 **-** Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69)

Financial incentives offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. Non financial incentives include guaranteed government purchases, special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

The advantage to our interp is limits- there are almost infinite incentives- only by limiting to financial incentives can the neg have any hope of keeping up with the number of mechanisms- they can procure for nearly any purpose- explodes the amount of negative prep that needs to be done

### DA

#### Uniqueness and issue specific spillover – military bases pursuing strong and collaborative local community relations now - key to solve land encroachment issues vital to military effectiveness - but energy siting decisions that cause local community backlash specifically spillover and undermine relationships

Boccuti, Faul and Gray, 12

Amanda Boccuti, GIS Support Analyst, Marstel-Day, LLC, providing analysis and GIS support for U.S. Marine Corps projects. Lauren Faul, Specializing in Strategic Communications Analyst, Marstel-Day, LLC, Her primary responsibilities entail the development of engagement plans for the U.S. Marine Corps which will provide them a framework to sustain the missions through community outreach and engagement. She has previously worked as a Communications Director on Capitol Hill and Congressional Liaison for the Marine Corps. Lauren Gray, Environmental Issues Researcher, Marstel-Day, LLC, offering research and analysis of environmental issues for encroachment control plans and communications, outreach and engagement strategies for the U.S. Marine Corps. Her primary focus areas include climate change effects and energy development, 5/21/12, http://engagingcities.com/article/establishing-creative-strategies-effective-engagement-between-military-installations-communi

Throughout the Nation’s history, military installations and ranges were historically established in undeveloped areas, except for those forts located to defend cities. Local communities developed near the installations for safety and economic reasons resulting in the installation being the up-to-that-point rural community’s primary economic engine. Routine communication between the installations and local communities were minimal because the installation was self-supporting and not subject to local laws and regulations. Communications were primarily social. Starting in the post-World War II era and accelerating as the 20th Century came to a close, installation-adjacent communities increased in both density and size – becoming less rural, more suburban or urban, and more economically diverse.¶ ¶ Military missions continue to evolve, incorporating new weapon platforms and training over larger areas and at all hours of the day and night. These changes in both surrounding communities and the installation missions have often lead to competing interests with respect to the economy, natural resource management, and land use. Military installations and local communities must, therefore, focus communication efforts on building partnerships to find mutually acceptable paths forward for resolving their competing interests. Developing collaborative relationships is imperative to turning otherwise conflicting interests into opportunities for mutually beneficial solutions. The nature of those interactions is defined by issue type, installation and community rapport, and available communication channels.¶ ¶ The four military services (i.e., Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force) have service-specific community engagement programs to develop partnerships; all four, however, conduct information sharing through the Public Affairs Office (PAO), which handles media and public relations. Three of the services – the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force – have established encroachment management policies that outline service responsibilities to establish, maintain, and sustain community relationships in order to reduce encroachment effects. This responsibility is usually assigned to a Community Plans and Liaison Office (CPLO) or an equivalent community planner. The CPLO and PAO work with their installation Commander to act as the military’s voice and point of engagement in the community through consistent messaging, establishing an installation presence in community forums, and planning community-engagement events and processes.¶ ¶ Though Department of Defense (DoD) mechanisms exist to develop community partnerships, mediating the different interests and priorities among military installations and their surrounding communities is a complex, nuanced process usually exercised by the services, through their installation leadership. Siting of renewable energy projects, environmental stewardship responsibilities, noise from training events, and other policy- and planning-related matters invoke difficult questions, such as: how can an installation and its surrounding communities concurrently pursue goals and development in a way that lead to mutual gain, obtaining threshold requirements and fair compromise? Finding interest nexuses and fostering an open, strong relationship in which those nexuses can be explored is key.

#### We have several links

#### Local community backlash - Even your solvency advocates admit the link is true and highly likely

Andres and Breetz 11Richard Andres, Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and a Senior Fellow and Energy and Environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic Research, Institute for National Strategic Studies, at the National Defense University, and Hanna Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Small Nuclear Reactorsfor Military Installations:Capabilities, Costs, andTechnological Implications, www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/StrForum/SF-262.pdf

Small reactors used on domestic military bases are ¶ likely to face a number of additional siting hurdles. As a ¶ distributed energy source, they are likely to face substantial “not-in-my-backyard” battles. Moreover, dispersing a ¶ large number of reactors leads to questions about longterm nuclear waste disposal.¶ 27¶ Arguably, reactors should be ¶ relatively safe on domestic military installations, certainly ¶ more secure than, for instance, the reactors situated in developing countries or intended for processing tar sands. ¶ Nevertheless, no issue involving nuclear energy is simple. ¶ Institutional and technical uncertainties—such as the security of sealed modules, the potential and unintended ¶ social and environmental consequences, or the design of ¶ reliable safeguards—make dispersing reactors across the ¶ country challenging. Some key issues that require consideration include securing sealed modules, determining how ¶ terrorists might use captured nuclear materials, carefully ¶ considering the social and environmental consequences of ¶ dispersing reactors, and determining whether Permissive ¶ Action Links technology could be used to safeguard them

#### plan sends critical signal of isolation to both local community and base officials - Military bases prioritizing community integration now

Parthemore and Rogers, 10 Christine Parthemore, Will Rogers, Center New American Security, 5/20, <http://www.cnas.org/node/4502>

Are small nuclear reactors a smart choice for increasing energy security and reducing greenhouse gas emissions at federal government facilities? In recent months this has become a hot question in particular at domestic U.S. military installations, which must meet unique energy needs while reducing their carbon footprints.¶ Now, it appears that this question is taking Capitol Hill by storm as well.¶ The media have reported that Tennessee Sen. Lamar Alexander (R) is proposing a joint Department of Energy/Department of Defense demonstration project to examine the use of small reactors on federal sites. For some Department of Energy sites, such as Oak Ridge National Lab in Alexander’s home state — a site certainly accustomed to housing nuclear technology — demonstrating new nuclear reactor technology is largely a no-brainer. However, using nuclear reactors to power the nation’s defense installations warrants deeper consideration.¶ Proponents of boosting this carbon-free energy source on military bases argue that these installations have unique capacities that would ease concerns over its use, namely more gates and more armed guards already on base 24/7. Likewise, the U.S. military services have unique energy security needs. Consistent energy supplies are a critical component of America’s ability to train at home and to operate globally. Energy is so important that some analysts are even exploring “islanding” the energy systems on some military installations to reduce vulnerabilities related to their reliance on often brittle domestic electric grids. Consideration of nuclear energy as part of these islanding concepts is on the rise.¶ On the other hand, opponents contend that sufficient numbers of military base personnel may not have the requisite training in nuclear reactor management, oversight and regulatory credentials to attend to reactors in the round-the-clock manner necessary. In most cases, additional qualified personnel and improved physical security and safety requirements would be needed. As with all nuclear power generation, materials proliferation, water usage, radioactive waste management and public opinion will also be major concerns.¶ Most military bases also strive to be integrated into their surrounding communities, and, by our experience, many base officials consider integrated electric infrastructure an important point of connection between local and military needs. Concepts for nuclear energy generation solely to supply military bases must be sensitive to what public perceptions could be in the event of extended blackouts for surrounding communities.¶ Any legislation to consider the option of small nuclear reactors on military bases must include examination of these important concerns.

#### Impact - strong local community relations key to buffering agreements that solve land encroachment – vital to military effectiveness and biodiversity protection

Powledge, 2008 Fred Powledge, writer and editor, Fred Powledge is the author of seventeen books and scores of magazine articles and reports. Powledge's articles have appeared in dozens of publications, including The New Yorker, Audubon, BioScience, and many others. They draw on his extensive experience as a journalist, which includes reporting as a staff member of The New York Times, the Atlanta Journal, and the Associated Press. He has served as a consultant to agricultural research institutions in Colombia, Peru, Sri Lanka, and Italy. He has contributed to biennial editions of World Resources, which is an authority on global environmental and development issues, and to several encyclopedias. Most recently, Fred Powledge has been the author of articles in the journal BioScience on a variety of important environmental subjects, .http://www.dodbiodiversity.org/ch10/Chapter.10.Partnerships.pp144-153.pdf

Buffering has become an important buzzword in military-community relations.¶ At most installations, civilian development and population growth make it highly¶ unlikely that the base itself can be enlarged, even though modern weaponry and¶ training techniques need expanded space. Thus was born the buffering idea.¶ 4¶ The Army led this movement in the nineteen-nineties by acquiring conservation easements on lands around Fort Bragg, North Carolina, that were suitable habitat for¶ the red-cockaded woodpecker.¶ 5¶ The Army eventually expanded and formalized¶ this strategy into the Army Compatible Use Buffer Program (acub).¶ The Marine Corps followed soon after by acquiring easements on land adjacent to its Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, also in North Carolina. In 2003,¶ the Department of Defense broadened the buffering idea to allow military departments (in the words of a dod document) to:¶ enter into an agreement with a state or private entity to limit development or property use that¶ is incompatible with the mission, to preserve habitat, or to relieve anticipated environmental¶ restrictions that would restrict, impede, or interfere with military training, testing, or operations on the installation.

### CP

#### The United States Federal Government should provide substantial market-fixed production cost incentives for energy production of small modular nuclear reactors and provide full funding and support to the NRC for expedited review of licensing issues related to small modular reactors.

#### Production cost incentive key- Incentivizes fast learning in advanced factory manufacturing which is necessary for commercialization

Rosner and Goldberg 2011 (Robert Rosner, astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, and Stephen Goldberg, Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.”, Technical Paper, Revision 1, November 2011)

Production Cost Incentive: A production cost incentive is a performance-based incentive. With a production cost incentive, the government incentive would be triggered only when the project successfully operates. The project sponsors would assume full responsibility for the upfront capital cost and would assume the full risk for project construction. The production cost incentive would establish a target price, a so-called “market-based benchmark.” Any savings in energy generation costs over the target price would accrue to the generator. Thus, a production cost incentive would provide a strong motivation for cost control and learning improvements, since any gains greater than target levels would enhance project net cash flow. Initial SMR deployments, without the benefits of learning, will have significantly higher costs than fully commercialized SMR plants and thus would benefit from production cost incentives. Because any production cost differential would decline rapidly due to the combined effect of module manufacturing rates and learning experience, the financial incentive could be set at a declining rate, and the level would be determined on a plant-by-plant basis, based on the achievement of cost reduction targets.43 The key design parameters for the incentive include the following:¶ 1. The magnitude of the deployment incentive should decline with the number of SMR modules and should phase out after the fleet of LEAD and FOAK plants has been deployed.¶ 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly.¶ 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit.

### K

#### The affirmative’s takes part in the naturalization of the military as the optimal mode of politics- this creates a Clauswitzian political sphere where war is the only political choice

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

These stratocratic controls of planetary human activity reveal more than the ideology of a single administration; they are an extension of what we can now see as the complete devotion to an apparatus that captures all cultural and political energies in terms of what Clausewitz defined as "policy." The original state of "emergency" as defined by the Bush Administration in the wake of the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks has been naturalized and sedimented as to become a fundamental starting point of human existence. Consequently, understanding the full intensity of the age of militariality requires more than the common critical awareness of Clausewitz's central doctrine: "War is merely the continuation of policy by other means" (28). It requires first an understanding that for Clausewitz, war is the very ontological basis of human existence, a basis that transcends culture, history and temporality. War defines the very structure of human subjectivity, a juridico-natural "code of law" that is "deeply rooted" in a people, an army, a government: "war is a paradoxical trinity—composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy" (30). Clausewitz assigns a constituency to each of the registers of this trinity: "The first of these…mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government" [End Page 143] (30). In a totalizing problematic organized according to the idea of war serving as the basis of human existence, the people of a nation are equated with that of a blind primordial force of violence: "the first," which refers to "primordial violence, hatred, and enmity" identifies the people living in the nation. "Government" therefore names that entity constituted for the exclusive purpose of controlling its unstable citizenry by reorienting the energies of the people towards warfare. This reorientation lays the groundwork and delineates the horizon of human creativity, and determines the single legitimized space of freedom: the army, where the "creative spirit is free to roam." The space of instability, of chance, which is the condition for the possibility of creativity, enters into the war-footing picture of reality only on this register of militarized human activity. This connection here is not a matter of association; military activity defines the very essence of freedom and human creativity. The army and its state are not defined in this picture in traditional terms of democracy, protection, and service to a people. Nor are they the a sign of the discourse of biopower, for biopower has its eyes on the productivity of a population and functions according to a general administration of life that, although affecting "distributions around a norm," still invites and produces a certain amount of heterogeneity (Foucault 266). The army and the state are instead named as the necessary foundational machinic force that determines the war footing constitution of humanity, ensuring that all its energies are channeled in a single direction: "The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people" (Clausewitz 31). The government and the army, in fact, only arise and become increasingly indispensable as the movement of humans through history becomes more "civilized" and "intellectually developed": "In any primitive, warlike race, the warrior spirit is far more common than among civilized peoples. It is possessed by almost every warrior: but in civilized societies only necessity will stimulate it in the people as a whole, since they lack the natural disposition for it" (45). This explains the constant disdain for "intellectuals," for they are understood to be part of the general problem of the so-called civilizing process, the "general intellectual development of a given society" (45, italics in original). This intellectual development is a double-edged sword for Clausewitz and the war-footing polity. On the one hand Clausewitz must have access to at least a modicum of classificatory procedures, otherwise he would not be able to establish the lesser other whose constitution makes possible the essential act of war. On the other hand the non-primitive human consciousness must acquire "appropriate gifts of intellect and temperament" and not be distinguished by "great power(s) of meditation" (44, 48). Instead what is needed is "mental force," a "firmness" of opinion that does not waver: "We say a man has strength of character, or simply has character, if he sticks to his convictions….Such firmness cannot show itself, of course, if a man keeps changing his mind" (54, [End Page 144] emphasis in original).11 This affects the realm of knowledge production as well, for "Knowledge in war is very simple"; and a "high degree of education" simply leads to "ridiculous pedantry" (96, 95, emphasis in original). It is not that life and the political have collapsed in the total politicization of life, as Agamben argues, or not solely. This collapse is only one of the outcomes of the total militarization of the biopolitical settlement, of the bios. The civil bios has no role in this problematic; it does not even exist. In this characterization war, and not biopower, becomes the very basis of the political: "war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse"; "The political object is the goal, war is the means of reaching it" (28, 29). We can see the full manifestation of Clausewitz's polity as war in the truth-statements of militariality advocates. "Step 8" of War Footing, is clear: "Wage Political Warfare" (136). A month after 9/11 Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld launched the Office of Strategic Influence (OSI). The OSI is "a component of a broader, government-wide strategic communications campaign, specifically [designed] to assist government agencies in crafting policy regarding the military aspects of information operations" (139). The program was shut down, but its advocates make it clear that it should be revived as soon as possible, on the grounds that its tight connection between information and militarization can bring about the planned unidirectional metaphysical orientation of warfare with greater speed than any other approach. Militariality sets up a program for direct political warfare and stands that against the "far more limited effort known as 'public diplomacy'": "even when they are well conceived and well executed...public diplomacy strategies will be a long-term effort. This is in their nature, given the reliance they place on such instruments as international media programming, exchange visits of political and cultural figures, humanitarian and development assistance, training future leaders, and so forth. Such efforts take years....And we do not have the luxury of time" (141). The suggestions for a plan of action include the immediate execution of a political warfare strategy, the drafting of legislative vehicles for political warfare, the strengthening of CIA clandestine services, the housing of the primary responsibility for political warfare in the Department of Defense, and the direct use of the Internet as a tool of political warfare (143–145). The consequences to be drawn from all of this are severe. Information in the post-9/11 state of constant "emergency" generated by the government of the Bush administration and its war footing organizations must now be identified as organizing not only the general political arrangement of life but the greater and more amorphous register of civil existence as well. It is in this sense that we are witnessing the creation of a new World Stratocratic Picture, a new totality, one that has its telos in the total control of the totality (the subtext of the above passage concerning diplomacy is its dependency on an actual engagement with an international community, a dependency that violates the [End Page 145] unilateral orientation adhering to the decision-making process of the military polity). In the creation of a totality capable of being totally controlled the indissoluble connection between the political and the civil changes dramatically. It can no longer be said that the civil is indirectly tied to the political. The line between the two may never have been solid, but in the "state of exception," which installs a justification for acting "outside the normal order" of a democratic polity, sites of human production, knowledge, information, media reports, entertainment, the Internet, defense, militarization, representation, and human consciousness itself, all flow in and out of one another so as to confuse any possibility of making clear distinctions between them. The political regime, progressively acting directly on the civil register, diminishes the civil register to the point of its eventual erasure. With the erosion of the civil register it becomes clearer that metamilitarization appears increasingly as an essential technique of the polity rather than an exceptional measure. A war footing philosophy thus becomes the very constitutive paradigm of remaining popular civil institutions such as the media and film production. Sound bite culture is only one sign of this.

#### The impact is extinction – Military control of nuclear power causes interlocking decision mechanisms that make nuclear war seem rational

Byrne and Toly 2006 (John Byrne, Head of the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, a leading institution for interdisciplinary graduate education, research, and advocacy in energy and environmental policy, Distinguished Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University of Delaware, 2007 Nobel Peace Prize for his work on the IPCC, and Noah Toly, Director of the the Urban Studies and Wheaton in Chicago programs, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse,” p. 1-32)

From climate change to acid rain, contaminated landscapes, mercury pollution, and biodiversity loss, the origins of many of our least tractable environmental problems can be traced to the operations of the modern energy system. A scan of nightfall across the planet reveals a social dila that also accompanies this system’s operations: invented over a century ago, electric light remains an experience only for the socially privileged. Two billion human beings—almost one-third of the planet’s population—experience evening light by candle, oil lamp, or open fire, reminding us that energy modernization has left intact—and sometimes exacerbated—social inequalities that its architects promised would be banished (Smil, 2003: 370 - 373). And there is the disturbing link between modern energy and war. 3 Whether as a mineral whose control is fought over by the powerful (for a recent history of conflict over oil, see Klare, 2002b, 2004, 2006), or as the enablement of an atomic war of extinction, modern energy makes modern life possible and threatens its future. With environmental crisis, social inequality, and military conflict among the significant problems of contemporary energy-society relations, the importance of a social analysis of the modern energy system appears easy to establish. One might, therefore, expect a lively and fulsome debate of the sector’s performance, including critical inquiries into the politics, sociology, and political economy of modern energy. Yet, contemporary discourse on the subject is disappointing: instead of a social analysis of energy regimes, the field seems to be a captive of euphoric technological visions and associated studies of “energy futures” that imagine the pleasing consequences of new energy sources and devices. 4 One stream of euphoria has sprung from advocates of conventional energy, perhaps best represented by the unflappable optimists of nuclear power 12 Transforming Power who, early on, promised to invent a “magical fire” (Weinberg, 1972) capable of meeting any level of energy demand inexhaustibly in a manner “too cheap to meter” (Lewis Strauss, cited in the New York Times 1954, 1955). In reply to those who fear catastrophic accidents from the “magical fire” or the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a new promise is made to realize “inherently safe reactors” (Weinberg, 1985) that risk neither serious accident nor intentionally harmful use of high-energy physics. Less grandiose, but no less optimistic, forecasts can be heard from fossil fuel enthusiasts who, likewise, project more energy, at lower cost, and with little ecological harm (see, e.g., Yergin and Stoppard, 2003). Skeptics of conventional energy, eschewing involvement with dangerously scaled technologies and their ecological consequences, find solace in “sustainable energy alternatives” that constitute a second euphoric stream. Preferring to redirect attention to smaller, and supposedly more democratic, options, “green” energy advocates conceive devices and systems that prefigure a revival of human scale development, local self-determination, and a commitment to ecological balance. Among supporters are those who believe that greening the energy system embodies universal social ideals and, as a result, can overcome current conflicts between energy “haves” and “havenots.” 5 In a recent contribution to this perspective, Vaitheeswaran suggests (2003: 327, 291), “today’s nascent energy revolution will truly deliver power to the people” as “micropower meets village power.” Hermann Scheer echoes the idea of an alternative energy-led social transformation: the shift to a “solar global economy... can satisfy the material needs of all mankind and grant us the freedom to guarantee truly universal and equal human rights and to safeguard the world’s cultural diversity” (Scheer, 2002: 34). 6 The euphoria of contemporary energy studies is noteworthy for its historical consistency with a nearly unbroken social narrative of wonderment extending from the advent of steam power through the spread of electricity (Nye, 1999). The modern energy regime that now powers nuclear weaponry and risks disruption of the planet’s climate is a product of promises pursued without sustained public examination of the political, social, economic, and ecological record of the regime’s operations. However, the discursive landscape has occasionally included thoughtful exploration of the broader contours of energy-environment-society relations. As early as 1934, Lewis Mumford (see also his two-volume Myth of the Machine, 1966; 1970) critiqued the industrial energy system for being a key source of social and ecological alienation (1934: 196): The changes that were manifested in every department of Technics rested for the most part on one central fact: the increase of energy. Size, speed, quantity, the multiplication of machines, were all reflections of the new means of utilizing fuel and the enlargement of the available stock of fuel itself. Power was dissociated from its natural human and geographic limitations: from the caprices of the weather, from the irregularities that definitely restrict the output of men and animals. 02Chapter1.pmd 2 1/6/2006, 2:56 PMEnergy as a Social Project 3 By 1961, Mumford despaired that modernity had retrogressed into a lifeharming dead end (1961: 263, 248): ...an orgy of uncontrolled production and equally uncontrolled reproduction: machine fodder and cannon fodder: surplus values and surplus populations... The dirty crowded houses, the dank airless courts and alleys, the bleak pavements, the sulphurous atmosphere, the over-routinized and dehumanized factory, the drill schools, the second-hand experiences, the starvation of the senses, the remoteness from nature and animal activity—here are the enemies. The living organism demands a life-sustaining environment. Modernity’s formula for two centuries had been to increase energy in order to produce overwhelming economic growth. While diagnosing the inevitable failures of this logic, Mumford nevertheless warned that modernity’s supporters would seek to derail present-tense 7 evaluations of the era’s social and ecological performance with forecasts of a bountiful future in which, finally, the perennial social conflicts over resources would end. Contrary to traditional notions of democratic governance, Mumford observed that the modern ideal actually issues from a pseudomorph that he named the “democratic-authoritarian bargain” (1964: 6) in which the modern energy regime and capitalist political economy join in a promise to produce “every material advantage, every intellectual and emotional stimulus [one] may desire, in quantities hardly available hitherto even for a restricted minority” on the condition that society demands only what the regime is capable and willing to offer. An authoritarian energy order thereby constructs an aspirational democracy while facilitating the abstraction of production and consumption from non-economic social values. The premises of the current energy paradigms are in need of critical study in the manner of Mumford’s work if a world measurably different from the present order is to be organized. Interrogating modern energy assumptions, this chapter examines the social projects of both conventional and sustainable energy as a beginning effort in this direction. The critique explores the neglected issue of the political economy of energy, underscores the pattern of democratic failure in the evolution of modern energy, and considers the discursive continuities between the premises of conventional and sustainable energy futures.

#### The alternative is to reject the affirmative. This rejection opens up spaces to create discourses alternative to the American exceptional military project

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

All of these transformations owe their existence, of course, to a long and complex history that cannot be articulated in the space available here. The cords of militariality extend back to a number of historical developments in ontological thought, judiciary systems, agricultural reorganizations, sovereign displacements, national reterritorializations, economic restructurings, and the colonial expansions that have generated today's international community. These cords are more difficult to see than those present in the stratocracy itself—one fact of militariality's character that opens a pathway for a real awareness of its increasing excessiveness and thus the potential for resistances to develop across ethnic, religious, and national lines. The paradox of militariality's strength and simultaneous fragility is precisely this visible excessiveness, which is part of its self-destructive essence. The greater problem is in some sense the development of a general awareness of those previously-existing discourses of modern liberal humanism that so easily establish, time and again, the stratocratic polities of the modern era. Even so, the visible nature of these cords of militariality—its direct daylight attacks on and incarcerations of foreign and domestic constituencies, its fully mediatized legal signings, its denouncements of the educational system and the international community—should not be understood as lacking in power. Any criticism of militariality will need to take into consideration the heavy economic, material, and faith-based investments in its project and continual existence. These investments hide the stratocracy's hysterization of the [End Page 147] polity with the general concept of necessity: it is necessary to take this action because we are under attack.12 But, if it still can be said that democracy owes its existence to the kind of interrogative thinking that challenges the unrelenting necessities forced on human existence, then it may come to be known that necessity will be the end of democracy, and the constabularies of militariality the architects of this end.

### China Adv

#### Pivot is not inevitable-China is peacefully developing- efforts to contain China cause backlash

Etzioni 2012 [Amitai Etzioni served as a senior advisor to the Carter White House; taught at Columbia University, Harvard and The University of California at Berkeley; and is a university professor and professor of international relations at The George Washington University June 14, 2012 The National Interest “Obama's Asia 'Bluff'” http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/obamas-asia-bluff-7051]

When a leading expert on military affairs recently told a Brookings Institution meeting that President Obama’s much-touted pivot to Asia was “a bluff,” I considered the statement way off the mark. But since then, I have concluded that there is indeed less to Obama’s grand change in strategy than meets the eye. In fact, the pivot makes little sense. This suggests that one ought to look for domestic explanations.¶ The media points to the drawdown of American troops in the Middle East (particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan) and their increase in the Far East as exhibit one of the realignment of American military forces called for by the pivot. Actually, the new commitment to Asia is minuscule. The press refers to new deployment of 2,500 Marines in the region, but only 250 troops have actually arrived to date. The remainder are not expected to arrive for years. Furthermore, even when in full force—some say ten years from now—the Marines will add little to the 55,442 troops already stationed in the Asia-Pacific region at the end of last year, mostly in Japan (36,708), Guam (4,272) and afloat (13,618).¶ Defense Secretary Leon Panetta announced in early June that there also will be a shift in U.S. naval forces. While until now the United States has divided its warships roughly equally between the Atlantic and the Pacific, the Pacific will now host 60 percent of the fleet, albeit of a smaller fleet.¶ However, Panetta stressed that it will “take years for these concepts, and many of the investments we are making, to be fully realized.” There also will be more frequent visits by the American warships in Asian ports, and some ships will be berthed in Singapore, which is sure to delight the sailors and some local professionals but otherwise not matter much.¶ More significant is the question of what role these forces will play in the region. Obviously, our troops—even as augmented with a few Marines—are not meant to engage in any forthcoming military confrontation with China, with its constantly expanding and increasingly modernized army consisting of 2,285,000 active troops.¶ Nor is there any sign that China seeks a military confrontation with the United States. Although China’s military capacity is expanding, even the most hawkish American observers do not think China could stage such a confrontation for at least a decade. Moreover, that the Marines will be located 2,600 miles away from China reveals they are not meant to serve as a tripwire, which would entail placing them on the beaches of Taiwan or at the island chains contested in the South China Sea.¶ Military analysts will argue that these moves are not meant to provide a substantial realignment of military assets but rather to send a message. But as moviemaker Samuel Goldwyn famously quipped, “If you want to send a message, use Western Union.” Using troops does send a message—but is it one we wish to send?¶ Both Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski strongly favored heightened U.S. attempts to engage China as a partner in maintaining global order and urged “co-evolution” with China rather than attempts to contain it. There remains plenty of time to turn to military moves if China refuses to become a responsible stakeholder in the international order. True, China has made several rather assertive claims in the South China Sea, but these have almost uniformly involved laying claims as a starting point for negotiations. The United States may feel that it ought to support countries close to China, such as Vietnam, Malaysia and the Philippines, so that they will not risk being bullied by the rising global power. However, this can be accomplished through treaties, trade and aid without resorting to the present U.S. strategy of militarizing the conflict.¶ Why then the military “pivot to Asia”? It does make sense as one part of an election-year campaign, designed to deprive the GOP of one of its favorite and winning claims: that Democrats are weak on foreign policy. The more American voters concentrate on the Far East—in which no war looms and we can act as tough as we want without facing short-term consequences or exorbitant expenditures—the more they might be distracted from the shambles in Afghanistan and the resurgence of Al Qaeda in Yemen and Somalia. Hence, the better the world looks.¶ Mitt Romney’s hawkish statements about China and Russia suggest the Democrats are not the only ones seeking to play this card. Both sides should note, though, that the message is being received. China is likely to respond in kind by further accelerating its military buildup and repositioning some of its own forces. Indeed, it may well deepen its already considerable military ties with Pakistan. The notion that the United States could bankrupt China by involving it in an arms race, as Reagan did to speed the disintegration of the Soviet Union, is fanciful given that the United States is in more dire economic straits than is China and that China can invest in next-generation cyber weapons, space arms and antiship missiles without straining its economy.

#### Asia pivot is seen as containment- causes China to build up more

Glaser 2012 [Bonnie S. Glaser senior fellow with the ¶ Freeman Chair in China Studies at CSIS, where ¶ she works on issues related to Chinese foreign and ¶ security policy. Prior to joining CSIS, she served as ¶ a consultant for various U.S. government offices, ¶ including the Departments of Defense and State. ¶ Ms. Glaser has written extensively on Chinese threat ¶ perceptions and views of the strategic environment ¶ and on China’s foreign policy 2012 “Pivot to Asia: Prepare for Unintended Consequence” Center for Strategic and International Studies http://csis.org/files/publication/120405\_GF\_Final\_web-sm.pdf]

The Obama administration’s initial policy in ¶ 2009 raised fears in many Asian capitals of a ¶ G2 condominium that would make decisions ¶ over the heads of others. Those concerns were ¶ unwarranted and short lived. Beijing interpreted ¶ the U.S. approach as weakness, which, along ¶ with China’s economic success and America’s ¶ struggles, led to a year of Chinese hubris that ¶ manifested itself in a series of intimidating ¶ actions in China’s neighborhood. Subsequent ¶ entreaties by regional states to counterbalance ¶ China increased U.S. attention to the Asia-Pacific ¶ region. Now, the U.S. Asia “pivot” has prompted ¶ Chinese anxiety about U.S. containment and ¶ heightened regional worries about intensified ¶ U.S.-China strategic competition.¶ In the run-up to the leadership transition that will ¶ take place at China’s 18th Party Congress this fall, ¶ Beijing is inwardly focused and unlikely to act on ¶ its fears. However, 2013 could see a shift in Chinese ¶ foreign policy based on the new leadership’s ¶ judgment that it must respond to a U.S. strategy ¶ that seeks to prevent China’s reemergence as a ¶ great power.¶ Signs of a potential harsh reaction are already ¶ detectable. The U.S. Asia pivot has triggered ¶ an outpouring of anti-American sentiment in ¶ China that will increase pressure on China’s ¶ incoming leadership to stand up to the United ¶ States. Nationalistic voices are calling for military ¶ countermeasures to the bolstering of America’s ¶ military posture in the region and the new ¶ U.S. defense strategic guidelines. For example, ¶ an article published in China’s Global Times, a ¶ jingoistic newspaper owned by the Communist ¶ Party mouthpiece People’s Daily, called for China ¶ to strengthen its long-range strike capabilities.

#### Containment causes China relations collapse- the pivot is largely symbolic so there is no deterrent benefit

Carpenter 2011 [Ted Galen Carpenter Senior fellow for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, is the author of eight books on international affairs November 30, 2011 The National Interest “Washington’s Clumsy China Containment Policy” http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/washington%E2%80%99s-clumsy-china-containment-policy-6202]

Those moves, along with previous efforts to strengthen cooperative military ties with other traditional allies such as South Korea and Japan and one-time U.S. adversaries such as Vietnam, have all the earmarks of a rather unsubtle containment policy directed against China. It is a foolish strategy that will complicate and perhaps permanently damage the crucial U.S.-China relationship. Perhaps even worse, it is a containment strategy that is long on symbolism and short on substance, thereby managing to be simultaneously provocative and ineffectual.¶ Take the U.S. decision to send 2,500 Marines to Australia. It is hard to imagine a scenario in which such a small deployment would be militarily useful. If there is a security contingency somewhere in East Asia, it is likely to be decided by air and naval power, not a meager force of Marines. Yet, while militarily useless, such a deployment conveys a hostile message to Beijing, thereby managing to antagonize the Chinese.¶ A similar conclusion is warranted with regard to the Obama administration’s transparent effort to revitalize the nearly moribund alliance with the Philippines. That chronically misgoverned, third-rate military power would hardly make a good security partner in any crisis. Yet by siding with a country that is deeply embroiled with China over territorial claims in the South China Sea, the United States once again appears to be going out of its way to antagonize Beijing.¶ That would be an ill-advised approach under the best of circumstances. But to embrace a containment policy—especially one that is primarily bluster and symbolism—when Washington badly needs China to continue funding the seemingly endless flow of U.S. Treasury debt verges on being dim-witted. It’s never a good idea to anger one’s banker. And one can assume that Beijing is watching U.S. actions, not just the pro-forma assurances that the United States wants good relations and does not regard China as a threat. Those assurances ring increasingly hollow, and one can assume that Chinese leaders will react accordingly. That does not bode well for the future of the U.S.-China relationship.

#### U.S.-China relations key to global warming cooperation – key to global solution.

Kenneth G. Lieberthal, Visiting Fellow @ Foreign Policy and David B. Sandalow, Senior Fellow @ Foreign Policy, 9-23-2009, Overcoming Obstacles to U.S.-China Cooperation on Climate Change, The Brookings Institution, http://www.brookings.edu/ reports/2009/01\_climate\_change\_lieberthal\_sandalow.aspx

Opportunities for collaboration in fighting climate change are plentiful, but moving forward at the scale needed will require high-level political support in two very different societies, each with considerable suspicion of the other. This report recommends ways to win such support and sustain it for the long term. Chapter 1 of the report provides a primer on two topics: climate change and U.S.-China relations. It describes the climate change threat, concluding that every year of delay in responding to it puts both countries—and the planet—at greater risk. Because the United States and China are the world’s top two greenhouse gas emitters, together accounting for more than 40% of annual emissions, **any solution requires both countries** to transition to low-carbon economies. U.S.-China cooperation on climate change would have **not only bilateral but global benefits**.

#### Warming causes extinction

Sify ’10 [Sydney newspaper citing Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at University of Queensland and Director of the Global Change Institute, and John Bruno, associate professor of Marine Science at UNC (Sify News, “Could unbridled climate changes lead to human extinction?” ]

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of greenhouse gases are driving irreversible and dramatic changes in the way the oceans function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. The findings of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' emerged from a synthesis of recent research on the world's oceans, carried out by two of the world's leading marine scientists. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is further evidence that we are well on the way to the next great extinction event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly if the trend continues. The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added. The 'fundamental and comprehensive' changes to marine life identified in the report include rapidly warming and acidifying oceans, changes in water circulation and expansion of dead zones within the ocean depths. These are driving major changes in marine ecosystems: less abundant coral reefs, sea grasses and mangroves (important fish nurseries); fewer, smaller fish; a breakdown in food chains; changes in the distribution of marine life; and more frequent diseases and pests among marine organisms. Study co-author John F Bruno, associate professor in marine science at The University of North Carolina, says greenhouse gas emissions are modifying many physical and geochemical aspects of the planet's oceans, in ways 'unprecedented in nearly a million years'. 'This is causing fundamental and comprehensive changes to the way marine ecosystems function,' Bruno warned, according to a GCI release.

#### Regional regimes solve their offense- ensures no arms race

Joseph M. Parent Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami. Paul K. Macdonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College. Nov/Dec 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6 Foreign Affairs “The Wisdom of Retrenchment” Ebsco

Asia is also ready for a decreased U.S. military presence, and Washington should begin gradually withdrawing its troops. Although China has embarked on an ambitious policy of military modernization and engages in periodic saber rattling in the South China Sea, its ability to project power remains limited. Japan and South Korea are already shouldering greater defense burdens than they were during the Cold War. India, the Philippines, and Vietnam are eager to forge strategic partnerships with the United States. Given the shared interest in promoting regional security, these ties could be sustained through bilateral political and economic agreements, instead of the indefinite deployments and open-ended commitments of the Cold War.

#### No impact to Malacca shutdown – trade will quickly re-route

Eugene Gholz (an associate professor of public affairs at the University of Texas at Austin) Daryl G. Press (an associate professor of government at Dartmouth College) Harvey M. Sapolsky (a professor of public policy and organization at MIT) and Benjamin H. Friedman (research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute) Fall 2009 “Restraining Order: For Strategic Modesty” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/articles/2009-Fall/full-Sapolsky-etal-Fall-2009.html

If there is trouble in the Strait of Malacca, ships will quickly reroute through the nearly-as-convenient Straits of Lombok or Makassar. If disruptions abroad make it harder to sell U.S. bicycles in Korea, manufacturers will sell them in Portugal. Because of globalization, the United States depends more on access to the global economy as a whole but depends less on any specific economic relationship. The oil market seems to stand out as an exception. Disruptions to oil supply routinely cause huge price spikes and painful adjustments. But the danger of oil disruptions does not require that Washington police the Middle East; rather, the United States ought to retain large stockpiles of oil and other critical materials. The U.S. government has already amassed approximately 700 million barrels of oil. If you add the stockpiles in the European Union, Japan, South Korea, and China, the total for the industrialized world is approximately 1.5 billion barrels of oil. And those are only government-controlled stocks; most analysts believe private holdings exceed official stockpiles. When one compares these massive reserves against plausible disruptions, government-controlled stockpiles alone count as more than sufficient to maintain global supply. The extreme flexibility of the global economy adds to restraint’s appeal as a strategy for the United States. The global economy is not a rigid chain with links that must be protected. It is a flexible, constantly changing web that needs no global policeman to direct its traffic

### Heg Adv

#### Grid resilient- Even worst case scenario it doesn’t hurt the military

Lewis 2010 (James Andrew Lewis, senior fellow and director of the Technology and Public Policy Program CSIS, March 2010, “The Electrical Grid as a Target for Cyber Attack,” http://csis.org/files/publication/100322\_ElectricalGridAsATargetforCyberAttack.pdf)

This conclusion is different from the strategic consequences on a cyber attack on the power grid. The United States routinely suffers blackouts. The nation does not collapse. In the short term, military power and economic strength are not noticeably affected - a good example for opponents to consider is Hurricane Katrina, which caused massive damage but did not degrade U.S. military power in or even long-term economic performance. Is there any cyber attack that could match the hurricane?¶ The United States is a very large collection of targets with many different pieces making up its electrical infrastructure. While a single attack could interrupt service, the large size and complexity of the American economy make it more resilient. Even without a Federal response plan, the ability of electrical companies to work quickly together to restore service is impressive and we should not underestimate the ingenuity of targets to recover much more rapidly than expected. This is a routine occurrence in aerial bombing: impressive damage is quickly rectified by a determined opponent.

#### No energy cut off for the military

Alic 2012 (John Alic, professor at John Hopkins, March 2012, “Defense Department Energy Innovation: Three Cases,” online)

The Energy Information Administration expects the 12 members of OPEC, which account for some 70 percent¶ of estimated world reserves, to pump slightly more than 40 percent of world oil production over the next several¶ decades.c U.S. oil imports will remain high. At the same time, supplies have become more diversified since the¶ 1970s, and the OPEC cartel weaker. Canada now ships more oil to the United States than does any other nation¶ (followed by Mexico, and only then Saudi Arabia). Domestic output has crept upward in recent years. All these¶ factors tend to argue against a repetition of unexpectedly sudden supply constrictions. So does the dependence of¶ many exporting states on oil revenues as a prop to internal security, by buying off political opponents or buying¶ weapons to suppress them.¶ To some observers, common sense nevertheless seems to imply that dependence on imported oil weakens the¶ U.S. economy, and by extension national security, given that military power depends, if indirectly, on the size¶ and composition of a nation’s economy. These extrapolations from dependence on imported oil to some sort of¶ larger national vulnerability have little foundation in empirically grounded understanding of either economic¶ affairs or military security. Within the analytical framework of economics, weakness and strength are problematic¶ notions, lacking an accepted basis in quantitative measures; governments collect statistics on output, income,¶ and productivity, not “strength.” Trade deficits, furthermore, are usually taken to be derivative of savings and¶ investment, viewed as the fundamental forces driving a nation’s balance of payments. The implication of this more¶ or less standard view is that a reduction in U.S. imports of oil (e.g., from greater domestic output), would simply¶ lead to a rise in imports of other goods and services. Third, the relationships between economic performance and¶ military strength are loose. The Soviet Union, after all, managed to remain a superpower for decades by steering a¶ large share of economic output to its military.¶ The implications of oil imports for U.S. security interests, then, seem oblique.

#### Heg doesn’t solve war

Barbara Conry (former associate policy analyst, was a public relations consultant at Hensley Segal Rentschler and an expert on security issues in the Middle East, Western Europe, and Central Asia at the CATO Institute) and Charles V. Pena (Senior Fellow at the Independent Institute as well as a senior fellow with the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, and an adviser on the Straus Military Reform Project at the CATO Institute) 2003 “47. US Security Strategy” CATO Handbook for Congress, http://www.cato.org/pubs/handbook/hb108/hb108-47.pdf

Another rationale for attempting to manage global security is that a world without U.S. hegemony would soon degenerate into a tangle of chaos and instability, in which weapons proliferation, genocide, terrorism, and other offensive activities would be rampant. Prophets of such a development hint that if the United States fails to exercise robust political and military leadership today, the world is condemned to repeat the biggest mistakes of the 20th century—or perhaps do something even worse. Such thinking is seriously flawed. First, instability in the international system is nothing new, and most episodes do not affect U.S. vital interests. Furthermore, to assert that U.S. global leadership can stave off otherwise inevitable global chaos vastly overstates the power of any single country to influence world events. Indeed, many of the problems that plague the world today, such as civil wars and ethnic strife, are largely impervious to external solutions. There is little to back up an assertion that only Washington’s management of international security can save the world from political, economic, or military conflagration.

### Water

#### Nuclear power can’t solve world shortages- nuclear desal doesn’t work and consumes even more water.

Smith, 11 (Gar, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War, June, edited by Ernest Callenbach, NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE, International Forum on Globalization series focused on False Solutions, <http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear_Roulette_book.pdf>, p. 30)

By 2025, 3.5 billion people will face severe fresh-water shortages. Nuclear proponents¶ groping for justifications to expand nuclear power have argued that the waste heat from power¶ plants can provide a “cheap and clean” solution to the inherently costly process of removing¶ salt from seawater. Desalination plants (there are 13,080 worldwide, mostly oil- and gas-fired¶ and mostly in wealthy desert nations) already produce more than 12 billion gallons of drinkable¶ water a day.¶ 153¶ The first nuclear desalinator was installed in Japan in the late 1970s and scores¶ of reactor-heated desalination plants are operating around the world today.¶ But nuclear desalination is another False Solution.The problem with atomic water-purifiers is¶ that using heat to treat seawater is an obsolete 20¶ th¶ -century technology.Thermal desalination¶ has given way to new reverse osmosis systems that are less energy intensive and 33 times cheaper¶ to operate.¶ 154¶ Nuclear desalination advocates claim that wind, solar, and wave power aren’t up¶ to the task while new low-temperature evaporation technology may be able to produce highpurity water at temperatures as low as 122° Fahrenheit.¶ 155¶ Promoting reactors as a solution to¶ the world’s water shortage is especially ludicrous since nuclear power plants consume more¶ water than any other energy source.¶ 156¶ Even proponents admit there is a potential risk that running seawater through a radioactive¶ environment might contaminate the drinking water produced.¶ 157¶ Undeterred, scientists in¶ Russia and India have proposed anchoring small atom-powered water-plants offshore near¶ densely populated coastal cities. But this would provide no relief for the billions of people¶ living inland in water-starved regions of North Africa and Asia.¶ Desalination is merely a way of giving a marginal new purpose to existing reactors whose¶ balance sheets would be improved if they were retrofitted with desalination chambers.As with¶ power generation, so with desalination: efficiency in water use (better irrigation technology,¶ crop selection, eliminating transit losses, etc.) beats new production.¶ A real solution to the growing global water shortage needs to address the increasing amount¶ of water diverted to wasteful agricultural and industrial practices and concentrate on preventing¶ the water from being contaminated in the first place—by, among other things, capping the¶ size of local populations to match locally available water supplies.

#### Can’t export tech – so can’t solve countries like India, Pakistan, etc.

**Platts 10-1**-12 [Platts is a leading global provider of energy, petrochemicals and metals information, and a premier source of benchmark price assessments for those commodity markets, “Export reform needed to increase US nuclear market share: NEI,” <http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/ElectricPower/6666149>]

Export controls on technology related to nuclear power should be reformed to allow US companies to capture a larger share of growing international markets, the Nuclear Energy Institute said Monday. The US Department of Commerce estimates the world market for nuclear power technology, fuel and related services and equipment at "upwards of" $750 billion over the next 10 years, Richard Myers, vice president for policy development, planning and supplier programs at NEI, said at a press conference Monday in Washington to release a report the US nuclear power industry commissioned on the topic. "It is a myth that the US nuclear supply chain has disappeared," Myers said. Most manufacturing of large "heavy metal" components for nuclear power plants, such as reactor vessels, is now done in Asia, but many US firms manufacture "precision components" for the nuclear industry and would stand to benefit from increased ability to compete with other countries, Myers said. US licensing and regulatory reviews of nuclear exports, however, are "unduly burdensome," have confusing "layers of jurisdiction" shared by at least four federal agencies, and typically take at least a year to complete, "months longer" than reviews in other exporter countries, he said. As a result, the US export control regime is "far more complex and more difficult to navigate ... than comparable regimes in other nations," Myers said. The report prepared by the law firm Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman for NEI said that "US agencies should be able to increase the efficiency of their license processing through stronger executive branch procedures. By signaling to potential customers that US exports may be licensed on a schedule comparable to those of foreign export control regimes, such an improvement could significantly 'level the playing field' for US exporters in the near term." Many such reforms can be accomplished "administratively," without the need for legislation, James Glasgow, a partner at Pillsbury who specializes in nuclear export law, said during the press conference. The US Department of Energy is currently amending some of its export regulations, known as the Part 810 rule, and reforming that rule could provide significant opportunities to US exporters, Glasgow said. Unfortunately**,** some of DOE's proposed revisions to the rule go in the wrong direction, adding regulatory requirements and hurdles, Myers said. Some potential customers for US nuclear exports see DOE's Part 810 review as "the choke point" for an order, and "sometimes that's an evaluation criterion" for deciding whether to buy from a US firm, Glasgow said. In such situations, delay in the review can be "the functional equivalence of denial" of permission for the export because the buyer looks elsewhere, he said.

#### No China – Russia annexation conflicts for resources.

Brian Dunn TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 04, 2012 Is China's Threat to Russia a Myth?

<http://thedignifiedrant.blogspot.com/2012/09/is-chinas-threat-to-russia-myth.html>

So is the threat of Russia losing their Far East to China a false threat?¶ The balance of forces in the Far East has shifted away from Russia. The populations on either side of the border give China a huge advantage in numbers. Russian raw materials are needed by China. And China ultimately believes those lands were stolen from China. ¶ Yet the trend of Chinese settlers moving in to Russia's Far East has apparently ended and reversed:¶ With the Soviet collapse of 1991 a fading memory, fears that a rising China might colonize and eventually annex the east are scoffed at by local experts - even if Moscow occasionally plays up the perceived threat to Russia's territorial integrity.¶ "We still face the task of defending our far eastern territory from excessive expansion by citizens of bordering states," Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev intoned at a cabinet meeting last month after returning from a trip to Vladivostok, where he opened the Russky Island bridge to traffic.¶ "There are fewer Chinese here than there were 10 years ago," replied sinologist Viktor Larin, adding that low-paid jobs were now being taken by migrant laborers from former-Soviet Central Asia and nearby North Korea. The Chinatowns of Russia's far east had all but disappeared, he said, as migrants were lured home by economic growth rates more than twice as high as Russia's.¶ The contrast on each side of the border is stark, the Chinese territories booming and drawing in ever more workers while the Russian Far East struggles with the drift westwards.¶ China's more than 1.3 billion population needs Russia's Siberian and far eastern natural resources, the oil, the minerals and timber , and "it's cheaper to buy them than to fight for them," said Larin.¶ "They don't need to settle here."¶ Fears China might occupy swathes of Russia's eastern territory were, he said, a "collective, subconscious myth".¶ It's interesting that the settlers have reversed the post-Soviet trend. That lessens the threat of creeping annexation as Russians lose ground in the cities and towns of the region.¶ I'm going to have to look for information on this to revise my thinking on the Far East as a potential Chinese threat to Russia.

#### Best studies disproves their speculation about water conflict escalation

**Weinthal studies Rengosh ’11** (Routledge Handbook of Global Public Health Associate Professor of Environmental Policy Environmental Sciences & Policy PhD Political Science, Columbia University, 1998 MPhil Political Science, Columbia University, 1994 MA Political Science, Columbia University, 1993 BA Government and Environmental Studies, Oberlin College, 1989 Weinthal's experience lies in environmental policy, international environmental institutions, the political-economy of the resource curse, water cooperation and conflict, and environmental security.

By the end of the twentieth century, it was thus widely assumed that water scarcity would be a driver of conflict between nation states, especially in the arid regions of MEN A. World leaders such as former UN secretary-general, Boutros Boucros-Ghali, famously warned, 'the next war in the Middle East will be fought over water, not polities' (Vesilind 1993: 53). The Economist, furthermore, predicted in 1999 that \*[w]ith 3,5 billion people affected by water shortages by 2050, conditions are ripe for a century of water conflicts'. The empirical evidence, however, has yet to support such prophecies. Rather, when it comes to water resources at the interstate level, cooperation is much more ubiquitous. The historical record shows that states rarely if ever go to war over water; in parsing more than 1,800 state-to-state water interactions in trans-boundary basins between 1946 and 1999, Wolf et al. (200.3) demonstrated that none have led to formal war.

#### No military capacity – internal capacity to de-escalate overwhelms your links

Steven A. Cook (fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) Ray Takeyh (fellows at the Council on Foreign Relations) and Suzanne Maloney (senior fellow at Saban Center) June 28 2007 “Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast”, International Herald Tribune

Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else’s fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, the region has also developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.

#### They have no empirical data – history disproves escalation – squo coping mechanisms solve

Paul Cochrane (Middle East correspondent for International News Services) January 31, 2011 “The Middle East: On the edge of the abyss?”

Countless times I've read analysis and the blurb on the back of books that the Middle East is ‘on the brink’, a ‘tinderbox’ ready to explode due to the nepotistic nature of governments and the dire economic conditions of much of the region. Now more than ever, these predictions look like they may be coming true - a dictatorial regime has fallen in Tunisia and another is tottering in Egypt. Some of these analyses have predicted the imminent fall of the Middle East's regimes and monarchies for the past four decades. A Middle East ‘spring’ was just around the corner, the people would rise up and the region's overwhelmingly authoritarian regimes would no longer have their days in the sun. Democracy would prevail. There have certainly been many coups, the overthrow of kings and dictators, and - of course - wars since the region was cookie-cut into separate countries through the fall of the Ottoman Empire, before and after World War One. But that tinder box never exploded. It didn't happen after the 1967 or 1973 wars between Arab states and Israel; it didn't happen after the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran; it didn't happen following the 1990-91 Second Gulf war or the 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq; and it didn't happen after the July 2006 war between Israel and Lebanon's Hezbollah. The sparks that could have ignited the tinderbox were diffused, snuffed out by the internal security forces and outside meddling, and the malaise continued. But it would seem that these analyses forecasting the Middle East's imminent explosion were premature. It has taken until now for the people to stand up en masse and say ‘kifaya’, ‘enough’ in Arabic - enough of high unemployment, corruption, cronyism, repression, phony elections, lousy education and low standards of living.

#### Water scarcity prevents wars- especially true with Indo-Pak

**Alam ‘2** (Questioning the water wars rationale: a case study of the Indus Waters Treaty Geographical Journal, The, Dec, 2002 by Undala Z. Alam

**Despite bellicose statements, even at the highest levels, India and Pakistan persisted in negotiating over the Indus basin**. This suggests that **though statements made by key decisionmakers in public may suggest a move towards war**, the statements are used to generate domestic support for a political position. As seen in the Indus basin, the political rhetoric did not match the governments' actions **which sought to resolve an international water dispute through cooperation**. **In winter 2001-2002, against a backdrop of deteriorating Indo-Pakistan relations, notably the attack on the Indian parliament in December 2001,** statements were made in India that it would unilaterally abrogate the Indus Waters Treaty (Dawn 2001 2002a; The Tribune 2002). Despite considerable discussion within the Indian and Pakistani press, the Permanent Indus Commission, set up as part of the Treaty, met for the 37th time in New Delhi on 29 May 2002 for three days (Dawn 2002b; The Hindu 2002; The Indian Express 2002; Paukert 2002). **This can be seen as a clear indication of the countries commitment to the Treaty despite statements** by senior decisionmakers and speculation in the press. The experience from the Indus basin, therefore, throws into question whether public statements made for a domestic audience are truly indicative of a country's intent to go to war over shared waters. Conclusion The water wars rationale would suggest that India and Pakistan should have gone to war over the Indus basin. Despite water scarcity, competitive use, Pakistan's absolute dependency upon the basin and the wider dispute involving a series of issues including Kashmir, **the two countries cooperated instead**. With the good offices of the World Bank, India and Pakistan negotiated the Indus Waters Treaty over a period of nine years, signing it in September 1960. The principal explanation for this Indo-Pakistan cooperation is based upon the finances that the Treaty brought with it in the Indus Basin Development Fund. However, the financial explanation is inadequate, as it does not explain why the countries cooperated over nine years so that there was a treaty to finance. Nor does it explain the repeated negotiations for the temporary ad hoc agreements that supplied water to Pakistan during the larger negotiations for a comprehensive agreement. An alternative explanation is that **India and Pakistan cooperated because it was water rational. In other words, cooperation was needed to safeguard the countries' long-term access to shared water.** This suggests that the issues of water scarcity, competitive use and a wider conflict do not necessarily lead to war, **since war cannot guarantee a country's water supply in the long term.**

#### Deterrence prevents India/Pakistan conflict

Tepperman 2009 (Jonathan Tepperman, Deputy Editor at Newsweek Magazine and former Deputy Managing Editor of Foreign Affairs, September 14, 2009, Newsweek, September 14, 2009, Lexis Academic)

The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it.

#### No China – Russia annexation conflicts for resources.

Brian Dunn TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 04, 2012 Is China's Threat to Russia a Myth?

<http://thedignifiedrant.blogspot.com/2012/09/is-chinas-threat-to-russia-myth.html>

So is the threat of Russia losing their Far East to China a false threat?¶ The balance of forces in the Far East has shifted away from Russia. The populations on either side of the border give China a huge advantage in numbers. Russian raw materials are needed by China. And China ultimately believes those lands were stolen from China. ¶ Yet the trend of Chinese settlers moving in to Russia's Far East has apparently ended and reversed:¶ With the Soviet collapse of 1991 a fading memory, fears that a rising China might colonize and eventually annex the east are scoffed at by local experts - even if Moscow occasionally plays up the perceived threat to Russia's territorial integrity.¶ "We still face the task of defending our far eastern territory from excessive expansion by citizens of bordering states," Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev intoned at a cabinet meeting last month after returning from a trip to Vladivostok, where he opened the Russky Island bridge to traffic.¶ "There are fewer Chinese here than there were 10 years ago," replied sinologist Viktor Larin, adding that low-paid jobs were now being taken by migrant laborers from former-Soviet Central Asia and nearby North Korea. The Chinatowns of Russia's far east had all but disappeared, he said, as migrants were lured home by economic growth rates more than twice as high as Russia's.¶ The contrast on each side of the border is stark, the Chinese territories booming and drawing in ever more workers while the Russian Far East struggles with the drift westwards.¶ China's more than 1.3 billion population needs Russia's Siberian and far eastern natural resources, the oil, the minerals and timber , and "it's cheaper to buy them than to fight for them," said Larin.¶ "They don't need to settle here."¶ Fears China might occupy swathes of Russia's eastern territory were, he said, a "collective, subconscious myth".¶ It's interesting that the settlers have reversed the post-Soviet trend. That lessens the threat of creeping annexation as Russians lose ground in the cities and towns of the region.¶ I'm going to have to look for information on this to revise my thinking on the Far East as a potential Chinese threat to Russia.

## 2NC

### 2NC Limits Overview

#### That is almost limitless

Leos 2007 [Leonard Leos ¶ Paul Rouleau ¶ Mark Wadsworth ¶ June 2007 Naval Post Graduate School MBA PROFESSIONAL REPORT ¶ “Budget Scoring of Alternative Financing¶ Methods for Defense Requirements” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473232]

Alternative financing consists of almost any financing option or combination of ¶ options that can be used in lieu of conventional full-funding. The private sector has ¶ metrics such as profit or stock price that help motivate corporate executives in their ¶ selection of the most beneficial financing method for their company. Without these ¶ incentives, the federal budget process remains a delicate balance between agency needs ¶ and Congressional control of the purse. Current scoring guidelines are designed to ¶ provide the decision-makers in Congress with the most informative representation of ¶ current and future government obligations. The legislation also has the effect of biasing ¶ full-funding versus other forms of financing. Yet, in certain situations, the needs and ¶ resources of the government can be combined with the capabilities of the private sector to ¶ form a partnership that is beneficial to both parties. Public-private Partnerships represent ¶ the most practical financing method available that harnesses these capabilities and ¶ addresses the needs of the DoD.

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

#### Turns their offense—limits are vital to creativity and innovation

David Intrator (President of The Creative Organization) October 21, 2010 “Thinking Inside the Box,” http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities. What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution. This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally. Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

### A2: Webb

#### They do not meet their own counter-interp- alternative financing includes PPP’s means they don’t have to use cash

Leos 2007 [Leonard Leos ¶ Paul Rouleau ¶ Mark Wadsworth ¶ June 2007 Naval Post Graduate School MBA PROFESSIONAL REPORT ¶ “Budget Scoring of Alternative Financing¶ Methods for Defense Requirements” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473232]

PPPs can be used by the government to affordably take advantage of an ¶ underutilized asset, benefiting from private-sector expertise, or leverage private-sector ¶ financing in the short-term to acquire a public asset. Leasing may only be small part of ¶ the PPP. In some cases, the government may benefit from the revenue a leased asset ¶ generates rather than benefit from the use of an asset—serving as the lessor rather than ¶ the lessee (CBO, 2003, p. 26). Unfortunately, the Budget Committees, OMB and CBO ¶ are typically conservative in their scoring of these arrangements and typically do not ¶ discount the inherent benefits of these contracts from the overall budget authority ¶ assigned to the contract. The result is up-front budget authority scoring for the project, ¶ which may exclude the legislation from being passed. In Case Study Number One, ¶ various alternative financing strategies involving governmental housing and buildings ¶ will be examined for potential applications to finance military capital acquisitions. In ¶ another Case Study, share-in-savings contracts will be examined utilizing the Energy ¶ Savings Performance Contracts case. Together, these case studies will demonstrate how ¶ current scoring guidelines are used to score alternative financing arrangements based ¶ solely on the financial obligation without sufficient regard to the program’s benefits.

#### In fact most likely they will barter for the power

Leos 2007 [Leonard Leos ¶ Paul Rouleau ¶ Mark Wadsworth ¶ June 2007 Naval Post Graduate School MBA PROFESSIONAL REPORT ¶ “Budget Scoring of Alternative Financing¶ Methods for Defense Requirements” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473232]

In a 2003 study by the GAO, PPPs were identified as the most prevalent ¶ ¶ alternative financing method, with over 54 different agreements in existence within U.S. 16¶ ¶ agencies (GAO, 2003, August). PPPs are a particularly popular alternative-financing ¶ ¶ technique for the DoD due to their great flexibility and ability to apply private-sector ¶ ¶ capital and expertise to public needs and resources. In this symbiotic relationship, each ¶ ¶ party benefits from its participation in the partnership. The government is unable to be ¶ ¶ the most efficient provider of all necessary services and equipment items for the public ¶ ¶ sector. OMB Circular A-76 acknowledges this reality and provides guidelines with which ¶ ¶ to outsource public requirements to the private sector and promote efficiency (OMB, ¶ ¶ 2003). In some cases, adaptable technologies or industrial capacity already exist in the ¶ ¶ private sector that could address the requirements of the military. A PPP can be formed ¶ ¶ to exploit these opportunities in a manner conventional full-funding procurement cannot. ¶ ¶ Despite the efficiencies of PPPs, the scoring of PPP legislation has become ¶ ¶ increasingly conservative—limiting the flexibility originally granted by statuary authority ¶ ¶ to several Federal agencies. The CBO and OMB believe that Federal agencies are using ¶ ¶ special purpose public-private ventures as a way to access private capital without ¶ ¶ triggering lease-purchase guidelines and to avoid recording obligations up-front in their ¶ ¶ budgets. This section will discuss these concerns and other scoring issues using several ¶ ¶ examples from the DoD’s privatization of military housing and the VA’s enhanced-use ¶ ¶ lease authority. ¶ ¶ The majority of PPPs involve the Federal Government’s real property or other ¶ ¶ underutilized assets that can be developed, revitalized, or managed by the private sector. ¶ ¶ The key element of a PPP is that the government possesses some non-monetary asset that ¶ ¶ has value to the private sector. In a typical fully funded contract, the government must ¶ ¶ set aside funds sufficient to cover all obligations in the first year of the project. In PPP ¶ ¶ agreements, the government is able to barter an asset or use existing conditions in lieu of ¶ ¶ full payment to reduce their obligations. These assets can include loan guarantees, longer ¶ ¶ lease terms, debt issuance, guaranteed minimum rates of occupancy, or even the transfer ¶ ¶ of the asset at the completion of the lease term. Figure 1 depicts the wide degree of ¶ ¶ versatility of PPP contracts in managing responsibility throughout the life of an asset.

### 2NC Grammar DA

#### ‘for energy production’ is an adjectival phrase- it must modify the financial incentive

Rozakis 2003 [Laurie E. Rozakis, Ph.D. Excerpted from The Complete Idiot's Guide to Grammar and Style © 2003 “Prepositional Phrases: The Big Daddy of Phrases” http://www.infoplease.com/cig/grammar-style/prepositional-phrases-big-daddy-phrases.html]

When a prepositional phrase serves as an adjective, it's called an adjectival phrase. (That was a no-brainer, eh? Who says you don't get a break in this English biz?)¶ An adjectival phrase, as with an adjective, describes a noun or a pronoun. Here are some examples:¶ The manager with the pink slips terrorized the employees.¶ The adjectival phrase “with the pink slips” describes the noun “manager.”¶ The price of the promotion was much too steep.¶ The adjectival phrase “of the promotion” describes the noun “price.”¶ Something in the corner of the desk was moving.¶ The adjectival phrase “in the corner” describes the noun “something”; the adjectival phrase “of the desk” describes the noun “corner.”

### A2: Waxman

#### Contextual definitions bad – intent to define outweighs

Eric Kupferbreg (University of Kentucky, Senior Assistant Dean, Academic & Faculty Affairs at Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies Associate Director, Trust Initiative at Harvard School of Public Health) 1987 “Limits - The Essence of Topicality” http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Kupferberg1987LatAmer.htm

Often, field contextual definitions are too broad or too narrow for debate purposes. Definitions derived from the agricultural sector necessarily incorporated financial and bureaucratic factors which are less relevant in considering a 'should' proposition. Often subject experts' definitions reflected administrative or political motives to expand or limit the relevant jurisdiction of certain actors. Moreover, field context is an insufficient criteria for choosing between competing definitions. A particularly broad field might have several subsets that invite restrictive and even exclusive definitions. (e.g., What is considered 'long-term' for the swine farmer might be significantly different than for the grain farmer.) Why would debaters accept definitions that are inappropriate for debate? If we admit that debate is a unique context, then additional considerations enter into our definitional analysis.

### A2: Reasonability

#### Or nuclear powered subs

O'Rourke 2012 [Ronald O'Rourke ¶ Specialist in Naval Affairs ¶ April 2, 2012 Congressional Research Service “Navy Virginia (SSN-774) Class Attack ¶ Submarine Procurement: Background and ¶ Issues for Congress” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL32418.pdf]

The Navy’s proposed FY2013 budget requests $3,217.6 million in procurement funding to ¶ ¶ complete the procurement cost of the 17¶ ¶ th¶ ¶ and 18¶ ¶ th¶ ¶ Virginia (SSN-774) class nuclear-powered ¶ ¶ attack submarines. The FY2013 budget estimates the combined procurement cost of these two ¶ ¶ boats at $5,107.9 million, and the ships have received a total of $1,890.3 million in prior-year ¶ ¶ advance procurement (AP) and Economic Order Quantity (EOQ) funding. The Navy’s proposed ¶ ¶ FY2013 budget also requests $874.9 million in AP funding for Virginia-class boats to be procured ¶ ¶ in future years. The Navy’s proposed FY2013 budget defers the scheduled procurement of one ¶ ¶ Virginia-class boat from FY2014 to FY2018. ¶ ¶ The two Virginia-class boats requested for procurement in FY2013 are the final two in a group of ¶ ¶ eight covered by a multiyear procurement (MYP) arrangement for the period FY2009-FY2013. ¶ ¶ The Navy this year is requesting congressional approval for a new MYP arrangement that would ¶ ¶ cover the next nine Virginia-class boats scheduled for procurement in FY2014-FY2018 (in annual ¶ ¶ quantities of 1-2-2-2-2). ¶ ¶ The Department of Defense (DOD) announced in January 2012 that it wants to build Virginiaclass boats procured in FY2019 and subsequent years with an additional mid-body section, called ¶ ¶ the Virginia Payload Module (VPM), that contains four large-diameter, vertical launch tubes that ¶ ¶ the boats would use to store and fire additional Tomahawk cruise missiles or other payloads, such ¶ ¶ as large-diameter unmanned underwater vehicles (UUVs). Building Virginia-class boats with the ¶ ¶ VPM might increase their unit procurement costs by about 15%-20%, and would increase the ¶ ¶ total number of torpedo-sized weapons (such as Tomahawks) that they could carry by about 76%. ¶ ¶ The Navy’s FY2013 30-year SSN procurement plan, if implemented, would not be sufficient to ¶ ¶ maintain a force of 48 SSNs consistently over the long run. The Navy projects under that plan ¶ ¶ that the SSN force would fall below 48 boats starting in FY2022, reach a minimum of 43 boats in ¶ ¶ FY2028-FY2030, and remain below 48 boats through FY2034.

#### Or maybe they could buy domestic oil, natural gas or CTL

Buis and Clark 2012 [Tom Buis CEO, Growth EnergyGrowth Energy Board Co-Chair Gen. Wesley K. Clark (Ret.) May 23, 2012 The National Journal “American Families Need American Fuel” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php]

Even worse, according to a new Bloomberg Government analysis, Pentagon spending on fuel is dramatically increasing. This will force the military to dedicate even more funds toward energy costs, at the expense of other priorities, like training and paying soldiers. In fact, every $.25 increase in the cost of jet fuel makes a $1 billion difference in the Department of Defense’s bottom line – a debt that will be passed along to the American taxpayer.¶ And if that's not enough to make you want to avoid foreign oil, then consider this: every dollar hike in the international, politically-rigged price of oil hands Iran about $3 million more per day, that their regime can use to sow mischief, fund terrorism, and develop missiles and nuclear weapons.¶ Enough is enough! We have domestic alternatives that can protect American interests, and promote prosperity and security – including, more domestic oil production, using natural gas and biofuels, like ethanol, as fuel, converting coal to liquid fuel, and moving as rapidly as possible to vehicles powered by green energy.

### 2NC A2: Korea Add on

#### No advanced missile capability for NK against Guam/US – test failures prove and they are posturing

Rachel Hirshfeld First Publish: 10/9/2012, 7:27 PM<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/160654#.UItSwsVG8o4>

¶ "It could be a bluff, as there is no evidence that North Korea has succeeded in tests of a missile with a range long enough to hit the US mainland," said Yun Duk-Min, a professor at Korea National Diplomatic Academy, according to AFP.¶ ¶ "It might also be aimed at boosting military morale and rallying support behind (new leader) Kim Jong-Un,” he added.¶ ¶ In April, the North carried out a failed rocket launch in what it claimed was a bid to put a satellite into orbit.¶ ¶ American and South Korean officials, as well as the United Nations Security Council, condemned the act as a cover for developing and testing intercontinental ballistic missile technology.¶ ¶ In 1998, a rocket called the Taepodong-1 flew over Japan and crashed into the Pacific. In 2006, the North launched the Taepodong-2, which exploded seconds after liftoff. It launched another long-range rocket, the Unha-2, in 2009. While its first two stages appeared to have worked, American and South Korean officials said the third stage never separated.¶ ¶ In April, North Korea’s Unha-3 rocket disintegrated in midair shortly after takeoff.

#### Zero risk of Korean conflict

Ashley **Rowland**, 12/3/20**10**. Stars and Stripes. “Despite threats, war not likely in Korea, experts say,” http://www.stripes.com/news/despite-threats-war-not-likely-in-korea-experts-say-1.127344?localLinksEnabled=false.

Despite increasingly belligerent threats to respond swiftly and strongly to military attacks, analysts say there is one thing both North Korea and South Korea want to avoid: an escalation into war. The latest promise to retaliate with violence came Friday, when South Korea’s defense minister-to-be said during a confirmation hearing that he supports airstrikes against North Korea in the case of future provocations from the communist country. “In case the enemy attacks our territory and people again, we will thoroughly retaliate to ensure that the enemy cannot provoke again,” Kim Kwan-jin said, according to The Associated Press. The hearing was a formality because South Korea’s National Assembly does not have the power to reject South Korean president Lee Myung-bak’s appointment. Kim’s comments came 10 days after North Korea bombarded South Korea’s Yeonpyeong island near the maritime border, killing two marines and two civilians — the first North Korean attack against civilians since the Korean War. South Korea responded by firing 80 rounds, less than half of the 170 fired by North Korea. It was the second deadly provocation from the North this year. In March, a North Korean torpedo sank the South Korean warship Cheonan, killing 46 sailors, although North Korea has denied involvement in the incident. The South launched a series of military exercises, some with U.S. participation, intended to show its military strength following the attack. John Delury, a professor at Yonsei University in Seoul, said South Korea is using “textbook posturing” to deter another attack by emphasizing that it is tough and firm. But it’s hard to predict how the South would respond to another attack. The country usually errs on the side of restraint, he said. “I think they’re trying to send a very clear signal to North Korea: Don’t push us again,” Delury said. “For all of the criticism of the initial South Korean response that it was too weak, in the end I think people don’t want another hot conflict. I think the strategy is to rattle the sabers a bit to prevent another incident.” Meanwhile, Yonhap News reported Friday that North Korea recently added multiple-launch rockets that are capable of hitting Seoul, located about 31 miles from the border. The report was based on comments from an unnamed South Korean military source who said the North now has 5,200 multiple-launch rockets. A spokesman for South Korea’s Joint Chiefs of Staff would not comment on the accuracy of the report because of the sensitivity of the information. Experts say it is a question of when — not if — North Korea will launch another attack. But those experts doubt the situation will escalate into full-scale war. “I think that it’s certainly possible, but I think that what North Korea wants, as well as South Korea, is to contain this,” said Bruce Bechtol, author of “Defiant Failed State: The North Korean Threat to International Security” and an associate professor of political science at Angelo State University in Texas. He said North Korea typically launches small, surprise attacks that can be contained — not ones that are likely to escalate. Delury said both Koreas want to avoid war, and North Korea’s leaders have a particular interest in avoiding conflict — they know the first people to be hit in a full-scale fight would be the elites.

#### Aggressive policy in the region creates NK war- deterrence is ineffective

IBT 10-6, International Business Times, "Reports Say South Korea, US Revise Defense Agreement; North Korean Media Call For ’Great War’", <http://www.ibtimes.com/reports-say-south-korea-us-revise-defense-agreement-north-korean-media-call-great-war-842375>

North Korea’s state-run news agency published sinister warnings of a new war in the Korean peninsula even as South Korean media reported Saturday that Seoul and Washington had reached an agreement on extending the range of South Korean ballistic missiles to counter defense threat from Pyongyang.¶ The KCNA website showed the warnings across its front page. "Let’s realize the nation’s desire for a great war for national reunification,” the message read.¶ "We will mercilessly punish aggressors, provokers through national actions,” the message continued. "U.S. imperialists and South Korean Lee Myung Bak regime should not act reckless.”¶ South Korea’s Chosun Ilbo daily cited an unnamed government official to report an agreement reached by Washington and Seoul on extending the range of the ballistic missiles to 800 kilometers from the current 300 kilometers to cover all of North Korea.¶ The unnamed government source was quoted as saying that the two sides have also agreed to maintain the payload limit at the current level of 500 kilograms as under an agreement signed in 1979, which was revised in 2001 between the two military allies, Reuters reported.¶ However, if South Korea settles for a lesser missile range limit of 550 kilometers, it could increase the payload to one ton, the newspaper said.¶ Yonhap news agency also reported that an agreement had been reached between the two nations.¶ South Korean Foreign Minister Kim Sung-hwan told a parliamentary hearing Friday that negotiation with the U.S. over the missile issue had reached the "final stage,” without furnishing further details.¶ The KCNA warnings of a war and South Korean media reports on a revised defense agreement closely followed North Korean Vice Foreign Minister Pak Kil-yon’s address to the U.N. General Assembly earlier this week lashing out at the U.S. for its “hostile” policy toward Pyongyang that has left the Korean peninsula a “spark” away from a “thermonuclear war.”¶ "Today, due to the continued U.S. hostile policy towards DPRK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), the vicious cycle of confrontation and aggravation of tensions is an ongoing phenomenon on the Korean peninsula, which has become the world's most dangerous hot spot where a spark of fire could set off a thermonuclear war," Pak said.

### Central Asia

#### No risk of great power conflict in Central Asia: incentives to de-escalate and stable balance of power

Zhao Huasheng, director of the Center for Russia and Central Asia Studies at Fudan University, February 2005, CEF Quarterly, http://www.silkroadstudies.org/new/docs/CEF/CEF\_Quarterly\_Winter\_2005.doc.pdf, p. 31

China, Russia, and the United States will not go to open confrontation for several reasons. Generally speaking, the relations of the three powers in Central Asia depend on their general relations. In other words, if their general relations sour, their relations in Central Asia will go tense or intensify. Otherwise, if their general relations are good, their relations in Central Asia will not be hostile and openly confrontational. Conversely, in spite of the tripartite configuration among the three powers, especially the confrontation between Russia and the United States, like two tigers gazing at each other in their military bases in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, none of the three powers wants to undermine bilateral relations on the parochial issue of Central Asia. The coexistence of the three powers in Central Asia restrains their open confrontation as well. None of the three powers intends to ally with one against the other. Or, none is pleased to see a united front formed by two against one. At the same time, none wants to see Central Asia to be monopolized by one power. Therefore, the game played by three powers is good for the balance of power and not for open confrontation in any forms.

## Hegemony Adv

### Grid Resilient 2NC

#### Grid resilient

Clark 2012 (Paul Clark, MA candidate in Intelligence Studies at American Military University, April 28, 2012, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University, online)

In 2003, a simple physical breakdown occurred – trees shorted a power line and caused a¶ fault – that had a cascading effect and caused a power blackout across the Northeast (Lewis¶ 2010). This singular occurrence has been used as evidence that the electrical grid is fragile and¶ subject to severe disruption through cyber-attack, a disruption that could cost billions of dollars,¶ brings business to a halt, and could even endanger lives – if compounded by other catastrophic¶ events (Brennan 2012). A power disruption the size of the 2003 blackout, the worst in American¶ history at that time (Minkel 2008), is a worst case scenario and used as an example of the¶ fragility of the U.S. energy grid. This perceived fragility is not real when viewed in the context¶ of the robustness of the electrical grid.¶ When asked about cyber-attacks against the electrical grid in April of 2012, the¶ intelligence chief of U.S. Cyber Command Rear Admiral Samuel Cox stated that an attack was¶ unlikely to succeed because of the “huge amounts of resiliency built into the [electrical] system¶ that makes that kind of catastrophic thing very difficult” (Capaccio 2012). This optimistic view¶ is supported by an electrical grid that has proven to be robust in the face of large natural¶ catastrophes. Complex systems like the electrical grid in the U.S. are prone to failures and the¶ U.S. grid fails frequently. Despite efforts to reduce the risk out power outages, the risk is always¶ present. Power outages that affect more than 50,000 people have occurred steadily over the last¶ 20 years at a rate of 12% annually and the frequency of large catastrophes remains relatively¶ high and outages the size of the 2003 blackout are predicted to occur every 25 years (Minkel¶ 2008). In a complex system that is always at risk of disruption, the effect is mitigated by policies¶ and procedures that are meant to restore services as quickly as possible. The most visible of these policies is the interstate Emergency Management Assistance Compact, a legally binding¶ agreement allowing combined resources to be quickly deployed in response to a catastrophic¶ disaster such as power outages following a severe hurricane (Kapucu, Augustin and Garayev¶ 2009).¶ The electrical grid suffers service interruptions regularly, it is a large and complex system¶ supporting the largest economy in the world, and yet commerce does not collapse (Lewis 2010).¶ Despite blizzards, earthquakes, fires, and hurricanes that cause blackouts, the economy is¶ affected but does not collapse and even after massive damage like that caused by Hurricane¶ Katrina, national security is not affected because U.S. military capability is not degraded (Lewis¶ 2010).¶ Cyber-security is an ever-increasing concern in an increasingly electronic and¶ interconnected world. Cyber-security is a high priority “economic and national security¶ challenge” (National Security Council n.d.) because cyber-attacks are expected to become the¶ top national security threat (Robert S. Mueller 2012). In response to the threat Congress is¶ crafting legislation to enhance cyber-security (Brito and Watkins 2012) and the Department of¶ Homeland Security budget for cyber-security has been significantly increased (U.S. Senate¶ Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs 2012).

### Hegemony Defense 2NC

#### No credible threats now

Doug Bandow (senior fellow at the Cato Institute. He is a former special assistant to President Reagan) January 2010 “Military Spending — For What?” http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11143

The United States dominates the globe militarily. The threats facing America pale compared to its capabilities. Why, then, is Washington spending so much on the military? In 2010 the U.S. will spend roughly $700 billion on the military. This is an increase of 2 percent (after inflation) from the Obama administration's original nonwar defense budget of $534 billion. Despite initial plans for zero growth in defense spending in coming years, there are rumors that the Department of Defense will receive a 2 percent increase in real outlays through 2015. Still, some conservatives want to enshrine a military buildup in a law mandating fixed outlays at 4, 5 or even 6 percent of gross domestic product. Hawks focus on the percentage of GDP going to the military — currently about 4.4 percent — since that figure has fallen over the years. America spends more inflation- adjusted dollars on the military today than at any time since the end of World War II. Figured in 2000 dollars, the U.S. devoted $774.6 billion to the military in 1945, the final year of World War II. In 1953, the final year of the Korean War, military outlay ran to $416.1 billion. Expenditure during the Vietnam War peaked at $421.3 billion in 1968. By contrast, in 2010 — even before the Afghan surge and other unplanned expenditure — the administration expected to spend $517.8 billion. That's more than during the lengthy, but often warm, Cold War. Expenditure as a percentage of GDP has fallen because the U.S. economy has grown. GDP in 2010 (in 2000 dollars) will run to about $11.7 trillion. That is almost twice as much as in 1986, more than three times as much as in 1968, and nearly six times as much as in 1953. Military outlay should be tied to threats, not economic growth. Can anyone credibly claim the military threat facing America is two, three, or six times as great today as during those years? Today the U.S. does not face a significant military threat. As Colin Powell famously declared in 1991 when chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "I'm running out of enemies. I'm down to Castro and Kim Il Sung." The U.S. has no great power enemies. Relations with China and Russia are at times uneasy, but not confrontational, let alone warlike. Washington is allied with every other industrialized state. America possesses the most sophisticated nuclear arsenal and the most powerful conventional force. Washington's reach exceeds that of Rome and Britain at their respective peaks. Other nations, most notably China, are stirring, but it will take years before they match, let alone overtake, the U.S. Even subtracting the costs of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars leaves American military outlay around five times that of China and 10 times that of Russia. Combine a gaggle of adversaries, enemies and rogues — Burma, Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Syria — and the U.S. spends perhaps 25 times as much. The United States is not alone. The European Union has 10 times the GDP and three times the population of Russia. Military outlay by the U.S. plus its NATO allies accounts for about 70 percent of world military spending. Add in America's other allies and friends, such as South Korea, and the total share of global military outlay hits 80 percent. In short, Washington spends what it spends not to defend America but to maintain the ability to overpower other nations. But it will become increasingly expensive for America to preserve the ability to attack countries like China. Terrorism remains a pressing security threat. However, terrorist attacks, though horrid, do not pose an existential danger. Al-Qaida is no replacement for Nazism and Communism, nuclear-topped ICBMs and armored divisions. Nor is traditional military force the best way to combat terrorism. Indeed, foreign intervention often promotes terrorism, like swatting a hornet's nest. America's military spending is determined by its foreign policy. America's commitments are a matter of choice. They don't make sense today. Engagement is good, but military force is not the only form of engagement. And any international involvement must balance costs and benefits. Adjusting commitments would allow a vastly different, and less expensive, force structure. The U.S. could make significant cuts and still maintain the globe's strongest and most sophisticated military — one well able to defend Americans.

### 2NC Nuke Deterrence Solves

#### Only nuclear can solve deterrence

Dr. Keith B. Payne is president of the National Institute for Public Policy, a nonprofit research center

he cofounded in 1981. He serves as a full professor and department head at the Graduate Department of

Defense and Strategic Studies, Missouri State University Strategic Studies Quarterly Spring 2009 “On Nuclear Deterrence and Assurance”

Rogues and potential opponents are expending considerable effort on hard and deeply buried bunkers. Some of these bunkers reportedly can be held at risk of destruction only via nuclear weapons.33 During the 1991 Gulf War, some Iraqi bunkers were “virtually invulnerable to conventional weapons.”34 In 1999, concerted NATO air attacks reportedly could not destroy a deep tunnel complex at the Pristina Airport in Kosovo. As a British inspector on the ground at the time reported, “On June 11, hours after NATO halted its bombing and just before the Serb military began withdrawing, 11 Mig-21 fighters emerged from the tunnels and took off for Yugoslavia.”35 Similarly, in 1996, senior Clinton administration officials observed that only nuclear weapons could threaten to destroy the suspected Libyan chemical weapons facility located inside a mountain near Tarhunah.36 Moreover, the US Cold War “legacy” nuclear arsenal apparently has limitations against some protected targets. “Furthermore, the current [nuclear] inventory only has a limited capability for holding hardened underground facilities at risk. The country’s only nuclear earth penetrating weapons . . . cannot survive delivery into certain types of terrain in which such facilities may be located.”37 Adversaries unsurprisingly seek to protect what they value. And, as Defense Secretary Harold Brown emphasized, US deterrence threats should be capable of holding at risk those assets valued by the opponent.38 Consequently, to the extent that we hope to apply the “logic of deterrence” to rogue-state decision makers, the US capability to threaten that which they value located within protected bunkers may be important for deterrence; if North Korean and other rogue leaders demonstrate the value they attribute to assets via buried and hardened bunkers, the US capability to hold those types of targets at obvious risk of destruction may be an important deterrent threat to those leaderships. Highlighting the potential value of nuclear capabilities to do so hardly connotes a rejection of deterrence in favor of “war fighting” as often is claimed; to the contrary, it reflects an attempt to find plausible deterrence tools suited to contemporary opponents and conditions. This is precisely the point made with regard to deterring the Soviet leadership in 1989 by R. James Woolsey, who subsequently served as the director of central intelligence in the Clinton administration: Successful deterrence requires being able to hold at risk those things that the Soviet leadership most values. The nature of the Soviet state suggests that the Soviet leaders most value themselves. This emphasizes the importance of being able to hold at risk deep underground facilities, such as those at Sharapovo, which can only be done effectively by an earth-penetrating [nuclear] weapon.39

## China Containment

### 2NC China No Rise

#### China can’t catch up and no risk of war

**Zenko and Cohen 12** (Micah Zenko, Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, and MIchael Cohen, Senior Fellow at the American Security Project, serves on the board of the National Security Network and has taught at Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs, served in the U.S. Department of State, former Senior Vice President at the strategic communications firm of Robinson, Lerer and Montgomery, bachelor’s degree in international relations from American University and a master’s degree from Columbia University, 3/14/2012, "Clear and Present Safety", yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/clear-and-present-safety)

As the threat from transnational terrorist groups dwindles, the United States also faces few risks from other states. China is the most obvious potential rival to the United States, and there is little doubt that China’s rise will pose a challenge to U.S. economic interests. Moreover, there is an unresolved debate among Chinese political and military leaders about China’s proper global role, and the lack of transparency from China’s senior leadership about its long-term foreign policy objectives is a cause for concern. However, the present security threat to the U.S. mainland is practically nonexistent and will remain so. Even as China tries to modernize its military, its defense spending is still approximately one-ninth that of the United States. In 2012, the Pentagon will spend roughly as much on military research and development alone as China will spend on its entire military. While China clumsily flexes its muscles in the Far East by threatening to deny access to disputed maritime resources, a recent Pentagon report noted that China’s military ambitions remain dominated by “regional contingencies” and that the People’s Liberation Army has made little progress in developing capabilities that “extend global reach or power projection.” In the coming years, China will enlarge its regional role, but this growth will only threaten U.S. interests if Washington attempts to dominate East Asia and fails to consider China’s legitimate regional interests. It is true that China’s neighbors sometimes fear that China will not resolve its disputes peacefully, but this has compelled Asian countries to cooperate with the United States, maintaining bilateral alliances that together form a strong security architecture and limit China’s room to maneuver. The strongest arguments made by those warning of Chinese influence revolve around economic policy. The list of complaints includes a host of Chinese policies, from intellectual property theft and currency manipulation to economic espionage and domestic subsidies. Yet none of those is likely to lead to direct conflict with the United States beyond the competition inherent in international trade, which does not produce zero-sum outcomes and is constrained by dispute-resolution mechanisms, such as those of the World Trade Organization. If anything, China’s export-driven economic strategy, along with its large reserves of U.S. Treasury bonds, suggests that Beijing will continue to prefer a strong United States to a weak one.

### 2NC No Guam Now

#### No Guam realignment

Jeffrey W. Hornung, Associate Professor at the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Honolulu, HI and an Adjunct Fellow with the Office of the Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1/5/12, Time to Acknowledge the Realignment Impasse,

http://csis.org/files/publication/120105\_Hornung\_RealignmentImpasse\_JapanPlatform.pdf

Japanese foreign minister Koichiro Gemba and U.S. secretary of state Hillary Clinton recently reaffirmed their countries’ commitment to an agreement to build a Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) in northern Okinawa and relocate over 8,000 Marines to Guam. Despite this high-level reaffirmation, the agreement is no longer workable. Although the allies are no closer to implementing it than they were the day negotiations began, developments over the past few months have pushed them further from their goal. Tokyo and Washington need to acknowledge that the conditions that were once conducive to implementation no longer exist. Because of the impasse, it is time to temper political rhetoric with reality.

### 2NC Containment Causes Conflict

#### Causes hardliner consolidation and China war

Harvey M. Sapolsky et al is a professor of public policy and organization at MIT. Benjamin H. Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute. Eugene Gholz is an associate professor of public affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. Daryl G. Press is an associate professor of government at Dartmouth College. World Affairs Fall 2009 “Restraining Order: For Strategic Modesty” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/restraining-order-strategic-modesty

Each of the two main strategic alternatives to restraint, primacy and global engagement, suffers from major flaws. Primacists seek to contain peer-competitors to America, especially China. They hope to dissuade Beijing from building a military to match its growing economic power. Some even want to destabilize the Beijing government by accelerating China’s liberalization in ways that would make modernization difficult to control, or by trying to embarrass the government (militarily or otherwise) in a way that would cause decades of political and economic disarray. Such an anti-China strategy is unwise. First, it is far from guaranteed that China will continue its economic rise or successfully manage the social strains that its government already faces. And a policy of active containment (let alone a policy of destabilization) may even make it easy for leaders in Beijing to rally nationalist sentiment against the United States and distract attention from their own failings. This sort of anti-China strategy accomplishes only one thing for sure: it turns tomorrow’s potential adversary into today’s certain one.

#### China does not see our presence as benign

Nathan and Scobell 2012 [Andrew J. Nathan Class of 1919 Professor of Political Science at Columbia University and Andrew Scobell Senior Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation Foreign Affairs Sep/Oct 2012, Vol. 91, Issue 5 “How China Sees America” EBSCO]

Beijing views this seemingly contradictory set of American actions through three reinforcing perspectives. First, Chinese analysts see their country as heir to an agrarian, eastern strategic tradition that is pacifistic, defense-minded, nonexpansionist, and ethical. In contrast, they see Western strategic culture -- especially that of the United States -- as militaristic, offense-minded, expansionist, and selfish.¶ Second, although China has embraced state capitalism with vigor, the Chinese view of the United States is still informed by Marxist political thought, which posits that capitalist powers seek to exploit the rest of the world. China expects Western powers to resist Chinese competition for resources and higher-value-added markets. And although China runs trade surpluses with the United States and holds a large amount of U.S. debt, China's leading political analysts believe the Americans get the better end of the deal by using cheap Chinese labor and credit to live beyond their means.¶ Third, American theories of international relations have become popular among younger Chinese policy analysts, many of whom have earned advanced degrees in the United States. The most influential body of international relations theory in China is so-called offensive realism, which holds that a country will try to control its security environment to the full extent that its capabilities permit. According to this theory, the United States cannot be satisfied with the existence of a powerful China and therefore seeks to make the ruling regime there weaker and more pro-American. Chinese analysts see evidence of this intent in Washington's calls for democracy and its support for what China sees as separatist movements in Taiwan, Tibet, and Xinjiang.¶ Whether they see the United States primarily through a culturalist, Marxist, or realist lens, most Chinese strategists assume that a country as powerful as the United States will use its power to preserve and enhance its privileges and will treat efforts by other countries to protect their interests as threats to its own security. This assumption leads to a pessimistic conclusion: as China rises, the United States will resist. The United States uses soothing words; casts its actions as a search for peace, human rights, and a level playing field; and sometimes offers China genuine assistance. But the United States is two-faced. It intends to remain the global hegemon and prevent China from growing strong enough to challenge it. In a 2011 interview with Liaowang, a state-run Chinese newsmagazine, Ni Feng, the deputy director of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences' Institute of American Studies, summed up this view. "On the one hand, the United States realizes that it needs China's help on many regional and global issues," he said. "On the other hand, the United States is worried about a more powerful China and uses multiple means to delay its development and to remake China with U.S. values."

#### Asia pivot strengthens perceptions that the US is dangerous to China- think it threatens the regime

Nathan and Scobell 2012 [Andrew J. Nathan Class of 1919 Professor of Political Science at Columbia University and Andrew Scobell Senior Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation Foreign Affairs Sep/Oct 2012, Vol. 91, Issue 5 “How China Sees America” EBSCO]

In the eyes of many Chinese analysts, since the end of the Cold War the United States has revealed itself to be a revisionist power that tries to reshape the global environment even further in its favor. They see evidence of this reality everywhere: in the expansion of NATO; the U.S. interventions in Panama, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo; the Gulf War; the war in Afghanistan; and the invasion of Iraq. In the economic realm, the United States has tried to enhance its advantages by pushing for free trade, running down the value of the dollar while forcing other countries to use it as a reserve currency, and trying to make developing countries bear an unfair share of the cost of mitigating global climate change. And perhaps most disturbing to the Chinese, the United States has shown its aggressive designs by promoting so-called color revolutions in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan. As Liu Jianfei, director of the foreign affairs division of the Central Party School of the Chinese Communist Party, wrote in 2005, "The U.S. has always opposed communist 'red revolutions' and hates the 'green revolutions' in Iran and other Islamic states. What it cares about is not 'revolution' but 'color.' It supported the 'rose,' 'orange', and 'tulip' revolutions because they served its democracy promotion strategy." As Liu and other top Chinese analysts see it, the United States hopes "to spread democracy further and turn the whole globe 'blue.'"

## 1NR

### Solvency

#### Better desal doesn’t require nukes

James F. Klausner et al, University of Florida, 2001, Innovative Diffusion Driven Desalination Process, http://www.netl.doe.gov/coal/E&WR/water/pp-mgmt/pubs/desalination\_paper.pdf. p. 12-3

The energy consumption for the DDD process is comparable to that for flash¶ distillation and reverse osmosis. The major advantage of the DDD process is that it can ¶ operate at low temperatures so that it requires an energy input with low thermodynamic¶ availability. This is important because the process can be driven by waste heat that ¶ would otherwise not be suitable for doing useful work or driving some other distillation ¶ process (such as flash distillation). A very interesting application for the DDD process is¶ to operate in conjunction with an existing process that produces large amounts of waste ¶ heat and is located in the vicinity of an ocean or sea. One such potential benefactor of the ¶ DDD process is the electric utility industry. Conventional steam driven power plants ¶ dump a considerable amount of energy to the environment via cooling water that is used ¶ to condense low pressure steam within the main condenser. Typically this cooling water¶ is either discharged back to its original source or it is sent to a cooling tower, where the¶ thermal energy is discharged to the atmosphere. Instead of dumping the thermal energy ¶ to the environment, the DDD process provides a means for putting the discarded thermal¶ energy to work to produce fresh water. Of course this application is limited to power ¶ producing facilities sited along the coastline. However, this should not be a significant ¶ limitation. Bullard and Klausner [8] studied the geographical distribution of fossil fired ¶ power plants built in the United States from 1970 to 1984. In their study they found that ¶ the two most significant attributes for siting a new fossil fired plant in a given ¶ geographical region are 1) proximity to a large body of water and 2) proximity to a large ¶ population base. The demographic make-up of the United States as well as other ¶ industrialized nations is such that major population centers reside along the coastline. ¶ Thus, the DDD process appears to be well suited for the power generation infrastructure ¶ in the United States.

### Cooperation

Cooperation is far more likely- empirically proven- water scarcity precludes military deployment which means it forces cooperation even if conflict is preferred

#### No water wars – from 1948 to 1999 the number of instance of cooperation over water outweighs the number of conflict 2 to 1 – Cooperation is much more likely – your apocalyptic predictions are wrong

IPS, Aug 25, 2006 [“Water Wars” a Myth, Says Experts, http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=34465, 8/15/07, Stevens]

A study sponsored by the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars points that despite newspaper headlines screaming "water wars are coming!", these apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history. "No nations have gone to war specifically over water resources for thousands of years. International water disputes -- even among fierce enemies -- are resolved peacefully, even as conflicts erupt over other issues," it says. The study also points out instances of cooperation between riparian nations -- countries or provinces bordering the same river -- that outnumbered conflicts by more than two to one between 1945 and 1999. Why? "Because water is so important, nations cannot afford to fight over it. Instead, water fuels greater interdependence. By coming together to jointly manage their shared water resources, countries can build trust and prevent conflict," argues the study, jointly co-authored by Aaron Wolf, Annika Kramer, Alexander Carius and Geoffrey Dabelko. The study also says most of the conflicts have been within nations, and that international rivers are a different story, although a vice president of the World Bank predicted in 1995 that "the wars of the next century will be about water."

#### Water is not the root cause of any conflict – other factors outweigh

David G. Victor, Adjunct Senior Fellow for Science and Technology professor of law at Stanford Law School and the director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development. He is also a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, November 1, 2007 National Interest “What Resource Wars?” http://www.cfr.org/publication/14710/what\_resource\_wars.html?breadcrumb=%2Fissue%2Fpublication\_list%3Fgroupby%3D2%26page%3D1%26id%3D18

While there are many reasons to fear global warming, the risk that such dangers could cause violent conflict ranks extremely low on the list because it is highly unlikely to materialize. Despite decades of warnings about water wars, what is striking is that water wars don’t happen—usually because countries that share water resources have a lot more at stake and armed conflict rarely fixes the problem. Some analysts have pointed to conflicts over resources, including water and valuable land, as a cause in the Rwandan genocide, for example. Recently, the UN secretary-general suggested that climate change was already exacerbating the conflicts in Sudan. But none of these supposed causal chains stay linked under close scrutiny—the conflicts over resources are usually symptomatic of deeper failures in governance and other primal forces for conflicts, such as ethnic tensions, income inequalities and other unsettled grievances. Climate is just one of many factors that contribute to tension. The same is true for scenarios of climate refugees, where the moniker “climate” conveniently obscures the deeper causal forces.

#### Water scarcity prevents wars- especially true with Indo-Pak

**Alam ‘2** (Questioning the water wars rationale: a case study of the Indus Waters Treaty Geographical Journal, The, Dec, 2002 by Undala Z. Alam

**Despite bellicose statements, even at the highest levels, India and Pakistan persisted in negotiating over the Indus basin**. This suggests that **though statements made by key decisionmakers in public may suggest a move towards war**, the statements are used to generate domestic support for a political position. As seen in the Indus basin, the political rhetoric did not match the governments' actions **which sought to resolve an international water dispute through cooperation**. **In winter 2001-2002,**

**against a backdrop of deteriorating Indo-Pakistan relations, notably the attack on the Indian parliament in December 2001,** statements were made in India that it would unilaterally abrogate the Indus Waters Treaty (Dawn 2001 2002a; The Tribune 2002). Despite considerable discussion within the Indian and Pakistani press, the Permanent Indus Commission, set up as part of the Treaty, met for the 37th time in New Delhi on 29 May 2002 for three days (Dawn 2002b; The Hindu 2002; The Indian Express 2002; Paukert 2002). **This can be seen as a clear indication of the countries commitment to the Treaty despite statements** by senior decisionmakers and speculation in the press. The experience from the Indus basin, therefore, throws into question whether public statements made for a domestic audience are truly indicative of a country's intent to go to war over shared waters. Conclusion The water wars rationale would suggest that India and Pakistan should have gone to war over the Indus basin. Despite water scarcity, competitive use, Pakistan's absolute dependency upon the basin and the wider dispute involving a series of issues including Kashmir, **the two countries cooperated instead**. With the good offices of the World Bank, India and Pakistan negotiated the Indus Waters Treaty over a period of nine years, signing it in September 1960. The principal explanation for this Indo-Pakistan cooperation is based upon the finances that the Treaty brought with it in the Indus Basin Development Fund. However, the financial explanation is inadequate, as it does not explain why the countries cooperated over nine years so that there was a treaty to finance. Nor does it explain the repeated negotiations for the temporary ad hoc agreements that supplied water to Pakistan during the larger negotiations for a comprehensive agreement. An alternative explanation is that **India and Pakistan cooperated because it was water rational. In other words, cooperation was needed to safeguard the countries' long-term access to shared water.** This suggests that the issues of water scarcity, competitive use and a wider conflict do not necessarily lead to war, **since war cannot guarantee a country's water supply in the long term.**

### Indo-Pak

#### No indo-pak war

**Ganguly ‘8** [Sumit Ganguly is a professor of political science and holds the Rabindranath Tagore Chair at Indiana University, Bloomington. “Nuclear Stability in South Asia,” International Security, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Fall 2008), pp. 45–70]

As the outcomes of the 1999 and 2001–02 crises show, nuclear deterrence is robust in South Asia. Both crises were contained at levels considerably short of full-scale war. That said, as Paul Kapur has argued, Pakistan’s acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability may well have emboldened its leadership, secure in the belief that India had no good options to respond. India, in turn, has been grappling with an effort to forge a new military doctrine and strategy to enable it to respond to Pakistani needling while containing the possibilities of conflict escalation, especially to the nuclear level.78 Whether Indian military planners can fashion such a calibrated strategy to cope with Pakistani probes remains an open question. This article’s analysis of the 1999 and 2001–02 crises does suggest, however, that nuclear deterrence in South Asia is far from parlous, contrary to what the critics have suggested. Three specific forms of evidence can be adduced to argue the case for the strength of nuclear deterrence. First, there is a serious problem of conflation in the arguments of both Hoyt and Kapur. Undeniably, Pakistan’s willingness to provoke India has increased commensurate with its steady acquisition of a nuclear arsenal. This period from the late 1980s to the late 1990s, however, also coincided with two parallel developments that equipped Pakistan with the motives, opportunities, and means to meddle in India’s internal affairs—particularly in Jammu and Kashmir. The most important change that occurred was the end of the conflict with the Soviet Union, which freed up military resources for use in a new jihad in Kashmir. This jihad, in turn, was made possible by the emergence of an indigenous uprising within the state as a result of Indian political malfeasance.79 Once the jihadis were organized, trained, armed, and unleashed, it is far from clear whether Pakistan could control the behavior and actions of every resulting jihadist organization.80 Consequently, although the number of attacks on India did multiply during the 1990s, it is difficult to establish a firm causal connection between the growth of Pakistani boldness and its gradual acquisition of a full-fledged nuclear weapons capability. Second, India did respond with considerable force once its military planners realized the full scope and extent of the intrusions across the Line of Control. Despite the vigor of this response, India did exhibit restraint. For example, Indian pilots were under strict instructions not to cross the Line of Control in pursuit of their bombing objectives.81 They adhered to these guidelines even though they left them more vulnerable to Pakistani ground ªre.82 The Indian military exercised such restraint to avoid provoking Pakistani fears of a wider attack into Pakistan-controlled Kashmir and then into Pakistan itself. Indian restraint was also evident at another level. During the last war in Kashmir in 1965, within a week of its onset, the Indian Army horizontally escalated with an attack into Pakistani Punjab. In fact, in the Punjab, Indian forces successfully breached the international border and reached the outskirts of the regional capital, Lahore. The Indian military resorted to this strategy under conditions that were not especially propitious for the country. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, India’s first prime minister, had died in late 1964. His successor, Lal Bahadur Shastri, was a relatively unknown politician of uncertain stature and standing, and the Indian military was still recovering from the trauma of the 1962 border war with the People’s Republic of China.83 Finally, because of its role in the Cold War, the Pakistani military was armed with more sophisticated, U.S.-supplied weaponry, including the F-86 Sabre and the F-104 Starfighter aircraft. India, on the other hand, had few supersonic aircraft in its inventory, barring a small number of Soviet-supplied MiG-21s and the indigenously built HF-24.84 Furthermore, the Indian military remained concerned that China might open a second front along the Himalayan border. Such concerns were not entirely chimerical, because a Sino-Pakistani entente was under way. Despite these limitations, the Indian political leadership responded to Pakistani aggression with vigor and granted the Indian military the necessary authority to expand the scope of the war. In marked contrast to the politico-military context of 1965, in 1999 India had a self-confident (if belligerent) political leadership and a substantially more powerful military apparatus. Moreover, the country had overcome most of its Nehruvian inhibitions about the use of force to resolve disputes.85 Furthermore, unlike in 1965, India had at least two reserve strike corps in the Punjab in a state of military readiness and poised to attack across the border if given the political nod.86 Despite these significant differences and advantages, the Indian political leadership chose to scrupulously limit the scope of the conflict to the Kargil region. As K. Subrahmanyam, a prominent Indian defense analyst and political commentator, wrote in 1993:. The awareness on both sides of a nuclear capability that can enable either country to assemble nuclear weapons at short notice induces mutual caution. This caution is already evident on the part of India. In 1965, when Pakistan carried out its “Operation Gibraltar” and sent in infiltrators, India sent its army across the cease-fire line to destroy the assembly points of the infiltrators. That escalated into a full-scale war. In 1990, when Pakistan once again carried out a massive infiltration of terrorists trained in Pakistan, India tried to deal with the problem on Indian territory and did not send its army into Pakistan-occupied Kashmir.87

### CN Annexation

China-Russia border conflicts won’t escalate – cooperation and interdependence overwhelm

Global Times | 2012-7-1 20:10:04 Long talks key to strengthening Sino-Russian ties

Having participated in China's negotiations with Russia on the energy cooperation, I know it can be very exhausting to hold such talks. The Russian delegates can be very changeable about certain specific items in order to maximize Russian profits. But after all, energy cooperation is an important factor in the Sino-Russian strategic cooperative partnership. China exceeded Japan to become the world's second largest importer of crude oil in 2009, and in 2011, foreign oil imports broke the critical 50 percent barrier. These facts show that oil and gas resources from Russia mean a lot for China's energy security. And mutual trust between the two giants is the basis of their energy cooperation. The future clashes in Sino-Russian energy deals will still revolve around the price issue. In this sense, if China insists on importing oil and gas from Russia at a price no higher than that in the domestic market, Russia may increase its exports of oil and gas to Europe. The solution to the price divergence is still to enhance substantive cooperation between the two countries. Russia and China will be tied more closely together due to mutual economic interests. Though spats and conflicts seem to be unavoidable in economic negotiations, they also provide a perfect chance for both sides to further learn about the political, economic and even cultural appeal of each other. All these factors can add to their mutual trust

# K

### Framework 2NC

#### Discourses of energy policy determine the solutions that we attempt

Laura Nader University of California, Berkeley Anthropological Quarterly 77.4 (2004) 771-791 “The Harder Path—Shifting Gears” Project Muse

I came to realize that energy discourses were often one of "no option." The inevitablity syndrome I called it. Whatever path was being proposed was a "have to path." For example, "we have to push nuclear because there are no alternatives." Such a coercive frame was limiting to say the least, especially [End Page 775] since other options were what was being examined. Method was also part of the problem. For example, growth models—that took for granted increasing per capita energy consumption—were disabling when economists (even Nobel economists) were examining less is more options. Also striking was the omnipresent model of unilinear development (a concept that anthropologists had left in the dust decades earlier), with little general understanding of macro-processes. For example, the recognition that civilizations arise but that they also collapse was missing from the thinking about the present. Prevalent was the nineteenth century belief that technological progress was equivalent to social progress. In such a progressivist evolutionary frame science too could only rise and not fall or wane. Furthermore, the possibility that experts might be part of the problem was novel to the expert who thought that he stood outside of the problem. The idea that the energy problem had human dimensions, that it was a human problem, slowly began to sink in, although such realization was rarely attributed to social science sources. Many of my commentaries were adamantly opposed in those years, to put it mildly. Colleagues rejected the idea that the science bureaucracies had a limiting effect on definitions and solutions, and also a framing effect on cultural outlook. This view was adamantly opposed by directors at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, and by those who believe that science is autonomous and culture free.

#### We are intellectuals not policymakers- this means you should think more about the academic content than the political ramifications- This militarized fear of the other causes and insular knowledge base that predetermines the solutions to problems

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

Militariality constitutes its political structures, its flows of power, its modes of individualization, and its thought processes according to what Deleuze once called the "cult of interiority" (258). The ontology of militariality sets itself in direct opposition to any unfolding upon an exteriority. The essence of information whether collection, retrieval, or illumination and dissemination is very different from the essence of exterior-unfolding-of-thought and subject-as-event, to speak like Badiou (41). Oriented towards a pre-determined goal, information is a geopolitical maneuver in a war over territory and resources. The US sovereign nation-state uses "information" to reterritorialize the biosphere (the human and the non-human that make up the earth's ecosystem) into a monopolized planetary biopolitical settlement in need of "freedom," "democracy" and now "energy security." Identities, foreign governments, environmental resources are each informized and redirected towards the needs of the sovereign interior. Such discourses as the "end of history" and the attempt on the part of neo-conservatives to subvert the UN's embrace of different forms of democracy in favor of developing a new league of nations are signs of what should properly be called the end of exteriority.

### A2 Wolforth

#### Americans have a tendency to overestimate our benefits to the world- prevents effective policy

Walt 2011[Stephen M. Walt, an FP contributing editor, is Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international affairs at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government NOVEMBER 2011, Foreign Policy, “The Myth of American Exceptionalism” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/10/11/the\_myth\_of\_american\_exceptionalism]

Bottom line: Americans take too much credit for global progress and accept too little blame for areas where U.S. policy has in fact been counterproductive. Americans are blind to their weak spots, and in ways that have real-world consequences. Remember when Pentagon planners thought U.S. troops would be greeted in Baghdad with flowers and parades? They mostly got RPGs and IEDs instead.

### 2NC Impact

#### This creates the psychological priming for conflict- most probable explanation for why we go to war

Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois ‘4 (Prof of Anthropology @ Cal-Berkely; Prof of Anthropology @ UPenn) (Nancy and Philippe, Introduction: Making Sense of Violence, in Violence in War and Peace, pg. 19-22)

This large and at first sight “messy” Part VII is central to this anthology’s thesis. It encompasses everything from the routinized, bureaucratized, and utterly banal violence of children dying of hunger and maternal despair in Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33) to elderly African Americans dying of heat stroke in Mayor Daly’s version of US apartheid in Chicago’s South Side (Klinenberg, Chapter 38) to the racialized class hatred expressed by British Victorians in their olfactory disgust of the “smelly” working classes (Orwell, Chapter 36). In these readings violence is located in the symbolic and social structures that overdetermine and allow the criminalized drug addictions, interpersonal bloodshed, and racially patterned incarcerations that characterize the US “inner city” to be normalized (Bourgois, Chapter 37 and Wacquant, Chapter 39). Violence also takes the form of class, racial, political self-hatred and adolescent self-destruction (Quesada, Chapter 35), as well as of useless (i.e. preventable), rawly embodied physical suffering, and death (Farmer, Chapter 34). Absolutely central to our approach is a blurring of categories and distinctions between wartime and peacetime violence. Close attention to the “little” violences produced in the structures, habituses, and mentalites of everyday life shifts our attention to pathologies of class, race, and gender inequalities. More important, it interrupts the voyeuristic tendencies of “violence studies” that risk publicly humiliating the powerless who are often forced into complicity with social and individual pathologies of power because suffering is often a solvent of human integrity and dignity. Thus, in this anthology we are positing a violence continuum comprised of a multitude of “small wars and invisible genocides” (see also Scheper- Hughes 1996; 1997; 2000b) conducted in the normative social spaces of public schools, clinics, emergency rooms, hospital wards, nursing homes, courtrooms, public registry offices, prisons, detention centers, and public morgues. The violence continuum also refers to the ease with which humans are capable of reducing the socially vulnerable into expendable nonpersons and assuming the license - even the duty - to kill, maim, or soul-murder. We realize that in referring to a violence and a genocide continuum we are flying in the face of a tradition of genocide studies that argues for the absolute uniqueness of the Jewish Holocaust and for vigilance with respect to restricted purist use of the term genocide itself (see Kuper 1985; Chaulk 1999; Fein 1990; Chorbajian 1999). But we hold an opposing and alternative view that, to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to make just such existential leaps in purposefully linking violent acts in normal times to those of abnormal times. Hence the title of our volume: Violence in War and in Peace. If (as we concede) there is a moral risk in overextending the concept of “genocide” into spaces and corners of everyday life where we might not ordinarily think to find it (and there is), an even greater risk lies in failing to sensitize ourselves, in misrecognizing protogenocidal practices and sentiments daily enacted as normative behavior by “ordinary” good-enough citizens. Peacetime crimes, such as prison construction sold as economic development to impoverished communities in the mountains and deserts of California, or the evolution of the criminal industrial complex into the latest peculiar institution for managing race relations in the United States (Waquant, Chapter 39), constitute the “small wars and invisible genocides” to which we refer. This applies to African American and Latino youth mortality statistics in Oakland, California, Baltimore, Washington DC, and New York City. These are “invisible” genocides not because they are secreted away or hidden from view, but quite the opposite. As Wittgenstein observed, the things that are hardest to perceive are those which are right before our eyes and therefore taken for granted. In this regard, Bourdieu’s partial and unfinished theory of violence (see Chapters 32 and 42) as well as his concept of misrecognition is crucial to our task. By including the normative everyday forms of violence hidden in the minutiae of “normal” social practices - in the architecture of homes, in gender relations, in communal work, in the exchange of gifts, and so forth - Bourdieu forces us to reconsider the broader meanings and status of violence, especially the links between the violence of everyday life and explicit political terror and state repression, Similarly, Basaglia’s notion of “peacetime crimes” - crimini di pace - imagines a direct relationship between wartime and peacetime violence. Peacetime crimes suggests the possibility that war crimes are merely ordinary, everyday crimes of public consent applied systematic- ally and dramatically in the extreme context of war. Consider the parallel uses of rape during peacetime and wartime, or the family resemblances between the legalized violence of US immigration and naturalization border raids on “illegal aliens” versus the US government- engineered genocide in 1938, known as the Cherokee “Trail of Tears.” Peacetime crimes suggests that everyday forms of state violence make a certain kind of domestic peace possible. Internal “stability” is purchased with the currency of peacetime crimes, many of which take the form of professionally applied “strangle-holds.” Everyday forms of state violence during peacetime make a certain kind of domestic “peace” possible. It is an easy-to-identify peacetime crime that is usually maintained as a public secret by the government and by a scared or apathetic populace. Most subtly, but no less politically or structurally, the phenomenal growth in the United States of a new military, postindustrial prison industrial complex has taken place in the absence of broad-based opposition, let alone collective acts of civil disobedience. The public consensus is based primarily on a new mobilization of an old fear of the mob, the mugger, the rapist, the Black man, the undeserving poor. How many public executions of mentally deficient prisoners in the United States are needed to make life feel more secure for the affluent? What can it possibly mean when incarceration becomes the “normative” socializing experience for ethnic minority youth in a society, i.e., over 33 percent of young African American men (Prison Watch 2002). In the end it is essential that we recognize the existence of a genocidal capacity among otherwise good-enough humans and that we need to exercise a defensive hypervigilance to the less dramatic, permitted, and even rewarded everyday acts of violence that render participation in genocidal acts and policies possible (under adverse political or economic conditions), perhaps more easily than we would like to recognize. Under the violence continuum we include, therefore, all expressions of radical social exclusion, dehumanization, depersonal- ization, pseudospeciation, and reification which normalize atrocious behavior and violence toward others. A constant self-mobilization for alarm, a state of constant hyperarousal is, perhaps, a reasonable response to Benjamin’s view of late modern history as a chronic “state of emergency” (Taussig, Chapter 31). We are trying to recover here the classic anagogic thinking that enabled Erving Goffman, Jules Henry, C. Wright Mills, and Franco Basaglia among other mid-twentieth-century radically critical thinkers, to perceive the symbolic and structural relations, i.e., between inmates and patients, between concentration camps, prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and other “total institutions.” Making that decisive move to recognize the continuum of violence allows us to see the capacity and the willingness - if not enthusiasm - of ordinary people, the practical technicians of the social consensus, to enforce genocidal-like crimes against categories of rubbish people. There is no primary impulse out of which mass violence and genocide are born, it is ingrained in the common sense of everyday social life. The mad, the differently abled, the mentally vulnerable have often fallen into this category of the unworthy living, as have the very old and infirm, the sick-poor, and, of course, the despised racial, religious, sexual, and ethnic groups of the moment. Erik Erikson referred to “pseudo- speciation” as the human tendency to classify some individuals or social groups as less than fully human - a prerequisite to genocide and one that is carefully honed during the unremark- able peacetimes that precede the sudden, “seemingly unintelligible” outbreaks of mass violence. Collective denial and misrecognition are prerequisites for mass violence and genocide. But so are formal bureaucratic structures and professional roles. The practical technicians of everyday violence in the backlands of Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33), for example, include the clinic doctors who prescribe powerful tranquilizers to fretful and frightfully hungry babies, the Catholic priests who celebrate the death of “angel-babies,” and the municipal bureaucrats who dispense free baby coffins but no food to hungry families. Everyday violence encompasses the implicit, legitimate, and routinized forms of violence inherent in particular social, economic, and political formations. It is close to what Bourdieu (1977, 1996) means by “symbolic violence,” the violence that is often “nus-recognized” for something else, usually something good. Everyday violence is similar to what Taussig (1989) calls “terror as usual.” All these terms are meant to reveal a public secret - the hidden links between violence in war and violence in peace, and between war crimes and “peace-time crimes.” Bourdieu (1977) finds domination and violence in the least likely places - in courtship and marriage, in the exchange of gifts, in systems of classification, in style, art, and culinary taste- the various uses of culture. Violence, Bourdieu insists, is everywhere in social practice. It is misrecognized because its very everydayness and its familiarity render it invisible. Lacan identifies “rneconnaissance” as the prerequisite of the social. The exploitation of bachelor sons, robbing them of autonomy, independence, and progeny, within the structures of family farming in the European countryside that Bourdieu escaped is a case in point (Bourdieu, Chapter 42; see also Scheper-Hughes, 2000b; Favret-Saada, 1989). Following Gramsci, Foucault, Sartre, Arendt, and other modern theorists of power-vio- lence, Bourdieu treats direct aggression and physical violence as a crude, uneconomical mode of domination; it is less efficient and, according to Arendt (1969), it is certainly less legitimate. While power and symbolic domination are not to be equated with violence - and Arendt argues persuasively that violence is to be understood as a failure of power - violence, as we are presenting it here, is more than simply the expression of illegitimate physical force against a person or group of persons. Rather, we need to understand violence as encompassing all forms of “controlling processes” (Nader 1997b) that assault basic human freedoms and individual or collective survival. Our task is to recognize these gray zones of violence which are, by definition, not obvious. Once again, the point of bringing into the discourses on genocide everyday, normative experiences of reification, depersonalization, institutional confinement, and acceptable death is to help answer the question: What makes mass violence and genocide possible? In this volume we are suggesting that mass violence is part of a continuum, and that it is socially incremental and often experienced by perpetrators, collaborators, bystanders - and even by victims themselves - as expected, routine, even justified. The preparations for mass killing can be found in social sentiments and institutions from the family, to schools, churches, hospitals, and the military. They harbor the early “warning signs” (Charney 1991), the “priming” (as Hinton, ed., 2002 calls it), or the “genocidal continuum” (as we call it) that push social consensus toward devaluing certain forms of human life and lifeways from the refusal of social support and humane care to vulnerable “social parasites” (the nursing home elderly, “welfare queens,” undocumented immigrants, drug addicts) to the militarization of everyday life (super-maximum-security prisons, capital punishment; the technologies of heightened personal security, including the house gun and gated communities; and reversed feelings of victimization).

### A2: Permutation

#### The aff only sees energy as a problem in that it’s a problem for the military- this ensures the perm gets coopted

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

The following constitutes some initial observations on what I argue to be the transformation of liberal capitalist democracy from governmentality to militariality, a transformation comparatively operative in discreet modes of existence throughout modernity, but one that has only achieved its full, normalized and even sanctioned appearance with the official passing-into-law of the post-9/11 Homeland Security Act and the USA Patriot Act, and the coming [End Page 139] to-actuality of preemptive warfare with the US declaration of war against Iraq.1 These legal proclamations and actualizing of war firmly establish the executive branch as the focal point of the discursive and material flows of power, making the judicial and the legislative little more than mouthpieces for the executive node and the capital interests that govern its operations.2 The "state of emergency" and the "war on terrorism" are the primary messianic tropes3 deployed by the State that indicate the passage from governmentality to materiality.4 Prior to these statements and acts of the executive branch warfare was characterized in terms of its secondary or hidden manifestations. War was a "last resort" to be preceded by a diplomacy that no matter how contrived or indissolubly related to a war agenda ostensibly warded off war. Or it was considered to be "outside the State apparatus," as detailed by Deleuze and Guattari.5 Or war had to be out of sight and denied, and appeared in the form of covert activity, as with the CIA training of the Contras in Nicaragua during the Reagan administration. Or war was an event that, in the US context, always took place "outside the nation," according to the re-symbolized history of George Bush in his September 20, 2001 address to the nation and the joint congress: "On September 11, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars, but for the past 136 years they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941."6 This address, however, states in no uncertain terms that war has come to American soil, which Bush identifies in his speech as "freedom itself." Moreover, recent military activity reveals that the US is now involved in more than preemptive warfare, but something that reflects a Clausewitzian "total war" as a naturalized "policy." The daylight October 26, 2008 attack on Syria and the continuing raids into Pakistan show that the government has begun to openly violate the sovereignty of nations with whom it is not as war.7 One of the most candid and sustained arguments for a generalized state of militariality appeared in 2006: Frank J. Gaffney's edited collection War Footing: 10 Steps America Must Take to Prevail in the War for the Free World. Contributors to this collection include R. James Woolsey (former director of the CIA), Kenneth R. Timmerman (executive director of the Foundation for Democracy in Iran), Andrew McCarthy (former assistant to Paul Wolfowitz and a senior fellow at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies), Anne Korin (co-director of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security (IAGS) and co-chair of the Set America Free Coalition), Caroline Blick (senior Middle East fellow at the Center for Security Policy in Washington), Timothy Connors (director of Manhattan Institute's Center for Policing Terrorism (CPT), Cliff Kincaid (president of America's Survival, Inc. (ASI)), among others. Gaffney himself is the founder and current president of the Center for Security Policy, and served as assistant secretary of defense for international security policy under Ronald Reagan. War Footing can be said to be a distillation [End Page 140] of the current perspectives and policies of a large body of neoconservative officials and organizations. Gaffney's volume presents in stark detail an argument for a meta-militarization of the planet. War Footing makes it an imperative that the military not only be firmly connected, but inform and in some cases govern the fundamental flows of American and global cultural production. The planet is represented as being in the grip of a worldwide "Islamofascist" march that stems from Northern Nigeria, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Turkey. Europe is characterized as facing the imminent threat of this march: "The native European population is now contracting at 2.2 million per year because of low birth rates. At the same time, the Muslim community in Europe is growing at 50 percent per decade. If current trends prevail, in twenty-five years we will see the Islamist-radicalized youth become a majority of the youth cohort in large European urban centers. We can only speculate as to what kind of European society will emerge should the rising tide of Islamofascism continue among Muslims there" (6). As with Foucault's concept of governmentality, militariality problematizes population as a fundamental issue. However, biopower no longer solely or even mainly operates along self-disciplinary flows of energy. With the shift to militariality, biopower becomes a direct military target. As a political target of power it takes on a greater geopolitical importance. Geographical regions become biopolitical settlements8 and are targeted according to a neo-eugenics logic of population control. Greater emphasis is placed on a demographics that is organized according to an overtly racialist orientation. This means that only certain populations become part of the general administration and management of life, of the power over life that supports its propagation, its health, its longevity. The demographical question applies equally to the domestic space. "Homeland Securities" is only the most visible sign of this. The Islamofacists in America are "well funded, well disciplined, and well organized" (6). As for the rest of the world: the Middle East is a "monster" "without logic and consistency"; China is a hegemonic threat to Asia; Latin America is in the midst of a totalitarian reemergence; and Russia is on its way back to an autocracy. In the totalizing problematic (in Althusser's sense of that term) of the world as constituted by this constabulary of militariality, the planet becomes visible as a recalcitrant enemy. Such a constitution signals the transformation of knowledge production at an ontological level. Geopolitical knowledge is replaced by the massive search for and accumulation of information. The world "revealed" by the militarized problematic is in turn confirmed by this transformation: information, which is constituted on the basis of confirming what is, drives out every other possibility of revealing. This is mass mobilization of information on a grand scale. Information mobilization and the subsequent illumination of corroborating information in turn pave the way for the mass mobilization of peoples. [End Page 141] The problematically controlled production of the geopolitical arena, with its demographic overcoding of the planet, thus functions according to a panoptic principle: the accumulation of control by the executive branch is matched by growing attempts of the US as a nation to control the war for freedom across the planet. This requires an increase in the ability of the sovereign state to increase forces of centralization. In its constitution of the planet as primarily an enemy, the authors of War Footing suggest that the UN be marginalized on the grounds that 1) it does not have the proper information for discriminating true from false democracies, and 2) it is an instrument in the service of those waging war against freedom. War footing advocates make their stance against the UN and the nongovernmental organizations that work with the UN clear: "The UN as currently constituted is now, and will remain, an instrument of political warfare wielded by enemies of the Free World. The UN is not merely resistant to the sort of systemic change that might bring it into closer alignment with its founding principles of protecting and promoting freedom. Such changes are, as a practical matter, impossible. Consequently, the United States...should marginalize the United Nations" (252). The consequences of this statement cannot be emphasized enough. As manifested in the discourse of militariality the UN is represented as an enemy of the free world in its essence: it "will remain" an instrument of warfare and no amount of participation will change that purported fact. The formerly active models of liberal humanist political engagement (parliamentary democracy, consensus, enlightenment communication and negotiation, etc.), models heavily deconstructed by critical intellectuals and theorists in the age of governmentality, are jettisoned completely. Instead war footing supporters propose the creation of a new organization to be called the "Free Nations" and composed "[o]nly [of] bona fide democracies" (253). What Heidegger once called the "age of the world picture" becomes, in the politics of militariality, the "age of the world stratocracy." This in turn demands that they main vehicle for the flow of information across the planet—the Internet—be restricted to panoptic, stratocratic management as well. The US Department of Commerce, which pushed and funded expansion of the Internet, has retained overall control of the "world wide web" from its earliest days because of war footing policies. Despite international pressure the DoC has said it will continue to maintain control of the Internet's root servers (the basic directory of the Internet) indefinitely. In 2005 the European Union began to organize a forum for deciding Internet public policy along the lines of a cooperative model.9 The forum was designed to bring the issue before the United Nations. War footing policy-makers and organizations such as the Set America Free Coalition, the Green Patriots, and America's Survival, Inc., have begun to issue a set of policy statements, so-called pledges and blueprints designed to oppose this cooperative model in no uncertain terms: "The Internet has become the most important engine for freedom, in [End Page 142] particular, for the free flow of information and ideas, in the history of the world. It has also become an indispensable element in the growth of international capitalism. The Internet, on the whole, works flawlessly, as currently managed, not 'controlled,' by a U.S. corporation. It is a perfect metaphor for the Pax Americana in the best sense of the word: an example of a largely benign, generous, and constructive use of U.S. power to benefit the entire planet. The very nature of the Internet requires the current form of entrepreneurial, unstructured, user driven, and rapidly adaptive management arrangement. The surest way to destroy the Internet is to surrender it to international bureaucrats and their multilateral masters" (War Footing 243–244). This same marginalization policy that defines the geopolitics of metamilitarization obtains in the war footing relation to the Law of the Sea Treaty, which was drafted by the UN and initiated by the one-world government advocates working in the World Federalist Association. The treaty's purpose is to oversee the planet's ocean commons to guard against the exploitation of seabed minerals and subterranean oil and gas. War footing organizations oppose the treaty on the grounds that it will erode the national sovereignty of the US: "Stop thinking of the world's oceans, international commerce, outer space, and the Internet as so-called global commons to be turned over to UN organizations" (253). The disdain in this remark for what environmentalists refer to frequently as the "commons" reflects the war that states have been waging on common spaces and common lands since the early days of colonial expansion.10 These stratocratic controls of planetary human activity reveal more than the ideology of a single administration; they are an extension of what we can now see as the complete devotion to an apparatus that captures all cultural and political energies in terms of what Clausewitz defined as "policy." The original state of "emergency" as defined by the Bush Administration in the wake of the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks has been naturalized and sedimented as to become a fundamental starting point of human existence. Consequently, understanding the full intensity of the age of militariality requires more than the common critical awareness of Clausewitz's central doctrine: "War is merely the continuation of policy by other means" (28). It requires first an understanding that for Clausewitz, war is the very ontological basis of human existence, a basis that transcends culture, history and temporality. War defines the very structure of human subjectivity, a juridico-natural "code of law" that is "deeply rooted" in a people, an army, a government: "war is a paradoxical trinity—composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy" (30). Clausewitz assigns a constituency to each of the registers of this trinity: "The first of these…mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government" [End Page 143] (30). In a totalizing problematic organized according to the idea of war serving as the basis of human existence, the people of a nation are equated with that of a blind primordial force of violence: "the first," which refers to "primordial violence, hatred, and enmity" identifies the people living in the nation. "Government" therefore names that entity constituted for the exclusive purpose of controlling its unstable citizenry by reorienting the energies of the people towards warfare. This reorientation lays the groundwork and delineates the horizon of human creativity, and determines the single legitimized space of freedom: the army, where the "creative spirit is free to roam." The space of instability, of chance, which is the condition for the possibility of creativity, enters into the war-footing picture of reality only on this register of militarized human activity. This connection here is not a matter of association; military activity defines the very essence of freedom and human creativity. The army and its state are not defined in this picture in traditional terms of democracy, protection, and service to a people. Nor are they the a sign of the discourse of biopower, for biopower has its eyes on the productivity of a population and functions according to a general administration of life that, although affecting "distributions around a norm," still invites and produces a certain amount of heterogeneity (Foucault 266). The army and the state are instead named as the necessary foundational machinic force that determines the war footing constitution of humanity, ensuring that all its energies are channeled in a single direction: "The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people" (Clausewitz 31). The government and the army, in fact, only arise and become increasingly indispensable as the movement of humans through history becomes more "civilized" and "intellectually developed": "In any primitive, warlike race, the warrior spirit is far more common than among civilized peoples. It is possessed by almost every warrior: but in civilized societies only necessity will stimulate it in the people as a whole, since they lack the natural disposition for it" (45). This explains the constant disdain for "intellectuals," for they are understood to be part of the general problem of the so-called civilizing process, the "general intellectual development of a given society" (45, italics in original). This intellectual development is a double-edged sword for Clausewitz and the war-footing polity. On the one hand Clausewitz must have access to at least a modicum of classificatory procedures, otherwise he would not be able to establish the lesser other whose constitution makes possible the essential act of war. On the other hand the non-primitive human consciousness must acquire "appropriate gifts of intellect and temperament" and not be distinguished by "great power(s) of meditation" (44, 48). Instead what is needed is "mental force," a "firmness" of opinion that does not waver: "We say a man has strength of character, or simply has character, if he sticks to his convictions….Such firmness cannot show itself, of course, if a man keeps changing his mind" (54, [End Page 144] emphasis in original).11 This affects the realm of knowledge production as well, for "Knowledge in war is very simple"; and a "high degree of education" simply leads to "ridiculous pedantry" (96, 95, emphasis in original). It is not that life and the political have collapsed in the total politicization of life, as Agamben argues, or not solely. This collapse is only one of the outcomes of the total militarization of the biopolitical settlement, of the bios. The civil bios has no role in this problematic; it does not even exist. In this characterization war, and not biopower, becomes the very basis of the political: "war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse"; "The political object is the goal, war is the means of reaching it" (28, 29). We can see the full manifestation of Clausewitz's polity as war in the truth-statements of militariality advocates. "Step 8" of War Footing, is clear: "Wage Political Warfare" (136). A month after 9/11 Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld launched the Office of Strategic Influence (OSI). The OSI is "a component of a broader, government-wide strategic communications campaign, specifically [designed] to assist government agencies in crafting policy regarding the military aspects of information operations" (139). The program was shut down, but its advocates make it clear that it should be revived as soon as possible, on the grounds that its tight connection between information and militarization can bring about the planned unidirectional metaphysical orientation of warfare with greater speed than any other approach. Militariality sets up a program for direct political warfare and stands that against the "far more limited effort known as 'public diplomacy'": "even when they are well conceived and well executed...public diplomacy strategies will be a long-term effort. This is in their nature, given the reliance they place on such instruments as international media programming, exchange visits of political and cultural figures, humanitarian and development assistance, training future leaders, and so forth. Such efforts take years....And we do not have the luxury of time" (141). The suggestions for a plan of action include the immediate execution of a political warfare strategy, the drafting of legislative vehicles for political warfare, the strengthening of CIA clandestine services, the housing of the primary responsibility for political warfare in the Department of Defense, and the direct use of the Internet as a tool of political warfare (143–145). The consequences to be drawn from all of this are severe. Information in the post-9/11 state of constant "emergency" generated by the government of the Bush administration and its war footing organizations must now be identified as organizing not only the general political arrangement of life but the greater and more amorphous register of civil existence as well. It is in this sense that we are witnessing the creation of a new World Stratocratic Picture, a new totality, one that has its telos in the total control of the totality (the subtext of the above passage concerning diplomacy is its dependency on an actual engagement with an international community, a dependency that violates the [End Page 145] unilateral orientation adhering to the decision-making process of the military polity). In the creation of a totality capable of being totally controlled the indissoluble connection between the political and the civil changes dramatically. It can no longer be said that the civil is indirectly tied to the political. The line between the two may never have been solid, but in the "state of exception," which installs a justification for acting "outside the normal order" of a democratic polity, sites of human production, knowledge, information, media reports, entertainment, the Internet, defense, militarization, representation, and human consciousness itself, all flow in and out of one another so as to confuse any possibility of making clear distinctions between them. The political regime, progressively acting directly on the civil register, diminishes the civil register to the point of its eventual erasure. With the erosion of the civil register it becomes clearer that metamilitarization appears increasingly as an essential technique of the polity rather than an exceptional measure. A war footing philosophy thus becomes the very constitutive paradigm of remaining popular civil institutions such as the media and film production. Sound bite culture is only one sign of this. In the stratocracy the environment itself is transformed biopolitically and co-opted for militarization: the ecosystem has now achieved visibility in the military problematic on the basis of its problematization as a potential target of terrorism (Little 1). This is made manifest in the sudden attention that war footing proponents now pay to the environment, an area of concern that until recently was completely demarcated in conservative circles as a "liberal cause." War footing proponents now directly attempt to transform the public's relation to the environmental crisis. The signifiers that disclose the truth of the many threats to the planet's ecosystem are being overwritten and erased by the single conservative allotrope "US Energy Security." 2005 was the year that we saw the beginning of "Green Patriotism," and the development of close ties between the military and environmental activism, or what should more properly be termed "environmentality." Now organizations such as the Green Patriots and the Set American Free Coalition can urge American companies to develop more hybrid vehicles on the grounds that we thereby avoid, by cutting off our dependence on foreign oil, the funding of foreign terrorists. Encouraging the use of Ethanol (a sugar based gasoline), Green Patriot organizations have already begun to plan the next preemptive strike in the metamilitarization of the planet: "until [the US development of an Ethanol agricultural industry] becomes economical...there is another source of ethanol that makes economic sense and that does not require a government subsidy: sugar cane. In Brazil, at least 25 percent of the fuel sold in gas stations is sugar-based ethanol.... Latin American and Caribbean countries like Guatemala, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Jamaica are all low-cost sugar cane producers. These nations could become key to US energy security [End Page 146] if large numbers of American vehicles [made the transition to Ethanol]" (53). Reconstellated in the new stratocracy, environmental activism becomes environmentality. The land and its inhabitants, the human and the non-human, now come to presence as a military problem.
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#### The aff should advocate increasing energy production

#### The subject: central government- the USFG.

#### The verb: increase- to make greater. or

#### The objects -Financial incentives means loans/grants

**UNCTAD, 4** - UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (“INCENTIVES”

http://unctad.org/en/docs/iteiit20035\_en.pdf

There is no uniform definition of what constitutes an “investment incentive”. (Box I.1. contains a list of commonly used incentives.) The only major international instrument that contains a partial definition is the SCM Agreement (see below). Governments use three main categories of investment incentives to attract FDI and to benefit more from it:

· financial incentives, such as outright grants and loans at concessionary rates;

· fiscal incentives such as tax holidays and reduced tax rates;

· other incentives, including subsidized infrastructure or services, market preferences and regulatory concessions, including exemptions from labour or environmental standards.

#### Restrictions are regulatory prohibitions

Words & Phrases 2004 v37A p410

N.D.Okla. 1939. "Restriction," as used in the statutes concerning restriction on alienation of lands inherited from deceased Osage allottees, is synonymous with "prohibition." Act April J8, 1912. §§ 6, 7, 37 Stat. 87, 88.—U.S. v. Mullendore, 30 F.Supp. 13, appeal dismissed 111 F.2d 898.— Indians 15(1).

This is the regulatory part

Words & Phrases: Perm Edition, 2002, vol 36A, p414

N.II. 1938. As used in statute giving towns power to "regulate and restrict" buildings by zoning regulations, "regulation" is synonymous with "restrict" and "restrictions" are embraced in "regulations. Puh.Laws. 1926, c. 41. W A»-y\* r

#### The direct object is energy production
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The appropriateness of the fossil Cumulative Energy Demand (CED) as an indicator for the environmental performance of products and processes is explored with a regression analysis between the environmental life-cycle impacts and fossil CEDs of 1218 products, divided into the product categories “energy production”, “material production”, “transport”, and “waste treatment”. Our results show that, for all product groups but waste treatment, the fossil CED correlates well with most impact categories, such as global warming, resource depletion, acidification, eutrophication, tropospheric ozone formation, ozone depletion, and human toxicity (explained variance between 46% and 100%). We conclude that the use of fossil fuels is an important driver of several environmental impacts and thereby indicative for many environmental problems. It may therefore serve as a screening indicator for environmental performance. However, the usefulness of fossil CED as a stand-alone indicator for environmental impact is limited by the large uncertainty in the product-specific fossil CEDbased impact scores (larger than a factor of 10 for the majority of the impact categories; 95% confidence interval). A major reason for this high uncertainty is nonfossil energy related emissions and land use, such as landfill leachates, radionuclide emissions, and land use in agriculture and forestry.

#### Links

#### 1. The SUBJECT of the action is the AFF team, not the USFG.

#### 2. The OBJECT of the action is the judge, not energy.

#### 1. Infinite regression—disregarding resolutional syntax produces an endless regression to small, trivial plans. For example, an aff only about the subject opens the door to ANY philosophy that speaks to ‘being.’

#### 2. Limits—resolutional limits encourage AFF innovation, predictive research on a designated topic, and clash—a precursor to productive education. Also, the inherent value of arguments within limits is greater, which link turns education arguments.

#### If our interpretation is net-beneficial it means there’s no reason to vote affirmative. If the case is true then it de-justifies the resolution. Teams are still signified by ‘AFF’ and ‘NEG’, so the resolution is a required measurement for ‘affirmation.’

They don’t get credit for 1AC preempts unless they’re clearly and explicitly extended in the 2AC- Our T argument is an explicit response to all of them so you should consider anything not in the 2AC dropped. Anything else places an unreasonable burden on the neg to answer 5 minutes of cards that are never explained.

### Off

#### Identity-based struggles can never come to grips with the Real of Capital because today’s global capitalism relentlessly fragments identities to ensure that capital’s homogenizing force will prevail.

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 2000, The Fragile Absolute, p. 11-15

So where are we, today, with regard to ghosts? The first paradox that strikes us, of course, is that this very process of global reflex¬ivization that mercilessly derides and chases the ghosts of the past generates not only its own immediacy but also its own ghosts, its own spectrality. The most famous ghost, which has been roaming around for the last 150 years, was not a ghost of the past, but the spectre of the (revolutionary) future — the spectre, of course, from the first sentence of The Communist Manifesto. The automatic reaction to The Manifesto of today’s enlightened liberal reader is: isn’t the text simply wrong on so many empirical accounts — with regard to its picture of the social situation, as well as the revolutionary perspective it sustains and propagates? Was there ever a political manifesto that was more clearly falsi¬fied by subsequent historical reality? Is not The Manifesto, at its best, the exaggerated extrapolation of certain tendencies dis¬cernible in the nineteenth century? So let us approach The Manifesto from the opposite end: where do we live today, in our global ‘post . . .‘ (postmodern, post-industrial) society? The slogan that is imposing itself more and more is ‘globalization’: the brutal imposition of the unified world market that threatens all local ethnic traditions, including the very form of the nation-state. And in view of this situation, is not the description of the social impact of the bourgeoisie in The Manifesto more relevant than ever? The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolution¬izing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolu¬tionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real condition in life, and his relations with his kind. The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere. The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civi¬lized nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the prod¬ucts of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness becomes more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.6 Is this not, more than ever, our reality today? Ericsson phones are no longer Swedish, Toyota cars are manufactured 60 per cent in the USA, Hollywood culture pervades the remotest parts of the globe. . . . Furthermore, does not the same go also for all forms of ethnic and sexual identities? Should we not supplement Marx’s description in this sense, adding also that sexual ‘one¬sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible’; that concerning sexual practices also, ‘all that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned’, so that capitalism tends to replace standard normative heterosexuality with a prolifera¬tion of unstable shifting identities and/or orientations? From time to time Marx himself underestimates this ability of the capitalist universe to incorporate the transgressive urge that seemed to threaten it; in his analysis of the ongoing American Civil War, for example, he claimed that since the English textile industry, the backbone of the industrial system, could not survive without the supply of cheap cotton from the American South rendered pos¬sible only by slave labour, England would be forced to intervene directly to prevent the abolition of slavery. So yes, this global dynamism described by Marx, which causes all things solid to melt into air, is our reality — on condition that we do not forget to supplement this image from The Manifesto with its inherent dialectical opposite, the ‘spiritualization’ of the very material process of production. While capitalism does suspend the power of the old ghosts of tradition, it generates its own mon¬strous ghosts. That is to say: on the one hand, capitalism entails the radical secularization of social life — it mercilessly tears apart any aura of authentic nobility, sacredness, honour, and so on: It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fer¬vour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved per¬sonal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom — Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.7 However, the fundamental lesson of the ‘critique of political econ¬omy’ elaborated by the mature Marx in the years after The Manifesto is that this reduction of all heavenly chimeras to brutal economic reality generates a spectrality of its own. When Marx describes the mad self-enhancing circulation of Capital, whose solipsistic path of self-fecundation reaches its apogee in today’s meta-reflexive speculations on futures, it is far too simplistic to claim that the spectre of this self-engendering monster that pursues its path regardless of any human or environmental concern is an ideolog¬ical abstraction, and that one should never forget that behind this abstraction there are real people and natural objects on whose productive capacities and resources Capital’s circulation is based, and on which it feeds like a gigantic parasite. The problem is that this ‘abstraction’ does not exist only in our (financial specula¬tor’s) misperception of social reality; it is ‘real’ in the precise sense of determining the very structure of material social processes: the fate of whole strata of populations, and sometimes of whole coun¬tries, can be decided by the ‘solipsistic’ speculative dance of Capital, which pursues its goal of profitability with a blessed indif¬ference to the way its movement will affect social reality. That is the fundamental systemic violence of capitalism, which is much more uncanny than direct pre-capitalist socio-ideological violence: this violence is no longer attributable to concrete individuals and their ‘evil’ intentions; it is purely ‘objective’, systemic, anonymous.

#### Capitalism’s preoccupation with endless accumulation will result in total ecological destruction and extinction

Foster 11,[John Bellamy ] Dec. 2011, Capitalism and the Accumulation of Catastrophe, Monthly Review, Vol. 63 Issue 07, <http://monthlyreview.org/2011/12/01/capitalism-and-the-accumulation-of-catastrophe> (Aug 2012)

Yet, the continued pursuit of Keynes’s convenient lie over the last eight decades has led to a world far more polarized and beset with contradictions than he could have foreseen. It is a world prey to the enormous unintended consequences of accumulation without limits: namely, global economic stagnation, financial crisis, and planetary ecological destruction. Keynes, though aware of some of the negative economic aspects of capitalist production, had no real understanding of the ecological perils—of which scientists had already long been warning. Today these perils are impossible to overlook. Faced with impending ecological catastrophe, it is more necessary than ever to abandon Keynes’s convenient lie and espouse the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. Capitalism, the society of “après moi le déluge!” is a system that fouls its own nest—both the human-social conditions and the wider natural environment on which it depends. The accumulation of capital is at the same time accumulation of catastrophe, not only for a majority of the world’s people, but living species generally. Hence, nothing is *fairer*—more just, more beautiful, and more necessary—today than the struggle to overthrow the regime of capital and to create a system of substantive equality and sustainable human development; a socialism for the twenty-first century.

#### The alternative is to reject capitalism through revolutionary action towards capitalism

Herod ‘4 James Herod author of several books on capitalism and social activist since 1968 Getting Free 2004 <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm>

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we�re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can�t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It�s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction. The content of this vision is actually not new at all, but quite old. The long term goal of communists, anarchists, and socialists has always been to restore community. Even the great peasant revolts of early capitalism sought to get free from external authorities and restore autonomy to villages. Marx defined communism once as a free association of producers, and at another time as a situation in which the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all. Anarchists have always called for worker and peasant self-managed cooperatives. The long term goals have always been clear: to abolish wage-slavery, to eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and to establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world.

# Case

#### Foregrounding of whiteness reinforces US exceptionalism, undermining solvency – their localization to intra-debate community issues is an exclamation mark

Carey 2009 (Jane Carey, Postcolonialism Researcher, Monach U, Leigh Boucher, School of Modern History & PLS, Marquarie U, and Katherine Ellinghaus (School of Hist Studies, Monach U), Re-Orienting Whiteness (B) 2009)

(p3-4) Arneson was not alone, as the flurry of similarly dissatisfied reviews indicated." Although not as scathing, Peter Kolchin, for example, also expressed uneasiness at the "elusive, undefined nature of whiteness," the lack of "historical grounding" of many contemporary studies, and the "over-reliance on whiteness in explaining the American past." 2° In assigning such overarching explanatory power to whiteness, he suggested, the field is prone to overstatement and overgeneralization, coming close to "portraying race as a ubiquitous and unchanging transhistorical force rather than a shifting and contingent 'construction.'" 21 Kolchin also briefly observed that one of the "most striking features" of whiteness studies is the "assumption—sometimes asserted and sometimes unspoken—that the racism they describe is uniquely American and that American whiteness can be understood in isolation." 22 The most influential U.S. scholarship, particularly that by labor historians, locates the creation of white identity entirely within historical circumstances quite specific to the United States, namely black chattel slavery and, later, mass immigration. 23 While this narrow national focus has not emerged as a prominent concern within existing critiques of the field, we argue that it is in fact of central importance. Much historical work on whiteness is even more narrowly positioned. As John Munro has outlined, it largely represents another in the series of U.S. labor history projects that have sought to answer the question Werner Sombart posed in 1906, "Why is there no socialism in the United States?," and is primarily concerned with finding "a usable past upon which an anti-capitalist and antiracist future can be envisioned." 24 This in part explains why it has largely ignored wider scholarship that does not share these, very particular, interests, and why many objections to whiteness studies have simply joined the long history of attempts to assert the primacy of class over race. 25 Despite pretensions to an almost universal applicability, distinct U.S. academic debates, as well as specific political projects and disavowals (particularly of the settler-colonial underpinnings of the United States), silently orient the field. In many ways, debates about whiteness have primarily reflected a turf war over leadership in the field of labor history in the United States. The issues at stake are far too important to allow them to be subsumed within such parochial concerns.

#### Whiteness studies fail – US model focus – they aggravate the problem by trying to sidestep our literature bases

Jane Carey (Postcolonialism Researcher, Monach U), Leigh Boucher (School of Modern History & PLS, Marquarie U), and Katherine Ellinghaus (School of Hist Studies, Monach U), Re-Orienting Whiteness (B) 2009

(p2) This is not to say that this collection is united by an unfaltering commitment to whiteness studies. It is equally shaped by a uneasiness with the field tendencies toward ahistoricity, reification, and universalization; its ill-defined analytic vocabulary; and especially its potential simply to reinscribe white people at the center of historical narratives. And we are acutely aware that, since its emergence, the field has proven "a lightning rod for critics.' I licked, alongside its rapid growth, the apparently deserved death of the field has been simultaneously announced as the latest headstone in a graveyard of academic fads. 7 A key development that argues these dismissive predictions, however, is the degree to which the terms "white" and "whiteness" have already been adopted by historians, particularly those writing about European colonialism. These categories have recently been inserted alongside class, gender, and various "others."' This book functions in some ways simply to highlight the significance of this quite startling analytic uptake. But it also registers a profound discomfort with the ways that whiteness has snuck through the backdoor into the historian's toolkit, often with little definition or explanation. Its meanings are often taken for granted, as if they were self-evident. The nuanced, historically grounded, and theoretically broad-ranging approaches in this collection suggest a number of ways forward for scholars. As Matt Wray has recently observed, "whiteness studies has left childhood and is now enduring adolescence. It's having its identity crisis right on time." 9 The time is ripe for a major reassessment of the field. In approaching this task, we wish to foreground the limitations that have resulted from the U.S.-centered nature of most whiteness scholarship. This is clearly problematic for a field that makes broad, even universal, claims to explaining the operations of "race." Whiteness, obviously, has had far wider geographic purchase. We seek to decenter the United States in the area of whiteness studies, and in some ways to recognize that it was never central to begin with. So too, the isolationist tendencies of U.S. whiteness scholarship have produced its lack of engagement with work on race in other contexts, particularly the analytic frames that have emerged through attempts to theorize European colonialism. We contend that this nationally and theoretically limited approach represents in fact the major weakness of the field." In other words, whiteness needs to be reconciled with the major intellectual currents that have shaped research on race outside the United States.

Wildersons argument denies Black agency and fails to come up with effective solutions

Saër Maty Ba (Professor of Film – University of Portsmouth and Co-Editor – The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration) “The US Decentred: From Black Social Death to Cultural Transformation” September 2011 , Cultural Studies Review, 17(2), , p. 385-387)

A few pages into Red, White and Black, I feared that it would just be a matter of time before Wilderson’s black‐as‐social‐death idea and multiple attacks on issues and scholars he disagrees with run (him) into (theoretical) trouble. This happens in chapter two, ‘The Narcissistic Slave’, where he critiques black film theorists and books. For example, Wilderson declares that Gladstone Yearwood’s Black Film as Signifying Practice (2000) ‘betrays a kind of conceptual anxiety with respect to the historical object of study— ... it clings, anxiously, to the film‐as‐text‐as‐legitimateobject of Black cinema.’ (62) He then quotes from Yearwood’s book to highlight ‘just how vague the aesthetic foundation of Yearwood’s attempt to construct a canon can be’. (63) And yet Wilderson’s highlighting is problematic because it overlooks the ‘Diaspora’ or ‘African Diaspora’, a key component in Yearwood’s thesis that, crucially, neither navel‐gazes (that is, at the US or black America) nor pretends to properly engage with black film. Furthermore, Wilderson separates the different waves of black film theory and approaches them, only, in terms of how a most recent one might challenge its precedent. Again, his approach is problematic because it does not mention or emphasise the inter‐connectivity of/in black film theory. As a case in point, Wilderson does not link Tommy Lott’s mobilisation of Third Cinema for black film theory to Yearwood’s idea of African Diaspora. (64) Additionally, of course, Wilderson seems unaware that Third Cinema itself has been fundamentally questioned since Lott’s 1990s’ theory of black film was formulated. Yet another consequence of ignoring the African Diaspora is that it exposes Wilderson’s corpus of films as unable to carry the weight of the transnational argument he attempts to advance. Here, beyond the US‐centricity or ‘social and political specificity of [his] filmography’, (95) I am talking about Wilderson’s choice of films. For example, Antwone Fisher (dir. Denzel Washington, 2002) is attacked unfairly for failing to acknowledge ‘a grid of captivity across spatial dimensions of the Black “body”, the Black “home”, and the Black “community”’ (111) while films like Alan and Albert Hughes’s Menace II Society (1993), overlooked, do acknowledge the same grid and, additionally, problematise Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Act (STEP) policing. The above examples expose the fact of Wilderson’s dubious and questionable conclusions on black film. Red, White and Black is particularly undermined by Wilderson’s propensity for exaggeration and blinkeredness. In chapter nine, ‘“Savage” Negrophobia’, he writes: The philosophical anxiety of Skins is all too aware that through the Middle Passage, African culture became Black ‘style’ ... Blackness can be placed and displaced with limitless frequency and across untold territories, by whoever so chooses. Most important, there is nothing real Black people can do to either check or direct this process ... Anyone can say ‘nigger’ because anyone can be a ‘nigger’. (235)7 Similarly, in chapter ten, ‘A Crisis in the Commons’, Wilderson addresses the issue of ‘Black time’. Black is irredeemable, he argues, because, at no time in history had it been deemed, or deemed through the right historical moment and place. In other words, the black moment and place are not right because they are ‘the ship hold of the Middle Passage’: ‘the most coherent temporality ever deemed as Black time’ but also ‘the “moment” of no time at all on the map of no place at all’. (279) Not only does Pinho’s more mature analysis expose this point as preposterous (see below), I also wonder what Wilderson makes of the countless historians’ and sociologists’ works on slave ships, shipboard insurrections and/during the Middle Passage,8 or of groundbreaking jazz‐studies books on cross‐cultural dialogue like The Other Side of Nowhere (2004). Nowhere has another side, but once Wilderson theorises blacks as socially and ontologically dead while dismissing jazz as ‘belonging nowhere and to no one, simply there for the taking’, (225) there seems to be no way back. It is therefore hardly surprising that Wilderson ducks the need to provide a solution or alternative to both his sustained bashing of blacks and anti‐ Blackness.9 Last but not least, Red, White and Black ends like a badly plugged announcement of a bad Hollywood film’s badly planned sequel: ‘How does one deconstruct life? Who would benefit from such an undertaking? The coffle approaches with its answers in tow.’ (340)

Social Death is an incomplete and unproductive frame for academic discussion

Daniel E. Rossi-Keen ( Assistant Professor of Communication Studies at Stetson University in

DeLand, Florida) Review Essay: The Life-Giving Gift of Acknowledgment (A Philosophical and Rhetorical Inquiry). By Michael J. Hyde. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2006; pp.

xviii + 336. $34.95 paper. Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Volume 11, Number 4, Winter 2008,

pp. 659-677 (Review) – obtained via Project Muse

Emphasis on philosophy abounds in the first half of the book. This is especially so in Hyde's treatment of the relationship between acknowledgment and the origins of existence (chapter 2), his examination of the reciprocity of acknowledgment and conscience (chapter 3), his consideration of how acknowledgment transforms space and time into common dwelling places (chapter 4), his explanation of the generation of a "home" by way of such rhetorical acts of acknowledgment (chapter 5), and his suggestion that acknowledgment functions as a caress (chapters 6 and 7). Though certainly not lacking [End Page 664] philosophical depth, the remaining chapters of the text are a bit more readily accessible to the nonspecialist. Herein, Hyde explores the relationship between acknowledgment and teaching (chapter 8), social death (chapter 9), and computer mediated culture (chapter 10). The book closes with an examination of the rhetoric surrounding the terrorist attacks of 9/11 (chapter 11), explaining how the rhetor may function in society as a hero. In the process of weaving together such seemingly disparate cases, Hyde gestures toward numerous resources for considering the role of rhetoric in guiding, shaping, and challenging prevailing enactments of public life. In fact, one of the most exciting features of this book is that it lends itself to so many extensions and applications. Within this text exists a philosophy of rhetoric, an ethic of human action, an anthropology, a statement both of humankind's origin and of its telos, a critique of contemporary culture, and much more. For this reason, Hyde's writing defies either simple categorization or casual reading. And this is, I think, precisely the strength and intent of the text. The text itself acts as what Hyde (2001) labels a "rhetorical interruption" (77–78), a call to stop and reckon with the state of the world as we currently perceive it. As such, The Life-Giving Gift of Acknowledgment does not always proceed in traditional ways, and some readers may therefore find themselves wanting more careful treatments of themes raised throughout the text. The rhetorician, for example, may wish for a more focused, traditional, and systematic treatment of the relationship between rhetoric and acknowledgment. The philosopher might hope for a more sustained analysis of Heidegger and Levinas. The scientist may call for further examination of the role of acknowledgment in the origins of existence. The theologian may be somewhat disappointed by Hyde's suggestive employment of religious themes. And the student of public affairs may wish for a more explicit statement of the implications of Hyde's work for communal human existence. In one sense, each of these disciplinarians would be justified in wanting more from Hyde's text, for Hyde admittedly leaves much unsaid and unexplored. In another sense, however, it is precisely this kind of narrowness that The Life-Giving Gift of Acknowledgment sets out to avoid. What Hyde has produced is an interdisciplinary treatment of the role of acknowledgment in varied aspects of human existence, and he justifiably demands that the reader do much of his or her own work in expanding and applying this theoretical construct.

#### Racialized descriptions of society reinscribe same racial binaries- constitutes the subject around race

Hartigan 2005- prof of anthropology @ UT, PhD from University of California, Santa Cruz

(John, South Atlantic Quarterly 104.3, Summer, “Culture against Race: Reworking the Basis for Racial Analysis”)

These racial identities define the type of subjects that Visweswaran advocates bringing into view via ‘‘a conception of race which is socially dynamic but historically meaningful,’’ even though their objectification potentially risks contributing, unintentionally, to the current resurgence in sociobiological notions of race. Visweswaran’s approach brings race to the fore of critical analysis, but the problem is that it also risks reproducing racial thinking in much the way ‘‘culture’’ has been accused of perpetuating race. Herbert Lewis highlights the perils in efforts to articulate this broader sensibility concerning race.8 Where Visweswaran strives to reanimate the ‘‘richly connotative 19th century sense of ‘race,’ ’’ with its invocations of ‘‘blood’’ as a form of collectivity that encompasses ‘‘numerous elements that we would today call cultural,’’ Lewis cautions against a ‘‘return to the pre-Boasian conception that combines race, culture, language, nationality and nationality in one neat package’’ (980). And though the equation of racial identity with the forms of persecution and exploitation highlighted by Visweswaran is insightful, Lewis observes that, pursued further, this logic reactivates a concept that ‘‘indissolubly connects groups of people and their appearance with beliefs about their capacity and behavior’’ (ibid.).Given the criteria she lists, Lewis argues, ‘‘it follows presumably that we should recognize as ‘races’ all those who have suffered one or another form of ill-treatment. Certainly Jews would now return to the status of a ‘racial’ group (as the Nazis contended), as do Armenians, Gypsies (Rom), ‘Untouchables’ (Dalits) in India, East Timorese, Muslim and Croats in Bosnia and Serbs in Croatia, educated Cambodians in Pol Pot’s Cambodia, both Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi’’ (ibid.). Every similarly subjected group would be reinscribed and reidentified with the very terms used initially to distinguish them for exploitation and persecution. Dominguez’s concerns about culture’s propensity for ‘‘perpetuating the very terms—of hierarchies of differential values—that constitute the hegemony’’ seem equally relevant to this attempt to ensconce race at the forefront of critical social analysis. There follow interminable questions of subdividing and distinguishing such races. Visweswaran’s description of the processes that produce ‘‘Chicanos and Puerto Ricans as races’’ leads Lewis to ask, ‘‘Are these two different ‘races’ or one? Can rich, powerful, and selfassured Puerto Ricans belong to this ‘race’? Do Dominicans, Ecuadorians, and Cubans each get to be their own race, or can they all be in one race with Chicanos and Puerto Ricans because they all speak (or once spoke) Spanish? Can Spanish-speakers from Spain belong, too?’’ (980). The problem with formulating research in terms of race is that it becomes very difficult to proceed without reproducing various racialized logics that promote the notion that groups are essentially differentiated—experientially and in terms of innate capacities and dispositions—by race.9 This is a problem that Gilroy takes as a basis for his critique of ‘‘raciology,’’ which I will examine further below.

#### Totalizing critiques of whiteness commodify races- essentialisms ensure no alt solvency

Hartigan 2005- prof of anthropology @ UT, PhD from University of California, Santa Cruz

(John, South Atlantic Quarterly 104.3, Summer, “Culture against Race: Reworking the Basis for Racial Analysis”)

One might be tempted to assume that Gilroy’s stance is largely polemical, but his critique is thoroughgoing, as is his call to reject ‘‘this desire to cling on to ‘race’ and go on stubbornly and unimaginatively seeing the world on the distinctive scales that it has specified.’’ In spite of powerful, novel efforts to fundamentally transform racial analysis—such as the emergence of ‘‘whiteness studies’’ or analyses of the ‘‘new racism’’—Gilroy is emphatic in ‘‘demand[ing] liberation not from white supremacy alone, however urgently that is required, but from all racializing and raciological thought, fromracialized seeing, racialized thinking, and racialized thinking about thinking’’ (40). In contrast to Visweswaran—and, interestingly, voicing concerns over ‘‘cultural politics’’ that resonate with Dominguez’s critique—Gilroy sees a host of problems in ‘‘black political cultures’’ that rely on ‘‘essentialist approaches to building solidarity’’ (38).14 Nor does he share Harrison’s confidence in making racism the centerpiece of critical cultural analysis. Gilroy plainly asserts that ‘‘the starting point of this book is that the era of New Racism is emphatically over’’ (34). A singular focus on racism precludes an attention to ‘‘the appearance of sharp intraracial conflicts’’ and does not effectively address the ‘‘several new forms of determinism abroad’’ (38, 34). We still must be prepared ‘‘to give effective answers to the pathological problems represented by genomic racism, the glamour of sameness, and the eugenic projects currently nurtured by their confluence’’ (41). But the diffuse threats posed by invocations of racially essentialized identities (shimmering in ‘‘the glamour of sameness’’) as the basis for articulating ‘‘black political cultures’’ entails an analytical approach that countervails against positing racism as the singular focus of inquiry and critique.15 From Gilroy’s stance, to articulate a ‘‘postracial humanism’’ we must disable any form of racial vision and ensure that it can never again be reinvested with explanatory power. But what will take its place as a basis for talking about the dynamics of belonging and differentiation that profoundly shape social collectives today? Gilroy tries to make clear that it will not be ‘‘culture,’’ yet this concept infuses his efforts to articulate an alternative conceptual approach. Gilroy conveys many of the same reservations about culture articulated by the anthropologists listed above. Specifically, Gilroy cautions that ‘‘the culturalist approach still runs the risk of naturalizing and normalizing hatred and brutality by presenting them as inevitable consequences of illegitimate attempts to mix and amalgamate primordially incompatible groups’’ (27). In contrast, Gilroy expressly prefers the concept of diaspora as a means to ground a new form of attention to collective identities. ‘‘As an alternative to the metaphysics of ‘race,’ nation, and bounded culture coded into the body,’’ Gilroy finds that ‘‘diaspora is a concept that problematizes the cultural and historical mechanics of belonging’’ (123). Furthermore, ‘‘by focusing attention equally on the sameness within differentiation and the differentiation within sameness, diaspora disturbs the suggestion that political and cultural identity might be understood via the analogy of indistinguishable peas lodged in the protective pods of closed kinship and subspecies’’ (125). And yet, in a manner similar to Harrison’s prioritizing of racism as a central concern for social inquiry, when it comes to specifying what diaspora entails and how it works, vestiges of culture reemerge as a basis for the coherence of this new conceptual focus. When Gilroy delineates the elements and dimensions of diaspora, culture provides the basic conceptual background and terminology. In characterizing ‘‘the Atlantic diaspora and its successor-cultures,’’ Gilroy sequentially invokes ‘‘black cultural styles’’ and ‘‘postslave cultures’’ that have ‘‘supplied a platform for youth cultures, popular cultures, and styles of dissent far from their place of origin’’ (178). Gilroy explains how the ‘‘cultural expressions’’ of hip-hop and rap, along with other expressive forms of ‘‘black popular culture,’’ are marketed by the ‘‘cultural industries’’ to white consumers who ‘‘currently support this black culture’’ (181). Granted, in these uses of ‘‘culture’’ Gilroy remains critical of ‘‘absolutist definitions of culture’’ and the process of commodification that culture in turn supports. But his move away from race importantly hinges upon some notion of culture. We may be able to do away with race, but seemingly not with culture.

#### Whiteness cant be the root cause- history of other races justifying violence based on racialization

Spickard 2009 Paul Spickard, Graduated Harvard, Ph.D in History from UC Berkeley, professor of history at UC Santa Barbara, review of “Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism”, in American Studies, vol 5 num 1/2, MUSE

For Sexton (as for the Spencers and Gordon) race is about Blackness, in the United States and around the world. That is silly, for there are other racialized relationships. In the U.S., native peoples were racialized by European intruders in all the ways that Africans were, and more: they were nearly extinguished. To take just one example from many around the world, Han Chinese have racialized Tibetans historically in all the ways (including slavery) that Whites have racialized Blacks and Indians in the United States. So there is a problem with Sexton's concept of race as Blackness. There is also a problem with his insistence on monoraciality. For Sexton and the others, one cannot be mixed or multiple; one must choose ever and only to be Black. I don't have a problem with that as a political choice, but to insist that it is the only possibility flies in the face of a great deal of human experience, and it ignores the history of how modern racial ideas emerged. Sexton does point out, as do many writers, the flawed tendencies in multiracial advocacy mentioned in the second paragraph above. But he imputes them to the whole movement and to the subject of study, and that is not a fair assessment.

#### Your explicit focus black academia flips the poles – if our scholarship is flawed because of its narrow focus then yours is too

John McWhorter (Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Associate Professor of Linguistics at UC Berkeley after teaching at Cornell University) 2000 “Losing the Race: Self-Sabotage in Black America” p. 51-4

Under the Cult of Separatism, expressions of mainstream culture considered “default” by most Americans of all colors are processed by many if not most blacks not as common coin, but as “white.” This alienates may black people from some of the most well-wrought, emotionally stirring art and ideas that humans have produced, miring the race in a parochialism that clips its spiritual wings. On a lunch date with a young black woman some time ago, I happened to be carrying a copy of Jane Eyre. For whatever its worth, at any give time I am likely to be reading Alice Walker or Gloria Naylor as Charlotte Bronte or Henry James; I read Tolstroy not out of a self-hating fascination with white people, but because the man wrote a crackling good and highly affecting story. (Anna Karenina so grabbed me that one day when I was reading it in Washington Square, the woman next to me said, “oh, look, there are Anna and Vronsky over there” and I looked up fully expecting to see them gliding by the skateboarders and drug dealers in their bourgeois finery, so real had they become to me.) However, for my black friend, Jane Eyre was not a book, it was a “white book.” “Oh, I’d never read something like that,” she said, quite casually. She preferred to read only books written by and about her own people. That includes a lot of great literature but the person who can immerse himself in the richness of James Baldwin but never experiences Tolstoy is like someone who thrills to a Haydn string quartet but refuses to hear one not of a Beethoven symphony. This person never tastes the whole meal. Yet as I have already said to often, Life Isn’t Perfect, and in terms of the world in general, none of us ever gets the whole meal. This woman will live a full life despite missing out on “white” novels. But often this perspective ends up selling out black Americans. For example, there is a magnificent complete three-CD recording of the original score of the musical Show Boat. It is marred at the beginning, however, when what is supposed to be a black chorus of stevedores sing stiffly with slightly British accents. This was a last-minute emergency measure. Show Boat was the first American musical to substantially address the tragedy of race relations, and includes a black chorus and a white chorus. Fittingly, a black chorus was hired for the recording, but walked out upon being required to sing the original lyrics of the opening chorus “Niggers all work on the Mississippi.” The recording was made in London, and while using American performers, had recruited a British white chorus. On such short notice, the producers had no choice but to have them step in to sing the black choruses as well. The accent difference is not a serious problem in the passages for the white chorus, but it naturally stands out much more when these Britishers are supposed to be deep Southern blacks. Over the years, the lyric in question has indeed been increasingly watered down for new productions in line with increasing racial sensitivity: “Darkies all work…,” “Colored folks work…,” and finally, “here we all work…” by the 1960s. this made sense, but by 1988, with nigger safely quarantined as one of the most socially inappropriate words in the English language to use in real life, the producers thought that singing the original lyric could be perceived as historical in intent, and furthermore, the original line had a true-to-life power that none of the substitutions have. The “Niggers all work on the Mississippi…” line is sung not by a happy gang of minstrels, but by grim, overworked black laborers bitterly quoting whites’ opinions of them; it is also an accurate depiction of the tendency for blacks to use nigger among themselves. Whether one calls this a therapeutic defusing of an epithet via appropriation, or evidence of underlying self-hatred (it is in truth both), the fact is that this use of nigger is undeniably real. It is difficult to believe that anyone who actually watches a production of Show boat, seeing how openly and sympathetically it treats the black condition, could fail to understand that the blacks singing this opening chorus “Niggers all work on the Mississippi” are eloquently protesting racism, not underlining it. This opening chorus portrays blacks giving vent to their frustration at their victimhood, surely something these protesters would champion. The only possible reasons someone would misunderstand this lyric is, quite simply, not having had occasion to listen to a recording, see a production, or rent a video. One suspects that these singers were only glancingly familiar with Show Boat, out of a sense that it is a “white musical” – “oh, I’d never go see anything like that.” As a result, they pass up an opportunity to lend one of black American cultures most precious legacies, the unique timbre and precision of choral singing, to this monumental recording, instead leaving our ancestors portrayed by British whites unable to render the material in the authentic style. This sense of mainstream culture as alien extends into academia as well. Manning Marable has explicitly urged black scholars to restrict their research to black issues, thereby explicitly deeming intellectual curiosity for its own sake to be inappropriate to black American people. Under this rubric, the black scholar is to study slavery, Africa, and social welfare, but never Russian history, Jane Eyre, or mainstream theater history. Many will see Marable as “concerned,” a “serious brother,” or “cool,” but obviously it is a short step from Marable to “oh, id never read that” and the Show Boat walkout. Separatism also has a tendency to close black people off to foreign cultures other than black ones. I once met an aspiring black linguist who had spent two years in China without learning Chinese beyond what he needed to buy food at the market. Most people who spend two years in a foreign country come back speaking the language, and this is especially true of linguists, for whom the experience often serves as a basis for career’s work. This was the only linguist I have ever met who spent two years abroad without becoming bilingual, and it is not likely to be accidental that he was black. Seperatism has a way of discouraging black Americans from learning foreign languages other than French and Spanish, spoken by many Caribbeans and Africans, and Swahili. In my lifetime, I have known only one black person who studied German (it was a required course), one (a Black Muslim) who took Arabic, and not one who took Russian, Chinese, or Japanese. Certainly there must have been some who studied the latter three (e.g, black political adviser Condoleza Rice speaks Russian). Nevertheless, it is significant that in a thirty-four-year language-centered life, I personally have never met any. What makes black people shy away form these languages – even in elite universities – is a sense that they are not “black” things. This particular branch of Separatist orientation has roots in segregation, of course, and was crystallized in the sixties as Separatism expanded into a general coping strategy. Now, however, this wariness of nonblack culture is too often a barrier sealing the black community off from enriching influences. The linguist wanted to go on to do academic study of the Chinese sound system, but he will never be competitive – almost every other linguist studying Chinese has learned to speak the language.

#### Don’t let them get away with playing the “all your evidence is a product of racism” card – you should hold their arguments to rigorous logical standards and not simply dismiss our evidence as ‘just another link’

John McWhorter (Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Associate Professor of Linguistics at UC Berkeley after teaching at Cornell University) 2000 “Losing the Race: Self-Sabotage in Black America” p. 54-5

As the spawn of Victimology, Separatism shares with its progenitor a tendency to be allowed to trump truth in cases that require choosing between them. In this vein, a considerable amount of black academic work downplays logical argument and factual evidence in the service of filling in an idealized vision of the black past and present, which is founded not upon intellectual curiosity but upon raising in-group self-esteem. Mother Egypt “Afrocentric History,” for example, is primarily founded upon a fragile assemblage of misreadings of classical texts to construct a scenario under which Ancient Egypt was a “black” civilization (was Anwar Sadat a “brother”?), raped by the Ancient Greeks, who therefore owed all notable in their culture to them. Professional classicists easily point out the errors in these claims, only to have their proponents dismiss them as “racists” for having even questioned them, neglecting in the process to provide actual answers. Indeed, to insist upon facts – or apparently, to master the complex classical languages in which the original documents were written – is “inauthentic.” The goal here is not to weigh evidence carefully in order to unearth the truth, but to construct interpretations of evidence that bolster a pre-conceived “truth,” like “creation scientists” whose objectivity is decisively crippled by a fundamental conviction that God must be the driver of the universe. Uninterested in any information inapplicable to the construction of the Afrocentric myth and closed to constructive engagement, these people may be many wonderful things, but one thing they are not is scholars. Yet they are respectfully addressed as “professor” by gullible students, and one eminent black undergraduate profiled in Ebony cited a volume of this kind of history as the most important book she had read that year. Ideally, an afrocentric academia is conceivable in which people simply apply the tools of the mainstream academia to illuminating black concerns. This is the vision most defenses of Afrocentric work are based on. However, in practice, the centrality of victimhood in the black cultural identity subverts this ideal. All too often, black scholarship is devoted not to general scholarly inquiry about black people, but a subset of this: Chronicling black victimhood past and present, and to remedy that victimhood, celebration and legitimization of black people past and present. Because black people are no more perfect than anyone else and life past and present is complex, this abridged conception of academic inquiry inherently conflicts with the commitment to mainstream academia to striving for assessment as unbiased as possible. In this conflict between victimology and truth, Victimology is naturally allowed the upper hand. The result is a sovereign entity where the outward forms of academia – articles, books, conferences, symposia – are harnessed to a local set of rules: a Separatist conception of academia. In “black” academia, as often as not, comment is preferred over question, folk wisdom is often allowed to trump rigorous argumentation, and sociopolitical intent is weighted more heavily than the empirical soundness of ones conclusions. There are certainly quite a few excellent black scholars, but overall, Separatist academic standards are pervasive enough to make black conferences quite often perceptibly less rigorous than mainstream ones. Many mainstream scholars would be, or have been, surprised at the sparseness of serious, constructive debate at may black conferences, unaware that because of the grips of victimology and separatism, this kind of debate would be superfluous to the proceedings, and even unwelcome. After four decades, many black academics have spent their entire careers in this alternate realm, and as such, have never been required to assess the full range of facts applying to a case, to construct rigorous arguments, or to address anything but the very politest and most superficial of criticism. Here is the beginnings of the notions at the center of “Afrocentric History” such as that Cleopatra was “black,” that Aristotle stole books from an Egyptian library that wasn’t even built until twenty-five years after he died, etc. Moderate black academics are more likely to say of the most egregious Afrocentric work that “more work needs to be done” than to actually pin it as nonsense, which makes complete sense when we realize that the fundamental commitment of much black academic work is not assessment of facts and testing of theories, but chronicling victimhood and reinforcing community self-esteem

#### Their cooption arguments are unsupported and nonfalsifiable – don’t buy their rhetorically powerful cards – force them to provide specific applications of their abstract evidence. Allowing them to get away with vague, jargon laden cards about race results in the same poor scholarship they criticize

John McWhorter (Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Associate Professor of Linguistics at UC Berkeley after teaching at Cornell University) 2000 “Losing the Race: Self-Sabotage in Black America” p. 55-8

This problem is by no means limited just to the collection of people committed to “afrocentric history”’ it is seldom far from the surface in any scholarly setting in the realm of “blackademia.” As a conference on black performance in 1999, a black scholar from England argued that whites’ tendency to adopt black American popular cultural forms is evidence not of an identification with black people, nor of a desire for cross-cultural harmony or understanding, but of a desire to eliminate the black presence via co-opting what makes them unique. Interesting idea, but hardly as obvious or incontrovertible as the operations of gravity. Does the white teen who like Snoop Doggy Dogg want to eliminate niggers, or does he simply like the beat and vibrate in tune with the antiestablishment attitude that has enthralled young Westerners since Goethe’s Young Werther? Did whites stir the blues and jazz into their marches and jigs to create rock music because they were racists, or because blues and jazz are among the most sublimely intoxicating aesthetic creations humanity has ever known Here in the Bay Area, I have noticed that white females of ages roughly ten to fourteen are fond of imitating black women’s “sassy” “uh-UHH!...” accompanied by the pushing forward of an admonishing second finger pointing upwards, and waved back and forth in opposition to corresponding “sassy swivel” neck movements (tough to describe on paper – thing of Aretha Franklin in The Blues Brothers). Perhaps I lack some exotic brand of insight, but I simply do not see sublimated hate in these girls – on the contrary, they are expressing a joyous admiration of black women’s trademark strength; it’s the melting pot in all of its glory. Similarly, among the white male high schoolers and undergraduates I see who perform hip-hop, imitating “ghetto” gestures and intonation as closely as they can, what I see is a sincere admiration of a massively compelling art form. A lot of these kids will even say “sometimes I wish I was black” – and I do not think that what they wish is that they could become black while real black people disappeared; what they wish – regardless of the fact that this would of course be more complicated than a fantasy dwells upon – is to join black people. Some might disagree with me, but just as many would not, and the point is that there are obviously issues to be discussed here. Yet the scholar at this conference simply put forth his declaration that this kind of imitation masks racist hatred without a shred of support. To be sure, his point was rendered especially seductive by the densely elegant jargon in which academics in the humanities are trained to couch their thoughts. Furthermore, this was all delivered in a gorgeous Oxonian accent which, in all of its calfskin suave, also betrayed that he is extremely unlikely to have experience nay of the particular slings and arrows of a black American inner-city, or even middle-class, life. In general, there was not a hint of anything but Sir Alec Guinness in his demeanor, and thus his statement cannot be informed by any personal discomfort with seeing “his” culture “co-opted.” Indeed, put aside his references to “mimesis” and “negation,” and all this guy was saying was “the only reason they imitate us is because they hate us.” Preface this statement with “Yo,” and its content remains exactly the same. Yet if “imitation is the sincerest form of flattery” has any value as a general aphorism, his was in essence an extremely underargued thesis. Mainstream conferences are devoted not to tossing out colorful accusations, but to sifting and evaluating the idea proposed by the participants. Yet despite this man’s having presented no evidence or argument whatsoever to support his claim, he was heartily applauded several times, and was one of the hits of the conference – he could barely get out of the auditorium for coffee, so besieged was he by people lauding him for telling it like it is. (No, I was not jealou – I was just attending the conference, not speaking at it!) Because this was a black conference, making an argument was less important than reaffirming common wisdom, and to hear common wisdome dressed up in arcane words and an Alistair Cooke accent is even better, in lending it the air of scholarly authority. The substance of scholarly authority, however, was a distinctly lesser concern. What was significant about this was that for anyone to ask this man to supply evidence for this point would have been as shockingly inappropriate as pullout a tuba and blowing on it. His point was simply assumed to be true, or at least, by the more exploratorily inclined, “a valid point of view.” But what this meant was that this was not a forum devoted to the presenting findings or evaluating conflicting interpretations of data or events – i.e., properly speaking it was not an academic exercise at all. It was a rally, designed to reinforced the emotionally based sentiments the audience and participants came in with. After all, even if the man was right, mainstream academia is not inclined to convene conferences with the purpose of proclaiming what is already known. Political science conferences do not feature various speakers presenting nimble variations upon the point that “war is bad”’ biologists do not convene to urgently remind one another that all forms of life are based on DNA. The Separatist current makes this kind of thing seem natural to conveners of many black conferences, out of a sense that actual academic debate is somehow “besides the point” for Africna Americans since our status as eternal victims make our regularly proclaiming this, as it would be for villagers in Chechnya, a more pressing concern. And make no mistake – the same priorities reign even without plumy accents and Judith Butler jargon. I once attended a conference where a black woman gave a paper taking issue with an article which, by her reading, denied that black female speech had any unique patterns. After criticizing the author, with the unspoken implication that this writer was one ore oppressor trying to deny black people their identity, the professor presented a few features of black female speech. In the question session afterwards, a white woman very politely pointed out that the author of the article in question was quite aware of the uniqueness and richness of black female speech, and that the professor’s interpretation was based on a misreading of the author’s phrasing. Ordinarily in academia, the presenter would defend herself by making specific reference to the article and its argumentation. Here, however, was a conflict between the tenets of mainstream academia and the very different ones in black academia. The professor’s sole answer was, “well, I read it as denying the uniqueness of black female speech, and that was my interpretation.” Period. It did not appear to even occur to her that an actual address of the issue might be germane. Unlike mainstream academics who come to a conference prepared to field criticism during question sessions, she considered herself to have done her job simply by presenting the list of black female speech traits – and at a black conference, she had. Indeed, her presentation was constructed not as a reasoned demonstration but as a backyard “calling-out” of the author in the name of injured pride. She opened by reading a passage form the author’s paper and then repeating it in a challenging intonation of mock disbelief, with friends in the audience assigned to shout back the phrase in the same tone of voice to evoke the black church’s call-and-response tradition; she then did this with two more phrases. This was cute, but couching an academic paper as a prelude to a ghetto catfight renders one’s presentation inherently immune to constructive discussion. To criticize it in any way, even politely, is to question not the lines of argument, but an expression of cultural identity – and thus the person themselves. Indeed, the professor’s set jaw at being questioned made it painfully clear that any further dwelling upon the point would be processed as a slight against her and her race, and the questioner has hip enough to intuit the conflict in traditions here and dutifully sit down.

#### Methodological criticisms of our evidence base on the institutionalized nature of race does not warrant simply ignoring it -

Martyn Hammersley (Prof. Education and Social Research @ Centre for Childhood, Development and Learning) 1993, British Journal of Sociology, “Research and 'anti-racism': the case of Peter Foster and his critics,” 44.3, 11-93, JSTOR]

Various sorts of criticism have been directed at the validity of Foster's work. Some is substantive in character, in other words it consists of a questioning of his claims on the basis of appeals to what is taken to be well-known from other sources. For example, critics sometimes rely on the findings of other research to throw doubt on the validity of Foster's conclusions. Thus, Connolly comments that the fact that Foster's findings challenge he growing" perceived wisdom" of a number of research and theoretical perspectives developed since the mid 1980s (. . .) raises numerous important issues concerning the study's political, ethical and theoretical orientation and, consequently, the research methods used.6 Accompanying these substantive criticisms, very often, are methodological criticisms: these question the inferences that Foster draws on the basis of his own or others' data. For instance, both Connolly and Gillborn and Drew challenge Foster's claim that there was little evidence of racism on the part of the teachers in the school he studied, on the grounds that he took insufficient account of black students' views.7 They argue that he explains away the unsolicited complaints of teacher racism voiced by three of the students he interviewed by treating these as products of a general anti-school attitude. The critics also argue that the fact that so few of the students reported the existence of teacher racism resulted from the influence on them of Foster's own status as a white middle class male whom they identified with the teachers. Another methodological criticism that has been made of Foster's study is that the school he investigated was atypical and therefore does not constitute a sound basis for generalisation to other schools.8 Interestingly, these methodological criticisms parallel in character, if not in force, those that Foster himself makes of other studies; indeed, of many of the studies on which his critics rely in their substantive criticisms. And he, and others, have responded to the attacks of the critics with further methodological arguments.9 What we have here, then, is a body of substantive and methodological arguments which are interpreted in conflicting ways by Foster and his critics. One response to this situation might be to call for further research designed to resolve the disagreement. I would not want to discourage this, but I doubt whether it would succeed. It seems to me that the roots of the disagreement lie more deeply than these substantive and methodological criticisms themselves. We get an inkling of this from the fact that Foster's critics sometimes combine such criticisms with what I will call meta-methodological arguments. These concerned effects in what they take to be the presuppositions n the basis of which Foster approached his own data and that of others. The clearest published example of such criticism is provided by Connolly. He argues that, as a result of his adoption of a Weberian orientation, Foster was unable to recognise the racism that was taking place 'under his nose' (p. 142) in the school he studied. Connolly sees Foster's work in terms of a deterministic model of research in which the findings are constrained by his starting assumptions, in such a way as to rule out the detection of many forms of racism. Gillborn and Drew hint at the same point, criticizing Foster's definition of racism as too narrow. l l In part, what seems to be implied in these arguments is that the evidence which Foster offers in his study, and his questioning of the findings of other studies, must be rejected because they are incompatible with the widely accepted theory that racism is institutionalized in British society, that it is part of the fundamental structure of that society on this basis his critics argue that while discrimination may not seem to be occurring in some particular setting, once we view this setting in the context of British (or English) society as a whole it will be seen to form part of a larger pattern of racism. So, here Foster's claims are being questioned on the grounds of his presumed commitment to an inadequate methodological framework, one which gives a misleading priority of micro-empirical evidence at the expense of macro-theoretical perspective. This can be summarised as the charged that Foster's work is empiricist1.2 And, of course this argument connects with much discussion of the methodology of qualitative research today, in which the empiricism of quantitative research, and of some qualitative work, is challenged on the basis of alternative epistemological ssumptions.l3 What is being rejected here can be more usefully (because more specifically) referred to as a foundationalist epistemology. This is the notion that research conclusions are founded, in some rigorously determinate fashion, on a body of evidence whose own validity is beyond question (for example, because it consists of reports of intersubjectively observable behaviour). Thus, Troyna criticizes Foster for 'methodological purism', which he interprets as requiring evidence that rules out all possible alternative interpretations.l4 Foundationalism has, of course, been subjected to very damaging criticism in philosophy, as well as in the social sciences, over the past 30 or 40 years, and I think it is clear that it is not defensible. There is no single, agreed alternative to foundationalism, but we can identify three radical alternatives that have become increasingly influential in social research in recent years; and whose influence is detectable in the writings of some of Foster's critics. These alternatives are: relativism, standpoint theory, and instrumentalism. These are not always clearly distinguished, and they are sometimes used in combination. However, I will try to show that none of them is very satisfactory. Applying relativism to the case under discussion, it would be argued that the validity of Foster's appeal to the canons of good research is relative to a particular methodological framework, namely positivism or post-positivism and that other frameworks would produce different conclusions. We may, for instance, decide to treat the claims of some black pupils that they and others have been subjected to racist treatment by teachers as necessarily true in their own terms, as reflecting their experience and the framework of assumptions that constitute it, that framework being incommensurable with the one adopted by Foster. Something like this may underlie Connolly's question: 'how can Foster as a White middle class male construct his own definition of racism to then use to judge the accuracy of Black working class students definitions?"5If treated as valid, this argument has the effect of apparently undercutting Foster's empirical research in the sense that it need no longer be treated by others as representing reality. Yet, at the same time, from this point of view Foster's arguments remain valid in their own terms; in fact, they remain as valid as those of his critics. This seems to lead to a sort of stalemate. And, of course, there is the problem that relativism is self-undermining: if it is true, then in its own terms it can only be true relative to a relativist framework; so that from other points of view it remains false.'6 As a non-relativist, this leaves Foster free to claim quite legitimately( even from the point of view of relativism) that his views represent reality, whereas a relativist critic could not make the same claim for her or his views but must treat them simply as representing a particular framework of beliefs to which he or she happens to be committed. The second view I want to consider is sometimes associated with versions of the first, but must be kept separate because it involves a quite distinctive and incompatible element. I will refer to this as standpoint theory. Here people's experience and knowledge is treated as valid or invalid by dint of their membership in some social category.'7 Here again Foster's arguments may be dismissed because they reflect his background and experience as a white, middle class, male teacher. However, this time the implication is that reality is obscured from those with this background because of the effects of ideology. By contrast, it is suggested, the oppressed (black, female and/or working class people) have privileged insight into the nature of society. This argument produces a victory for one side, not the stalemate that seems to result from relativism; the validity of Foster's views can therefore be dismissed. But in other respects this position is no more satisfactory than relativism. We must ask on what grounds we can decide that one group has superior insight into reality. This cannot be simply because they declare that they have this insight; otherwise everyone could make the same claim with the same legitimacy (we would be back to relativism). This means that some other form of ultimate justification is involved, but what could this be? In the Marxist version of this argument the working class (or, in practice, the Communist Party) are the group with privileged insight into the nature of social reality, but it is Marx and Marxist theorists who confer this privilege on them by means of a dubious philosophy of history.l8 Something similar occurs in the case of feminist standpoint theory, where the feminist theorist ascribes privileged insight to women, or to feminists engaged in the struggle for women’s emancipation. l9 However, while we must recognise that people in different social locations may have divergent perspectives, giving them distinctive insights, it is not clear why we should believe the implausible claim that some people have privileged access to knowledge while others are blinded by ideology.20

#### Our evidence should be preferred over their propaganda tactics – you should not ignore or reject our evidence because it doesn’t directly address institutionalized racism

Martyn Hammersley (Prof. Education and Social Research @ Centre for Childhood, Development and Learning) 1993, British Journal of Sociology, “Research and 'anti-racism': the case of Peter Foster and his critics,” 44.3, 11-93, JSTOR]

This is not to say that practitioners, such as 'anti-racist' educators, should simply ignore the findings of research. The point is rather that they should judge those findings in relation to their own practical knowledge and according to what is required to pursue their work well. On this basis it might be quite reasonable for 'anti-racists to continue with their campaign against racism among teachers despite the doubts that Foster has raised; though they would be foolish to completely ignore those doubts. All this said, the criticisms of Foster's work do not seem to derive primarily from such practical judgments about his findings. Many of them seem more motivated by a concern with its possible propaganda consequences: not only can Foster's work not be used to support the 'anti-racist' campaign against teacher racism, it could be used by the other side. Indeed, it seems to be suspected by some of the critics that Foster is working for the opposition. The key question, for some at least, is 'whose side are we on?'.44 I do not doubt that propaganda considerations are necessary ones for practitioners engaged in political activity to take into account. While in an ideal world, perhaps, disputes would be resolved on the basis of discussion in pursuit of the truth, it is clear I think that the world we live in is very far from that ideal. However, great danger arises if propaganda concerns come to outweigh other practical concerns. In these circumstances, practical activity is likely to fail because erroneous assumptions accumulate; and its failure may do widespread damage. It would be a mistake, then, it seems to me, for 'anti-racists to dismiss Foster's work. To the extent that it throws doubt on the accuracy of some of the assumptions on which they operate, they ought to consider its validity seriously and not simply ignore, reject or even try to suppress it.45I t may point to a necessary reconstruction of 'anti-racism' This might be required if it were true that racism on the part of British teachers was not widespread or that it did not play a significant role in the generation of 'racial' inequality. Accepting this would not involve a denial that there may be features of the British education system and society that generate the under achievement of black pupils. Indeed, Foster himself suggests one mechanism for this: the allocation of black pupils to schools that are less effective educationally.46Of course, there still remains the question of what level or sort of evidence should persuade 'anti-racists' that Foster is right. I do not want to speculate about this here, merely to point out that there should be some level of confirming evidence at which 'anti-racists' would accept this argument. And even if Foster does not provide that level of evidence, his work could be accepted by them as making a potential contribution to increasing the effectiveness of their activities.47I n my view these considerations should outweigh any negative propaganda effects that Foster's work is likely to have. After all, racists have seldom found it difficult to invent arguments and evidence to support their position, and have generally shown scant regard for the difference between such inventions and more soundly based scientific conclusions. I want to conclude by going even further than this and suggesting that 'anti-racists' are unwise to reject the conventional model of research in favour of an activist conception. One reason for this is that the propaganda capacity of research is to a large extent parasitic upon the conventional model. Once research becomes seen as geared to the pursuit of particular political goals, with research results being selected, even in part, according to their suitability for propaganda purposes, its propaganda value is gone.

#### The argument that their claims are constructed to protect normative legal that are false – this is a non-falsifiable conspiracy – their paranoid mode of though makes effective politics impossible.

Daniel Farber (PhD University of Michigan) and Suzanna Sherry (JD Constitutional Law Vanderbilt University). Beyond All Reason: A radical Assault on Truth in American Law. 1997. P. 166-7.

Radical multiculturalists tend to take a similar posture with respect to outsiders. Either the criticism is another effort by members of the dominant group to maintain their status and power, or it is pandering by members of the oppressed group to the power structure. Even outsiders who purport to be sympathetic to the radical multiculturalists position may be viewed with suspicion – they may be co-opting the radical potential of the movement. Indeed, once you take the position that truth and merit are masks for the exercise of power, there really isn’t any way to consider an argument expect as an attempted exercise of power. So the natural response is not to ask whether the argument is valid, but instead to look for the right tactical response to the hostile move. In addition, it becomes almost impossible to conceive of friendly criticism; to admit that the critic is honestly motivated by a concern about the truth of your own position would be to concede that “truth” is something other than a mask for power. If truth and merit do not exist, concerns about the truth or merit of work by multiculturalists can only be yet another power play. Moreover, as we have already discussed, radical multiculturalists like paranoids, can explain away any seemingly adverse evidence, because they know in advance that it cannot be valid. The paranoid knows that there is a conspiracy against him, and if there is evidence to the contrary, that only proves the power and deviousness of the conspiracy. Similarly, the radical multiculturalists can always deconstruct any apparently contrary evidence. The research agenda, after all, is not to test whether society is irredeemably racist and sexist but to uncover precisely how society is shaped by racism and sexism. Counter-evidence only increases the challenge. The paranoid mode of thought is a threat to efforts at dialogue between radical multiculturalists and others. Combined with the self-sealing nature of social constructionism and its reliance on stockries of oppression, it makes genuine intellectual engagement with outsiders difficult. Nevertheless, as we discuss in our “Conclusion,” prospects are not utterly hopeless. Something constructive may yet emerge from the clash between the radical multiculturalists and the mainstream.

#### We are rational human subjects - Knowledge is objective – we can use our understanding of our shared reality to make decisions – MAKE THEM PROVE WE ARE WRONG.

Daniel Farber (PhD University of Michigan) and Suzanna Sherry (JD Constitutional Law Vanderbilt University). Beyond All Reason: A radical Assault on Truth in American Law. 1997. P. 27

At least since the Enlightenment, knowledge has been thought of as universally accessible and objective. Something counts as knowledge of because of its pedigree but because of its content. That the Pope or the president or the New York Times says it does not insulate it from challenge. Moreover, you and I can know the same thing. We can convey that knowledge to others, and we can be persuaded through reason to reassess what we know. Some things even count as -common knowledge." Objectivity is a tricky concept. (Ask any philosopher.) In using the term objective knowledge, we have in mind something more modest :han eternal, unchanging truth, or what philosophers sometimes call the God's-eye view of the universe. Knowledge as understood at any riven time is not necessarily the same as ultimate truth. We someimes think we "know" things that seem well-established but turn out not to be true, as when everyone knew that the sun revolved around the earth, or that chocolate caused hyperactivity in children. These things have since been disproved, and we now have knowledge of—or at least a very well-justified belief in—their converses. Knowledge is nevertheless objective in the sense that it reflects something bevond fiat or a parochial viewpoint. We would, for instance, tend to discount an unsupported statement by the chocolate industry denying any relationship between chocolate and hyperactivity. This is because we generally believe that there are independent standards for evaluating claims to knowledge and for mounting challenges to established knowledge. Moreover, these standards are crucial to our common vision of knowledge as both objective and subject to change. What keeps knowledge from being stagnant is its universal vulnerability to challenge. Objectivity is the aspiration to eliminate beliefs based on bias, personal idiosyncracy, fiat, or careless investigation.
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### A2: Cap was African Americans

#### Capitalism originated in agrarian society before the assumed “assimilation of the West”

Ballve The Origin of Capitalism Posted on June 13, 2011 by Teo Ballvé <http://territorialmasquerades.net/the-origins-of-capitalism/> Review of Ellen Meinken Wood.

Her main argument is that a non-circular, denaturalizing account of the origins of capitalism must trace the origins of capitalism to the English countryside and its changing property relations beginning in the 16th Century. Contrary to most accounts, Wood writes: “It was not merchants or manufacturers who drove the process that propelled the early development of capitalism, The transformation of social property relations was firmly rooted in the countryside, and the transformation of English trade and industry was result more than cause of England’s transition to capitalism” (129).¶ Wood traces how changing property relations more than any other factor in the countryside drove the imperatives of “competition, accumulation, profit-maximization, and increasing labor-productivity” and how these eventually came to “regulate not only economic transactions but social relations in general” (7). Indeed, changing property relations in the English countryside was what really set the conditions of possibility for capitalism.

### A2: Ethics DA

#### **Rejection of capital is an ethical obligation**

**Zizek and Daly 2k4** (Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears).This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’).

## 1NR

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic
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#### Interpretation: The aff should advocate increasing incentives for and/or reduction of restrictions on energy production

This is the only grammatical interpretation of the resolution:

#### The subject: central government- the USFG.

#### The verb: increase- to make greater. or

#### The objects -Financial incentives means loans/grants

**UNCTAD, 4** - UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (“INCENTIVES”

http://unctad.org/en/docs/iteiit20035\_en.pdf

There is no uniform definition of what constitutes an “investment incentive”. (Box I.1. contains a list of commonly used incentives.) The only major international instrument that contains a partial definition is the SCM Agreement (see below). Governments use three main categories of investment incentives to attract FDI and to benefit more from it:

· financial incentives, such as outright grants and loans at concessionary rates;

· fiscal incentives such as tax holidays and reduced tax rates;

· other incentives, including subsidized infrastructure or services, market preferences and regulatory concessions, including exemptions from labour or environmental standards.

#### Restrictions are regulatory prohibitions

Words & Phrases 2004 v37A p410

N.D.Okla. 1939. "Restriction," as used in the statutes concerning restriction on alienation of lands inherited from deceased Osage allottees, is synonymous with "prohibition." Act April J8, 1912. §§ 6, 7, 37 Stat. 87, 88.—U.S. v. Mullendore, 30 F.Supp. 13, appeal dismissed 111 F.2d 898.— Indians 15(1).

This is the regulatory part

Words & Phrases: Perm Edition, 2002, vol 36A, p414

N.II. 1938. As used in statute giving towns power to "regulate and restrict" buildings by zoning regulations, "regulation" is synonymous with "restrict" and "restrictions" are embraced in "regulations. Puh.Laws. 1926, c. 41. W A»-y\* r

#### The direct object is energy production

Is Cumulative Fossil Energy Demand a Useful Indicator for the Environmental Performance of Products? M A R K A . J . HUIJBREGTS , \* , † L I N D A J . A . R O M B O U T S , † S T E F A N I E H E L L W E G , ‡ R O L F F R I S C H K N E C H T , § A . J A N H E N D R I K S , † D I K V A N D E M E E N T , † , | A D M . J . R A G A S , † L U C A S R E I J N D E R S , ⊥ A N D J A A P S T R U I J S | Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Wetland and Water Research, Faculty of Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, P.O. Box 9010, NL-6500 GL Nijmegen, The Netherlands, Institute for Chemical- and Bioengineering, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zu¨rich, CH-8093 Zu¨rich, Switzerland, Ecoinvent Centre, Ueberlandstrasse 129, CH-8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland, Laboratory for Ecological Risk Assessment, National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, P.O. Box 1, NL-3720 BA, Bilthoven, The Netherlands, and Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, NL-1018 WV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands 2006 American Chemical Society VOL. 40, NO. 3, 2006 / ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY 9 641 http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/es051689g

The appropriateness of the fossil Cumulative Energy Demand (CED) as an indicator for the environmental performance of products and processes is explored with a regression analysis between the environmental life-cycle impacts and fossil CEDs of 1218 products, divided into the product categories “energy production”, “material production”, “transport”, and “waste treatment”. Our results show that, for all product groups but waste treatment, the fossil CED correlates well with most impact categories, such as global warming, resource depletion, acidification, eutrophication, tropospheric ozone formation, ozone depletion, and human toxicity (explained variance between 46% and 100%). We conclude that the use of fossil fuels is an important driver of several environmental impacts and thereby indicative for many environmental problems. It may therefore serve as a screening indicator for environmental performance. However, the usefulness of fossil CED as a stand-alone indicator for environmental impact is limited by the large uncertainty in the product-specific fossil CEDbased impact scores (larger than a factor of 10 for the majority of the impact categories; 95% confidence interval). A major reason for this high uncertainty is nonfossil energy related emissions and land use, such as landfill leachates, radionuclide emissions, and land use in agriculture and forestry.

#### Links

#### 1. The SUBJECT of the action is the AFF team, not the USFG.

#### 2. The OBJECT of the action is the judge, not energy.

Impacts-

#### 1. Infinite regression—disregarding resolutional syntax produces an endless regression to small, trivial plans. For example, an aff only about the subject opens the door to ANY philosophy that speaks to ‘being’.

#### 2. Limits— Resolutional limits encourage AFF innovation and creativity, predictive research on a designated topic, and clash—a precursor to productive education. Also, the inherent value of arguments within limits is greater, which link turns education arguments. The alternative is dueling oratory with zero clash which moots the pedagogical benefits of debate as dialogue.

#### If our interpretation is net-beneficial it means there’s no reason to vote affirmative- they have to win a sustainable interpretation of the resolution.

#### If the case is true then it de-justifies the resolution. Teams are still signified by ‘AFF’ and ‘NEG’, so the resolution is a required measurement for ‘affirmation.’

### Off

#### Identity based politics act in opposition to Marxist analysis

Sharon Smith, ISR Issue 57, January–February 2008, The politics of identity http://www.isreview.org/issues/57/feat-identity.shtml

FIGHTING AGAINST oppression is an urgent issue in U.S. society today. Racism, sexism, and homophobia have all reached appalling levels—that seem only to rise with each passing year. White students in Jena hang nooses, and Black students end up in prison.1 Squads of Minutemen vigilantes patrol the Mexican border with impunity, for the sole purpose of terrorizing migrant communities.2 College campuses across the U.S. commemorate “Islamo-fascism awareness week” as if it were just another legitimate student activity.3 Fred Phelps and his Kansas-based Westboro Baptist Church congregation regularly picket outside funerals of gay soldiers killed in Iraq, proclaiming that they belong in hell.4¶ To be sure, the problem extends way beyond the extremist fringe. Media pundits barely comment on the outrages described above, while mainstream discourse regularly heaps contempt on those attempting to fight against oppression—including young women organizing against date rape (which is assumed to be a figment of their feminism-charged imaginations) and immigrants demanding basic legal rights (as if they are out to steal jobs from native-born workers). If the “playing field is level,” as so many in the mainstream media assume, those who object must therefore be seeking an unfair advantage.¶ It is no wonder, therefore, that so many people who experience oppression feel so embattled in the current political climate. Only a movement aimed at fighting oppression in all its forms can challenge the victim-blaming ideology that prevails today. The pressing need for such a movement is acknowledged here. Indeed, this article is intended to address the issue of how to most effectively fight back, since different political strategies lead to quite different conclusions about the kind of movement that is needed to challenge oppression. The bulk of this article is a critique of the theory behind what is known in academic and left circles as “identity politics”—the idea that only those experiencing a particular form of oppression can either define it or fight against it—counterposing to it a Marxist analysis. My central premise is that Marxism provides the theoretical tools for ending oppression, while identity politics does not.

#### The Affirmatives voices will become commodified by capitalism- dealing with the structural history of capitalism is a prerequisite to solving the Aff

Collins 1996 (Patricia Hill Collins, Distinguished University Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park, “What's in a name? Womanism, black feminism, and beyond.,” Black Scholar, 00064246, Winter/Spring96, Vol. 26, Uitgave 1)

BLACK WOMEN ARE AT A DECISION POINT that in many ways mirrors that faced by African Americans as a collectivity. Building on the pathbreaking works by Toni Cade Bambara, Ntozake Shange, Angela Davis, Toni Morrison, June Jordan, Alice Walker, Audre Lorde and other black women who "broke silence" in the 1970s, African American women in the 1980s and 1990s developed a "voice," a self-defined, collective black women's standpoint about black womanhood (Collins 1990). Moreover, black women used this standpoint to "talk back" concerning black women's representation in dominant discourses (hooks 1989). As a result of this struggle, African American women's ideas and experiences have achieved a visibility unthinkable in the past.¶ But African American women now stand at a different historical moment. Black women appear to have a voice, and with this new-found voice comes a new series of concerns. For example, we must be attentive to the seductive absorption of black women's voices in classrooms of higher education where black women's texts are still much more welcomed than black women ourselves. Giving the illusion of change, this strategy of symbolic inclusion masks how the everyday institutional policies and arrangements that suppress and exclude African Americans as a collectivity remain virtually untouched (Carby 1992; Du Cille 1994). Similarly, capitalist market relations that transformed black women's writing into a hot commodity threaten to strip their works of their critical edge. Initially, entering public space via books, movies, and print media proved invigorating. But in increasingly competitive global markets where anything that sells will be sold regardless of the consequences, black women's "voices" now flood the market. Like other commodities exchanged in capitalist markets, surplus cheapens value, and the fad of today becomes the nostalgic memory of tomorrow.

#### Capitalism’s preoccupation with endless accumulation will result in total ecological destruction and extinction

Foster 11,[John Bellamy ] Dec. 2011, Capitalism and the Accumulation of Catastrophe, Monthly Review, Vol. 63 Issue 07, <http://monthlyreview.org/2011/12/01/capitalism-and-the-accumulation-of-catastrophe> (Aug 2012)

Yet, the continued pursuit of Keynes’s convenient lie over the last eight decades has led to a world far more polarized and beset with contradictions than he could have foreseen. It is a world prey to the enormous unintended consequences of accumulation without limits: namely, global economic stagnation, financial crisis, and planetary ecological destruction. Keynes, though aware of some of the negative economic aspects of capitalist production, had no real understanding of the ecological perils—of which scientists had already long been warning. Today these perils are impossible to overlook. Faced with impending ecological catastrophe, it is more necessary than ever to abandon Keynes’s convenient lie and espouse the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. Capitalism, the society of “après moi le déluge!” is a system that fouls its own nest—both the human-social conditions and the wider natural environment on which it depends. The accumulation of capital is at the same time accumulation of catastrophe, not only for a majority of the world’s people, but living species generally. Hence, nothing is *fairer*—more just, more beautiful, and more necessary—today than the struggle to overthrow the regime of capital and to create a system of substantive equality and sustainable human development; a socialism for the twenty-first century.

#### Capitalism rationalizes imperialistic pre-emptive nuclear wars – culminates in extinction

Sam Webb 04, National Communist Party Chairman, People’s Weekly World Newspaper

Capitalism was never a warm, cuddly, stable social system. It came into the world dripping with blood from every pore, as Marx described it, laying waste to old forms of production and ways of life in favor of new, more efficient manufacturing. Since then it has combined nearly uninterrupted transformation of the instruments of production with immense wealth for a few and unrelieved exploitation, insecurity, misery, and racial and gender inequality for the many, along with periodic wars, and a vast zone of countries imprisoned in a seemingly inescapable web of abject poverty. Yet as bad as that record is, its most destructive effects on our world could still be ahead. Why do I say that? Because capitalism, with its imperatives of capital accumulation, profit maximization and competition, is the cause of new global problems that threaten the prospects and lives of billions of people worldwide, and, more importantly, it is also a formidable barrier to humankind’s ability to solve these problems. Foremost among these, in addition to ecological degradation, economic crises, population pressures, and endemic diseases, is the threat of nuclear mass annihilation. With the end of the Cold War, most of us thought that the threat of nuclear war would fade and with it the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But those hopes were dashed. Rather than easing, the nuclear threat is more palpable in some ways and caches of nuclear weapons are growing. And our own government possesses the biggest stockpiles by far. Much like previous administrations, the Bush administration has continued to develop more powerful nuclear weapons, but with a twist: it insists on its singular right to employ nuclear weapons preemptively in a range of military situations. This is a major departure from earlier U.S. policy – the stated policy of all previous administrations was that nuclear weapons are weapons of last resort to be used only in circumstances in which our nation is under severe attack. Meanwhile, today’s White House bullies demonize, impose sanctions, and make or threaten war on states that are considering developing a nuclear weapons capability. Bush tells us that this policy of arming ourselves while disarming others should cause no anxiety because, he says, his administration desires only peace and has no imperial ambitions. Not surprisingly, people greet his rhetorical assurances skeptically, especially as it becomes more and more obvious that his administration’s political objective is not world peace, but world domination, cunningly couched in the language of “fighting terrorism.” It is well that millions of peace-minded people distrust Bush’s rhetoric. The hyper-aggressive gang in the Oval Office and Pentagon and the absolutely lethal nature of modern weapons of mass destruction make for a highly unstable and explosive situation that could cascade out of control. War has a logic of its own. But skepticism alone is not enough. It has to be combined with a sustained mobilization of the world community – the other superpower in this unipolar world – if the hand of the warmakers in the White House and Pentagon is to be stayed. A heavy responsibility rests on the American people. For we have the opportunity to defeat Bush and his counterparts in Congress in the November elections. Such a defeat will be a body blow to the policies of preemption, regime change, and saber rattling, and a people’s mandate for peace, disarmament, cooperation, and mutual security. The world will become a safer place. In the longer run, however, it is necessary to replace the system of capitalism. With its expansionary logic to accumulate capital globally and its competitive rivalries, capitalism has an undeniable structural tendency to militarism and war. This doesn’t mean that nuclear war is inevitable. But it does suggest that nuclear war is a latent, ever-present possibility in a world in which global capital is king. Whether that occurs depends in large measure on the outcome of political struggle within and between classes and social movements at the national and international level.

#### The alternative is to reject capitalism through revolutionary action towards capitalism

Herod ‘4 James Herod author of several books on capitalism and social activist since 1968 Getting Free 2004 <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm>

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we�re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can�t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It�s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction. The content of this vision is actually not new at all, but quite old. The long term goal of communists, anarchists, and socialists has always been to restore community. Even the great peasant revolts of early capitalism sought to get free from external authorities and restore autonomy to villages. Marx defined communism once as a free association of producers, and at another time as a situation in which the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all. Anarchists have always called for worker and peasant self-managed cooperatives. The long term goals have always been clear: to abolish wage-slavery, to eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and to establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world.

# Case

#### Genealogy solves nothing- solvency is not its purpose- their genealogy fails because it is couched on solvency.

C. Colwell Visiting Assistant Professor at Villanova University 1997

Deleuze and Foucault: Series, Events, Genealogy (W)

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_&_event/v001/1.2colwell.html> (Acc. 1-8-02)

What genealogy does then, the difference it makes, is that it returns to the virtual structure of the event by problematizing it, by re-actualizing it in such a way as to preclude a singular and specific solution. What marks genealogy, particularly the genealogies of Nietzsche and Foucault, is its inability to provide solutions. Neither of the two had anything to say to their readers who asked when they finished their works—“What then?” Foucault especially refused to provide programs for the reform or replacement of prisons, mental institutions or an ethics of sexuality. Each sought to problematize anew problems that had supposedly been solved, problems that were only presented as problems to students by teachers who already knew the answers, problems no longer conceived of as real problems.

#### The insights of their standpoint are not complete and cannot exist outside of other knowledge structures

Collins 1996 (Patricia Hill Collins, Distinguished University Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park, “What's in a name? Womanism, black feminism, and beyond.,” Black Scholar, 00064246, Winter/Spring96, Vol. 26, Uitgave 1)

FINALLY, DESPITE THE PROMISE of this approach, it is important to consider the limitations of womanism, black feminism, and all other putatively progressive philosophies. Whether labeled "womanism," "black feminism," or something else, African American women could not possibly possess a superior vision of what community would look like, how justice might feel, and the like. This presupposes that such a perspective is arrived at without conflict, intellectual rigor, and political struggle. While black women's particular location provides a distinctive angle of vision on oppression, this perspective comprises neither a privileged nor a complete standpoint. In this sense, grappling with the ideas of heterogeneity within black women's communities and hammering out a self-defined, black women's standpoint leads the way for other groups wishing to follow a similar path. As for black women, we can lead the way or we can follow behind. Things will continue to move on regardless of our choice.

#### Black feminism cannot translate into real-world liberation

Collins 1996 (Patricia Hill Collins, Distinguished University Professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park, “What's in a name? Womanism, black feminism, and beyond.,” Black Scholar, 00064246, Winter/Spring96, Vol. 26, Uitgave 1)

First, it is important to keep in mind that the womanist/black feminist debate occurs primarily among relatively privileged black women. Womanism and black feminism would both benefit by examining the increasing mismatch between what privileged black women, especially those in the academy, identify as important themes and what the large numbers of African American women who stand outside of higher education might deem worthy of attention. While these African American women physically resemble one another and may even occupy the same space, their worlds remain decidedly different. One might ask how closely the thematic content of newly emerging black women's voices in the academy speak for and speak to the masses of African American women still denied literacy. Black women academics explore intriguing issues of centers and margins and work to deconstruct black female identity while large numbers of black women remain trapped in neighborhoods organized around old centers of racial apartheid. Talk of centers and margins, even the process of coming to voice itself, that does not simultaneously address issues of power leaves masses of black women doing the dry cleaning, cooking the fast food, and dusting the computer of the sister who has just written the newest theoretical treatise on black women.

#### Foregrounding of whiteness reinforces US exceptionalism, undermining solvency – their localization to intra-debate community issues is an exclamation mark

Carey 2009 (Jane Carey, Postcolonialism Researcher, Monach U, Leigh Boucher, School of Modern History & PLS, Marquarie U, and Katherine Ellinghaus (School of Hist Studies, Monach U), Re-Orienting Whiteness (B) 2009)

(p3-4) Arneson was not alone, as the flurry of similarly dissatisfied reviews indicated." Although not as scathing, Peter Kolchin, for example, also expressed uneasiness at the "elusive, undefined nature of whiteness," the lack of "historical grounding" of many contemporary studies, and the "over-reliance on whiteness in explaining the American past." 2° In assigning such overarching explanatory power to whiteness, he suggested, the field is prone to overstatement and overgeneralization, coming close to "portraying race as a ubiquitous and unchanging transhistorical force rather than a shifting and contingent 'construction.'" 21 Kolchin also briefly observed that one of the "most striking features" of whiteness studies is the "assumption—sometimes asserted and sometimes unspoken—that the racism they describe is uniquely American and that American whiteness can be understood in isolation." 22 The most influential U.S. scholarship, particularly that by labor historians, locates the creation of white identity entirely within historical circumstances quite specific to the United States, namely black chattel slavery and, later, mass immigration. 23 While this narrow national focus has not emerged as a prominent concern within existing critiques of the field, we argue that it is in fact of central importance. Much historical work on whiteness is even more narrowly positioned. As John Munro has outlined, it largely represents another in the series of U.S. labor history projects that have sought to answer the question Werner Sombart posed in 1906, "Why is there no socialism in the United States?," and is primarily concerned with finding "a usable past upon which an anti-capitalist and antiracist future can be envisioned." 24 This in part explains why it has largely ignored wider scholarship that does not share these, very particular, interests, and why many objections to whiteness studies have simply joined the long history of attempts to assert the primacy of class over race. 25 Despite pretensions to an almost universal applicability, distinct U.S. academic debates, as well as specific political projects and disavowals (particularly of the settler-colonial underpinnings of the United States), silently orient the field. In many ways, debates about whiteness have primarily reflected a turf war over leadership in the field of labor history in the United States. The issues at stake are far too important to allow them to be subsumed within such parochial concerns.

#### Whiteness studies fail – US model focus – they aggravate the problem by trying to sidestep our literature bases

Jane Carey (Postcolonialism Researcher, Monach U), Leigh Boucher (School of Modern History & PLS, Marquarie U), and Katherine Ellinghaus (School of Hist Studies, Monach U), Re-Orienting Whiteness (B) 2009

(p2) This is not to say that this collection is united by an unfaltering commitment to whiteness studies. It is equally shaped by a uneasiness with the field tendencies toward ahistoricity, reification, and universalization; its ill-defined analytic vocabulary; and especially its potential simply to reinscribe white people at the center of historical narratives. And we are acutely aware that, since its emergence, the field has proven "a lightning rod for critics.' I licked, alongside its rapid growth, the apparently deserved death of the field has been simultaneously announced as the latest headstone in a graveyard of academic fads. 7 A key development that argues these dismissive predictions, however, is the degree to which the terms "white" and "whiteness" have already been adopted by historians, particularly those writing about European colonialism. These categories have recently been inserted alongside class, gender, and various "others."' This book functions in some ways simply to highlight the significance of this quite startling analytic uptake. But it also registers a profound discomfort with the ways that whiteness has snuck through the backdoor into the historian's toolkit, often with little definition or explanation. Its meanings are often taken for granted, as if they were self-evident. The nuanced, historically grounded, and theoretically broad-ranging approaches in this collection suggest a number of ways forward for scholars. As Matt Wray has recently observed, "whiteness studies has left childhood and is now enduring adolescence. It's having its identity crisis right on time." 9 The time is ripe for a major reassessment of the field. In approaching this task, we wish to foreground the limitations that have resulted from the U.S.-centered nature of most whiteness scholarship. This is clearly problematic for a field that makes broad, even universal, claims to explaining the operations of "race." Whiteness, obviously, has had far wider geographic purchase. We seek to decenter the United States in the area of whiteness studies, and in some ways to recognize that it was never central to begin with. So too, the isolationist tendencies of U.S. whiteness scholarship have produced its lack of engagement with work on race in other contexts, particularly the analytic frames that have emerged through attempts to theorize European colonialism. We contend that this nationally and theoretically limited approach represents in fact the major weakness of the field." In other words, whiteness needs to be reconciled with the major intellectual currents that have shaped research on race outside the United States.

#### Racialized descriptions of society reinscribe same racial binaries- constitutes the subject around race

Hartigan 2005- prof of anthropology @ UT, PhD from University of California, Santa Cruz

(John, South Atlantic Quarterly 104.3, Summer, “Culture against Race: Reworking the Basis for Racial Analysis”)

These racial identities define the type of subjects that Visweswaran advocates bringing into view via ‘‘a conception of race which is socially dynamic but historically meaningful,’’ even though their objectification potentially risks contributing, unintentionally, to the current resurgence in sociobiological notions of race. Visweswaran’s approach brings race to the fore of critical analysis, but the problem is that it also risks reproducing racial thinking in much the way ‘‘culture’’ has been accused of perpetuating race. Herbert Lewis highlights the perils in efforts to articulate this broader sensibility concerning race.8 Where Visweswaran strives to reanimate the ‘‘richly connotative 19th century sense of ‘race,’ ’’ with its invocations of ‘‘blood’’ as a form of collectivity that encompasses ‘‘numerous elements that we would today call cultural,’’ Lewis cautions against a ‘‘return to the pre-Boasian conception that combines race, culture, language, nationality and nationality in one neat package’’ (980). And though the equation of racial identity with the forms of persecution and exploitation highlighted by Visweswaran is insightful, Lewis observes that, pursued further, this logic reactivates a concept that ‘‘indissolubly connects groups of people and their appearance with beliefs about their capacity and behavior’’ (ibid.).Given the criteria she lists, Lewis argues, ‘‘it follows presumably that we should recognize as ‘races’ all those who have suffered one or another form of ill-treatment. Certainly Jews would now return to the status of a ‘racial’ group (as the Nazis contended), as do Armenians, Gypsies (Rom), ‘Untouchables’ (Dalits) in India, East Timorese, Muslim and Croats in Bosnia and Serbs in Croatia, educated Cambodians in Pol Pot’s Cambodia, both Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi’’ (ibid.). Every similarly subjected group would be reinscribed and reidentified with the very terms used initially to distinguish them for exploitation and persecution. Dominguez’s concerns about culture’s propensity for ‘‘perpetuating the very terms—of hierarchies of differential values—that constitute the hegemony’’ seem equally relevant to this attempt to ensconce race at the forefront of critical social analysis. There follow interminable questions of subdividing and distinguishing such races. Visweswaran’s description of the processes that produce ‘‘Chicanos and Puerto Ricans as races’’ leads Lewis to ask, ‘‘Are these two different ‘races’ or one? Can rich, powerful, and selfassured Puerto Ricans belong to this ‘race’? Do Dominicans, Ecuadorians, and Cubans each get to be their own race, or can they all be in one race with Chicanos and Puerto Ricans because they all speak (or once spoke) Spanish? Can Spanish-speakers from Spain belong, too?’’ (980). The problem with formulating research in terms of race is that it becomes very difficult to proceed without reproducing various racialized logics that promote the notion that groups are essentially differentiated—experientially and in terms of innate capacities and dispositions—by race.9 This is a problem that Gilroy takes as a basis for his critique of ‘‘raciology,’’ which I will examine further below.

#### Totalizing critiques of whiteness commodify races- essentialisms ensure no alt solvency

Hartigan 2005- prof of anthropology @ UT, PhD from University of California, Santa Cruz

(John, South Atlantic Quarterly 104.3, Summer, “Culture against Race: Reworking the Basis for Racial Analysis”)

One might be tempted to assume that Gilroy’s stance is largely polemical, but his critique is thoroughgoing, as is his call to reject ‘‘this desire to cling on to ‘race’ and go on stubbornly and unimaginatively seeing the world on the distinctive scales that it has specified.’’ In spite of powerful, novel efforts to fundamentally transform racial analysis—such as the emergence of ‘‘whiteness studies’’ or analyses of the ‘‘new racism’’—Gilroy is emphatic in ‘‘demand[ing] liberation not from white supremacy alone, however urgently that is required, but from all racializing and raciological thought, fromracialized seeing, racialized thinking, and racialized thinking about thinking’’ (40). In contrast to Visweswaran—and, interestingly, voicing concerns over ‘‘cultural politics’’ that resonate with Dominguez’s critique—Gilroy sees a host of problems in ‘‘black political cultures’’ that rely on ‘‘essentialist approaches to building solidarity’’ (38).14 Nor does he share Harrison’s confidence in making racism the centerpiece of critical cultural analysis. Gilroy plainly asserts that ‘‘the starting point of this book is that the era of New Racism is emphatically over’’ (34). A singular focus on racism precludes an attention to ‘‘the appearance of sharp intraracial conflicts’’ and does not effectively address the ‘‘several new forms of determinism abroad’’ (38, 34). We still must be prepared ‘‘to give effective answers to the pathological problems represented by genomic racism, the glamour of sameness, and the eugenic projects currently nurtured by their confluence’’ (41). But the diffuse threats posed by invocations of racially essentialized identities (shimmering in ‘‘the glamour of sameness’’) as the basis for articulating ‘‘black political cultures’’ entails an analytical approach that countervails against positing racism as the singular focus of inquiry and critique.15 From Gilroy’s stance, to articulate a ‘‘postracial humanism’’ we must disable any form of racial vision and ensure that it can never again be reinvested with explanatory power. But what will take its place as a basis for talking about the dynamics of belonging and differentiation that profoundly shape social collectives today? Gilroy tries to make clear that it will not be ‘‘culture,’’ yet this concept infuses his efforts to articulate an alternative conceptual approach. Gilroy conveys many of the same reservations about culture articulated by the anthropologists listed above. Specifically, Gilroy cautions that ‘‘the culturalist approach still runs the risk of naturalizing and normalizing hatred and brutality by presenting them as inevitable consequences of illegitimate attempts to mix and amalgamate primordially incompatible groups’’ (27). In contrast, Gilroy expressly prefers the concept of diaspora as a means to ground a new form of attention to collective identities. ‘‘As an alternative to the metaphysics of ‘race,’ nation, and bounded culture coded into the body,’’ Gilroy finds that ‘‘diaspora is a concept that problematizes the cultural and historical mechanics of belonging’’ (123). Furthermore, ‘‘by focusing attention equally on the sameness within differentiation and the differentiation within sameness, diaspora disturbs the suggestion that political and cultural identity might be understood via the analogy of indistinguishable peas lodged in the protective pods of closed kinship and subspecies’’ (125). And yet, in a manner similar to Harrison’s prioritizing of racism as a central concern for social inquiry, when it comes to specifying what diaspora entails and how it works, vestiges of culture reemerge as a basis for the coherence of this new conceptual focus. When Gilroy delineates the elements and dimensions of diaspora, culture provides the basic conceptual background and terminology. In characterizing ‘‘the Atlantic diaspora and its successor-cultures,’’ Gilroy sequentially invokes ‘‘black cultural styles’’ and ‘‘postslave cultures’’ that have ‘‘supplied a platform for youth cultures, popular cultures, and styles of dissent far from their place of origin’’ (178). Gilroy explains how the ‘‘cultural expressions’’ of hip-hop and rap, along with other expressive forms of ‘‘black popular culture,’’ are marketed by the ‘‘cultural industries’’ to white consumers who ‘‘currently support this black culture’’ (181). Granted, in these uses of ‘‘culture’’ Gilroy remains critical of ‘‘absolutist definitions of culture’’ and the process of commodification that culture in turn supports. But his move away from race importantly hinges upon some notion of culture. We may be able to do away with race, but seemingly not with culture.

#### Can’t be the root cause- history disproves

Spickard 2009 Paul Spickard, Graduated Harvard, Ph.D in History from UC Berkeley, professor of history at UC Santa Barbara, review of “Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism”, in American Studies, vol 5 num 1/2, MUSE

For Sexton (as for the Spencers and Gordon) race is about Blackness, in the United States and around the world. That is silly, for there are other racialized relationships. In the U.S., native peoples were racialized by European intruders in all the ways that Africans were, and more: they were nearly extinguished. To take just one example from many around the world, Han Chinese have racialized Tibetans historically in all the ways (including slavery) that Whites have racialized Blacks and Indians in the United States. So there is a problem with Sexton's concept of race as Blackness. There is also a problem with his insistence on monoraciality. For Sexton and the others, one cannot be mixed or multiple; one must choose ever and only to be Black. I don't have a problem with that as a political choice, but to insist that it is the only possibility flies in the face of a great deal of human experience, and it ignores the history of how modern racial ideas emerged. Sexton does point out, as do many writers, the flawed tendencies in multiracial advocacy mentioned in the second paragraph above. But he imputes them to the whole movement and to the subject of study, and that is not a fair assessment.

## 2NC

#### AGAIN MORE PAPER CARDS FOR CAP STUFF

#### Geneaologies are anti-sciences – counter to Marxism - establishes our link argument

Kellner, 2006 http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/postmoderntheorych2.pdf

In order to theorize the birth of modern disciplinary and normalizing practices, genealogy¶ politicizes all facets of culture and everyday life. Following Nietzsche’s genealogies of¶ morality, asceticism, justice, and punishment, Foucault tries to write the histories of¶ unknown, forgotten, excluded, and marginal discourses. He sees the discourses of madness,¶ medicine, punishment and sexuality to have independent histories and institutional bases,¶ irreducible to macrophenomena such as the modern state and economy. Hence, against ‘the¶ tyranny of globalizing discourses’ (Foucault 1980a: p. 83), he calls for ‘an insurrection of¶ subjugated knowledges’ (1980a: p. 81), of those ‘disqualified’ discourses that positivistic¶ science and Marxism delegitimate because they are deemed marginal and/or non-formalizable.¶ Genealogies are therefore ‘anti-sciences’, not because they seek to ‘vindicate a lyrical right to ignorance or non-knowledge’ and attack the concepts and methods of science per se, but¶ rather because they contest ‘the [coercive] effects of the centralizing powers which are linked¶ to the institution and functioning of an organized scientific discourse’ (1980a: p. 84).

#### Their Gumbs evidence illustrates their strategy as that of radical instability of identity through language- that prevents coalitions from forming for political movements against capitalism

Charlie Bertsch (Ph.D. , English at UC-Berkeley) 1995 “Useful Fictions” Bad Subjects Online Journal Issue #19 http://bad.eserver.org/issues/1995/19/bertsch.html

Obviously, if we agree that an individual's will is constructed by social forces, then it becomes impossible to say that individuals are in complete control of their actions. Likewise, if we agree that qualities like race, gender, and sexual-preference are imposed on an individual by those forces, then it becomes impossible to state that a given individual is essentially anything. More generally, if we agree with this model, we are forced to acknowledge that the notion that individuals possess identity-in-the-singular is itself a construct. That is, we must acquiesce to the superficially radical idea that all identity is a fiction. We get a very different picture of transformational identities when we consider them in the light of this model. It suggests that transformational identities are not a special case, but the norm: if there can be no fixed identities, then what we have been calling 'transformations' are the only identities we have, plain and simple. Although this model suggests that all identities are fictional, its more extreme proponents — usually called 'post-structuralists' — reserve special animosity for the idea that the different identities an individual performs can somehow add up to a coherent 'self,' an identity-in-the-singular. They imply that the more time an identity must span and the greater the number of individual actions it must therefore encompass, the more dangerous it becomes. In a way, this is to argue that the problem is not which identities are made or how they are made, but that they sustain themselves at all. Unfortunately, if we draw this sort of conclusion from the constructivist model of identity, it is nearly impossible to imagine substantive political action. Almost all political action requires concerted effort towards a definite goal over time. And such effort, in turn, requires a reasonably stable identity. After all, it is impossible for individuals to strategize unless they know that they will have the same general goals tomorrow that they have today. In radically critiquing the idea of identity-in-the-singular, the post-structuralists who draw this conclusion ultimately promote passivity. Hegemony, Ideology, and Identity Of course, it is one thing to realize that all identity is a fiction, but quite another to decide what to do with that insight. We can draw other conclusions to from the constructivist model of identity, ones which can enable political action rather than inhibit it. In order to get a better sense of what they might look like, we need to take a detour through theory more directly concerned with the workings of society as a whole. When Marxist social theorist Antonio Gramsci looked at the Western world of the 1930s, he saw that vast numbers of people appeared strangely content to live within a power structure that runs counter to their own best interests. In trying to account for this phenomenon, Gramsci realized that the ruling class in modern societies does not rule by threat of force alone. He theorized that the majority of people in such societies behave themselves, not only because they fear punishment, but also because they consent to the power structure that maintains the status quo. Indeed, since most people do not break the law or seek to overthrow this power structure, it can be said that their consent plays a bigger role in perpetuating the dominance of the ruling class than does their fear of punishment. Gramsci called the achievement and maintenance of this consent 'hegemony.' Two aspects of Gramsci's theory of hegemony are particularly significant for our thinking about identity. The first is that he describes hegemony as a kind of cultural 'glue' able to bind and hold together very different sectors of modern societies, even ones which have little or nothing in common. As Stuart Hall phrases it in an article entitled 'Gramsci and Us,' hegemony 'does not reflect, it constructs a 'unity' out of difference.' The second aspect relates to the way hegemony manages to accomplish this. Because it resolves real differences into a semblance of unity, hegemony requires the creation and sustenance of an illusion. To put this another way, hegemony depends upon a collective fantasy in which conflicting sectors are perceived to be somehow alike, a fantasy that these sectors share a common identity. Hegemony is, in other words, a fiction of collective identity. But how does this relate to the issues surrounding individual identity that we have been discussing? Gramsci doesn't talk about individuals much, except to discuss the ways in which they bond together in organizations. As I will explain later, I think it might be good to start thinking about individuals in terms of collective identity. For now, however, we can turn to another Marxist social theorist who tried to build on both Gramsci's insights into collective identity and Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan's psychoanalytic insights about individual identity. In the essay 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Towards an Investigation' from which Bad Subjects derives its name, Louis Althusser revises the traditional Marxist definition of ideology. Instead of contrasting the illusions of ideology to the 'truth' of reality as Marx had implicitly done, Althusser argues that there is no escape from ideology. 'Ideology,' he writes, 'represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.' Because our minds always 'mediate' (or filter) our relation to reality, it is not possible for us to have direct access to it. Instead, we only have indirect access to reality through the socially constructed fictions with which we define ourselves and our place in the world. To rephrase this insight in terms of our topic, because identity takes shape when we distinguish between what and where we are, and because it is socially constructed, it derives from our imaginary relationship to our real conditions of existence. We could say that, if ideology represents, then identity is a principal effect of that representation. If all identity is a fiction, then it must be ideology that creates and sustains that fiction. As we can see, Althusser clearly argues for a constructivist model of identity. Where he differs from the post-structuralist proponents of this model whom we discussed earlier, however, is in his distinction between ideology-in-general and ideologies in the plural. 'Ideology-in-general' refers to the inescapable fact that we can never access reality directly: we always perceive it through what Lacan called the 'imaginary,' through fictions. Ideologies, on the other hand, are the historically specific fictions with which people of a given place and time make sense of themselves and their relation to the world. Making this distinction allows us to conclude that, while we cannot escape ideology-in-general, there is a lot at stake in determining which specific ideologies dominate our lives. This returns us to Gramsci's notion of hegemony. Since hegemony really depends on the creation and sustenance of a collective fiction of identity, it is really just a specific ideology that holds sway over the majority of people in a society. As Althusser's argument suggests, hegemony is therefore not eternal, but something that can be challenged by other specific ideologies. From a leftist perspective, challenging hegemony requires the creation of an alternative fiction of collective identity. That is, if we wish to disassemble a particular power structure, it is not enough to say that it is bad. And it certainly isn't enough to show that it is glued together by a fiction that resolves real differences into a semblance of unity. Rather, we need to provide a different logic with which to make society cohere, one in keeping with our political goals. Clearly, the idea that all identity is a fiction need not induce passivity. If, as Althusser argues, there is no political action, no 'practice except by and in an ideology,' then we must construct fictions of identity adequate to our political project. Those adherents to the constructivist model of identity who are so suspicious of identities that can be sustained over time seem to forget that, as Karl Marx puts it in The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, 'men make their own history,' though 'not of their own free will; not under circumstances they themselves have chosen but under the given and inherited circumstances with which they are directly confronted.' They forget, in other words, that the social forces that construct identity result from the collective activity of human beings. Indeed, from Bad Subjects' leftist perspective, the strength of this model comes from its recognition that identities are made, not found. That its proponents would forget that the social forces that construct identity are themselves made, not found, seems remarkable. Useful Fictions As we mentioned earlier, we live in a society that, for all of its modernity, still reserves a prominent place for fantasies of transformation. The majority of these fantasies, however, narrate metamorphoses in which individuals change more or less independently of the society around them. When we do get narratives in which individual transformation is more closely linked to collective transformation, such as in science-fiction tales of the 1950s or Star Trek: The Next Generation's stories about the Borg, they tend to be extremely pessimistic. While becoming a vampire or murderer can give a character personality and even glamour, becoming a standardized cog in an impersonal machine cannot. What all this suggests is that, although we need to imagine transformation, we are encouraged to imagine it only as individual transformation. This is a phenomenon leftists would do well to consider. Certainly, there are times when it is useful to imagine individual transformations. As several articles in Bad Subjects have attested, autobiographical 'conversion' narratives can be a powerful way of communicating with people who might ignore an explicitly political message. In the long run, however, our goal is not just to 'reach' people, but to organize them into a new and better society. The left needs to turn the idea of transformation on its head. We do not need narratives of individual transformation within a society that does not change. Instead, we need to construct fictions of identity that inspire individuals to work for social change; fictions of identity that are predicated not on the individual's opposition to society, but on her or his integration into it; fictions of identity in which individuals act, not as autonomous individuals, but as part of a collective movement; fictions, finally, that are worth believing in
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#### WE READ THE ARRINGTON CARD AGAIN…

# Rd 8 Neg v Baylor HK
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#### The aff is not a financial incentive for energy production

Book 11 [Managing Director, ClearView Energy Partners, LLC]

Kevin, Testimony before U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

SUBCOMMITTEES ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES AND OVERSIGHT, SEPTEMBER 22, http://waysandmeans.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Booktestimony922.pdf

Incentive cost ratios, implied abatement costs and implied displacement costs offer three possible ways to measure the performance of **federal financial incentives for energy production** and consumption. Metrics of this sort could be used to prioritize spending – dynamically, perhaps through a reverse auction – or through legislated formulas **that balance incentives for high-yield, low-cost sources with high-potential, emerging sources.** Fuels or technologies that consistently fall short of established benchmarks may require a different type of government financial intervention (e**.g. manufacturing assistance or pre-competitive R&D** in place of production **tax credits**) or a different mode of financial support (e.g. loan guaranteesinstead of tax credits **or deductions)**.

#### Procurement is not a financial incentive

Czinkota 2009 **-** Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69)

Financial incentives offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. Non financial incentives include guaranteed government purchases, special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

The advantage to our interp is limits- there are almost infinite incentives- only by limiting to financial incentives can the neg have any hope of keeping up with the number of mechanisms- they can procure for nearly any purpose- explodes the amount of negative prep that needs to be done

### CP

#### The United States Federal Government should provide substantial market-fixed production cost incentives for energy production of small modular nuclear reactors and provide full funding and support to the NRC for expedited review of licensing issues related to small modular reactors.

#### Production cost incentive key- Incentivizes fast learning in advanced factory manufacturing which is necessary for commercialization

Rosner and Goldberg 2011 (Robert Rosner, astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, and Stephen Goldberg, Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.”, Technical Paper, Revision 1, November 2011)

Production Cost Incentive: A production cost incentive is a performance-based incentive. With a production cost incentive, the government incentive would be triggered only when the project successfully operates. The project sponsors would assume full responsibility for the upfront capital cost and would assume the full risk for project construction. The production cost incentive would establish a target price, a so-called “market-based benchmark.” Any savings in energy generation costs over the target price would accrue to the generator. Thus, a production cost incentive would provide a strong motivation for cost control and learning improvements, since any gains greater than target levels would enhance project net cash flow. Initial SMR deployments, without the benefits of learning, will have significantly higher costs than fully commercialized SMR plants and thus would benefit from production cost incentives. Because any production cost differential would decline rapidly due to the combined effect of module manufacturing rates and learning experience, the financial incentive could be set at a declining rate, and the level would be determined on a plant-by-plant basis, based on the achievement of cost reduction targets.43 The key design parameters for the incentive include the following:¶ 1. The magnitude of the deployment incentive should decline with the number of SMR modules and should phase out after the fleet of LEAD and FOAK plants has been deployed.¶ 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly.¶ 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit.

### K

#### The affirmative’s takes part in the naturalization of the military as the optimal mode of politics- this creates a Clauswitzian political sphere where war is the only political choice

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

These stratocratic controls of planetary human activity reveal more than the ideology of a single administration; they are an extension of what we can now see as the complete devotion to an apparatus that captures all cultural and political energies in terms of what Clausewitz defined as "policy." The original state of "emergency" as defined by the Bush Administration in the wake of the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks has been naturalized and sedimented as to become a fundamental starting point of human existence. Consequently, understanding the full intensity of the age of militariality requires more than the common critical awareness of Clausewitz's central doctrine: "War is merely the continuation of policy by other means" (28). It requires first an understanding that for Clausewitz, war is the very ontological basis of human existence, a basis that transcends culture, history and temporality. War defines the very structure of human subjectivity, a juridico-natural "code of law" that is "deeply rooted" in a people, an army, a government: "war is a paradoxical trinity—composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy" (30). Clausewitz assigns a constituency to each of the registers of this trinity: "The first of these…mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government" [End Page 143] (30). In a totalizing problematic organized according to the idea of war serving as the basis of human existence, the people of a nation are equated with that of a blind primordial force of violence: "the first," which refers to "primordial violence, hatred, and enmity" identifies the people living in the nation. "Government" therefore names that entity constituted for the exclusive purpose of controlling its unstable citizenry by reorienting the energies of the people towards warfare. This reorientation lays the groundwork and delineates the horizon of human creativity, and determines the single legitimized space of freedom: the army, where the "creative spirit is free to roam." The space of instability, of chance, which is the condition for the possibility of creativity, enters into the war-footing picture of reality only on this register of militarized human activity. This connection here is not a matter of association; military activity defines the very essence of freedom and human creativity. The army and its state are not defined in this picture in traditional terms of democracy, protection, and service to a people. Nor are they the a sign of the discourse of biopower, for biopower has its eyes on the productivity of a population and functions according to a general administration of life that, although affecting "distributions around a norm," still invites and produces a certain amount of heterogeneity (Foucault 266). The army and the state are instead named as the necessary foundational machinic force that determines the war footing constitution of humanity, ensuring that all its energies are channeled in a single direction: "The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people" (Clausewitz 31). The government and the army, in fact, only arise and become increasingly indispensable as the movement of humans through history becomes more "civilized" and "intellectually developed": "In any primitive, warlike race, the warrior spirit is far more common than among civilized peoples. It is possessed by almost every warrior: but in civilized societies only necessity will stimulate it in the people as a whole, since they lack the natural disposition for it" (45). This explains the constant disdain for "intellectuals," for they are understood to be part of the general problem of the so-called civilizing process, the "general intellectual development of a given society" (45, italics in original). This intellectual development is a double-edged sword for Clausewitz and the war-footing polity. On the one hand Clausewitz must have access to at least a modicum of classificatory procedures, otherwise he would not be able to establish the lesser other whose constitution makes possible the essential act of war. On the other hand the non-primitive human consciousness must acquire "appropriate gifts of intellect and temperament" and not be distinguished by "great power(s) of meditation" (44, 48). Instead what is needed is "mental force," a "firmness" of opinion that does not waver: "We say a man has strength of character, or simply has character, if he sticks to his convictions….Such firmness cannot show itself, of course, if a man keeps changing his mind" (54, [End Page 144] emphasis in original).11 This affects the realm of knowledge production as well, for "Knowledge in war is very simple"; and a "high degree of education" simply leads to "ridiculous pedantry" (96, 95, emphasis in original). It is not that life and the political have collapsed in the total politicization of life, as Agamben argues, or not solely. This collapse is only one of the outcomes of the total militarization of the biopolitical settlement, of the bios. The civil bios has no role in this problematic; it does not even exist. In this characterization war, and not biopower, becomes the very basis of the political: "war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse"; "The political object is the goal, war is the means of reaching it" (28, 29). We can see the full manifestation of Clausewitz's polity as war in the truth-statements of militariality advocates. "Step 8" of War Footing, is clear: "Wage Political Warfare" (136). A month after 9/11 Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld launched the Office of Strategic Influence (OSI). The OSI is "a component of a broader, government-wide strategic communications campaign, specifically [designed] to assist government agencies in crafting policy regarding the military aspects of information operations" (139). The program was shut down, but its advocates make it clear that it should be revived as soon as possible, on the grounds that its tight connection between information and militarization can bring about the planned unidirectional metaphysical orientation of warfare with greater speed than any other approach. Militariality sets up a program for direct political warfare and stands that against the "far more limited effort known as 'public diplomacy'": "even when they are well conceived and well executed...public diplomacy strategies will be a long-term effort. This is in their nature, given the reliance they place on such instruments as international media programming, exchange visits of political and cultural figures, humanitarian and development assistance, training future leaders, and so forth. Such efforts take years....And we do not have the luxury of time" (141). The suggestions for a plan of action include the immediate execution of a political warfare strategy, the drafting of legislative vehicles for political warfare, the strengthening of CIA clandestine services, the housing of the primary responsibility for political warfare in the Department of Defense, and the direct use of the Internet as a tool of political warfare (143–145). The consequences to be drawn from all of this are severe. Information in the post-9/11 state of constant "emergency" generated by the government of the Bush administration and its war footing organizations must now be identified as organizing not only the general political arrangement of life but the greater and more amorphous register of civil existence as well. It is in this sense that we are witnessing the creation of a new World Stratocratic Picture, a new totality, one that has its telos in the total control of the totality (the subtext of the above passage concerning diplomacy is its dependency on an actual engagement with an international community, a dependency that violates the [End Page 145] unilateral orientation adhering to the decision-making process of the military polity). In the creation of a totality capable of being totally controlled the indissoluble connection between the political and the civil changes dramatically. It can no longer be said that the civil is indirectly tied to the political. The line between the two may never have been solid, but in the "state of exception," which installs a justification for acting "outside the normal order" of a democratic polity, sites of human production, knowledge, information, media reports, entertainment, the Internet, defense, militarization, representation, and human consciousness itself, all flow in and out of one another so as to confuse any possibility of making clear distinctions between them. The political regime, progressively acting directly on the civil register, diminishes the civil register to the point of its eventual erasure. With the erosion of the civil register it becomes clearer that metamilitarization appears increasingly as an essential technique of the polity rather than an exceptional measure. A war footing philosophy thus becomes the very constitutive paradigm of remaining popular civil institutions such as the media and film production. Sound bite culture is only one sign of this.

#### The impact is extinction – Military control of nuclear power causes interlocking decision mechanisms that make nuclear war seem rational

Byrne and Toly 2006 (John Byrne, Head of the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, a leading institution for interdisciplinary graduate education, research, and advocacy in energy and environmental policy, Distinguished Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University of Delaware, 2007 Nobel Peace Prize for his work on the IPCC, and Noah Toly, Director of the the Urban Studies and Wheaton in Chicago programs, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse,” p. 1-32)

From climate change to acid rain, contaminated landscapes, mercury pollution, and biodiversity loss, the origins of many of our least tractable environmental problems can be traced to the operations of the modern energy system. A scan of nightfall across the planet reveals a social dila that also accompanies this system’s operations: invented over a century ago, electric light remains an experience only for the socially privileged. Two billion human beings—almost one-third of the planet’s population—experience evening light by candle, oil lamp, or open fire, reminding us that energy modernization has left intact—and sometimes exacerbated—social inequalities that its architects promised would be banished (Smil, 2003: 370 - 373). And there is the disturbing link between modern energy and war. 3 Whether as a mineral whose control is fought over by the powerful (for a recent history of conflict over oil, see Klare, 2002b, 2004, 2006), or as the enablement of an atomic war of extinction, modern energy makes modern life possible and threatens its future. With environmental crisis, social inequality, and military conflict among the significant problems of contemporary energy-society relations, the importance of a social analysis of the modern energy system appears easy to establish. One might, therefore, expect a lively and fulsome debate of the sector’s performance, including critical inquiries into the politics, sociology, and political economy of modern energy. Yet, contemporary discourse on the subject is disappointing: instead of a social analysis of energy regimes, the field seems to be a captive of euphoric technological visions and associated studies of “energy futures” that imagine the pleasing consequences of new energy sources and devices. 4 One stream of euphoria has sprung from advocates of conventional energy, perhaps best represented by the unflappable optimists of nuclear power 12 Transforming Power who, early on, promised to invent a “magical fire” (Weinberg, 1972) capable of meeting any level of energy demand inexhaustibly in a manner “too cheap to meter” (Lewis Strauss, cited in the New York Times 1954, 1955). In reply to those who fear catastrophic accidents from the “magical fire” or the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a new promise is made to realize “inherently safe reactors” (Weinberg, 1985) that risk neither serious accident nor intentionally harmful use of high-energy physics. Less grandiose, but no less optimistic, forecasts can be heard from fossil fuel enthusiasts who, likewise, project more energy, at lower cost, and with little ecological harm (see, e.g., Yergin and Stoppard, 2003). Skeptics of conventional energy, eschewing involvement with dangerously scaled technologies and their ecological consequences, find solace in “sustainable energy alternatives” that constitute a second euphoric stream. Preferring to redirect attention to smaller, and supposedly more democratic, options, “green” energy advocates conceive devices and systems that prefigure a revival of human scale development, local self-determination, and a commitment to ecological balance. Among supporters are those who believe that greening the energy system embodies universal social ideals and, as a result, can overcome current conflicts between energy “haves” and “havenots.” 5 In a recent contribution to this perspective, Vaitheeswaran suggests (2003: 327, 291), “today’s nascent energy revolution will truly deliver power to the people” as “micropower meets village power.” Hermann Scheer echoes the idea of an alternative energy-led social transformation: the shift to a “solar global economy... can satisfy the material needs of all mankind and grant us the freedom to guarantee truly universal and equal human rights and to safeguard the world’s cultural diversity” (Scheer, 2002: 34). 6 The euphoria of contemporary energy studies is noteworthy for its historical consistency with a nearly unbroken social narrative of wonderment extending from the advent of steam power through the spread of electricity (Nye, 1999). The modern energy regime that now powers nuclear weaponry and risks disruption of the planet’s climate is a product of promises pursued without sustained public examination of the political, social, economic, and ecological record of the regime’s operations. However, the discursive landscape has occasionally included thoughtful exploration of the broader contours of energy-environment-society relations. As early as 1934, Lewis Mumford (see also his two-volume Myth of the Machine, 1966; 1970) critiqued the industrial energy system for being a key source of social and ecological alienation (1934: 196): The changes that were manifested in every department of Technics rested for the most part on one central fact: the increase of energy. Size, speed, quantity, the multiplication of machines, were all reflections of the new means of utilizing fuel and the enlargement of the available stock of fuel itself. Power was dissociated from its natural human and geographic limitations: from the caprices of the weather, from the irregularities that definitely restrict the output of men and animals. 02Chapter1.pmd 2 1/6/2006, 2:56 PMEnergy as a Social Project 3 By 1961, Mumford despaired that modernity had retrogressed into a lifeharming dead end (1961: 263, 248): ...an orgy of uncontrolled production and equally uncontrolled reproduction: machine fodder and cannon fodder: surplus values and surplus populations... The dirty crowded houses, the dank airless courts and alleys, the bleak pavements, the sulphurous atmosphere, the over-routinized and dehumanized factory, the drill schools, the second-hand experiences, the starvation of the senses, the remoteness from nature and animal activity—here are the enemies. The living organism demands a life-sustaining environment. Modernity’s formula for two centuries had been to increase energy in order to produce overwhelming economic growth. While diagnosing the inevitable failures of this logic, Mumford nevertheless warned that modernity’s supporters would seek to derail present-tense 7 evaluations of the era’s social and ecological performance with forecasts of a bountiful future in which, finally, the perennial social conflicts over resources would end. Contrary to traditional notions of democratic governance, Mumford observed that the modern ideal actually issues from a pseudomorph that he named the “democratic-authoritarian bargain” (1964: 6) in which the modern energy regime and capitalist political economy join in a promise to produce “every material advantage, every intellectual and emotional stimulus [one] may desire, in quantities hardly available hitherto even for a restricted minority” on the condition that society demands only what the regime is capable and willing to offer. An authoritarian energy order thereby constructs an aspirational democracy while facilitating the abstraction of production and consumption from non-economic social values. The premises of the current energy paradigms are in need of critical study in the manner of Mumford’s work if a world measurably different from the present order is to be organized. Interrogating modern energy assumptions, this chapter examines the social projects of both conventional and sustainable energy as a beginning effort in this direction. The critique explores the neglected issue of the political economy of energy, underscores the pattern of democratic failure in the evolution of modern energy, and considers the discursive continuities between the premises of conventional and sustainable energy futures.

#### The alternative is to reject the affirmative. This rejection opens up spaces to create discourses alternative to the American exceptional military project

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

All of these transformations owe their existence, of course, to a long and complex history that cannot be articulated in the space available here. The cords of militariality extend back to a number of historical developments in ontological thought, judiciary systems, agricultural reorganizations, sovereign displacements, national reterritorializations, economic restructurings, and the colonial expansions that have generated today's international community. These cords are more difficult to see than those present in the stratocracy itself—one fact of militariality's character that opens a pathway for a real awareness of its increasing excessiveness and thus the potential for resistances to develop across ethnic, religious, and national lines. The paradox of militariality's strength and simultaneous fragility is precisely this visible excessiveness, which is part of its self-destructive essence. The greater problem is in some sense the development of a general awareness of those previously-existing discourses of modern liberal humanism that so easily establish, time and again, the stratocratic polities of the modern era. Even so, the visible nature of these cords of militariality—its direct daylight attacks on and incarcerations of foreign and domestic constituencies, its fully mediatized legal signings, its denouncements of the educational system and the international community—should not be understood as lacking in power. Any criticism of militariality will need to take into consideration the heavy economic, material, and faith-based investments in its project and continual existence. These investments hide the stratocracy's hysterization of the [End Page 147] polity with the general concept of necessity: it is necessary to take this action because we are under attack.12 But, if it still can be said that democracy owes its existence to the kind of interrogative thinking that challenges the unrelenting necessities forced on human existence, then it may come to be known that necessity will be the end of democracy, and the constabularies of militariality the architects of this end.

### Grid

#### Blackouts inevitable- Grid

Epstein 10/28 (David Epstein, meteorologist, “Wind and water will increase through tomorrow evening,” Boston.com, http://www.boston.com/news/weather/weather\_wisdom/2012/10/hurricane\_sandy\_and\_noreaster.html)

Here it's difficult to broad brush inland areas with one forecast. I will put forth some ranges of wind, and you can expect that if you are further south, up high on a hill, or near the water, that your winds will be on the stronger side. Those of you in a valley, far inland and up north will be on the lower side. I expect winds inland to range from 25-40 knots with higher gusts in the 45-55 knot range. If winds stay on the lower end of the range the power outages will won't be as bad. I don't expect hurricane force winds inland. Winds like this can cause power outages and how long your power is out is anyone's estimate. Hopefully, the power companies learned from the mistakes made in Irene and the October snowstorm last year and we won't have days and days without power. Some of you may not even lose power. I think when the storm is over, it will be the wind you remember more than anything.¶ Wind¶ The wind concerns me the most because it will impact the most number of people. High winds take down trees and those fallen trees will impact the power situation. I am already mentally preparing for no power for two days based on what I see for the winds Monday. I believe our winds will be similar to Irene last August inland but stronger at the coast. The one saving grace may be that the leaves are off the trees in many areas and this will help to prevent as much damage to the trees as if the leaves where on still. Leaves act like little sails to catch the wind and without them, the air can pass through the branches easier. The map shows the sustained wind and gusts forecast for Monday. Click to make it bigger.

#### No energy cut off for the military

Alic 2012 (John Alic, professor at John Hopkins, March 2012, “Defense Department Energy Innovation: Three Cases,” online)

The Energy Information Administration expects the 12 members of OPEC, which account for some 70 percent¶ of estimated world reserves, to pump slightly more than 40 percent of world oil production over the next several¶ decades.c U.S. oil imports will remain high. At the same time, supplies have become more diversified since the¶ 1970s, and the OPEC cartel weaker. Canada now ships more oil to the United States than does any other nation¶ (followed by Mexico, and only then Saudi Arabia). Domestic output has crept upward in recent years. All these¶ factors tend to argue against a repetition of unexpectedly sudden supply constrictions. So does the dependence of¶ many exporting states on oil revenues as a prop to internal security, by buying off political opponents or buying¶ weapons to suppress them.¶ To some observers, common sense nevertheless seems to imply that dependence on imported oil weakens the¶ U.S. economy, and by extension national security, given that military power depends, if indirectly, on the size¶ and composition of a nation’s economy. These extrapolations from dependence on imported oil to some sort of¶ larger national vulnerability have little foundation in empirically grounded understanding of either economic¶ affairs or military security. Within the analytical framework of economics, weakness and strength are problematic¶ notions, lacking an accepted basis in quantitative measures; governments collect statistics on output, income,¶ and productivity, not “strength.” Trade deficits, furthermore, are usually taken to be derivative of savings and¶ investment, viewed as the fundamental forces driving a nation’s balance of payments. The implication of this more¶ or less standard view is that a reduction in U.S. imports of oil (e.g., from greater domestic output), would simply¶ lead to a rise in imports of other goods and services. Third, the relationships between economic performance and¶ military strength are loose. The Soviet Union, after all, managed to remain a superpower for decades by steering a¶ large share of economic output to its military.¶ The implications of oil imports for U.S. security interests, then, seem oblique.

#### Grid resilient- Even worst case scenario it doesn’t hurt the military

Lewis 2010 (James Andrew Lewis, senior fellow and director of the Technology and Public Policy Program CSIS, March 2010, “The Electrical Grid as a Target for Cyber Attack,” http://csis.org/files/publication/100322\_ElectricalGridAsATargetforCyberAttack.pdf)

This conclusion is different from the strategic consequences on a cyber attack on the power grid. The United States routinely suffers blackouts. The nation does not collapse. In the short term, military power and economic strength are not noticeably affected - a good example for opponents to consider is Hurricane Katrina, which caused massive damage but did not degrade U.S. military power in or even long-term economic performance. Is there any cyber attack that could match the hurricane?¶ The United States is a very large collection of targets with many different pieces making up its electrical infrastructure. While a single attack could interrupt service, the large size and complexity of the American economy make it more resilient. Even without a Federal response plan, the ability of electrical companies to work quickly together to restore service is impressive and we should not underestimate the ingenuity of targets to recover much more rapidly than expected. This is a routine occurrence in aerial bombing: impressive damage is quickly rectified by a determined opponent.

#### Cyberterror threats are exaggerated – too many vested interests for accurate predictions

Jerry Brito (senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center and directs the Technology Policy Program at George Mason University) and Tate Watkins (research associate for the Technology Policy Program and the State and Local Policy Project at George Mason University) April 26, 2011 “Loving the Cyber Bomb? The Dangers of Threat Inflation in Cybersecurity Policy” <http://mercatus.org/sites/default/files/publication/WP1124_Loving_cyber_bomb.pdf>

An industrial complex reminiscent of the Cold War‘s may be emerging in cybersecurity today. Some serious threats may exist, but we have also seen evidence of threat inflation. Alarm raised over potential cyber threats has led to a cyber industry build-up and political competition over cyber pork. 1. Build-up In many cases, those now inflating the scope and probability of cyber threats might well benefit from increased regulation and more government spending on information security. Cybersecurity is a big and booming industry.163 The U.S. government is expected to spend $10.5 billion per year on information security by 2015, and analysts have estimated the worldwide market to be as much as $140 billion per year.164 The Department of Defense has also said it is seeking more than $3.2 billion in cybersecurityfunding for 2012.16In recent years, in addition to traditional information security providers like MacAfee, Symantec, and Checkpoint, defense contractors and consulting firms have recognized lucrative opportunities in cybersecurity.166 To weather probable cuts on traditional defense spending, and to take advantage of the growing market, these firms have positioned themselves to compete with information security firms for government contracts.167 Lockheed Martin, Boeing, L-3 Communications, SAIC, and BAE Systems have all launched cybersecurity business divisions in recent years.168 Other traditional defense contractors, like Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, and ManTech International, have also invested in information security products and services.169 Such investments appear to have positioned defense firms well. In 2009, the top 10 information technology federal contractors included Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, General Dynamics, Raytheon, SAIC, L-3 Communications, and Booz Allen Hamilton.170 Traditional IT firms also see more opportunities to profit from cybersecurity business in both the public and private sectors.171 Earlier this year, a software security company executive noted ―a very large rise in interest in spending on computer security by the government.‖172 And as one IT market analyst put it: ―It‘s a cyber war and we‘re fighting it. In order to fight it, you need to spend more money, and some of the core beneficiaries of that trend will be the security software companies.‖173 Some companies from diverse industries have also combined forces in the cybersecurity buildup. In 2009, a combination of defense, security, and tech companies, including Lockheed, McAfee, Symantec, Cisco, Dell, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, Juniper Networks, and Microsoft, formed a cybersecurity technology alliance to study threats and innovate solutions.174 IT lobbyists, too, have looked forward to cybersecurity budget increases, to the dismay of at least one executive at a small tech firm, who claimed, ―Money gets spent on the vendors who spend millions lobbying Congress.‖175 There are serious real online threats, and security firms, government agencies, the military, and private companies clearly must invest to protect against such threats. But as with the Cold War bomber and missile gap frenzies, we must be wary of parties with vested interests exaggerating threats, leading to unjustified and superfluous defense spending in the name of national security.

#### No unauthorized launch – psychological resistance.

Quinlan, 2009 (Michael, former top official in the British Ministry of Defence, “Thinking about Nuclear Weapons: Principles, Problems, Prospects” p. 63-69)

Even if initial nuclear use did not quickly end the fighting, the supposition of inexorable momentum in a developing exchange, with each side rushing to overreaction amid confusion and uncertainty, is **implausible**. It fails to consider what the situation of the decisionmakers would really be. Neither side could want escalation. Both would be appalled at what was going on. Both would be desperately looking for signs that the other was ready to call a halt. Both, given the capacity for evasion or concealment which modem delivery platforms and vehicles can possess, could have in reserve significant forces invulnerable enough not to entail use-or-lose pressures. (It may be more open to question, as noted earlier, whether newer nuclear weapon possessors can be immediately in that position; but it is within reach of any substantial state with advanced technological capabilities, and attaining it is certain to be a high priority in the development of forces.) As a result, neither side can have any predisposition to suppose, in an ambiguous situation of fearful risk, that the right course when in doubt is to go on copiously launching weapons. And none of this analysis rests on any presumption of highly subtle or pre-concerted rationality. The rationality required is plain. The argument is reinforced if we consider the possible reasoning of an aggressor at a more dispassionate level. Any substantial nuclear armoury can inflict destruction outweighing any possible prize that aggression could hope to seize. A state attacking the possessor of such an armoury must therefore be doing so (once given that it cannot count upon destroying the armoury pre-emptively) on a judgement that the possessor would be found lacking in the will to use it. If the attacked possessor used nuclear weapons, whether first or in response to the aggressor's own first use, this judgement would begin to look dangerously precarious.

#### Extinction impossible

Gregg Easterbrook (a senior fellow at The New Republic) July 2003 “We're All Gonna Die!” http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic\_set=

Germ warfare!Like chemical agents, biological weapons have never lived up to their billing in popular culture. Consider the 1995 medical thriller Outbreak, in which a highly contagious virus takes out entire towns. The reality is quite different. Weaponized smallpox escaped from a Soviet laboratory in Aralsk, Kazakhstan, in 1971; three people died, no epidemic followed. In 1979, weapons-grade anthrax got out of a Soviet facility in Sverdlovsk (now called Ekaterinburg); 68 died, no epidemic. The loss of life was tragic, but no greater than could have been caused by a single conventional bomb. In 1989, workers at a US government facility near Washington were accidentally exposed to Ebola virus. They walked around the community and hung out with family and friends for several days before the mistake was discovered. No one died. The fact is, evolution has spent millions of years conditioning mammals to resist germs. Consider the Black Plague. It was the worst known pathogen in history, loose in a Middle Ages society of poor public health, awful sanitation, and no antibiotics. Yet it didn't kill off humanity. Most people who were caught in the epidemic survived. Any superbug introduced into today's Western world would encounter top-notch public health, excellent sanitation, and an array of medicines specifically engineered to kill bioagents. Perhaps one day some aspiring Dr. Evil will invent a bug that bypasses the immune system. Because it is possible some novel superdisease could be invented, or that existing pathogens like smallpox could be genetically altered to make them more virulent (two-thirds of those who contract natural smallpox survive), biological agents are a legitimate concern. They may turn increasingly troublesome as time passes and knowledge of biotechnology becomes harder to control, allowing individuals or small groups to cook up nasty germs as readily as they can buy guns today. But no superplague has ever come close to wiping out humanity before, and it seems unlikely to happen in the future.

#### No retaliation- Obama

Michael Crowley (Senior Editor the New Republic) January 2010 “Obama and Nuclear Deterrence”, http://www.tnr.com/node/72263

The Los Angeles Times ran an important story yesterday about the Obama administration's Nuclear Posture Review, which evaluates U.S. policy towards the use of nuclear weapons. Apparently there's a debate inside the administration--one that is splitting the civilians from the generals--not just about the size of our nuclear stockpile but also how we conceive of possible first-strike and retaliatory policies. A core issue under debate, officials said, is whether the United States should shed its long-standing ambiguity about whether it would use nuclear weapons in certain circumstances, in hopes that greater specificity would give foreign governments more confidence to make their own decisions on nuclear arms. Some in the U.S. argue that the administration should assure foreign governments that it won't use nuclear weapons in reaction to a biological, chemical or conventional attack, but only in a nuclear exchange. Others argue that the United States should promise that it would never use nuclear weapons first, but only in response to a nuclear attack. As the story notes, some experts don't place much weight on how our publicly-stated doctrine emerges because they don't expect foreign nations to take it literally. And the reality is that any decisions about using nukes will certainly be case-by-case. But I'd still like to see some wider discussion of the underlying questions, which are among the most consequential that policymakers can consider. The questions are particularly vexing when it comes to terrorist groups and rogue states. Would we, for instance, actually nuke Pyongyang if it sold a weapon to terrorists who used it in America? That implied threat seems to exist, but I actually doubt that a President Obama--or any president, for that matter--would go through with it.

### Prolif

#### No nuke reniassance

Matthew L. Wald, “Nuclear Power’s Death Somewhat Exaggerated,” New York Times, April 10, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/11/business/energy-environment/nuclear-powers-death-somewhat-exaggerated.html, accessed 7-8-2012.

NUCLEAR energy is going through an odd patch. It refuses to die, but it does not prosper. This is how modest the nuclear industry’s prospects now look: Senator Lamar Alexander, a Tennessee Republican who has called for building 100 reactors in the next few years, told a conference of industry specialists in late March that the long-ballyhooed “nuclear renaissance” did not really exist anymore. Now, he said, it is an “awakening to the awareness of nuclear.” But it is an awakening with a price of $30 billion or more. Mr. Alexander was speaking to a conference convened on the 33rd anniversary of the Three Mile Island accident, a few weeks after the Nuclear Regulatory Commission gave permission to build a power reactor for the first time in more than 30 years, for the twin Vogtle reactors near Augusta, Ga. Those will cost $14 billion, if all goes well, and more if it does not. A few days after he spoke, the commission approved a license for another pair of reactors in South Carolina, which will cost about the same. Several other companies are laying out hundreds of millions of dollars in planning for reactors that may or may not get to the groundbreaking stage. The industry’s three great recent stumbling blocks, the Fukushima accident of March 2011, the exceptionally low price of natural gas and a recession that has stunted demand for power, mock the idea that dozens of new reactors are waiting in the wings. But in an era of worry over global warming, support is plentiful for at least keeping a toe in the water.

#### No cascade of proliferation – its all alarmist rhetoric

Muthia Alagappa, pub. date: 2008, Distinguished Senior Fellow, East-West Center, “The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia,” accesed: 1-6-09, p. 521-2, Google Books

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventative action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India’s and Pakistan’s nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran’s quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country’s security concerns about the U ntiedStates and Tehran’s regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S.-Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in it’s political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country’s decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. Through appealing, the domino theory is not predictive; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that sub region (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

#### No escalation from prolif

Victor Asal and Kyle Beardsley, pub. date: 2007, Assistant Prof. Pol. Sci. – SUNY Albany, and Kyle Beardsley, Asst. Prof. Pol. Sci. – Emory Univ., Journal of Peace Research, “Proliferation and International Crisis Behavior,” accessed: 12-18-09, http://jpr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/44/2/139

The literature on international conflict is divided on the impact of nuclear proliferation on state conflict. The optimists’ argument contends that nuclear weapons raise the stakes so high that states are unlikely to go to war when nuclear weapons enter the equation. The pessimists rebut this argument, contending that new proliferators are not necessarily rational and that having nuclear weapons does not discourage war but rather makes war more dangerous. Focusing on one observable implication from this debate, this article examines the relationship between the severity of violence in crises and the number of involved states with nuclear weapons. The study contends that actors will show more restraint in crises involving more participants with nuclear weapons. Using data from the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) project, the results demonstrate that crises involving nuclear actors are more likely to end without violence and, as the number of nuclear actors involved increases, the likelihood of war continues to fall. The results are robust even when controlling for a number of factors including non-nuclear capability. In confirming that nuclear weapons tend to increase restraint in crises, the effect of nuclear weapons on strategic behavior is clarified. But the findings do not suggest that increasing the number of nuclear actors in a crisis can prevent war, and they cannot speak to other proliferation risks

#### Chinese nuclear power slowing-none approved last year, few to be approved this year

Liu Yiyu January 2, 2012 (reporter for China Daily, “Nuclear approvals to be resumed at slower rate”, http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2012-02/01/content\_14514229.htm)

The nation will restart projects soon, however, numbers are set to be reduced BEIJING - China will slow approvals of nuclear projects after the resumption, which is expected to take place this year, according to an industry expert from a national energy think tank. "China will be cautious in pursuing nuclear power and is likely to approve only three or four projects each year, compared with the boom in new projects during the 11th Five-Year Plan period (2005-2010)," said Xiao Xinjian, a nuclear industry expert at the national Energy Research Institute, affiliated with the National Development and Reform Commission. The country had been accelerating its nuclear development since 2008, with 14 reactors approved in 2008 and six in 2009. Following the nuclear leak in Japan in the wake of the March 11 earthquake and tsunami, the Chinese government announced a suspension of approvals for nuclear power stations. It also conducted rigorous safety checks at all nuclear projects, including those under construction. No new project was approved or started last year.

#### No US/China war—It’s in neither country’s best interest

Ackerman 2011 (Robert Ackerman, May 10, 2011, “War Between China, U.S. Not Likely,” http://www.afcea.org/signal/signalscape/index.php/2011/05/10/11510/)

The United States and China are not likely to go to war with each other because neither country wants it and it would run counter to both nations’ best interests. That was the conclusion of a plenary panel session hosted by former Good Morning America host David Hartman at the 2011 Joint Warfighting Conference in Virginia Beach. Adm. Timothy J. Keating, USN (Ret.), former head of the U.S. Pacific Command, noted that China actually wants the United States to remain active in the Asia-Pacific region as a hedge against any other country’s adventurism. And, most of the other countries in that region want the United States to remain active as a hedge against China. Among areas of concern for China is North Korea. Wallace “Chip” Gregson, former assistant secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, said that above all China fears instability, and a North Korean collapse or war could send millions of refugees streaming into Manchuria, which has economic problems of its own.

#### Asia's shared values prevent war and escalation.

Barry Desker, dean of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, NTU, The Straits Times (Singapore), "Why war is unlikely in Asia" June 25, 2008 lexis

Although the United States has been the hegemon in the Asia-Pacific since the end of World War II, it will probably not remain the dominant presence in the region over the next 25 years. A rising China will pose a critical challenge to the US, probably more difficult than the challenge posed by the Soviet Union during the Cold War. This will lead to a profound change in the region's strategic environment. But the rise of China does not automatically mean that conflict is likely. First, a more assertive China does not mean a more aggressive China. Beijing appears content to press its claims peacefully (if forcefully) through existing avenues and institutions. Second, when we examine the Chinese military buildup, we find that there may be less there than some might have us believe. The Chinese war machine is not quite as threatening - although still worrisome - as some fear. Instead of Washington's perspectives shaping Asia-Pacific affairs coercively, the rise of China is likely to see a new paradigm in international affairs. The nascent 'Beijing Consensus', for want of a better term, would consist of the following attributes: The leadership role of the authoritarian state, a technocratic approach to governance, an emphasis on social rights and obligations over individual rights, a reassertion of the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference, support for freer markets and stronger regional and international institutions. The argument that there is an emerging 'Beijing Consensus' is not premised on the rise of the 'East' and decline of the 'West', as sometimes seemed to be the sub-text of the earlier 1990s 'Asian values' debate. But like the previous debate, this new debate will reflect alternative philosophical traditions. At issue is the appropriate balance between the rights of the individual and those of the state. This debate will highlight the values China and other states in the region share. By contrast, one conventional American view is that Sino-American competition will result in 'intense security competition with considerable potential for war' in which most of China's neighbours 'will join with the United States to contain China's power'. Asia's shared values are likely to reduce the risk of such conflict and result in regional pressure for an accommodation of and engagement with China, rather than a confrontation with it. In its interactions with the region, China itself is beginning to be interested in issues of proper governance, the development of domestic institutions and the strengthening of regional institutions. Nor is Chinese policy unchanging, even on the issue of sovereignty. For example, there has been an evolution in Chinese thinking on the question of freedom of passage through the straits of Malacca and Singapore. China supported the claims of the littoral states to sovereign control over the straits when the Law of the Sea Convention was concluded in 1982. But its increasing dependence on imported oil shipped through the straits has led to a shift in favour of burden-sharing, the recognition of the rights of user states and the need for cooperation between littoral states and user states. China has also revised its earlier advocacy of strict non-intervention and non-interference. Its support for global initiatives such as peacekeeping and nuclear non-proliferation - as well as its restrained use of its veto in the UN Security Council and its active role in the World Trade Organisation - indicates it is aware that responsible participation in global institutions can shape perceptions of a rising China. Beijing has also greatly lowered the tone and rhetoric of its strategic competition with the US. This is significant as most South-east Asian states prefer not to have to choose between the US and China, and have adopted 'hedging' strategies in their relationships with the two powers. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) is certainly in the midst of the most ambitious upgrading of its combat capabilities since the early 1960s. Its current defence doctrine is centred on the ability to fight 'Limited Local Wars'. The emphasis is on pre-emption, surprise and shock value, given that the earliest stages of conflict may be crucial to the outcome of a war. Thus the PLA has pursued the acquisition of weapons for asymmetric warfare. It mimics the US military in terms of the ambition and scope of its transformational efforts - and therefore challenges the US military at its own game. Nevertheless, China is still at least two decades behind the US in terms of its defence capabilities. It is certainly acquiring new and better equipment, but its current military buildup is indicative of an evolutionary, steady-state and sustaining - rather than disruptive or revolutionary - innovation and change. War in the Asia-Pacific is unlikely. But the emergence of East Asia, especially China, will require adjustments by the West, just as Asian societies had to adjust to Western norms and values during the American century.

### Shale

#### Natural Gas industry is strong

Smith 2012 [Rebecca Smith Wall Street Journal 3-15-2012 “Cheap Natural Gas Unplugs U.S. Nuclear-Power Revival” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304459804577281490129153610.html]

Across the country, utilities are turning to natural gas to generate electricity, with 258 plants expected to be built from 2011 through 2015, federal statistics indicate. Not only are gas-fired plants faster to build than reactors, they are much less expensive. The U.S. Energy Information Administration says it costs about $978 per kilowatt of capacity to build and fuel a big gas-fired power plant, compared with $5,339 per kilowatt for a nuclear plant.¶ Already, the inexpensive natural gas is putting downward pressure on electricity costs for consumers and businesses.¶ The EIA has forecast that the nation will add 222 gigawatts of generating capacity between 2010 and 2035—equivalent to one-fifth of the current U.S. capacity. The biggest chunk of that addition—58%—will be fired by natural gas, it said, followed by renewable sources, including hydropower, at 31%, then coal at 8% and nuclear power at 4%.

#### Plan reverses trend of expanded natural gas

Smith 2012 [Rebecca Smith Wall Street Journal 3-15-2012 “Cheap Natural Gas Unplugs U.S. Nuclear-Power Revival” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304459804577281490129153610.html]

The U.S. nuclear industry seemed to be staging a comeback several years ago, with 15 power companies proposing as many as 29 new reactors. Today, only two projects are moving off the drawing board.¶ What killed the revival wasn't last year's nuclear accident in Japan, nor was it a soft economy that dented demand for electricity. Rather, a shale-gas boom flooded the U.S. market with cheap natural gas, offering utilities a cheaper, less risky alternative to nuclear technology.

#### US Natural gas key to check Russian expansionism

**Medlock et al 2011** (Kenneth B. Medlock III, Ph.D., Amy Myers Jaffe, Peter R. Hartley, Ph.D., July 2011, “Shale Gas and US National Security,” James A. Baker Institute, online)

Natural gas—if not disadvantaged by government policies that protect competing fuels, such as coal—stands to play a very important role in the U.S. energy mix for decades to come. Rising shale gas production has already delivered large beneficial impacts to the United States. Shale gas resources are generally located in close proximity to end-use markets where natural gas is utilized to fuel industry, generate electricity and heat homes. This offers both security of supply and economic benefits. Rising shale gas supplies have significantly reduced U.S. requirements for imported liquefied natural gas (LNG), which has already had geopolitical implications. For example, it has played a key role in weakening Russia’s ability to wield an “energy weapon” over its European customers by increasing alternative supplies to Europe in the form of LNG displaced from the U.S. market. Rising shale gas supply has also led to lower domestic natural gas prices, which lowers the costs of initiatives to diversify the American automobile fleet to run on non-oil based fuels such as electricity and compressed natural gas. In both the U.S. and abroad, the promise of growing shale gas production has raised the prospects for greater use of natural gas, an outcome with significant implications for global environmental objectives since lower-cost natural gas can displace fuels associated with higher air pollution and greater carbon intensity, such as coal and oil. Without doubt, the natural gas supply picture in North America has changed substantially, and it has had a ripple effect around the globe not only through displacement of supplies in global trade but also by fostering a growing interest in shale resource potential in other parts of the world. Thus, North American shale gas developments are having effects far beyond the North American market, and these impacts are likely to expand over time. Prior to the innovations leading to the recent increases in shale gas production, huge declines were expected in domestic production in the United States, Canada, and the North Sea. This meant an increasing reliance on foreign supplies at a time when natural gas was becoming more important as a source of energy. Shale gas developments stand to exert enormous influence on the structure of the global gas market. Throughout the 1990s, natural gas producers in the Middle East and Africa, anticipating rising demand for LNG from the United States in particular, began investing heavily in expanding LNG export capability, concomitant with investments in regasification being made in the United States. But the rapid growth in shale gas production has since turned such expectations upside down and rendered many of those investments obsolete. Import terminals for LNG are now scarcely utilized, and the prospects that the United States will become highly dependent on LNG imports in the coming years are receding, with some proposals now emerging for exports of LNG from North America. Rising shale gas production in the United States is already impacting markets abroad. In particular, LNG supplies whose development was anchored to the belief that the United States would be a premium market are now being diverted to European and Asian buyers. Not only has this immediately presented consumers in Europe with an alternative to Russian pipeline supplies, it is also exerting pressure on the status quo of indexing gas sales to a premium marker determined by the price of petroleum products. In fact, Russia has already had to accept lower prices for its natural gas and is now allowing a portion of its sales in Europe to be indexed to spot natural gas markets, or regional market hubs, rather than oil prices. This change in pricing terms signals a major paradigm shift. The recent developments around shale in the United States are also having another, potentially market structure altering, effect. Revelations about the existence of technically—and possibly commercially—viable shale gas resources are also occurring in other regions around the world, with shale gas potential being discussed in Europe, China, India, Australia, and elsewhere. To be sure, the enormity of global shale gas potential will have significant geopolitical ramifications and exert a powerful influence on U.S. energy and foreign policy. The state of knowledge regarding the amount of shale gas that is economically recoverable has changed rapidly over the last 10 years. A simple chronology is as follows: • As recently as 2003, the National Petroleum Council2 estimated that about 38 trillion cubic feet (tcf) of technically recoverable resources were spread across multiple basins in the North America. • In 2005, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) was using an estimate of 140 tcf in its Annual Energy Outlook as a mean for North American technically recoverable shale gas resources. • In 2008, Navigant Consulting, Inc.3 estimated a range of between 380 tcf and 900 tcf of technically recoverable resources, putting the mean at about 640 tcf. • In 2009, the Potential Gas Committee4 put its mean estimate at just over 680 tcf. • In 2011, Advanced Resources International (ARI) reported an estimate of about 1,930 tcf for North America, with over 860 tcf in U.S. gas shales alone.5 Note that although each assessment listed above is from an independent source, the estimates are increasing over time as more drilling occurs and technological advances are made, which is an indication of the learning-by-doing that is still occurring in this important play. Moreover, the shift in the generally accepted assessment of recoverable shale resources has left producers, consumers, and governments all grappling with the implications for markets and geopolitics. Utilizing scenario analysis based on peer-reviewed, scientific assessments of the properties of shales (which the Baker Institute then uses to develop its own technically recoverable estimates and associated finding and development cost curves), this Baker Institute study, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy, is able to demonstrate that U.S. shale gas can help abate the enhancement of geopolitical power wielded by key petro-states as global primary energy use shifts increasingly to natural gas. Specifically, shale gas will play a critical role in diminishing the petro-power of major natural gas producers in the Middle East, Russia, and Venezuela and will be a major factor limiting global dependence on natural gas supplies from the same unstable regions that are currently uncertain sources of the global supply of oil. In this way, shale gas can play a critical role in averting a reinforcement of the political risk we currently face in the global oil market. The geopolitical repercussions of expanding shale gas production include the following: • Virtually eliminates U.S. requirements for imported LNG for at least two decades • Reduces competition for LNG supplies from the Middle East, thereby moderating prices and spurring greater use of natural gas, an outcome with significant implications for global environmental objectives • Combats the long-term potential monopoly power of a “gas OPEC” or a single producer such as Russia to exercise dominance over large natural gas consumers in Europe or elsewhere • Reduces Russia’s market share in non-FSU Europe from 27 percent in 2009 to about 13 percent by 2040, reducing the chances that Moscow can use energy as a tool for political gain • Reduces the future share of world gas supply from Russia, Iran, and Venezuela; without shale discoveries, these nations would have accounted for about 33 percent of global gas supply in 2040, but with shale, this is reduced to 26 percent • Reduces the opportunity for Venezuela to become a major LNG exporter and thereby lowers longer-term dependence in the Western Hemisphere and in Europe on Venezuelan LNG • Reduces U.S. and Chinese dependence on Middle East natural gas supplies, lowering the incentives for geopolitical and commercial competition between the two largest consuming countries and providing both countries with new opportunities to diversify their energy supply • Reduces Iran’s ability to tap energy diplomacy as a means to strengthen its regional power or to buttress its nuclear aspirations.

#### Expansionism causes global nuclear war

**Blank 2009** (Stephen Blank, Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, March 2009, “Russia And Arms Control: Are There Opportunities For The Obama Administration?,” online)

Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation. 168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need. 169 Simultaneously, The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD. First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author 170 ) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances 7 in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD. 171 Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes, But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.

#### Econ resilient

Fareed Zakaria (editor of Newsweek International) December 2009 “The Secrets of Stability,” http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/2]

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic n this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all. A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

#### **Chemical industry demand declining despite supply increases**

Fulp 11 (Mickey, Certified Professional Geologist with a B.Sc. Earth Sciences with honor from the University of Tulsa, and M.Sc. Geology from the University of New Mexico, “What's Up (or Down) with the Nat Gas Market?,” 7-12-11, The Energy Report, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/10247>)

Domestic demand for natural gas comes from four general uses: Residential and commercial: 22%; space heating and cooking. Industrial: 38%; fuel for the pulp and paper, metal, chemical, petroleum refining and food-processing industries; feedstock for plastic, chemical and fertilizer production. These uses are projected to decline as the economy moves toward less energy-intensive manufacturing processes.
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#### ‘for energy production’ is an adjectival phrase- it must modify the financial incentive

Rozakis 2003 [Laurie E. Rozakis, Ph.D. Excerpted from The Complete Idiot's Guide to Grammar and Style © 2003 “Prepositional Phrases: The Big Daddy of Phrases” http://www.infoplease.com/cig/grammar-style/prepositional-phrases-big-daddy-phrases.html]

When a prepositional phrase serves as an adjective, it's called an adjectival phrase. (That was a no-brainer, eh? Who says you don't get a break in this English biz?)¶ An adjectival phrase, as with an adjective, describes a noun or a pronoun. Here are some examples:¶ The manager with the pink slips terrorized the employees.¶ The adjectival phrase “with the pink slips” describes the noun “manager.”¶ The price of the promotion was much too steep.¶ The adjectival phrase “of the promotion” describes the noun “price.”¶ Something in the corner of the desk was moving.¶ The adjectival phrase “in the corner” describes the noun “something”; the adjectival phrase “of the desk” describes the noun “corner.”

#### Grammar is a prerequisite to clash and creativity

**Leahy, 2005** (Anna Leahy, assistant professor at North Central College and award winning poet, Pedagogy; Vol. 5 Issue 2, p304-308, 5p, “Grammar Matters: A Creative Writer’s Argument” Spring, EBSCO)

Wallace Stegner (2002: 64–65), in On Teaching and Writing Fiction, notes, “Whether dismembered syntax has sprung from ignorance or from the lust after originality, I believe it should be questioned. After all, all a reader knows is the marks on the printed page. Those marks have to contribute meaning.” Like Stegner, I think commas matter, as do sentence structures that convey, support, or make ironic the meanings of the words themselves. Ursula Le Guin (1998: 33), in Steering the Craft, puts it slightly differently: our standards for writing, including for grammar and syntax, must be higher than in conversation, “because when we read, we don’t have the speaker’s voice and expression and intonation to make half-finished sentences and misused words clear. We only have the words. And, to be clear to as many readers as possible, they have to follow the agreed-upon rules, the shared rules, of grammar and usage.” When a student spells one word as another or misses a comma after an unwieldy clause, we can downplay its importance, having seen enough similar slips to surmise a larger idea. If pointed out to the student, she sometimes asserts, “But you know what I meant.” Do I? Does she want to relinquish control of meaning to me? I draw my references here from creative writers because I come to teaching as a creative writer. This position gives me a strange cachet in the grammar business. After all, if a poet supposedly exuding a spontaneous overfl ow of emotion cares about grammar and syntax, it mustn’t be all stifl ing regulations. So, I opt to quote to my students the likes of Tom Robbins and Stephen King instead of Strunk and White, whose work I appreciate more than I expect my students will. Grammar, according to Kim Addonizio and Dorianne Laux (1997: 171), “sounds stern, forbidding, and worst of all dull. It smacks of the elementary school classroom, of the meaningless dissection of sentences, of onerous burdens laid on the helpless shoulders of children. But if you are really interested in writing poetry, grammar can be something else: a door to rooms you might never otherwise discover, a way to realize and articulate your visions in language.” Knowing and talking about grammar, syntax, and style—recollecting in tranquillity, shall we say—is part of immersing oneself in language as a writer and is the student’s responsibility when using language to convey ideas. And I now see it more clearly as part of my responsibility as a teacher. The creative writer’s approach to grammar, syntax, and style allows me to bring import and enthusiasm to this teacherly responsibility, to assert its power and reward in writing. In Skinny Legs and All, novelist Robbins (1991: 172) includes a scene in which his characters discuss a word used sloppily, in this case neat. Can o’ Beans remarks, “Slang possesses an economy, an immediacy that’s attractive, all right, but it devalues experience by standardizing and fuzzing it. It hangs between humanity and the real world like a . . . a veil. Slang just makes people more stupid, that’s all, and stupidity eventually makes them crazy.” Fair or not, vague, confusing, or inaccurate sentences imply that those undesirable sentence qualities apply to the ideas and, in the world beyond the classroom, to the writer. Grammar and syntax indeed might allow people to articulate, as clearly as possible, the world and, perhaps, to see it clearly as well. As Le Guin notes (1998: 32), “Even with the best intentions, language misused, language used stupidly, carelessly, brutally, language used wrongly, breeds lies, half-truths, confusion.” To be lax with grammar and syntax might both reflect and cause confusion or ignorance.

### 2NC Limits Overview

#### They expand limits to any rule that also requires spending by the government

**Schoofs ‘4** (Sam Schoofs, Calvin College, 2004, Washington Internships for Students of Engineering Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, 6 August 2004 “A federal Renewable Portfolio Standard: Policy Analysis and Proposal”)

D. Renewable Energy Policy Overview There are two main categories of renewable energy policies. The first category gives some financial incentives to encourage renewable energy that includes tax incentives, grants, loans, rebates, and production incentives [13]. Tax incentives cover personal, sales, property, and corporate taxes and they help to reduce the investment costs and to reward investors for their support of renewable energy sources [12], [13]. As an example, 24 states currently have some form of grant program in place that ranges from as small as $500 up to $1,000,000 [13]. The second category of renewable energy policies is called rules and regulations, which mandate a certain action from an obligated entity. Included within this category are renewable portfolio standards, equipment certification, solar/wind access laws, **and green power purchasing**/aggregation polices [13]. As an example, equipment certification allows the states to regulate the performance criteria that equipment is required to meet in order to be eligible for financial incentives [12]. Seven states currently have equipment certification programs in place

#### Literally doubles the educational benefit

**Arrington 2009** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic

### Energy Production

Its electricity generation

Is Cumulative Fossil Energy Demand a Useful Indicator for the Environmental Performance of Products? M A R K A . J . HUIJBREGTS , \* , † L I N D A J . A . R O M B O U T S , † S T E F A N I E H E L L W E G , ‡ R O L F F R I S C H K N E C H T , § A . J A N H E N D R I K S , † D I K V A N D E M E E N T , † , | A D M . J . R A G A S , † L U C A S R E I J N D E R S , ⊥ A N D J A A P S T R U I J S | Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Wetland and Water Research, Faculty of Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, P.O. Box 9010, NL-6500 GL Nijmegen, The Netherlands, Institute for Chemical- and Bioengineering, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zu¨rich, CH-8093 Zu¨rich, Switzerland, Ecoinvent Centre, Ueberlandstrasse 129, CH-8600 Duebendorf, Switzerland, Laboratory for Ecological Risk Assessment, National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, P.O. Box 1, NL-3720 BA, Bilthoven, The Netherlands, and Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, NL-1018 WV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands 2006 American Chemical Society VOL. 40, NO. 3, 2006 / ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY 9 642 http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/es051689g

Life-Cycle Inventory Database. The Ecoinvent database v1.2 (4), containing life-cycle information for many products consumed in the western economy, has been used to derive cumulative fossil energy demands and lifecycle impact scores. Table 3 provides an overview of the product groups and the corresponding number of products considered. Energy production includes both heat and electricity production processes by nonrenewable energy sources (oil, hard coal, lignite, natural gas, nuclear) and renewable energy sources (hydropower, photovoltaic, wood, wind). Material production comprises many different product types, including plastics, chemicals, metals, agricultural products, and building materials. Transport includes transport of products by road, ship, train, airplane, and pipelines. Finally, waste treatment represents various types of landfill and incineration. We confined the analysis to products (and services) reported in equal units to avoid distortions in the regression analysis due to largely different (and arbitrary) sizes of the functional units. To minimize the interdependency between the production processes, we limited the energy production dataset to production of heat and electricity at the operation unit only. Further aggregated unit processes, such as electricity mixes in the various European countries, were excluded from the dataset. Furthermore, for cogeneration energy processes allocation based on energy content is applied only, excluding results for the same process, but based on another allocation rule, such as exergy

### A2: PTC Limits out Nuke Affs

There are still tons of restrictions affs on the nuclear side- impossibility of placing restrictions on energy production on that half of the topic means that we should limit the incentives part of the topic more

#### You can make the Nuclear PTC escalate to offset construction costs

NEI, October 2009, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Policies That Support New Nuclear Power Plant Development,” <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/factsheet/policiessupportnewplantdevelopment/>

The production tax credit (PTC) for new nuclear generation (section 1306 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) allows 6,000 megawatts of new nuclear capacity to earn $18 per megawatt-hour for the first eight years of operation. The maximum tax credit for any one plant is capped at $125 million per year. In 2005, $18 per megawatt-hour was comparable to the PTC for renewable resources. However, unlike the renewable PTC, which increases annually with inflation, the nuclear PTC does not escalate. In 2006, the Internal Revenue Service published guidelines for implementing the nuclear PTC program. For a facility to be eligible for credits: The construction and operating license application must be submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Dec. 31, 2008. The plant must be under construction by January 1, 2014. The plant must be operating by January 1, 2021. The 6,000 megawatts of available credits will be divided among eligible facilities on a pro rata basis according to the facilities' nameplate capacities. Although the PTC reduces the cost of the power generated by these new plants once they are up and running, it does little to offset the construction and commissioning risk.

### A2: Limits Out Military Affs

This is actually a benefit to our interp- procurement affs would ruin this topic- the military needs a lot of energy and they buy a wreck of stuff

#### For example solar and wind purchasing

**Wald 11** (Matthew L., writer on energy policy for thirty years for the NY Times, February 4, 2011, “Clean-energy firms, find private investors; projects aided by grants from U.S. attract $4 for every $1 taxpayers spent,” The International Herald Tribune, lexis)

In late 2009, the U.S. government gave $151 million in grants to advance 37 clean-energy ideas deemed too radical or too preliminary to attract much private financing - like electricity storage that mimics photosynthesis and batteries that double or triple the amount of energy they can store.¶ Since then, six of the projects have made enough progress to attract $108 million in private venture capital financing - about four private dollars for every dollar that the taxpayers spent to get them rolling - the Department of Energy was to announce Thursday.¶ While none of the projects are expected to result in commercial products for years to come, the Obama administration is emphasizing the early signs of success as it seeks to persuade a sometimes skeptical Congress to approve more money for clean-energy innovation.¶ Success is probably 10 to 20 years away, said Arun Mujamdar, director of the program, which is called the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy. But the private investment is ''a good sign, an endorsement of some sort,'' he said. ''The best thing the government can do is to catalyze investment.''¶ While 31 projects have not yet attracted outside help, all are continuing, according to the department. Josh Lerner, a professor at Harvard Business School and an expert on venture capital, said he would have been surprised if most of the projects had quickly attracted private financing. If all the projects had quickly drawn private money, it would have suggested that the projects would have happened without government intervention, Mr. Lerner said.¶ With a track record of 6 of 37 being picked up, ''it's hard not to feel it's a reasonable indicator that they're doing something right,'' he said.¶ While the government took ownership stakes in automakers and banks that got taxpayer help, it has not done so with the energy companies it has financed through the program, known as ARPA-E, so taxpayers reap no direct benefits.¶ Congress modeled the program after the better-known Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or Darpa, which provided early seed money for the Internet and sponsored competitions to build sophisticated robotic vehicles, among other projects. Most of Darpa's projects fail to produce commercial products, but the basic research it finances has sometimes led to breakthroughs.¶ For the first round of ARPA-E projects, the Energy Department focused on wind and solar energy production, energy storage and the capture and storage of carbon dioxide. No carbon storage project attracted outside investment, in part because investors no longer expect a government cap on carbon dioxide emissions to help drive demand. But sun and wind power and storage technologies did lure investors.¶ Envia Systems, which received $4 million in government money, used a material licensed from Argonne National Laboratory to build a better cathode, or negative terminal, for a battery. Envia, which is based in Newark, California, recently signed a contract with General Motors to begin delivery in 2014 of a material that will let batteries store roughly twice as much electricity per kilogram compared with the batteries now going into the Chevrolet Volt, said Michael Sinkula, a co-founder of the company.¶ Envia recently raised $17 million from an alliance of investors that included G.M., and it is now pursuing research on a better anode, or positive terminal, which will yield an even bigger improvement in the weight-to-energy ratio, Mr. Sinkula said.¶ Another battery company, 24M, a spinoff of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and A123 Systems, got a $2.55 million government grant and took in $10 million in venture capital money. It is also working on a lithium-ion battery with much higher energy density.¶ A solar cell company, 1366 Technologies, got $4 million from ARPA-E and has raised $33.4 million in private money. 1366, based in Lexington, Massachusetts, casts silicon wafers, a basic building block of solar cells, directly into their final form, which is 0.008 inch thick. That 0.2-millimeter cast cuts the price of the finished solar cells about 40 percent, the company said.¶ Sun Catalytix, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, uses a catalyst to help break up water molecules when they are exposed to electric current. The hydrogen from the water is absorbed by other molecules into an energy-rich material that can be burned in an internal combustion engine or converted back into electricity, said Amir Nashat, who is the acting chief executive of the company and also a principal in the venture capital firm Polaris Venture Partners.¶ Polaris and others, including Tata of India, put $9.5 million into the company after it got a $4 million ARPA-E grant. But Sun Catalytix is still years from releasing a product, Mr. Nashat said.¶ The two other companies financed by ARPA-E that attracted private investment were General Compression, which is developing a demonstration plant for a method to store electricity for later use and leveraged a $750,000 grant into $12 million in private capital; and FloDesign, which is working on a more efficient wind turbine based on the design of jet engines and used its $8.3 million grant to eventually raise another $27 million.

#### Or nuclear powered subs

O'Rourke 2012 [Ronald O'Rourke ¶ Specialist in Naval Affairs ¶ April 2, 2012 Congressional Research Service “Navy Virginia (SSN-774) Class Attack ¶ Submarine Procurement: Background and ¶ Issues for Congress” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL32418.pdf]

The Navy’s proposed FY2013 budget requests $3,217.6 million in procurement funding to ¶ ¶ complete the procurement cost of the 17¶ ¶ th¶ ¶ and 18¶ ¶ th¶ ¶ Virginia (SSN-774) class nuclear-powered ¶ ¶ attack submarines. The FY2013 budget estimates the combined procurement cost of these two ¶ ¶ boats at $5,107.9 million, and the ships have received a total of $1,890.3 million in prior-year ¶ ¶ advance procurement (AP) and Economic Order Quantity (EOQ) funding. The Navy’s proposed ¶ ¶ FY2013 budget also requests $874.9 million in AP funding for Virginia-class boats to be procured ¶ ¶ in future years. The Navy’s proposed FY2013 budget defers the scheduled procurement of one ¶ ¶ Virginia-class boat from FY2014 to FY2018. ¶ ¶ The two Virginia-class boats requested for procurement in FY2013 are the final two in a group of ¶ ¶ eight covered by a multiyear procurement (MYP) arrangement for the period FY2009-FY2013. ¶ ¶ The Navy this year is requesting congressional approval for a new MYP arrangement that would ¶ ¶ cover the next nine Virginia-class boats scheduled for procurement in FY2014-FY2018 (in annual ¶ ¶ quantities of 1-2-2-2-2). ¶ ¶ The Department of Defense (DOD) announced in January 2012 that it wants to build Virginiaclass boats procured in FY2019 and subsequent years with an additional mid-body section, called ¶ ¶ the Virginia Payload Module (VPM), that contains four large-diameter, vertical launch tubes that ¶ ¶ the boats would use to store and fire additional Tomahawk cruise missiles or other payloads, such ¶ ¶ as large-diameter unmanned underwater vehicles (UUVs). Building Virginia-class boats with the ¶ ¶ VPM might increase their unit procurement costs by about 15%-20%, and would increase the ¶ ¶ total number of torpedo-sized weapons (such as Tomahawks) that they could carry by about 76%. ¶ ¶ The Navy’s FY2013 30-year SSN procurement plan, if implemented, would not be sufficient to ¶ ¶ maintain a force of 48 SSNs consistently over the long run. The Navy projects under that plan ¶ ¶ that the SSN force would fall below 48 boats starting in FY2022, reach a minimum of 43 boats in ¶ ¶ FY2028-FY2030, and remain below 48 boats through FY2034.

#### Or maybe they could buy domestic oil, natural gas or CTL

Buis and Clark 2012 [Tom Buis CEO, Growth EnergyGrowth Energy Board Co-Chair Gen. Wesley K. Clark (Ret.) May 23, 2012 The National Journal “American Families Need American Fuel” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php]

Even worse, according to a new Bloomberg Government analysis, Pentagon spending on fuel is dramatically increasing. This will force the military to dedicate even more funds toward energy costs, at the expense of other priorities, like training and paying soldiers. In fact, every $.25 increase in the cost of jet fuel makes a $1 billion difference in the Department of Defense’s bottom line – a debt that will be passed along to the American taxpayer.¶ And if that's not enough to make you want to avoid foreign oil, then consider this: every dollar hike in the international, politically-rigged price of oil hands Iran about $3 million more per day, that their regime can use to sow mischief, fund terrorism, and develop missiles and nuclear weapons.¶ Enough is enough! We have domestic alternatives that can protect American interests, and promote prosperity and security – including, more domestic oil production, using natural gas and biofuels, like ethanol, as fuel, converting coal to liquid fuel, and moving as rapidly as possible to vehicles powered by green energy.

The idea that they need military affs to beat the states CP is foolish- maybe the aff should just have to beat the states CP- if that means that they have to beat it on theory that is fine because it will allow the community to define the scope of fiat we will allow the negative to have in that regard

### Grid Adv

### Grid Resilient 2NC

#### Grid resilient

Clark 2012 (Paul Clark, MA candidate in Intelligence Studies at American Military University, April 28, 2012, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University, online)

In 2003, a simple physical breakdown occurred – trees shorted a power line and caused a¶ fault – that had a cascading effect and caused a power blackout across the Northeast (Lewis¶ 2010). This singular occurrence has been used as evidence that the electrical grid is fragile and¶ subject to severe disruption through cyber-attack, a disruption that could cost billions of dollars,¶ brings business to a halt, and could even endanger lives – if compounded by other catastrophic¶ events (Brennan 2012). A power disruption the size of the 2003 blackout, the worst in American¶ history at that time (Minkel 2008), is a worst case scenario and used as an example of the¶ fragility of the U.S. energy grid. This perceived fragility is not real when viewed in the context¶ of the robustness of the electrical grid.¶ When asked about cyber-attacks against the electrical grid in April of 2012, the¶ intelligence chief of U.S. Cyber Command Rear Admiral Samuel Cox stated that an attack was¶ unlikely to succeed because of the “huge amounts of resiliency built into the [electrical] system¶ that makes that kind of catastrophic thing very difficult” (Capaccio 2012). This optimistic view¶ is supported by an electrical grid that has proven to be robust in the face of large natural¶ catastrophes. Complex systems like the electrical grid in the U.S. are prone to failures and the¶ U.S. grid fails frequently. Despite efforts to reduce the risk out power outages, the risk is always¶ present. Power outages that affect more than 50,000 people have occurred steadily over the last¶ 20 years at a rate of 12% annually and the frequency of large catastrophes remains relatively¶ high and outages the size of the 2003 blackout are predicted to occur every 25 years (Minkel¶ 2008). In a complex system that is always at risk of disruption, the effect is mitigated by policies¶ and procedures that are meant to restore services as quickly as possible. The most visible of these policies is the interstate Emergency Management Assistance Compact, a legally binding¶ agreement allowing combined resources to be quickly deployed in response to a catastrophic¶ disaster such as power outages following a severe hurricane (Kapucu, Augustin and Garayev¶ 2009).¶ The electrical grid suffers service interruptions regularly, it is a large and complex system¶ supporting the largest economy in the world, and yet commerce does not collapse (Lewis 2010).¶ Despite blizzards, earthquakes, fires, and hurricanes that cause blackouts, the economy is¶ affected but does not collapse and even after massive damage like that caused by Hurricane¶ Katrina, national security is not affected because U.S. military capability is not degraded (Lewis¶ 2010).¶ Cyber-security is an ever-increasing concern in an increasingly electronic and¶ interconnected world. Cyber-security is a high priority “economic and national security¶ challenge” (National Security Council n.d.) because cyber-attacks are expected to become the¶ top national security threat (Robert S. Mueller 2012). In response to the threat Congress is¶ crafting legislation to enhance cyber-security (Brito and Watkins 2012) and the Department of¶ Homeland Security budget for cyber-security has been significantly increased (U.S. Senate¶ Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs 2012).

### 2NC CBW

#### Delivery is impossible – most likely methods ensure only a 5% risk

Stimson Center 2005 (Henry L. Stimson Center, Frequently Asked Questions: Likelihood of Terrorists Acquiring and Using Chemical or Biological Weapons, http://www.stimson.org/cwc/terror.htm)

Terrorists cannot count on just filling the delivery system with agent, pointing the device, and flipping the switch to activate it. Facets that must be deciphered include the concentration of agent in the delivery system, the ways in which the delivery system degrades the potency of the agent, and the right dosage to incapacitate or kill human or animal targets. For open-air delivery, the meteorological conditions must be taken into account. Biological agents have extreme sensitivity to sunlight, humidity, pollutants in the atmosphere, temperature, and even exposure to oxygen, all of which can kill the microbes. Biological agents can be dispersed in either dry or wet forms. Using a dry agent can boost effectiveness because drying and milling the agent can make the particles very fine, a key factor since particles must range between 1 to 10 ten microns, ideally to 1 to 5, to be breathed into the lungs. Drying an agent, however, is done through a complex and challenging process that requires a sophistication of equipment and know-how that terrorist organizations are unlikely to possess. The alternative is to develop a wet slurry, which is much easier to produce but a great deal harder to disperse effectively. Wet slurries can clog sprayers and undergo mechanical stresses that can kill 95 percent or more of the microorganisms.

## Prolif Adv

### China Rise UQ

#### China can’t catch up and no risk of war

**Zenko and Cohen 12** (Micah Zenko, Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, and MIchael Cohen, Senior Fellow at the American Security Project, serves on the board of the National Security Network and has taught at Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs, served in the U.S. Department of State, former Senior Vice President at the strategic communications firm of Robinson, Lerer and Montgomery, bachelor’s degree in international relations from American University and a master’s degree from Columbia University, 3/14/2012, "Clear and Present Safety", yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/clear-and-present-safety)

As the threat from transnational terrorist groups dwindles, the United States also faces few risks from other states. China is the most obvious potential rival to the United States, and there is little doubt that China’s rise will pose a challenge to U.S. economic interests. Moreover, there is an unresolved debate among Chinese political and military leaders about China’s proper global role, and the lack of transparency from China’s senior leadership about its long-term foreign policy objectives is a cause for concern. However, the present security threat to the U.S. mainland is practically nonexistent and will remain so. Even as China tries to modernize its military, its defense spending is still approximately one-ninth that of the United States. In 2012, the Pentagon will spend roughly as much on military research and development alone as China will spend on its entire military. While China clumsily flexes its muscles in the Far East by threatening to deny access to disputed maritime resources, a recent Pentagon report noted that China’s military ambitions remain dominated by “regional contingencies” and that the People’s Liberation Army has made little progress in developing capabilities that “extend global reach or power projection.” In the coming years, China will enlarge its regional role, but this growth will only threaten U.S. interests if Washington attempts to dominate East Asia and fails to consider China’s legitimate regional interests. It is true that China’s neighbors sometimes fear that China will not resolve its disputes peacefully, but this has compelled Asian countries to cooperate with the United States, maintaining bilateral alliances that together form a strong security architecture and limit China’s room to maneuver. The strongest arguments made by those warning of Chinese influence revolve around economic policy. The list of complaints includes a host of Chinese policies, from intellectual property theft and currency manipulation to economic espionage and domestic subsidies. Yet none of those is likely to lead to direct conflict with the United States beyond the competition inherent in international trade, which does not produce zero-sum outcomes and is constrained by dispute-resolution mechanisms, such as those of the World Trade Organization. If anything, China’s export-driven economic strategy, along with its large reserves of U.S. Treasury bonds, suggests that Beijing will continue to prefer a strong United States to a weak one.

#### Not an aggressive power now

Thompson 2010 [Drew Thompson is director of China studies and Starr senior fellow at the Nixon Center MARCH/APRIL 2010 “Think Again: China's Military” Foreign Policy http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/22/think\_again\_chinas\_military?page=0,6]

But widespread perceptions of China as an aggressive, expansionist power are off base. Although China's relative power has grown significantly in recent decades, the main tasks of Chinese foreign policy are defensive and have not changed much since the Cold War era: to blunt destabilizing influences from abroad, to avoid territorial losses, to reduce its neighbors' suspicions, and to sustain economic growth. What has changed in the past two decades is that China is now so deeply integrated into the world economic system that its internal and regional priorities have become part of a larger quest

: to define a global role that serves Chinese interests but also wins acceptance from other powers.

## 1NR

#### WE ALSO READ SOME CARDS THAT SAID WE HAVE A BUNCH OF NATURAL GAS ALREADY (Cant find them at the moment)

#### Discourses of energy policy determine the solutions that we attempt

Laura Nader University of California, Berkeley Anthropological Quarterly 77.4 (2004) 771-791 “The Harder Path—Shifting Gears” Project Muse

I came to realize that energy discourses were often one of "no option." The inevitablity syndrome I called it. Whatever path was being proposed was a "have to path." For example, "we have to push nuclear because there are no alternatives." Such a coercive frame was limiting to say the least, especially [End Page 775] since other options were what was being examined. Method was also part of the problem. For example, growth models—that took for granted increasing per capita energy consumption—were disabling when economists (even Nobel economists) were examining less is more options. Also striking was the omnipresent model of unilinear development (a concept that anthropologists had left in the dust decades earlier), with little general understanding of macro-processes. For example, the recognition that civilizations arise but that they also collapse was missing from the thinking about the present. Prevalent was the nineteenth century belief that technological progress was equivalent to social progress. In such a progressivist evolutionary frame science too could only rise and not fall or wane. Furthermore, the possibility that experts might be part of the problem was novel to the expert who thought that he stood outside of the problem. The idea that the energy problem had human dimensions, that it was a human problem, slowly began to sink in, although such realization was rarely attributed to social science sources. Many of my commentaries were adamantly opposed in those years, to put it mildly. Colleagues rejected the idea that the science bureaucracies had a limiting effect on definitions and solutions, and also a framing effect on cultural outlook. This view was adamantly opposed by directors at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, and by those who believe that science is autonomous and culture free.

#### We are intellectuals not policymakers- this means you should think more about the academic content than the political ramifications- This militarized fear of the other causes and insular knowledge base that predetermines the solutions to problems

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

Militariality constitutes its political structures, its flows of power, its modes of individualization, and its thought processes according to what Deleuze once called the "cult of interiority" (258). The ontology of militariality sets itself in direct opposition to any unfolding upon an exteriority. The essence of information whether collection, retrieval, or illumination and dissemination is very different from the essence of exterior-unfolding-of-thought and subject-as-event, to speak like Badiou (41). Oriented towards a pre-determined goal, information is a geopolitical maneuver in a war over territory and resources. The US sovereign nation-state uses "information" to reterritorialize the biosphere (the human and the non-human that make up the earth's ecosystem) into a monopolized planetary biopolitical settlement in need of "freedom," "democracy" and now "energy security." Identities, foreign governments, environmental resources are each informized and redirected towards the needs of the sovereign interior. Such discourses as the "end of history" and the attempt on the part of neo-conservatives to subvert the UN's embrace of different forms of democracy in favor of developing a new league of nations are signs of what should properly be called the end of exteriority.