## Manufacturing

#### The environment is resilient but nuclear war turns it

Schweickart 10 – David Schweickart 10 is Professor at Loyola University Chicago. He holds a Ph.D. in Mathematics (University of Virginia), and a Ph.D. in Philosophy (Ohio State University). “Is Sustainable Capitalism Possible?” Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 41 (2010) 6739–6752

It is not true either that the various ecological crises we are facing will bring about “the end of the world.” Consider the projections of the Stern Review, the recently released report commissioned by the British Government. If nothing is done, we risk “major disruption to economic and social activity, later in this century and the next, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and economic depression of the first half of the 20th century.”¶ This is serious. Some sixty million people died in World War Two. The Stern Review estimates as many as 200 million people could be permanently displaced by rising sea level and drought. But this is not “the end of the world.” Even if the effects are far worse, resulting in billions of deaths—a highly unlikely scenario—there would still be lots of us left. If three-quarters of the present population perished, that would still leave us with 1.6 billion people—the population of the planet in 1900. ¶ I say this not to minimize the potentially horrific impact of relentless environmental destruction, but to caution against exaggeration. We are not talking about **thermonuclear war**—which could have extinguished us as a species. (It still might.) And we shouldn’t lose sight of the fact that millions of people on the planet right now, caught up in savage civil wars or terrorized by U.S. bombers (which dropped some 100,000 lbs. of explosives on a Baghdad neighborhood during one ten-day period in January 2008—the amount the fascists used to level the Basque town of Guernica during the Spanish Civil War), are faced with conditions more terrible than anyone here is likely to face in his or her lifetime due to environmental degradation.

## Solvency

### Impact---Uncertainty

#### Natural gas is key to energy security – but regulatory certainty is key

Medlock et al. 11 - Dr. Kenneth B. Medlock, Ph.D. in economics, fellow in Energy and Resource Economics at the Baker Institute, and former advisor to the U.S. Department of Energy and the California Energy Commission, AND\*\*\* Amy Myers Jaffe, graduate from Princeton University, fellow of Energy Studies and director of the Energy Forum at the Baker Institute, and associate director of the Rice Energy Program, AND\*\*\* Dr. Peter R. Hartley, Ph.D in economics at Rice University, [July 2011, "Shale Gas and U.S. National Security,” http://bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-DOEShaleGas-07192011.pdf](file:///C%3A/Users/Pei/Desktop/ROGERS%20HOUSE/July%202011%2C%20%22Shale%20Gas%20and%20U.S.%20National%20Security%2C)

Natural gas stands to play a positive role in the global energy mix, making it easier to shift away from more polluting, higher carbon-intensity fuels and increasing the near-term options to improve energy security and handle the challenge of climate change. The ample geologic endowment of shale gas in North America and potentially elsewhere around the globe means that natural gas prices will likely remain affordable and that the high level of supply insecurity currently facing world oil supplies could be eased by a shift to greater use of natural gas without fear of increasing the power of large natural gas resource holders such as Russia, Iran, and Venezuela.¶ To tap this benefit, **it will be essential for the United States to promote a** stable investment climate **with** regulatory certainty**.** In particular, the United States will need adopt policies that ensure shale gas exploitation can proceed steadily and predictably with sound environmental oversight. The United States should focus squarely on setting the policies needed to ensure that shale gas can play a significant role in the U.S. and global energy mix, thereby contributing to greater diversification of global energy supplies and to the **long-term national interests of the United States**.

#### Government certainty is key to private investment

Johnsen 12 – Erika Johnsen, writer for Hot Air, June 25th, 2012, "Oh, great: More fracking rules are definitely happening by 2013" hotair.com/archives/2012/06/25/oh-great-more-fracking-rules-are-definitely-happening-by-2013/

Natural gas has already demonstrated a great aptitude for fitting in with our infrastructure, and investors are going **absolutely bonkers over its potential without any pushing from the federal government** necessary. We could all be starting our natural-gas engines in the foreseeable future, if the government would just quit dithering and provide some certainty:

#### Lack of certainty destroys the natural gas industry

Freedenthal 11 – Carol Freedenthal, January 2011, "Are Political Games Destroying Domestic Oil & Gas Industry?" Pipeline and Gas Journal, January 2011, Volume 238 No. 1,pipelineandgasjournal.com/are-political-games-destroying-domestic-oil-gas-industry

Uncertainty is the most toxic element to capital-intensive industries like oil and gas companies. For the millions and billions of dollars and the immense risk taken in prospecting for hydrocarbon supplies, uncertainty will kill the best company and its intentions. The day after the mid-term elections, President Obama made an issue of both parties cooperating in developing energy policy especially in energy projects to “advance cleaner-burning natural gas, electric cars, and nuclear power.”

## 2AC Restrictions Topicality

#### We meet – we reduce restrictions on energy production

Orford 12 – Adam D. Orford, J.D. from Columbia University School of Law, editor in chief of the Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, May 29th, 2012, "EPA To Regulate Air Emissions from Hydraulic Fracturing As Industry Comes Under Scrutiny" [www.martenlaw.com/newsletter/20120529-air-emissions-from-hydraulic-fracturing](http://www.martenlaw.com/newsletter/20120529-air-emissions-from-hydraulic-fracturing)

**EPA’s new rules** phase out 40 C.F.R Part 60, subparts KKK and LLL (dealing with equipment leaks and SO2 emissions at natural gas production facilities), incorporating and expanding on the prior restrictions in new subpart OOOO (NSPS for natural gas production, transmission, and distribution). The rules also revise 40 C.F.R. Part 63, Subparts HH and HHH (NESHAPs for natural gas production, transmission, and storage facilities). The new regulations will consume many pages of the Federal Register,[17] are highly technical, and should be consulted directly regarding specific requirements. The remainder of this article describes the new green completion rule, and summarizes the more significant new fugitive emissions controls.

#### EPA air emissions regulations prohibit energy production

Osa & Palmer 11 – RICHARD OSA is a Senior Atmospheric Scientist at Stantec Consulting, Inc., and holds the Qualified Environmental Professional certification. Mr. Osa has over 30 years of environmental consulting experience, including Clean Air Act legislative and regulatory analysis. He has managed air quality projects throughout North America, including permitting efforts in most of the US EPA regions. AND\*\*\* TODD PALMER is a lawyer and technical consultant at Michael Best and Friedrich, a Midwestern law firm. Mr. Palmer has over 19 years of varied industry experience and specifically focused much of his legal career on Clean Air Act matters. December 2011, "Analysis of EPA's proposed clean air restrictions on oil and gas operations," [www.worldoil.com/December-2011-Analysis-of-EPAs-proposed-clean-air-restrictions-on-oil-and-gas-operations.html](http://www.worldoil.com/December-2011-Analysis-of-EPAs-proposed-clean-air-restrictions-on-oil-and-gas-operations.html)

Like other industries, oil and gas facilities have also been prohibited from emitting pollutants at rates or concentrations that exceed EPA-defined national ambient air quality standards—ambient concentrations of a pollutant that are deemed protective of human health and the environment. States and local units of government are empowered to impose emission limits on facilities within their jurisdictions to protect these air quality standards.

#### The plan only reduces what is considered topical under their interpretation – we reduce restrictions – that’s our plan text

#### Counter-interpretation – restrictions are conditions on action

Plummer 29 J., Court Justice, MAX ZLOZOWER, Respondent, v. SAM LINDENBAUM et al., Appellants Civ. No. 3724COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT100 Cal. App. 766; 281 P. 102; 1929 Cal. App. LEXIS 404September 26, 1929, Decided, lexis

The word "restriction," when used in connection with the grant of interest in real property, is construed as being the legal equivalent of "condition." Either term may be used to denote a limitation upon the full and unqualified enjoyment of the right or estate granted. The words "terms" and "conditions" are often used synonymously when relating to legal rights. "Conditions and restrictions" are that which limits or modifies the existence or character of something; a restriction or qualification. It is a restriction or limitation modifying or destroying the original act with which it is connected, or defeating, terminating or enlarging an estate granted; something which defeats or qualifies an estate; a modus or quality annexed by him that hath an estate, or interest or right to the same, whereby an estate may be either defeated, enlarged, or created upon an uncertain event; a quality annexed to land whereby an estate may be defeated; a qualification or restriction annexed to a deed or device, by virtue of which an estate is made to vest, to be enlarged or defeated upon the happening or not happening of a particular event, or the performance or nonperformance of a particular act.

#### Prefer it

#### No limits distinction – no way to distinguish the number of outright ban affs and affs that restriction production AND include the chance of total prohibition

#### Aff ground outweighs – the negative always has something to say – bad affs with no literature set the ground for a bad debate

#### Education – they prevent holistic energy education – they destroy natural gas and coal affs because they are all based on EPA emissions restrictions

#### Topic meaning – there are no direct federal prohibitions – only we can give meaning to every topic word; resolutional language is the only non-arbitrary way to set predictable limits

#### No ground loss or bidirectionality – we will always defend high production and substantial checks

#### No limits offense – functional limits check and generics like the States CP solve all incentives affs

#### Reasonability – competing interpretations cause a race to the bottom to arbitrarily exclude the aff

## 2AC SEP CP

### 2AC Block

#### Low prices are key to the steel industry

IHS 11 (IHS Global Insight - leading economic analysis and forecasting firm, December 2011, "The Economic and Employment Contributions of Shale Gas in the United States," anga.us/media/235626/shale-gas-economic-impact-dec-2011.pdf)

Energy from electricity or natural gas makes up a higher proportion of the value of iron ore processed¶ from taconite in the Great Lakes region. Given that the price for iron ore is essentially a global price, domestic¶ producers of iron ore pellets are benefitting from higher margins due to lower electricity and natural gas prices. With these incrementally higher margins, domestic iron ore pellet production is likely¶ higher than it would otherwise be.¶ The steel industry is expected to be reactivated with the improvement of auto manufacturing and an increase¶ in construction activity. Moreover, the development of shale gas has given a considerable boost¶ to the steel industry by increasing the demand for steel pipes. Used for drilling, production, transportation,¶ and distribution, steel pipes are essential to the natural gas industry, and the large infrastructure¶ investments already announced could have quite a significant impact on the steel industry.

#### That’s key to F-22 production and aircraft carries – solves power projection

AISI 5 (“STEEL INDUSTRY REMAINS INTEGRAL TO NATION’S SECURITY”, http://www.steel.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=2005&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=13484)

The American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) honors U.S. veterans this November 11 for their service -- both past and present -- in preserving America's national security. American steel and specialty metals also play a role in securing our nation as they are found in virtually every military platform.¶ "The domestic steel industry has transformed itself into an innovative industry that produces more versatile steels, which serve our military," said Andrew G. Sharkey, III, president and CEO of AISI. "This Veterans Day, AISI and its member companies want to acknowledge the pride both U.S. veterans and the steel industry take in ensuring national security."¶ A solid force in U.S. national security, steel helps arm military Humvees, helicopters, ships, as well as the soldiers themselves. For example, some might be unaware that the hull of the USS New York contains 20 tons of steel that were salvaged from the remnants of the World Trade Center. As Senator Hillary Clinton (D-NY) has stated, " ... a vital, healthy domestic steel industry is important not only for the economic health of our nation, but for our national security, as well."¶ Abrams tanks consume 187,000 tons of steel plate in the production of 8,500 tanks, which result in 22 tons of plate in each tank. Each aircraft carrier contains 50,000 tons of steel plate and steel makes up about 20 percent of the materials used in the F-18 and F-22 military aircraft. The up- armored Humvee in use by the U.S. Army includes steel plating around the cab of the vehicle, offering improved protection against small arms fire and shrapnel. Steel plating underneath is designed to survive up to eight pounds of explosives beneath the engine to four pounds in the cargo area.¶ Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) recently noted the importance of maintaining a healthy domestic steel industry as it relates to our nation's military preparedness. Historically, specialty and high-strength steels have been procured strictly from American mills, which is a fact the domestic steel industry hopes remains in tact as the threat of state-subsidized foreign steel flooding our market remains.¶ The Department of Defense's (DOD) primary use of steel in weapons systems is for shipbuilding, but steel is also an important component in ammunition, aircraft parts, and aircraft engines. DOD's steel requirements are satisfied by both integrated steel mills (consumers of iron ore) and mini-mills (consumers of scrap).¶ With the desire never to be dependent on foreign nations for the steel for military applications, AISI urges defense of U.S. trade laws so that examples such as the USS New York are sustained and American steel continues to play a vital role in national security.

#### And, carriers guarantee crisis management – prevents conflict escalation

Eaglen 8 (Senior Policy Analyst for National Security at the Heritage Foundation, 8-1-8’ (Mackenzie, “Aircraft Carriers Are Crucial”, The Washington Post)

In an age of guerrilla warfare and counterinsurgency operations, many U.S. officials appear content to overlook the importance of conventional weapons such as the aircraft carrier. That's a serious mistake.¶ For any U.S. president, the aircraft carrier embodies the ultimate crisis management tool. Continuously deployed throughout the globe, carrier-strike groups give our military unparalleled freedom of action to respond to a range of combat and non-combat missions. The recent George Washington incident only further emphasizes the significance of maintaining a robust carrier fleet, one large enough to meet all contingencies and "surge" in crises, no matter what may happen.¶ Carriers can move large contingents of forces and their support to distant theaters, respond rapidly to changing tactical situations, support several missions simultaneously, and, perhaps most importantly, guarantee access to any region in the world.¶ In a time when America's political relationships with other countries can shift almost overnight, aircraft carriers can reduce America's reliance on others -- often including suspect regimes -- for basing rights. A carrier's air wing can typically support 125 sorties a day at a distance up to 750 nautical miles. They also operate as a hub in the strike group's command, control, communications and intelligence network, playing an increasingly larger role in controlling the battlespace at sea.¶ Whether in a direct or support role, carriers have taken part in almost every major military operation the U.S. has undertaken since the Second World War. They also serve as first-rate diplomatic tools to either heighten or ease political pressure. When tensions with North Korea or Iran increase, a carrier, or sometimes two, is sent to patrol off their coast. And when an election takes place in a nascent democracy or country central to U.S. interests, a strike group typically is sailing offshore.¶ In March, when Taiwan held important presidential elections that will chart the future of that country's relationship with China, both the Kitty Hawk and Nimitz trolled nearby to ensure a smooth transition of events and deliver a psychological message of U.S. interest.¶ And at a time when policymakers expect to spend less on defense and where the services' lists of unfunded requirements continues to mount, we'll likely call on the aircraft carrier to perform an expanded array of duties, ranging from humanitarian relief to counterinsurgency support and temporary basing for Special Operations Forces.¶ As the Navy assumes responsibility for humanitarian missions in places such as Africa and South America, it will rely on aircraft carriers to provide immediate relief following natural disasters. During Operation Unified Assistance, following the December 2004 tsunami and during relief efforts following Hurricane Katrina, for instance, they placed a central role..

#### Perm do both

#### Perm do the counterplan – competition must be based on a mandate of the plan, not a likely outcome

#### 1. Strategic cost/strategic benefit – vague plans mean we cannot shift or further define our plan in the 2AC – DAs solve likely outcome ground

#### 2. Most predictable – based on wording of plan – the aff chooses it and the neg interprets it – it’s key to research of words as defined in law

#### 3. They justify process counterplans – these steal the aff and make offense impossible – destroys clash and switch side debate – independent voting issue

#### The counterplan is a reduction – restrictions must be enforced – if it’s on paper but not enforced it is NOT a restriction

Berger 1 Justice Opinion, INDUSTRIAL RENTALS, INC., ISAAC BUDOVITCH and FLORENCE BUDOVITCH, Appellants Below, Appellants, v. NEW CASTLE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT and NEW CASTLE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF LAND USE, Appellees Below, Appellees. No. 233, 2000SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE776 A.2d 528; 2001 Del. LEXIS 300April 10, 2001, Submitted July 17, 2001, Decided lexis

We disagree. Statutes must be read as a whole and all the words must be given effect. 3 The word "restriction" means "a limitation (esp. in a deed) placed on the use or enjoyment of property." 4 If a deed restriction has been satisfied, and no longer limits the use or enjoyment of the property, then it no longer is a deed restriction -- even though the paper on which it was written remains. [\*\*6] Thus, the phrase "projects containing deed restrictions requiring phasing…," in Section 11.130(A)(7) means presently existing deed restrictions. As of June 1988, the Acierno/Marta Declaration contained no remaining deed restrictions requiring phasing to coincide with improvements to the transportation system. As a result, the Acierno/Marta projects should not have been included in the scope of the Budovitches' TIS.

#### Perm do the plan by adding the alternate penalty option of the counterplan and providing exemptions [adding an alternate penalty option allowing violators to choose penalization solely through entry into a Supplemental Environmental Program requiring payment of 1% of revenue from all violating activities to an Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Trust Fund managed by dedicated non-profit organizations, conducted in co-ordination with, and with oversight by, the Department of Energy, to support the development and commercialization of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion, with an initial focus on providing financing for a 10 megawatt pilot project demonstration plant. Implementation of the Supplemental Environmental Program should provide a shield from additional legal penalties stemming from the violating action, including citizen suits and penalties under state law.  Any conflicting federal laws and regulations should be modified to provide a narrow exemption for the above act.]

#### Counterplan has the EPA give the finger to Congress and override their authority, which links way harder to politics

#### It does not solve the case

#### Uncertainty – the existence of restrictions deters future planning and investment – that’s Gerard

#### Total shutdown – restrictions will justify EPA shutting down the whole industry – that’s Capiello

#### Manufacturing – the US cannot solve competitiveness if the restrictions are still perceived to be on the books – deters investment

#### **No one will take the exemption, and the SEP is not enough money to fund OTEC**

Brown 11 – Mr. Brown holds an MBA from New York University and a BA from Brown University. Matthew Brown is President of InterEnergy Solutions, a consulting firm that focuses on clean energy policy and finance. 2011, "Brief #1: Funding Mechanisms for Energy Efficiency"ase.org/resources/brief-1-funding-mechanisms-energy-efficiency

Funds are not predictable because they depend on fines that state environmental agencies issue, as well as on the interest that industry may or may not have in paying for a particular project. Companies sometimes view SEPs as a cumbersome alternative **to simply paying a fine and moving on with business operations.¶** **Not likely to provide large amounts of funding.**

#### **The SEP will not be approved – their author**

Bonorris 7 – Steven Bonorris, Editor, The Public Law Research Institute University of California, Hastings College of the Law, 2007, [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf-http%3A//www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf)

Legal Principles¶ 1. A SEP will not be approved if the violator is otherwise legally required to perform¶ the proposed activity.¶ 2. SEPs should have a clear relationship to the violation. This relationship exists if the project reduces the overall environmental or public health impacts or risks to¶ which the violation contributes, or is designed to reduce the likelihood of similar violations in the future. A SEP may not be directly related to the violation if the¶ project is either: ¶ a. A pollution prevention project that provides significant environmental benefit; or¶ b. Some other multi-media or facility-wide activity that provides widespread¶ environmental benefit.

#### No solvency --- causes regulatory uncertainty

Steven Bonorris 7, Associate Director for Research, Public Law Research Institute, UC Hastings College of the Law, 1/25/7, “Supplemental Environmental Projects: A Fifty State Survey with Model Practices,” <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/enforce/settlements/ABAHastingsSEPreport.pdf>

The capacity for underdeterrence is particularly acute as the SEP cost itself is a new source of regulatory uncertainty: usually, SEP costs are assessed and reported by the violator, and the regulator has no mechanism for confirming the reported figures. 187 Opportunistic violators may overestimate SEP costs in order to receive greater relief from the calculated penalty, or they may underreport the business benefits of SEPs. 188 In order to track SEP implementation, many state SEP policies require the submission of detailed cost estimates and certifications of progress, as well as provide for stipulated penalties for SEPs that end up costing less than estimated. However, the literature has not quantified the efficacy of these measures against opportunistic violators. 189

## 2AC Neoliberalism Kritik

#### Perm do both

#### No reason linchpin

#### Sustainability is coming now but collapse destroys it

Rifkin 10 – Jeremy Rifkin, President of the Foundation on Economic Trends, January 11, 2010, “'The Empathic Civilization': Rethinking Human Nature in the Biosphere Era,” online: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeremy-rifkin/the-empathic-civilization\_b\_416589.html

The pivotal turning points in human consciousness occur when new energy regimes converge with new communications revolutions, creating new economic eras. The new communications revolutions become the command and control mechanisms for structuring, organizing and managing more complex civilizations that the new energy regimes make possible. For example, in the early modern age, print communication became the means to organize and manage the technologies, organizations, and infrastructure of the coal, steam, and rail revolution. It would have been impossible to administer the first industrial revolution using script and codex.¶ Communication revolutions not only manage new, more complex energy regimes, but also change human consciousness in the process. Forager/hunter societies relied on oral communications and their consciousness was mythologically constructed. The great hydraulic agricultural civilizations were, for the most part, organized around script communication and steeped in theological consciousness. The first industrial revolution of the 19th century was managed by print communication and ushered in ideological consciousness. Electronic communication became the command and control mechanism for arranging the second industrial revolution in the 20th century and spawned psychological consciousness.¶ Each more sophisticated communication revolution brings together more diverse people in increasingly more expansive and varied social networks. Oral communication has only limited temporal and spatial reach while script, print and electronic communications each extend the range and depth of human social interaction.¶ By extending the central nervous system of each individual and the society as a whole, communication revolutions provide an evermore inclusive playing field for empathy to mature and consciousness to expand. For example, during the period of the great hydraulic agricultural civilizations characterized by script and theological consciousness, empathic sensitivity broadened from tribal blood ties to associational ties based on common religious affiliation. Jews came to empathize with Jews, Christians with Christians, Muslims with Muslims, etc. In the first industrial revolution characterized by print and ideological consciousness, empathic sensibility extended to national borders, with Americans empathizing with Americans, Germans with Germans, Japanese with Japanese and so on. In the second industrial revolution, characterized by electronic communication and psychological consciousness, individuals began to identify with like-minded others.¶ Today, we are on the cusp of another historic convergence of energy and communication--a third industrial revolution--that could extend empathic sensibility to the biosphere itself and all of life on Earth. The distributed Internet revolution is coming together with distributed renewable energies, making possible a sustainable, post-carbon economy that is both globally connected and locally managed.¶ In the 21st century, hundreds of millions--and eventually billions--of human beings will transform their buildings into power plants to harvest renewable energies on site, store those energies in the form of hydrogen and share electricity, peer-to-peer, across local, regional, national and continental inter-grids that act much like the Internet. The open source sharing of energy, like open source sharing of information, will give rise to collaborative energy spaces--not unlike the collaborative social spaces that currently exist on the Internet.¶ When every family and business comes to take responsibility for its own small swath of the biosphere by harnessing renewable energy and sharing it with millions of others on smart power grids that stretch across continents, we become intimately interconnected at the most basic level of earthly existence by jointly stewarding the energy that bathes the planet and sustains all of life.¶ The new distributed communication revolution not only organizes distributed renewable energies, but also changes human consciousness. The information communication technologies (ICT) revolution is quickly extending the central nervous system of billions of human beings and connecting the human race across time and space, allowing empathy to flourish on a global scale, for the first time in history.¶

#### Action with policy relevance is key when survival is at stake

Norton 5 (Bryan G, professor of philosophy at the Georgia Institute of Technology, “Sustainability: A Philosophy of Adaptive Ecosystem Management”, University of Chicago Press, November 1, 2005, pp. 151-154)

Pragmatists pay attention to the particularities of unique situations. In action-forcing situations, it is often possible to provide helpful, if context- sensitive, guidance to decide what to accept as certain enough to guide action and what is not so certain and therefore requires further study. These decisions, which occur within a value-laden context, allow us to use agreements about values—however limited and situation-specific—to accept certain goals as consensus goals. Then we can pursue observations and management experiments to reduce debilitating uncertainty regarding techniques to achieve those goals. Shared values and goals can, in this way, sometimes serve as the solid ground on which to stand to undertake experimentation with means to achieve the goals, thereby reducing uncertainty about system functioning. At other times, of course, beliefs about the system and its behavior seem undeniable, and we can stand on these planks to deliberate about realistic and wise goals. The epistemology of adaptive management thus provides for gradual progress and improvement of both our belief system and our preferences and values, by using experience to triangulate between temporarily accepted beliefs and values. The most controversial aspect of this knowledge- seeking strategy, perhaps, is the idea that in concrete situations shared values can sometimes serve as a solid basis upon which to pursue mission-oriented science to reduce uncertainty about outcomes of our choices. To explore this idea, it is essential that we understand environmental values in such a way that through successive applications of our method, values can be improved over time. In this and the remaining chapters in part 2,1 provide such a context-sensitive approach that can serve to bootstrap both our values and our factual understanding of management situations simultaneously.¶ Likening our epistemological problem to a ride on Neuraths boat, which is required to stay afloat indefinitely while repairs are made, we can understand our problem as one of deciding which of our beliefs to accept as strong enough and which should be submitted to immediate and critical review and testing. Sailors on the boat are motivated by their desire to survive, and so they undertake the repairs on the boat with great deliberation and care. They must not only make important technical judgments regarding which planks are becoming weak with age and rot, but they must also make judicious choices regarding which planks must, given the importance of their function, be given priority. Analogously, as adaptive managers, we are driven by the desire to stay afloat and to prosper as a community, and we must similarly decide carefully what beliefs to accept as given, which should be doubted, and which points of uncertainty are of highest priority, given the shared goals of the community. Like Neuraths sailors, we must make such epistemological judgments under pressure; if we guess wrong and stand on a weak board to fix a stronger one, we face danger, if we stand on a strong board and fix a weak one, we could still face danger if, for example, we choose to fix weak boards of no direct importance to the seaworthiness of the vessel and ignore others that might fail catastrophically. We must, like Justice Holmes's judge, act in a way that fulfills several social demands, including the demand that the present decision be both consistent with precedent and legal tradition and also responsive to the new demands of a new situation.¶ The particular context of a real management dilemma—a context always suffused with value—can be very important for pragmatists in determining which beliefs should be accepted, however provisionally, and which should be submitted to more intense scrutiny by observation and experiment. The necessity of acting—and refraining from action is itself an action—enforces a kind of discipline, a discipline felt in a particular **situation with** real values at stake. In some situations, for example when the very existence of the community is threatened, decisions can be seen against a backdrop of unquestioned values (community survival); in these situations consensus on values may be far stronger than consensus on science. Epistemological decisions, in situations where decisions are forced and important values are at stake, thus involve judgments of importance as well as truth. We can only examine our whole belief system and try to find some beliefs we can temporarily place beyond doubt. Given the goal of management, we first concentrate on beliefs that are most important to the ongoing voyage, postponing examination of others until later: we keep our ship afloat, gradually transforming it plank by plank. Similarly, adaptive managers sometimes, by hypothesis, help themselves to a platform of beliefs in order to question the goals that should be pursued; and at other times we assume our goals are worthy ones and proceed to test appropriate scientific hypotheses related to the attainment of those goals. Optimistically, the adaptive manager believes that this platform, which shifts over time and in the process of many trials, yields **improved understanding** and improved goals **through** an alternation between **action** and reflection. This may be the only effective way to respond to wicked problems as they arise in a community with diverse and sometimes competing values.¶ Of course one might object that this whole process is circular and that no "true" justification of goals or actions takes place. We assume facts to support values, and we then stand on the values to support the importance of scientific research to reduce uncertainty and to allow actions to support those values. Now we play our epistemological trump card—the ability of diverse communities, if they operate in an open, democratic mode—to focus attention on weak assumptions and unjustifiable principles. In open public debate and open public processes, when well-informed stakeholders have free access to information and to political institutions, diverse members of a community will have an incentive to identify weaknesses—scientific, economic, and moral—in policies proposed by competing groups. If a process can be created that mimics the process the repairmen on Neuraths boat must develop if they are to survive, then we can give up the dry dock of a priori, self-evident truths and trust science and the observational method, especially if empowered by a strong sense of shared community values, to identify weak planks and keep the boat afloat. So a reasonable way to proceed, in an adaptive management framework, is to inspire stakeholders and participants to challenge and question both the beliefs of science and the proposed goals and values. Democracy, in this sense, can be a powerful engine of truth-seeking. A diverse population, in adaptive management as well as in Darwinian evolution, increases adaptability, by exploring a variety of available options, winnowing out the weak assumptions, and pursuing the most justifiable goals within a particular situation.

#### Lefty environmental alarmism fails---we must create sustainable energy by pursuing (oil/coal/natural gas) to solve---only the aff offers a middle-ground whereas their alt disadvantages everyone except the small intellectual elite

Bradley 3 Robert, president of the Institute for Energy Research in Houston and an adjunct scholar of the Cato Institute. He received the Julian Simon Memorial Award for 2002 and is author, most recently, of Climate Alarmism Reconsidered, published by the Institute of Economic Affairs in London, "Energy Realism Overtaking Energy Alarmism" October 1, news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2003/10/01/energy-realism-overtaking-energy-alarmism?quicktabs\_4=1

In the 1970s and 1980s, energy policy debates in the U.S. were mostly over the regulation of oil and natural gas prices and allocation. Energy shortages and price spikes led many to adopt an “energy-is-bad, energy conservation is good” position.¶ In the early 1990s, the energy policy debate shifted to energy “sustainability.” Depletion, pollution, reliability (security), and anthropogenic (man-made) climate change are the four sustainability issues. The last, climate change, is by far the most important of the four for the future of carbon-based energies.¶ Where does the energy sustainability debate stand as of mid-2003? The intellectual momentum has shifted to the optimists who see environmental progress as the norm and who believe that the market’s improvement process will effectively solve new problems along the way.¶ What has changed to mute energy alarmism? Six trends have been especially important.¶ (1) Eco-Energy Planners No Longer in Power¶ First, the end of the Clinton/Gore era has taken the eco-energy planners out of the seat of power and put them on the sidelines where few outside of their choir are listening. Gone is the Gore-led President’s Council on Sustainable Development, which marginalized the opposition--the sound science, realism-based, free-market environmentalists. Instead, Bush and Cheney released their National Energy Policy: Report of the National Energy Policy Development Group (May 2001), which set a pro-development tone for the “official” debate. High oil and gas prices since then have also added momentum to the cause of resource and infrastructure development over conservationism.¶ Where did the leaders of eco-energy interventionism go? Tapping into a huge reservoir of funding from such left-of-center foundations as Rockefeller, Turner, MacArthur, Packard, and Pew, they are scattered around at different “green” groups. In particular, they are administering and advising two energy groups in their political exile:¶ The Energy Future Coalition (http://www.energyfuturecoalition.org). Its White Paper on a new energy future concludes, “We aim at ambitious but achievable goals: cutting U.S. oil consumption and carbon emissions by a third from current levels over the next 25 years, and sharply increasing access to modern energy services in the developing world.”¶ This CO2 reduction target is more draconian than the Bush-rejected U.S. obligation under the Kyoto Protocol of 7 percent below 1990 levels. It is drastically below the “business as usual” forecast from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA)--a 42 percent increase (1.5 percent per year) in CO2 emissions from 2000 to 2025. Oil usage, meanwhile, is forecast by the EIA to grow 1.6 percent per year, or 47 percent in the same 25 years.¶ This indeed would be a new energy future--and one that would require extensive government planning and re-direction of today’s consumer-driven energy sector. Energy rationing would be a likely result.¶ The National Commission on Energy Policy (http://www.energycommission.org/about/). Co-chaired by Harvard environmentalist John Holdren, it will release its study in late 2004 or early 2005. Expect no surprises. There will be alarms about carbon dioxide emissions with recommendation of a plethora of activist policies to forcefully redirect energy sources away from carbon fuels and reduce total energy usage.¶ **Consumers are not buying into energy alarmism from these energy scare groups. The public wants affordable, reliable, plentiful energy today and tomorrow**. No amount of private foundation money will change this--so long as the climate and energy realists document the facts and present them in terms of common-sense free-market principles to the public, industry, and other groups.¶ (2) Doomsayers Have Been Exposed¶ A new voice, Björn Lomborg, has exposed the shaky intellectual foundations of doom-and-gloom environmentalism in a way that has captured international media interest. Julian Simon could not do this in his lifetime, but Lomborg--who originally set out to refute Simon but ended up agreeing with him after intensive investigation with a working group--has done so!¶ The Lomborg phenomenon began with his book, The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the True State of the World (Cambridge University Press, 2001), which received favorable publicity in such quarters as the New York Times and Washington Post as well as other publications around the world. The doomsayers ignored the book at first (their strategy is to assert, not debate) but suddenly found themselves losing out by their silence.¶ A spate of vitriolic attacks on Lomborg followed, despite his affable, scholarly demeanor and politically correct credentials as a former member of Greenpeace, vegetarian, and openly gay.¶ The media’s reaction to Lomborg has forced his critics to come to the intellectual table to refute him with facts and theory**. Cracks of dissent have opened among the liberal environmentalists’ ranks**. A well-known European climate alarmist, Michael Grubb, wrote in a book review for Science magazine, “To any modern professional, it is no news at all that the 1972 Limits to Growth study was mostly wrong or that Paul Ehrlich and Lester Brown have perennially exaggerated the problems of food supply.”¶ Contrary to Grubb’s assertion, it is big news that an environmental alarmist should acknowledge the flaws in work published by Ehrlich and Brown, two of the most revered names in the environmentalist movement.¶ In the face of that statement, what do Lomborg’s critics do--attack Grubb, stay silent and lick their wounds, or prominently announce, as Laurel did to Hardy, “I’m better now”? They stayed silent. Still, the monolithic front of intellectual environmentalism is under severe pressure thanks to Lomborg.¶ (3) Heightened Concern over Third-World Poverty¶ Poverty from a lack of modern energy and clean water has been elevated to a major international sustainability problem, reducing the urgency of addressing perceived long-run problems such as man-made climate change. Real development, not “sustainable development” as defined by western environmentalist groups, gained the upper hand at the United Nations’ World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg last year. And it has continued this way, thanks in part to the influence of Lomborg.¶ Development as a competing environmental paradigm is the major theme of a new book by Jack Hollander. The Real Environmental Crisis: Why Poverty, Not Affluence, Is the Environment’s Number One Enemy, takes false alarmism to task and urges that the environment can best be improved by focusing on real, here-and-now problems like poverty in the Third World. Hollander is professor emeritus of energy and resources at the University of California at Berkeley, a bastion of energy and climate alarmism. His book is another signal that major changes are afoot.¶ Science, the flagship publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, whose members compose the environmental science community, is prone to views expressing energy and climate alarmism. Yet a December 6, 2002 editorial, titled “In Praise of Petroleum?” asked an obvious question:¶ Does it make sense to ask the poor to take on novel devices and fuels that have never been tried elsewhere? … **Rather than excluding petroleum, some of this one-time gift from nature ought actually to be reserved to help fulfill our obligation to bring the health and welfare of all people to a reasonable level: an** essential goal of sustainable development**, no matter how defined**.¶ (4) Even Alarmists Are Facing Reality¶ Climate and energy realities are breaking through in mainstream analysis, further cracking the anti-carbon environmentalist cartel. A major study published in Science by 18 authors, “Advanced Technology Paths to Global Climate Stability: Energy for a Greenhouse Planet,” forthrightly concluded that the technology does not exist to shift from carbon energies to low-carbon ones. The mass quantities are not available, and what supply there could be cannot be produced at an acceptable cost to society.¶ “**Revolutionary changes in the technology of energy production, distribution, storage, and conversion” are required, changes that “cannot be simply regulated” into being**. This view, authored within the energy-alarmist community, contradicts the mantra of environmental groups that are urging more and more short-term regulation and subsidies for renewable energy and energy conservation to address what they see as the carbon problem.¶ The same study takes the wind out of the Kyoto Protocol:¶ Paradoxically, Kyoto is too weak and too strong: Too strong because its initial cuts are perceived as an economic burden by some (the United States withdrew for this stated reason); too weak because much greater emission reductions will be needed and we lack the technology to make them.¶ (5) Side Effects of Renewables Split the Environmental Movement¶ Discontent with politically correct renewable energies, particularly wind power, is beginning to set in among anti-development environmentalists. A June 5 New York Times article, for example, reported proposed U.S. wind farm projects have created “huge turbulence with the environmental movement.” The article continued,¶ The growing [wind] industry has caused a kind of identity crisis among people who think of themselves as pro-environment, forcing them to choose between the promise of clean, endlessly renewable energy and the perils of imposing giant man-made structures on nature.¶ A highly publicized debate over a proposed 420 megawatt project off the coast of southern New England (powered by GE turbines that stand 100 meters tall on land and up to 75 meters when offshore) has pitted local environmentalists against their national brethren. Asks one writer for Renewable Energy World: “Will the real environmentalist please stand up?”¶ (6) Seeking Relevance in the Center¶ The sixth, and by no means least important, trend causing the country’s movement away from energy alarmism is the **intellectual left’s overall shift toward the center, in a quest for policy relevance**.¶ Consider the transition being made by John Holdren, holder of the Teresa and John Heinz professorship in environmental policy at Harvard University. In the 1970s Holdren, along with Paul and Anne Ehrlich, wrote:¶ A massive campaign must be launched to restore a high-quality environment in North America and to de-develop the United States. ... Resources and energy must be diverted from frivolous and wasteful uses in overdeveloped countries to filling the genuine needs of underdeveloped countries. This effort must be largely political.¶ Such a view if stated today would rupture Holdren’s standing as a collaborator in the energy policy debate. Instead Holdren opens his 2000 “Memorandum to the President” with this statement: “A reliable and affordable supply of energy is absolutely critical to maintaining and expanding economic prosperity where such prosperity already exists and to creating it where it does not.”¶ This sea change gives moral sanction to energy as an improving consumer product, not just a political product in the quest for “sustainability.” Such pragmatism is by no means limited to Holdren. Al Gore contradicted the energy policy outlines of his book, Earth in the Balance, when he stated on the campaign trail for the U.S. Presidency in 2000:¶ I think we need to bring gasoline prices down. . . . I have made it clear in this campaign that I am not calling for any tax increase on gasoline, on oil, on natural gas, or anything else. I am calling for tax cuts to stimulate the production of new sources of domestic energy and new technologies to improve efficiency.¶ More Work to Do¶ This is not to say that the battle between anti-growth alarmists and free-market realists is about to be won with direct political ramifications. There are a number of negative trends that require the best efforts of the climate and energy realists to turn the great climate and carbon alarm into just a shrill noise that gets lost in the night. But it does suggest that energy realists are winning in ways that have not occurred before.¶ What work remains to be done? Energy alarmism is being used as a tool to try to portray Republicans and President Bush as anti-environment. Yet carbon dioxide constraints on energy are anti-consumer, particularly to lower-income consumers. The premier energy-environmental think tank, Resources for the Future (RFF), speaks with one voice for regulating carbon dioxide despite a solid intellectual case for keeping the lid closed on this Pandora’s Box. RFF should stop speaking with one voice on such a two-sided issue or be held accountable when regulation begins and the highly predictable negative consequences follow.¶ By engaging in climate alarmism, European-based major oil companies have given false sanction to the intellectual and political left and opened themselves to charges of “greenwashing” given their massive, growing hydrocarbon operations. Meanwhile, their paltry investments in wind and solar are proving to be financially underperforming.¶ Finally, the Bush administration is proving too timid to officially reject government-sponsored programs for voluntary greenhouse gas reductions--programs that are likely to create the institutions and incentives to result in mandatory programs later on. Being “a little pregnant” is not a strategy that can last.¶ Overall, the debate over energy and climate alarmism is winnable for the proponents of energy and climate realism. Even in a worst-case situation where the U.S. adopts carbon dioxide (CO2) regulation, the program(s) will be so messy and watered down that virtually everyone will be left unsatisfied. There will be higher energy prices and gross inefficiencies reminiscent of earlier abandoned regulatory schemes. There will be a pound of corporate welfare for every ounce of real emission reductions, giving corporate critics on the Left plenty to lament.¶ More urgent environmental priorities will be left with fewer resources. In short, virtually **everybody will be worse off except for a small intellectual elite. Proponents of energy policy activism must ask themselves: Is this worth fighting for?**

#### Failure to engage with market mechanisms only reproduces the worst parts of the status quo – only working with the world as it is renders another world possible

Bryant 12—professor of philosophy at Collin College (Levi, We’ll Never Do Better Than a Politician: Climate Change and Purity, 5/11/12, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/well-never-do-better-than-a-politician-climate-change-and-purity/)

**However**, pointing this out and **deriding market based solutions doesn’t get us very far**. In fact, such a response to proposed market-based solutions is downright dangerous and irresponsible. The fact of the matter is that **1) we** currently **live in a market based world, 2) there is not**, in the foreseeable future **an alternative system on the horizon, and 3), above all,** we need to do something now**.** **We can’t afford to reject interventions simply because they don’t meet our ideal conceptions** of how things should be. **We have to work with the world that is here, not the one that we would like to be here**. And here it’s crucial to note that pointing this out does not entail that we shouldn’t work for producing that other world. It just means that we have to grapple with the world that is actually there before us.¶ It pains me to write this post because I remember, with great bitterness, the diatribes hardcore Obama supporters leveled against legitimate leftist criticisms on the grounds that these critics were completely unrealistic idealists who, in their demand for “purity”, were asking for “ponies and unicorns”. This rejoinder always seemed to ignore that words have power and that Obama, through his profound power of rhetoric, had, at least **the power to shift public debates and frames, opening a path to making new forms of policy and new priorities possible.** **The tragedy was that he didn’t use that power,** though he has gotten better.¶ I do not wish to denounce others and dismiss their claims on these sorts of grounds. As a Marxist anarchists, I do believe that we should fight for the creation of an alternative hominid ecology or social world. I think that the call to commit and fight, to put alternatives on the table, has been one of the most powerful contributions of thinkers like Zizek and Badiou. If we don’t commit and fight for alternatives those alternatives will never appear in the world. **Nonetheless, we still have to grapple with the world we find ourselves in**. And it is here, in my encounters with some Militant Marxists, that I sometimes find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they are unintentionally **aiding and abetting the very things they claim to be fighting**. **In their refusal to become impure, to work with situations or assemblages as we find them, to sully their hands, they end up** reproducing the very system they wish to topple and change**. Narcissistically they get to sit there, smug in their superiority and purity, while everything continues as it did before because they’ve refused to become politicians or** engage **in the difficult concrete work of assembling** human and nonhuman **actors to render another world possible.** As a consequence, they occupy the position of Hegel’s beautiful soul that denounces the horrors of the world, celebrate the beauty of their soul, **while depending on those horrors of the world to sustain their own position**. ¶ To engage in politics is to engage in networks or ecologies of relations between humans and nonhumans. To engage in ecologies is to descend into networks of causal relations and feedback loops that you cannot completely master and that will modify your own commitments and actions. But there’s no other way, there’s no way around this, and we do need to act now.

#### Capitalism is inevitable

Wood 2 (Ellen M., Ph.D in political science from UCLA, The Origin of Capitalism, pg. 4-6)

These question-begging explanations have their origina in classical political economy and Enlightenment conceptions of progress. Together, they give an account of historical development in which the mergence and growth to maturity of capitalism are already prefigured in the earliest manifestations of human rationality, in the technological advances that began when Homo Sapiens first wielded a tool, and in the acts of exchange human beings have practised since time immemorial. History’s journey to that final destination, to ‘commercial society’ or capitalism, has, to be sure, been long and arduous, and many obstacles hace stood in its way. But its progress has nonetheless been natural and inevitable. Nothing more is required, then, to explain the ‘rise of capitalism’ than an account of how many obstacles to its forward movement have been lifted- sometimes gradually, sometimes suddenly, with revolutionary violence. In more accounts of capitalism and its origin, there really *is* no origin. Capitalism seems always to be there, somewhere; and it only needs to be released from its chains- for instance, from the fetters of feudalism- to be allowed to grow and mature. Typically, these fetters are political: the parasitic powers of lordship, or the restrictions of an autocratic state. Sometimes they are cultural or ideological: perhaps the wrong religion. These contraints confine the free movement of ‘economic’ actors, the free expression of econmic rationality. The ‘economic’ in these formulations is identified with exchange or markets; and it is here that we can detect the assumption that the seeds of capitalism are contained in the most primitive acts of exchange, in any form of trade or market activity. That assumption is typically connected With the other presupposition: that history has been an almost natural process of technological development. One way or another, capitalism more or less **naturally appears when** and where **expanding markets and technological development reach the right level**, allowing sufficient wealth to be accumulated so that is can be profitably reinvested. Many Marxist explanations are fundamentally the same- with the addition of bourgeois revolutions to help break the fetters. The effect of these explanation is to stress the continuity between non-capitalist and capitalist societies, and to deny the disguise of the specificity of capitalism. Exchange has existed more or less forever, and it seems that the capitalist market is just more of the same. In this kind of argument, because capitalism’s specific and unique need constantly to revolutionize the forces of production is just an extension and an acceleration of universal and transhistorical, almost natural, tendencies, industrialization is the inevitable outcome of humanity’smost basic inclinations. So the lineage of capitalism passes naturally from the earliest Babylonian merchant through the medieval burgher to the early modern bourgeois and finally to the industrial capitalist. There is similar logic in certain Marxist versions of this story, even though the narrative in more recent version often shifts from the town to the countryside, and merchants are replaced by rural commodity producers, small or ‘middling’ farmers waiting for the opportunity to blossom into full-blown capitalists. In this kind of narrative, petty commodity production, released from the bonds of feudalism, grows more or less naturally into capitalism, and petty commodity producers, just given the chance, will take the capitalist road. Central to these conventional accounts of history are certain assumptions, explicit or implicit, about human nature and about how human beings will behave, if only given the chance. They will, so the story goes, always avail themselves of the opportunity to maximize profits through acts of exchange, and in order to realize that natural inclination, they will always find ways of improving the organization and instruments of work in order to enhance the productivity of labor.

#### Economic methodology is key to accurate predicitons

Beabout 8 – Gregory R. Beabout 2008 is an adjunct fellow of the Center for Economic Personalism and Associate Professor of Philosophy at Saint Louis University Challenges to Using the Principle of Subsidiarity for Environmental Policy; 5 U. St. Thomas L.J. 210 (2008)

Economics offers many insights into how the world around us works, much more than would be possible to summarize even in a full-length law review article with many footnotes.5 From among those many insights, I have selected three "propositions" that demonstrate the fundamental points that economics is necessary, but not sufficient, to address environmental issues and that economics is necessary, but not sufficient, to reconcile the obligations of faith toward the poor and the need to protect the environment.¶ By "propositions" I mean fundamental truths about human behavior and the natural world that we ignore at our peril, truths as basic as the laws of gravity or humanity's susceptibility to sin. We can write statutes or regulations that ignore these-and Congress, legislatures, and regulators the world over frequently do-but such measures risk the same fatal results as bridges built without accounting for gravity. These propositions I will offer are economic "theory," but they are theory in the sense that the laws of gravity are a theory and are founded upon economic insights spanning hundreds of years of careful analyses, testing of hypotheses, and rigorous debates. That does not mean all economists agree on all policy implications or that every prediction by an economist comes true. It does mean that the core principles of the discipline are not mere matters of opinion and that economics is not a "point of view" to be accorded equal weight with folk tales or political preferences. All theories of how the world works are not equal -some work better than others and the ones that work deserve greater weight in policy debates than the ones that do not. Economics' great strength is that it is a concise and powerful theory that explains the world remarkably well. Those who ignore its insights are doomed to fail.¶ Science fiction author Robert Heinlein coined the phrase "TANSTAAFL" as a shorthand way of saying "There Ain't No Such Thing As A Free Lunch" in his classic 1966 science fiction novel The Moon is a Harsh Mistress, in which he described a revolution by residents of lunar colonies against oppressive governments on Earth in 2076.6 Heinlein had the revolutionaries emblazon TANSTAAFL on their flag and wove the principle through the free lunar society he imagined-a place where even air cost people money.¶ "No free lunch" means that everything costs something. Everything. No exceptions. At a minimum, if I spend my time doing one activity, I cannot spend that time doing something else. Economists refer to the idea that resources devoted to one activity are unavailable for other activities as "opportunity cost." If we do X, we cannot use those resources to do Y. The failure to recognize that there is an opportunity cost to committing resources to any given use can have disastrous consequences because when we do not recognize that our actions have costs we cannot intelligently consider our alternatives. And if we cannot assess the costs and benefits of our alternatives, we cannot make reasoned choices among them.7 In short, tradeoffs matter, and we need to pay attention to them.

#### Perm do the alternative – this is justified by vague alts and floating PIKs, which are both voting issues for being unpredictable and stealing aff ground

#### The alternative is rooted in the ivory tower – their call to do nothing is elitist

Greaber& Shukaitis 7 – anthropologist and research fellow at Leicester (David Graeber and Stevphen Shukaitis, anthropologist and lecturer at Goldsmiths College, London, former associate prof Anthropology at Yale, and research fellow at the University of Leicester Centre for Philosophy and Political Economy, “Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations, Collective Theorization,” February 2007, pg. 22-23)

The figures more or less speak for themselves. Baudrillard is considered canonical and more regularly cited in all disciplines, even if many authors often only cite him in order to disagree with him. Debord is seen as a minor figure in art or literary studies, and is almost unknown outside them. Raoul Vaneigem might as well never have been born.This is interesting for any number of reasons. If you ask a scholar in, say, a cultural studies department what they think of the Situationists, you are likely to witness some kind of intellectual brush of the hand. The usual response is a dismissal of them as silly ‘50s or ‘60s Marxists, along the lines of the Frankfurt School who believed that capitalism was an all-powerful system of production and consumers were hapless dupes being fed manufactured fantasies. Eventually, you will then be told, students of popular culture came to realize **this position was elitist and puritanical.** After all, if one examines how real working people actually live, one will discover that they construct the meaning of their lives largely out of consumer goods but that they do it **in their own creative**, subversive **fashion and not as passive dupes of marking executives**. In other words, **real proletarians don’t need some French bohemian pamphleteer to call on them to subvert the system,** **they’re already doing it** on their own. Hence, this sort of literature is an insult to those in whose name it claims to speak. It doesn’t deserve to be taken seriously. This is one reason we think the case of Baudrillard is so telling. After all, if Debord and Venigem are being elitist, Baudrillard is obviously a thousand times more so. Debord and Vaneigem at least thought it was possible to strike back against the spectacle. Baudrillard is obviously a thousand times more so. Debord and Vanigem at least thought it was possible to strike back against the spectacle. Baudrillard no longer does. For him, we are nothing but helpless dupes and there’s nothing we can do about it; except, perhaps, to step back and admire our own cleverness for at least (unlike the pathetic fools still insisting they can change things) having figured that out. Yet Baudrillard remains an academic superstar. One as to ask: if the cultural studies folks are right to dismiss the Situationists as elitists with contempt for the real lives of non-academics, why is that non-academics continue to buy their books? Why is it that non-academics are pretty much the *only* people who continue to buy their books? Because it’s not just info-shops. Since the late ’70s, Situationist ideas, slogans and forms of analysis have become so thoroughly inscribed in the sensibilities of punk rock that it’s almost impossible to listen for very long to certain strains of counter-cultural music without hearing some catchy phrase taken directly from the works of Raoul Vaneigem. The Situationists have managed to become *part* of popular culture while cultural studies has remained completely trapped in the academy. It is these practices of do-it-yourself cultural production that Ben Holtzman, Craig Hughges, and Kevin Van Meter describe in this volume as forms for developing post-capitalist social relations in the present. The obvious conclusion is that it’s precisely Baudrillard’s elitism that makes him palatable for academics, because it’s the kind of elitism that **tells** its **readers not to do anything.** It’s okay to argue that it’s not necessary to change the world through political action. It’s okay to argue it’s not possible. What’s not okay – or anyway, what’s considered tiresome and uninteresting – is to write works that cannot be read as anything but a call to action. Debaord *can* be read simply as a theorist, though it requires a good deal of willful blindness. In the case of Vaneigem it’s nearly impossible. Hence, in the eyes of the academy: Deboard is a minor figure and Vaneigem does not exist.

#### Reviving semiconductors is key to stop EMP attacks

Spring 94 (Baker Spring, Researcher – Heritage Foundation, Backgrounder, http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/BG987.cfm)

In addition to ensuring the reliability of the existing stockpile, testing has other important and practical uses. Nuclear tests will be required to field new systems as previous generations of weapons become old and obsolete. No testing means no modernization, which means, ultimately, no nuclear stockpile. Moreover, testing is used to "harden" conventional weapons and non-nuclear defenses by exposing them to the effects of nuclear explosions. If these systems are not hardened, a regional adversary will be tempted to explode a nuclear weapon in the air in order to knock out these non-nuclear systems. (The U.S. ability to produce semiconductors that are hardened against the radiation emitted by nuclear weapons is weakening. For a discussion of this alarming problem, see: Lt. Col. Bill Swiderek, "Evaluating the Viability of Rad-Hard Fab Lines," Military & Aerospace Electronics, September 20, 1993, pp. 4, 14-15.)

#### An EMP attack is likely

Cooper and Pfaltzgraff 10 Henry F., Chairman of the Board of Directors of High Frontier and Chairman Emeritus of Applied Research Associates – Empact America, and Robert L., President – Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis and Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies – Tufts University, “A Dangerous Gap in Our Defenses?,” National Review Online, 12-14,<http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/255192/dangerous-gap-our-defenses-henry-f-cooper-brrobert-l-pfaltzgraff-jr>

The 2004 Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack observed that a single nuclear weapon exploded at high altitude above the United States will interact with the Earth’s atmosphere, ionosphere, and magnetic field and can produce a damaging electromagnetic pulse over hundreds of square miles. This could shut down, for an indefinite period, telecommunications and electrical-power grids, as well as the electronics-dependent transportation systems that support the “just-in-time” marketing, manufacturing, and delivery of essentially all commodities upon which we are dependent. It could cut off water and food supplies to urban areas and create chaos that would return the United States to 19th-century life, but without the life support then provided by an indigenous agricultural society. It could also hobble banking and related business transactions, which in turn could extend the catastrophic effects into the global economy. Disabling even one of our critical infrastructure elements would have severe consequences for others — effects from which advanced, technologically interdependent societies might not easily recover. This threat is not merely hypothetical. Several years ago, Iran tested a short-range ballistic missile in a way that indicated an interest in developing an EMP capability. Even terrorists might purchase such missiles, possibly armed with nuclear weapons. Furthermore, recent reports that Iran has agreed to install ballistic missiles in Venezuela suggest that we could face a threat via future pathways across the Caribbean. This could become a modern version of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Yet no national strategy addresses this threat or underwrites a serious program to counter its effects — though such a capability would be possible as an inexpensive adjunct to existing and planned missile-defense programs.

#### Extinction

Pry 10 (Peter Vincent, director of the U.S. Nuclear Strategy Forum, “What America Needs to Know About EMPs” http://wethearmed.com/index.php?topic=8450.0)

EMP is not just a threat to computers and electronic gadgets, but to all the critical infrastructures that depend on electronics and electricity -- communications, transportation, banking and finance, food and water -- and that sustain modern civilization and the lives of the American people. In 2008, the congressionally mandated Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack delivered its final report to Congress, the Defense Department, and the Department of Homeland Security. The commission concluded that terrorist groups, rogue states, China, and Russia are theoretically capable of launching a catastrophic EMP attack against the United States and either had contingency plans to do so or were actively pursuing the ability. Iran, North Korea, China, and Russia have scientific and military research programs dedicated to or supportive of EMP capability, and their military doctrinal writings explicitly describe EMP attacks against the United States. Based on eight years of research and analysis, 50 years of data from nuclear tests and EMP simulators, and never-before-attempted EMP tests, the commission found that any nuclear weapon, even a low-yield one, could potentially pose a catastrophic EMP threat to the United States, mainly because of the great fragility of the electric grid. One scenario of particular concern is a nuclear-armed Iran transferring a short- or medium-range nuclear missile to terrorist groups that could perform a ship-launched "anonymous" EMP attack against the United States. Iranian military strategists have written about EMP attacks against the United States, and Iran has successfully practiced launching a ballistic missile off a ship and flight-tested its Shahab-3 medium-range missile to detonate at high altitude, as if practicing an EMP attack. The commission also noted credible Russian claims that they had developed what the Russians call "super-EMP" weapons -- low-yield nuclear weapons specially designed to generate extraordinarily powerful EMP fields -- and that the Russian Duma had raised the prospect of a disabling EMP attack against the United States during NATO's bombing of Serbia in May 1999. The EMP Commission also, in the first such preview by any official body, warned that a "great" geomagnetic storm could be as catastrophic as a nuclear EMP attack -- and that this naturally occurring EMP event is inevitable. Normally, geomagnetic storms occur at high northern latitudes, not over the United States, and usually are not sufficiently powerful to cause catastrophic damage. But every hundred years or so, a "great" geomagnetic storm occurs that could cause catastrophic damage to electronics -- and the infrastructures that rely upon them -- over much of the Northern Hemisphere. The world has not experienced a great geomagnetic storm since the advent of the electronic age, not since the Carrington event of 1859 -- but many scientists think we are overdue. A great geomagnetic storm could generate an EMP covering the United States equivalent to the high-altitude detonation of a very powerful megaton-class nuclear weapon. Weinberger accuses the EMP Commission of deliberately "exaggerating the capabilities of a potential EMP attack." This is a serious allegation, as deliberately misrepresenting the facts about the EMP threat would constitute an ethical and legal violation. As evidence, Weinberger offers the opinion of Philip Coyle of the Center for Defense Information. Whatever Coyle's opinion may be, he is no authority on the commission's work and has participated in none of it. In any case, even he only accuses the EMP Commission of using "inflammatory language" but not of misrepresenting facts. As a member of the EMP Commission's staff, I can assure the public that the EMP commissioners adhered to the highest standards of professionalism and scientific objectivity. If the findings of the EMP Commission sound alarming, it is because they are. The EMP commissioners did their duty and followed the data. The EMP Commission's threat assessment and recommendations represent the best work so far produced by the United States on EMP and is the best-informed basis for national security policy. The EMP Commission's conclusions were also backed up by the findings of another congressional commission, this one chaired by former Defense Secretary William Perry. Their 2009 report independently concluded that terrorists, rogue states, China, and Russia could pose an EMP threat to the United States and advocated immediate implementation of the EMP Commission's recommendations.

### 2AC Gas Prices Russia DA

#### **Non-unique and no link – production is high now and we just maintain the status quo by reducing restrictions that would cause future reductions**

#### No link – we do not affect world gas prices

#### Prices have peaked – they’re headed way down

Fazil 11/9/12 [Mohamed Fazil, Stockmarketsreview.com, “The recent drop in oil prices is more politically driven than fundamentally,” http://www.stockmarketsreview.com/extras/recent\_drop\_in\_oil\_prices\_more\_politically\_driven\_than\_fundamentally\_321217/]

In the commodity segment, crude oil has remained the prime focus since the last four to five years. Except for 2012, China is the only country that accounted for incremental growth in demand. Sharp contraction in Chinese GDP has shaved off oil imports and the oil market still struggles to find another China. Even though the Chinese economy may pick up growth in the first half of 2013, we do not expect any meaningful growth in oil imports due to the structural problems in China.¶ US’s efforts to increase its domestic oil production will lead to a drop in oil imports. Even though the US oil demand moves up it will not lead to a significant jump in oil imports from the Middle East. Due to the austerity trap, we feel Europe’s economic woes are likely to put a cap on EU’s demand for oil.¶ The global oil market is showing more resistance towards ultra loose monetary policies and stimulus drugs. If meaningful recovery is expected after bold steps from the ECB and the Federal Reserve, it would not be possible with high oil prices. Developing economies which were growth engines of the global economy need to lower fuel costs as most of them are battling high inflation, which has forced governments to take favourable steps to stimulate the economy. We are of the view that the recent drop in oil prices is more politically driven than fundamentally driven.¶ We are of the opinion that oil prices have peaked out for the next three quarters and any spike due to geopolitical tensions or liquidity injections should be sold. We feel the WTI crude oil may drop and test the levels of $85-$82/barrels in the next three quarters.

#### LNG exports now

Moniz et al. 11 – Ernest J. Moniz, Cecil and Ida Green Professor of Physic and Engineering Systems at MIT, and director of the MIT Energy Initiative, AND\*\*\* Henry D. Jacoby, professor of management at MIT, AND\*\*\* Anthony J.M. Meggs, engineer at MIT, June 9th, 2011, "The Future of Natural Gas," an interdisciplinary study, web.mit.edu/mitei/research/studies/documents/natural-gas-2011/NaturalGas\_Report.pdf

It should also be noted that **the U.S. exports natural gas**. LNG exports from Alaska to Japan have been in place for 40 years, but are likely to face additional competition in the Asian market, particularly as the Cook Inlet production tapers off. Part of this competition may come from Canada, which has a large shale gas resource. The Department of Energy (DOE) has approved an application to export LNG from a Gulf of Mexico (GOM) facility. The U.S. also exports natural gas by pipeline to Mexico and Canada, although with a significant net import from Canada. Especially since passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), there has been increased North American energy market integration.¶ The large Canadian shale gas resource adds to the diversity of supply within the functioning North American market.

#### Russia already switched to spot pricing

Medlock et al. 11 - Dr. Kenneth B. Medlock, Ph.D. in economics, fellow in Energy and Resource Economics at the Baker Institute, and former advisor to the U.S. Department of Energy and the California Energy Commission, AND\*\*\* Amy Myers Jaffe, graduate from Princeton University, fellow of Energy Studies and director of the Energy Forum at the Baker Institute, and associate director of the Rice Energy Program, AND\*\*\* Dr. Peter R. Hartley, Ph.D in economics at Rice University, [July 2011, "Shale Gas and U.S. National Security,” http://bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-DOEShaleGas-07192011.pdf](file:///C%3A/Users/Pei/Desktop/ROGERS%20HOUSE/July%202011%2C%20%22Shale%20Gas%20and%20U.S.%20National%20Security%2C)

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.

#### Economy collapsing now

Lyudmila Alexandrova 11-7, ITAR-TASSRussia and India Report, “Russian economy already in crisis”, <http://indrus.in/articles/2012/11/06/russian_economy_already_in_crisis_18885.html>

The latest developments in the Russian economy make it unmistakably evident that the crisis is already here and large-scale counter-measures must be taken now, analysts say. They believe that government investments, budget deficit and a reduction in military spending would help push up economic growth rates.¶ The Economic Forecasting Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences has published a quarterly macroeconomic preview to offer its vision of the causes of the slow-down of economic activity in Russia. The experts believe that “the ongoing developments in the economy can **already be described as a crisis** – of mechanisms of growth and economic management.” They blame the crisis on shrinking foreign demand and on harsher monetary, credit and budgetary policies.¶ “The current developments already require large-scale anti-crisis measures and an active economic policy,” the document says. The resource base of Russia’s commercial banks should be increased in order to maintain the current overheating of the retail loans market and provide credits for companies. The other growth mechanism that should be employed is a build-up of government and quasi-government investment (companies that are entirely or partially owned by the state provide up to 40 percent of capital investments).¶ As a matter of fact, the institute’s experts believe that the macroeconomic postulate price stability should enjoy priority over quick economic growth is very wrong, says the daily Kommersant. The authors of the analysis warn that today is not the right time for more monetary experiments.¶ The Economic Forecasting Institute expects a growth of oil prices to $122 per barrel in 2015, but at the same time it predicts a slowdown of economic growth to 2.2 percent and a stable inflation of six percent in the same year. In other words, the think tank foresees no forthcoming changes to the structure of the economy or the quality of the business and investment climate. They point to the **likelihood of a reduction in the accumulation of capital assets, low growth in labour productivity and lack of an influx of direct investments**. This is precisely what they describe as the crisis of economic management.¶ Experts at the Development Centre of the Higher School of Economics see eye to eye with their EFI colleagues. According to their estimates, the **quarterly rates of the GDP growth in Russia have been steady on the decline** since the middle of last year. The bad investment climate and slowly growing demand has caused investment to shrink since the beginning of the year, while the rate of capital flight has been soaring. The next outflow of capital has already exceeded 90 billion dollars and no end of this trend is in sight.¶The macroeconomic forecast contained in the draft budget for three years to come is unrealistic, experts at the Higher School of Economics said. Economic growth in the country may grind to a halt by the end of this year. Even if the world economy keeps rising slowly and oil prices stay high, Russia will show a GDP growth rate of **no more than 1.3 percent** in 2015.

#### Low prices cause diversification

Moiseev 12 Alexey Moiseev is head of macroeconomic analysis at VTB Capital, July 6, 2012, “Modernisation is Russia's cure for 'Dutch disease'”, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sponsored/russianow/business/9382538/russia-dutch-disease.html

Russia has experienced the full effects of the de-industrialisation syndrome known as “Dutch disease”**.**¶Any country trying to diversify will always face major challenges if it tries to do so when commodity prices are high**.** In such an environment,return on capital in the commodity sectors will typically be much higher than elsewhere in the economy, causing capital to drift away from manufacturing sectors towards commodity production **and trading. This de-industrialisation is known as “Dutch disease” and was named after a similar trend noted in the Netherlands after natural gas was discovered in the North Sea.¶ Russia has experienced the full effects of this well-known syndrome.** The government made every effort to prevent, or at the very least to slow, the decline in other sectors of the economy brought about by the loss of capital. The main technique used was the imposition ofextremely high mineral resourceextraction taxes and export tariffs on the oil sector.¶ This worked for a short period, but became far less successful when the government started increasing social spending significantly in the run-up to the 2007-08 election.Higher spending resulted in higher inflation, which put vastly increased wage pressures on the non-resource orientated private sector, dramatically eroding its competitiveness**.**

#### Diversification leads to stability

VOA 11 Voice of America, November 7, 2011, “IMF: Russia Must Reduce Oil Dependence, Diversify”, http://www.voanews.com/content/imf-russia-must-reduce-oil-dependence-133449298/169363.html

The head of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) says that Russia, the world's largest oil producer, needs to reduce its reliance on oil revenues and diversify its economy to keep it stable.¶ The IMF's managing director, Christine Lagarde, said Tuesday in Moscow that even though Russia has enacted fiscal reforms in recent years, it still faces "important vulnerabilities." She said the country's budget deficit, excluding oil revenues, has more than tripled, and that Russia needs to move "toward a more vibrant and diversified economy."

## 2AC Russia

#### **Non-unique and no link – production is high now and we just maintain the status quo by reducing restrictions that would cause future reductions**

#### No link – we do not affect world gas prices

#### Prices have peaked – they’re headed way down

Fazil 11/9/12 [Mohamed Fazil, Stockmarketsreview.com, “The recent drop in oil prices is more politically driven than fundamentally,” http://www.stockmarketsreview.com/extras/recent\_drop\_in\_oil\_prices\_more\_politically\_driven\_than\_fundamentally\_321217/]

In the commodity segment, crude oil has remained the prime focus since the last four to five years. Except for 2012, China is the only country that accounted for incremental growth in demand. Sharp contraction in Chinese GDP has shaved off oil imports and the oil market still struggles to find another China. Even though the Chinese economy may pick up growth in the first half of 2013, we do not expect any meaningful growth in oil imports due to the structural problems in China.¶ US’s efforts to increase its domestic oil production will lead to a drop in oil imports. Even though the US oil demand moves up it will not lead to a significant jump in oil imports from the Middle East. Due to the austerity trap, we feel Europe’s economic woes are likely to put a cap on EU’s demand for oil.¶ The global oil market is showing more resistance towards ultra loose monetary policies and stimulus drugs. If meaningful recovery is expected after bold steps from the ECB and the Federal Reserve, it would not be possible with high oil prices. Developing economies which were growth engines of the global economy need to lower fuel costs as most of them are battling high inflation, which has forced governments to take favourable steps to stimulate the economy. We are of the view that the recent drop in oil prices is more politically driven than fundamentally driven.¶ We are of the opinion that oil prices have peaked out for the next three quarters and any spike due to geopolitical tensions or liquidity injections should be sold. We feel the WTI crude oil may drop and test the levels of $85-$82/barrels in the next three quarters.

#### LNG exports now

Moniz et al. 11 – Ernest J. Moniz, Cecil and Ida Green Professor of Physic and Engineering Systems at MIT, and director of the MIT Energy Initiative, AND\*\*\* Henry D. Jacoby, professor of management at MIT, AND\*\*\* Anthony J.M. Meggs, engineer at MIT, June 9th, 2011, "The Future of Natural Gas," an interdisciplinary study, web.mit.edu/mitei/research/studies/documents/natural-gas-2011/NaturalGas\_Report.pdf

It should also be noted that **the U.S. exports natural gas**. LNG exports from Alaska to Japan have been in place for 40 years, but are likely to face additional competition in the Asian market, particularly as the Cook Inlet production tapers off. Part of this competition may come from Canada, which has a large shale gas resource. The Department of Energy (DOE) has approved an application to export LNG from a Gulf of Mexico (GOM) facility. The U.S. also exports natural gas by pipeline to Mexico and Canada, although with a significant net import from Canada. Especially since passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), there has been increased North American energy market integration.¶ The large Canadian shale gas resource adds to the diversity of supply within the functioning North American market.

#### Russia already switched to spot pricing

Medlock et al. 11 - Dr. Kenneth B. Medlock, Ph.D. in economics, fellow in Energy and Resource Economics at the Baker Institute, and former advisor to the U.S. Department of Energy and the California Energy Commission, AND\*\*\* Amy Myers Jaffe, graduate from Princeton University, fellow of Energy Studies and director of the Energy Forum at the Baker Institute, and associate director of the Rice Energy Program, AND\*\*\* Dr. Peter R. Hartley, Ph.D in economics at Rice University, [July 2011, "Shale Gas and U.S. National Security,” http://bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-DOEShaleGas-07192011.pdf](file:///C%3A/Users/Pei/Desktop/ROGERS%20HOUSE/July%202011%2C%20%22Shale%20Gas%20and%20U.S.%20National%20Security%2C)

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.

#### Economy collapsing now

Lyudmila Alexandrova 11-7, ITAR-TASSRussia and India Report, “Russian economy already in crisis”, <http://indrus.in/articles/2012/11/06/russian_economy_already_in_crisis_18885.html>

The latest developments in the Russian economy make it unmistakably evident that the crisis is already here and large-scale counter-measures must be taken now, analysts say. They believe that government investments, budget deficit and a reduction in military spending would help push up economic growth rates.¶ The Economic Forecasting Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences has published a quarterly macroeconomic preview to offer its vision of the causes of the slow-down of economic activity in Russia. The experts believe that “the ongoing developments in the economy can **already be described as a crisis** – of mechanisms of growth and economic management.” They blame the crisis on shrinking foreign demand and on harsher monetary, credit and budgetary policies.¶ “The current developments already require large-scale anti-crisis measures and an active economic policy,” the document says. The resource base of Russia’s commercial banks should be increased in order to maintain the current overheating of the retail loans market and provide credits for companies. The other growth mechanism that should be employed is a build-up of government and quasi-government investment (companies that are entirely or partially owned by the state provide up to 40 percent of capital investments).¶ As a matter of fact, the institute’s experts believe that the macroeconomic postulate price stability should enjoy priority over quick economic growth is very wrong, says the daily Kommersant. The authors of the analysis warn that today is not the right time for more monetary experiments.¶ The Economic Forecasting Institute expects a growth of oil prices to $122 per barrel in 2015, but at the same time it predicts a slowdown of economic growth to 2.2 percent and a stable inflation of six percent in the same year. In other words, the think tank foresees no forthcoming changes to the structure of the economy or the quality of the business and investment climate. They point to the **likelihood of a reduction in the accumulation of capital assets, low growth in labour productivity and lack of an influx of direct investments**. This is precisely what they describe as the crisis of economic management.¶ Experts at the Development Centre of the Higher School of Economics see eye to eye with their EFI colleagues. According to their estimates, the **quarterly rates of the GDP growth in Russia have been steady on the decline** since the middle of last year. The bad investment climate and slowly growing demand has caused investment to shrink since the beginning of the year, while the rate of capital flight has been soaring. The next outflow of capital has already exceeded 90 billion dollars and no end of this trend is in sight.¶The macroeconomic forecast contained in the draft budget for three years to come is unrealistic, experts at the Higher School of Economics said. Economic growth in the country may grind to a halt by the end of this year. Even if the world economy keeps rising slowly and oil prices stay high, Russia will show a GDP growth rate of **no more than 1.3 percent** in 2015.

#### Low prices cause diversification

Moiseev 12 Alexey Moiseev is head of macroeconomic analysis at VTB Capital, July 6, 2012, “Modernisation is Russia's cure for 'Dutch disease'”, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sponsored/russianow/business/9382538/russia-dutch-disease.html

Russia has experienced the full effects of the de-industrialisation syndrome known as “Dutch disease”**.**¶Any country trying to diversify will always face major challenges if it tries to do so when commodity prices are high**.** In such an environment,return on capital in the commodity sectors will typically be much higher than elsewhere in the economy, causing capital to drift away from manufacturing sectors towards commodity production **and trading. This de-industrialisation is known as “Dutch disease” and was named after a similar trend noted in the Netherlands after natural gas was discovered in the North Sea.¶ Russia has experienced the full effects of this well-known syndrome.** The government made every effort to prevent, or at the very least to slow, the decline in other sectors of the economy brought about by the loss of capital. The main technique used was the imposition ofextremely high mineral resourceextraction taxes and export tariffs on the oil sector.¶ This worked for a short period, but became far less successful when the government started increasing social spending significantly in the run-up to the 2007-08 election.Higher spending resulted in higher inflation, which put vastly increased wage pressures on the non-resource orientated private sector, dramatically eroding its competitiveness**.**

#### Diversification leads to stability

VOA 11 Voice of America, November 7, 2011, “IMF: Russia Must Reduce Oil Dependence, Diversify”, http://www.voanews.com/content/imf-russia-must-reduce-oil-dependence-133449298/169363.html

The head of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) says that Russia, the world's largest oil producer, needs to reduce its reliance on oil revenues and diversify its economy to keep it stable.¶ The IMF's managing director, Christine Lagarde, said Tuesday in Moscow that even though Russia has enacted fiscal reforms in recent years, it still faces "important vulnerabilities." She said the country's budget deficit, excluding oil revenues, has more than tripled, and that Russia needs to move "toward a more vibrant and diversified economy."

#### Economic diversification solves aggression and nationalism

Cohen & Ericson 9 – Ariel Cohen, Ph.D., Senior Research Fellow, The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, AND\*\*\* Richard Ericson, Ph.D., Chair of the Department of Economics at the East Carolina University and former Director of the Harriman Institute at Columbia University, November 2nd, 2009, The Heritage Foundation, “Russia's Economic Crisis and U.S.-Russia Relations: Troubled Times Ahead,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/11/russias-economic-crisis-and-us-russia-relations-troubled-times-ahead>

An economic model based on natural resources would tend to perpetuate authoritarianism, nationalism, and corruption, and it would require Russia to follow a neo-imperial policy throughout the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) to support Russian domination of the pipeline system. In a way, the petrostate model and the associated militarized foreign policy require Russia to label the U.S. as an enemy. A more open and diversified economy would be more compatible with democratization and the rule of law. Russia's falling economic performance has dampened some aspects of the revisionist rhetoric, but has not drastically changed Russia's foreign policy narrative, which remains decidedly anti-status quo and implicitly anti-American. Recent increases in oil prices ensure the continuation of this policy. Even during the current crisis, Russia has continued to voice strong grievances against the West and made revisionist demands to change key international economic and European security institutions for its benefit. Unless the Kremlin significantly reorients its foreign and security policy priorities, the Obama Administration's attempt to "reset" U.S.-Russian relations may fail. Only a coherent policy by the Obama Administration and Congress can force the Russian leadership to realize that they would be better served by cooperating with the U.S. and the West than by subverting it. The Russian Petrostate Rollercoaster In the 1990s, the Russian economy struggled with a difficult transition from central planning to a market economy under Boris Yeltsin. In the current decade, wealth from raw materials has fueled an increasingly revisionist foreign policy. Yet while the Russian elite views Russia as a great energy and military power, its economic productivity is only one-third of U.S. productivity,[4] and its gross domestic product (GDP) is between $1.1 trillion and $1.8 trillion, depending on oil prices, and is smaller than the GDPs of France, Italy, and the U.K. From 2000 to 2008, the Kremlin benefited from rising oil prices. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin's popularity soared as Russia entered a period of intense economic growth. By 2008, Russia had become one of the 10 largest economies in the world. In only 10 years, its GDP had increased by more than eightfold (measured in U.S. dollars), having grown at an average annual rate of around 7 percent in constant rubles.[5] Real wages increased significantly, from $62 in 1999 to $529 in 2007.[6] Russia had the best stock market performance of any emerging markets during this time.[7] This economic growth occurred despite the Kremlin's efforts, beginning in 2003, to renationalize much of Russia's natural resources and other strategic sectors of the economy. In 2003, the Kremlin took control of YUKOS, the largest publicly traded Russian oil company, and jailed its owner Mikhail Khodorkovsky. During Putin's second presidential term, the Kremlin's international rhetoric and actions became increasingly assertive, even aggressive. The euphoria surrounding Russia as the "hottest new emerging market" and the considerable increase in living standards have obscured the fact that the economy lacks a diversified base and heavily depends on energy exports. (See Table 2.) Russia suffers from desperately weak rule of law, including property rights and corporate and state governance.[8] Its economy is not technologically competitive, labor costs are high, productivity is low, and foreign direct investment is stunted by state corruption and the lack of the rule of law.

#### Now is key – failure to enact political reforms causes violent revolutions

Freeland and Gutterman 12 – Chrystia Freeland and Steve Gutterman, writers for Reuters, January 17, 2012, “Russia faces violent revolution if it doesn’t embrace democracy, billionaire Putin challenger declares”, http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/01/17/russia-faces-violent-revolution-if-it-doesnt-embrace-democracy-billionaire-putin-challenger-declares/

MOSCOW — Mikhail Prokhorov, a super-rich tycoon challenging Vladimir Putin for Russia’s presidency in March, said his country faced the danger of violent revolution if it did not break conservative resistance and move quickly to democracy.¶ Prokhorov, a billionaire bachelor long seen more as playboy than politician, told The Freeland File on reuters.com Russians had shaken off a post-Soviet apathy and were now “just crazy about politics.” He denied accusations he was a Kremlin tool, let into the race to split the opposition and lend democratic legitimacy to a vote Putin seems almost certain to win.¶ Putin is seeking to return to the Kremlin and rule until at least 2018, but protests against alleged fraud in a December 4 parliamentary vote have exposed growing discontent with the system he has dominated for 12 years.¶ “What worked before does not work now. Look in the streets. People are not happy,” Prokhorov, 46, said in the interview beneath the windowed dome that soars above his spacious office on a central Moscow boulevard close to the Kremlin.¶ “It is time to change,” said Prokhorov, ranked by Forbes magazine as Russia’s third-richest person, with an $18-billion metals-to-banking empire that includes the New Jersey Nets basketball team in the United States.¶ “Stability at any price is no longer acceptable for Russians.”¶ But Prokhorov made clear he considers revolution equally unacceptable for a country with grim memories of a century of hardship, war and upheaval starting with Vladimir Lenin’s 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, instead calling for “very fast evolution.”¶ “I am against any revolution, because I know the history of Russia. Every time we have revolution, it was a very bloody period,” he said.¶ The son of a Soviet sports official, Prokhorov has a basketball player’s 204-cm (6-foot-8) frame, a narrow face and a head of short-cut hair graying around the edges. In a dark suit and blue shirt that looked modest for a¶ Russian tycoon, he sat straight and spoke in English.¶ Public political consciousness is on the rise after years of apathy. The Soviet mentality is fading as a generation of Russians who “don’t know who Lenin was” grows up, he said. The country was finally ripe for change.¶ “We now have all the pieces in place to move very fast to being a real democracy,” Prokhorov said.¶ But he suggested there was a mounting battle in the ruling elite between liberals like himself and conservatives “ready to pay any price” to maintain the status quo. Russia, he said, could face a bloody revolution if opponents of reform prevail.¶ “If there are no changes in Russia, from day to day this risk will increase,” Prokhorov said. “Because 15, 20 percent of the population, the most active ones living in the big cities, want to live in a democratic country.”

#### That causes miscalculation and nuclear war

Pry 99 (Peter Vincent, Former US Intelligence Operative, War Scare: U.S.-Russia on the Nuclear Brink, netlibrary)

Russian internal troubles—such as a leadership crisis, coup, or civil war—could aggravate Russia’s fears of foreign aggression and lead to a miscalculation of U.S. intentions and to nuclear overreaction. While this may sound like a complicated and improbable chain of events, Russia’s story in the 1990s is one long series of domestic crises that have all too often been the source of nuclear close calls. The war scares of August 1991 and October 1993 arose out of coup attempts. The civil war in Chechnya caused a leadership crisis in Moscow, which contributed to the nuclear false alarm during Norway’s launch of a meteorological rocket in January 1995. Nuclear war arising from Russian domestic crises is a threat the West did not face, or at least faced to a much lesser extent, during the Cold War. The Russian military’s continued fixation on surprise-attack scenarios into the 1990s, combined with Russia’s deepening internal problems, has created a situation in which the United States might find itself the victim of a preemptive strike for no other reason than a war scare born of Russian domestic troubles. At least in nuclear confrontations of the 1950s–1970s—during the Berlin crisis, Cuban missile crisis, and 1973 Middle East war—both sides knew they were on the nuclear brink. There was opportunity to avoid conflict through negotiation or deescalation. The nuclear war scares of the 1980s and 1990s have been one-sided Russian affairs, with the West ignorant that it was in grave peril.

## 2AC Politics

#### Won’t pass – parties want 2013 deal

Barno 11/7—retired Lieutenant General of the United States Army. Master’s in National Security and Strategic Studies from Georgetown University—Dr. Nora Bensahel is Deputy Director of Studies and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security—AND Joel Smith and Jacob Stokes; Research Assistants at the Center for a New American Security (David, Brace Yourself, [www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace\_yourself?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace_yourself?page=full))

The national security establishment has focused primarily on the potential cuts to the Pentagon, which would total some $500 billion over the next decade. In their third debate, Mitt Romney warned Barack Obama that such cuts would devastate the military, leading the president to promise: "It will not happen." But the likelihood of cuts to defense spending cannot be considered in isolation from all the other elements of the fiscal cliff, and with the election behind us, it's time to admit there is a strong possibility that sequestration will take effect -- because both the president and Congress could benefit politically.¶ continues ¶ Continued gridlock during the lame duck session remains a high probability, and budget talks will likely involve a significant amount of brinksmanship among negotiators trying to maximize their own gains -- brinksmanship that could well end in failure, preventing a deal and driving the nation off the fiscal cliff.¶ As noted above, the tight legislative calendar in the lame duck session and the large number of weighty issues on the docket makes it very likely negotiations on any sizable deal will continue until the last possible moment. If talks break down at that point, the time left to agree to a delay would be very short. Efforts to broker a delay agreement would probably have to be moving at the same time as efforts to agree on a grand bargain. But lawmakers looking for a deal would likely shun simultaneous efforts, lest the possibility of delay remove the time pressure needed to reach a bargain.¶ Although President Obama has strongly opposed sequestration as a way to reduce the deficit, it remains unclear whether he would support legislation to undo it without an agreement on new sources of revenue. In August, he told a Virginia newspaper, "If the choice is between sequester going through or tax cuts continuing for millionaires and billionaires, I think it's pretty clear what the American people would choose." But the president also clearly stated during the final presidential debate that sequestration "will not happen." Although his spokesmen walked back that language the following day, it remains unclear to what degree Obama sees sequestration as an unacceptable outcome. Republicans leaders, on the other hand, have demonstrated their equally strong opposition to new taxes.¶ Some legislators from both parties might see advantage in letting the nation go off the fiscal cliff and allowing the sequester cuts to take effect. According to press reports, some Republicans have promised to slow down the legislative process to ensure that there is no deal to delay the cuts. For Republicans deficit hawks, ensuring that Congress reduces government spending, whatever the consequences, is the highest priority. Grover Norquist, the influential head of Americans for Tax Reform, recently stated, "Sequestration is not the worst thing"; and Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio), who chairs the conservative Republican Study Committee, has said, "The only thing worse than cutting national defense is not having any scheduled cuts at all take place." For Democrats, going off the fiscal cliff would improve their bargaining position with Republicans -- taxes would rise significantly and defense spending would be cut.¶ In a perverse twist of logic, both parties might benefit from the new baselines created by going off the fiscal cliff. Allowing the Bush-era tax cuts to expire would automatically raise taxes on the majority of Americans to pre-2001 levels, which would reduce the deficit by $3.7 trillion over the next decade. With sequestration in force, spending would be cut by about $1 trillion over 10 years, carved equally out of defense and non-defense discretionary accounts. Ironically, these new baselines might actually break the partisan deadlock because Republican lawmakers could then vote in favor of a tax "cut," and as revenues increase, more Democratic lawmakers may be willing to vote to "increase" spending on defense programs.¶ Of course, this would be high-stakes game of chicken for both the White House and Congress. It would seriously disrupt planning throughout the Department of Defense and defense industry, shake market confidence in the United States, and slow U.S. economic growth. But recent reports have indicated that the effects of defense sequestration, tax hikes and spending cuts would be slower and less damaging in the short term than the rhetoric would suggest -- leaving room to go off the cliff and cut a deal early in the 113th Congress without causing lasting damage to the economy, national security, or domestic programs. Lawmakers from both parties might therefore see going off the cliff as a practical way of reaching a broader consensus in 2013 about balancing the nation's revenues and expenditures.

#### Expanding domestic natural gas is key to a fiscal cliff deal

CNBC 11-7 – “Cheap US Energy Can Help Solve ‘Fiscal Cliff’: Pickens,” 11/7/12, http://www.cnbc.com/id/49730576

Cheap US Energy Can Help Solve ‘Fiscal Cliff’: Pickens¶ Billionaire energy investor Boone Pickens told CNBC’s "Closing Bell" on Wednesday that **energy policy can be an important part of any solution to** the country’s fiscal problems. ¶ After House Speaker John Boehner indicated Republicans in the House were open to looking at taxes and tax reform to fix the "fiscal cliff," Pickens said, “To me the solution is some of those things and you could put energy in there.” ¶ Pickens has long been a proponent of weaning the U.S. off OPEC oil in favor of the natural gas and other resources that can be found across North America. ¶ “Our industry has done an unbelievably good job of providing the cheapest energy in the world to the United States," Pickens said. "We have the cheapest oil [CLCV1 86.07 0.98 (+1.15%) ] by 15 percent, the cheapest natural gas [NGCV1 3.503 -0.105 (-2.91%) ] by 75 percent and the cheapest gasoline [RBCV1 2.6992 0.0919 (+3.52%) ] by 50 percent.” ¶ With the cheapest energy available in the world, Pickens expects industry to come back to the U.S. and help bolster growth. ¶ “But you’re going to have to have some leadership from Washington to understand the resources, understand what the resources can do and then sell it to the world,” he added.

#### No impact on defense

Korb 9/9 Lawrence Korb is a former assistant secretary of defense in the Reagan administration and is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress. “Cuts Would Not Affect Security,” 2012, NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/09/09/how-big-should-the-defense-budget-be/cuts-would-not-affect-security

But the United States can afford defense cuts, **without undermining national securit**y, for four reasons:¶ First, the United States has just gone through an enormous defense buildup. The budget increased, in real terms, for an unprecedented 13 straight years between 1998 and 2012. Even during the Reagan buildup, defense spending grew for only four years before dropping back to more sustainable levels.¶ Second, the cuts being discussed are smaller than they seem. The first $500 billion **come from projected growth**, so the budget will fall by just $6 billion next year and then grow at about the same pace as inflation. **Even with sequestration, defense spending would be brought back** **only** **to its 2006 level** in real terms -- more than we spent on average under Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush.¶ Third, ending this indiscriminate growth will force the Pentagon to manage its funds more carefully. Over the past decade, the Pentagon squandered $46 billion on weapons it later canceled, and let half its procurement programs balloon beyond their original budgets.¶ Finally, we face a world with relatively few major threats. And even with sequestration-size cuts, **we would still account for more than 40 percent of the world’s defense spending**, and our allies would account for about half of the rest.

#### No impact on the economy – empirically denied

Hulbert 10/26 Mark, MaretWatch, "A contrarian take on fiscal cliff worries", 2012, www.marketwatch.com/story/a-contrarian-take-on-fiscal-cliff-worries-2012-10-26?mod=mw\_streaming\_stream

CHAPEL HILL, N.C. (MarketWatch) — Fears of falling off the fiscal cliff have become this Halloween season’s nightmare scenario.¶ And that scenario is very scary indeed — double-digit drops in the stock market, an economic recession if not depression, and so forth.¶ But when lots of investors become gripped by the same scary scenario, my contrarian instincts kick into gear, leading me to explore the possibility that things might not be as bad as they otherwise seem.¶ Here’s a list of reasons why we might not want to be freaked out by the fiscal cliff:¶ There’s more than one way of jumping off the fiscal cliff, and not all of them would be particularly scary. As my colleague Rob Schroeder pointed out early this week, our politicians in Washington could send the U.S. over the cliff only temporarily, or decide to kick the can down the road altogether. “Of 5 ‘fiscal cliff’ outcomes only 1 is disaster,” he argues. ( Read full story. )¶ In any case, the markets appear to be giving very low probability to the most disastrous of scenarios — a full-scale jump off the fiscal cliff, precipitating a sharp economic slowdown. To be sure, there is no Intrade contract exactly associated with that scenario; the closest is a contract tied to the U.S. economy slipping into a recession in 2013. Intrade currently assigns just a 29.6% probability to such a recession, which is lower than this contract’s average level over the last six months.¶ Another straw in the wind in this regard comes from analyzing the performance of tax harvesting strategies. If investors were certain that tax rates would be appreciably higher in 2013 than they are now, then they presumably would be selling from their taxable accounts those of their holdings in which they have the biggest unrealized gains — and holding on to their positions in which they have big unrealized losses. For both reasons, momentum strategies would have become less profitable in recent weeks — something for which there is no clear evidence.¶ Another thing worth keeping in mind is that we’ve been down this road before. Remember the government budget crisis in 1995, which followed the 1994 midterm elections in which the Republican party won control of both the House and the Senate? That crisis led two separate government shutdowns: One in mid-November 1995 and the other from mid-December 1995 through early January 1996. And yet, far from crashing, the Dow Jones Industrial Average DJIA +0.14% gained several percent during those shutdowns.¶ The summer of 2011 appears to be a counter-example, since the political stalemate in Washington led to the downgrade of the U.S. government’s credit rating, which in turn precipitated a very scary drop in the market. But the market learned from that experience: The Dow had recovered from all of that drop within a few short months, and the world continued to lend money to the U.S. government at rock-bottom rates. In fact, the U.S. 10-year Treasury note yield XX:TNX -4.27% is today nearly 100 basis points lower than where it stood at the time of Uncle Sam’s credit downgrade.

#### Democrats love the plan – they are trying to distance themselves from Obama’s energy policy

Lederman 9-21 – Josh Lederman, writer for the Associated Press, September 21st, 2012, "House moves to quash Obama coal, gas rules " [www.msnbc.msn.com/id/49120538/ns/us\_news-environment/t/house-moves-quash-obama-coal-gas-rules/#.UG-dtfUyfjJ](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/49120538/ns/us_news-environment/t/house-moves-quash-obama-coal-gas-rules/#.UG-dtfUyfjJ)

Energy issues have flared in several competitive House and Senate races this year, with Democrats seeking distance from Obama and their party. In West Virginia, Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin, facing re-election in November, has embraced the GOP's "war on coal" language and echoed their attacks on the EPA. Both candidates in North Dakota's tossup Senate race have criticized Obama for hampering energy production.¶ Democrats voting with Republicans Friday to support the package included Reps. Nick Rahall of West Virginia, Mark Critz of Pennsylvania and Ben Chandler of Kentucky.

#### No economic decline war

Jervis 11 – Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Semiconductors are key to US nuclear modernization

Chandratre et al. 7 – V.B. Chandratre et al 7, Menka Tewani, R.S. Shastrakar, V. Shedam,¶ S. K. Kataria and P. K. Mukhopadhyay¶ Electronics Division,¶ Bhabha Atomic Research Centre ¶ “AN APPROACH TO MODERNIZING NUCLEAR¶ INSTRUMENTATION: SILICON-BASED SENSORS,¶ ASIC AND HMC” October, http://www.barc.ernet.in/publications/nl/2007/200710-2.pdf

Modernization of nuclear instrumentation is pursued for realizing the goal of¶ compact portable nuclear instruments, detector mount electronics and related instrumentation that can be¶ designed, developed and manufactured, to mitigate contemporary instrumentation challenges.¶ The activity aims at indigenous design and development of crucial components of nuclear instrumentation.¶ Efforts are also undertaken to develop the critical microelectronics technologies to fulfill the gaps in nuclear instruments “ end to end”. The activity’s objective has been¶ fulfilled by working in close collaboration with semiconductor foundries and¶ HMC (Hybrid Micro Circuits) facilities. Various ASIC, sensors, IP cores, HMC, display devices¶ and critical instrumentation modules developed, are discussed.¶ The design and development of nuclear instruments require a variety of high performance components and¶ sensors. Till recently these components were available¶ and activity based on this approach has grown mature,¶ with good expertise in related areas but has availability¶ and obsolescence issues. As the technologies have moved¶ up, various competing devices, techniques and¶ technologies are available today. It’s important and as¶ well prudent to catch up with these cutting edge¶ developments, for a very strong reason that we have¶ not been able to catch up with previous technology¶ movements. Technology updates are difficult and have¶ higher lead times with steeper learning curve. The¶ Electronics Division has taken a modest initiative in¶ fulfilling the gap in this area. Care has been taken to¶ develop critical instrumentation by an approach of “mix¶ and match”, integrating the newer development in the¶ existing instrumentation on the basis of merit and¶ requirements. Nuclear instrumentation has been a strong driver for¶ technology developments worldwide. The low / medium¶ energy instrumentation requirements we meet fairly with¶ combination of NIM, CAMAC, FASTBUS and VME-based¶ instrumentation. With use of the sensors of higher¶ granularity, higher event rate, imaging and tracking¶ requirements coupled with complex trigger mechanism,¶ the approach has changed to low power detector mount¶ electronics or monolithic sensor with electronics. Rapid¶ developments in semiconductor technology have aided¶ in realizing this concept.

#### Empirically proven

Cook 7**—**CFR senior fellow for Mid East Studies. BA in international studies from Vassar College, an MA in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and both an MA and PhD in political science from the University of Pennsylvania(Steven, Ray Takeyh, CFR fellow, and Suzanne Maloney, Brookings fellow, 6 /28, Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast, http://www.iht.com/bin/print.php?id=6383265, AG)

Underlying this anxiety was a scenario in which Iraq's sectarian and ethnic violence spills over into neighboring countries, producing conflicts between the major Arab states and Iran as well as Turkey and the Kurdistan Regional Government. These wars then destabilize the entire region well beyond the current conflict zone, involving heavyweights like Egypt. This is scary stuff indeed, but with the exception of the conflict between Turkey and the Kurds, the scenario is far from an accurate reflection of the way Middle Eastern leaders view the situation in Iraq and calculate their interests there. It is abundantly clear that major outside powers like Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey are heavily involved in Iraq. These countries have so much at stake in the future of Iraq that it is natural they would seek to influence political developments in the country. 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.**

#### Nuclear war

Lieber & Press 9 - Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, November-December 2009, “The Nukes We Need: Preserving the American Deterrent,” Foreign Affairs, p. 50-51

This second criticism has merit. Nevertheless, the benefits of maintaining effective counterforce capabilities trump the costs. Strong counterforce capabilities should make adversaries expect that escalating a conventional war will lead to a disarming attack, not a cease-fire. Beyond deterrence, these capabilities will provide a more humane means of protecting allies who are threatened by nuclear attack and give U.S. leaders the ability to pursue regime change if an adversary acts in a truly egregious fashion. Moreover, some danger of escalation is unavoidable because the style of U.S. conventional operations will inevitably blind, rattle, and confuse U.S. adversaries. If the United States has powerful counterforce tools, these may dissuade its enemies from escalating in desperate times, and U.S. leaders would have a much more acceptable option if deterrence fails. The nuclear forces the **United** **States** builds today must be able to act as a reliable deterrent, even in much darker times. Many of those who recommend a much smaller U.S. nuclear arsenal—and assign little importance to a nuclear counterforce option—fail to consider the great difficulties of maintaining deterrence during conventional wars. The U.S. nuclear arsenal should retain sufficient counterforce capabilities to make adversaries think very carefully before threatening to use, putting on alert, or actually using a nuclear weapon. Any nuclear arsenal should also give U.S. leaders options they can stomach employing in these high-risk crises. Without credible and effective options for responding to attacks on allies or U.S. forces, the United States will have difficulty deterring such attacks. Unless the United States maintains potent counterforce capabilities, U.S. adversaries may conclude—perhaps correctly—that the United States’ strategic position abroad rests largely on a bluff.

#### Political capital not key

Beckmann 11 - Assistant Professor Department of Political Science & Center for the Study of Democracy @ U. C., Irvine

Practicing Presidential Leadership: A Model of Presidents’ Positive Power in U.S. Lawmaking, Journal of Theoretical Politics January 2011 23: 3-20

For political scientists, however, the resources allocated to formulating and implementing the White House’s lobbying offensive appears puzzling, if not altogether misguided. Far from highlighting presidents’ capacity to marshal legislative proposals through Congress, the prevailing wisdom now stresses contextual factors as predetermining his agenda’s fate on Capitol Hill. Indeed, from the particular “political time” in which he happens to take office (Skowronek (1993)) to the state of the budget (Brady and Volden (1998); Peterson (1990)), the partisan composition of Congress (Bond and Fleisher (1990); Edwards (1989); see also Gilmour (1995); Groseclose and McCarty (2001); Sinclair (2006)) to the preferences of specific “pivotal” voters (Brady and Volden, 1998; Krehbiel, 1998), current research suggests a president’s congressional fortunes are basically beyond his control. The implication is straightforward, as Bond and Fleisher indicate: . . . presidential success is determined in large measure by the results of the last election. If the last election brings individuals to Congress whose local interests and preferences coincide with the president’s, then he will enjoy greater success. If, on the other hand, most members of Congress have preferences different from the president’s, then he will suffer more defeats, and no amount of bargaining and persuasion can do much to improve his success. (1990, 13).

#### No impact – January deal solves

Chait 11/8—NY Mag (Jonathan, Erskine Bowles Bids to Spoil Obama Second Term, nymag.com/daily/intel/2012/11/erskine-bowles-bids-to-spoil-obama-second-term.html)

That is totally false.¶ Going over the fiscal cliff and then doing nothing for another year would mean a huge tax hike and spending cut. But waiting until January would mean extremely gradual tax increases and spending cuts, ones that would not even begin to take place immediately, because Obama has the ability to delay their implementation. And even after they're implemented, the effect would be gradual, and could subsequently be canceled out. It’s like saying if you go three weeks without food you’ll die so if dinner isn’t on the table at 6 o'clock sharp terrible consequences will follow.¶ The reason many liberals want to wait until January is that it would make a deal much easier to strike, and ensure that the result is on more liberal terms. Once the entire Bush tax cuts have expired, President Obama would no longer have to pry revenue out of tax-hating Republicans. He’ll have all the revenue he wants and more. He could offer them a tax cut. He’ll likewise have huge defense cuts to bargain away.

#### Winners win

Marshall and Prins 11 (BRYAN W, Miami University and BRANDON C, University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy, “Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force”, Sept, Presidential Studies Quarterly 41, no. 3)

Presidents rely heavily on Congress in converting their political capital into real policy success. Policy success not only shapes the reelection prospects of presidents, but it also builds the president’s reputation for political effectiveness and fuels the prospect for subsequent gains in political capital (Light 1982). Moreover, the president’s legislative success in foreign policy is correlated with success on the domestic front. On this point, some have largely disavowed the two-presidencies distinction while others have even argued that foreign policy has become a mere extension of domestic policy (Fleisher et al. 2000; Oldfield and Wildavsky 1989) Presidents implicitly understand that there exists a linkage between their actions in one policy area and their ability to affect another. The use of force is no exception; in promoting and protecting U.S. interests abroad, presidential decisions are made with an eye toward managing political capital at home (Fordham 2002).

#### Natural gas lobby shields the link

Browning & Clifford 11 – James Browning, Regional State Director – Common Cause, AND\*\*\* Pat Clifford, Stone Senior Fellow – HUC-UC Ethics Center, October 1st, 2011, “Fracking for Support: Natural Gas Industry Pumps Cash Into Congress,” http://www.commoncause.org/site/pp.asp?c=dkLNK1MQIwG&b=7831813)

Natural gas interests have spent more than $747 million during a 10-year campaign – stunningly successful so far – to avoid government regulation of hydraulic “fracking,” a fast-growing and environmentally risky process used in Ohio and at least a dozen other states to tap underground gas reserves, according to a new study by Common Cause. A faction of the natural gas industry has directed more than $20 million to the campaigns of current members of Congress – including $600,000 to Ohioans -- and put $726 million into lobbying aimed at shielding itself from oversight, according to the report, the third in a series of “Deep Drilling, Deep Pockets” reports produced by the non-profit government watchdog group. Rep. John Boehner led Ohio’s Congressional delegation with $186,900 raised from fracking interests, followed Sen. Rob Portman with $91,000, Rep. Steve Chabot with $59,050, and Rep. Steve Stivers with $51,250. “Players in this industry have pumped cash into Congress in the same way they pump toxic chemicals into underground rock formations to free trapped gas,” said Common Cause President Bob Edgar. “And as fracking for gas releases toxic chemicals into groundwater and streams, the industry’s political fracking for support is toxic to efforts for a cleaner environment and relief from our dependence on fossil fuels.” The report also tracks $2.8 million in campaign contributions to Ohio’s state elected officials and notes that Ohio’s fracking regulations are among the weakest of any state. Gov. John Kasich was the leading individual recipient with $213,519, followed by former Gov. Ted Strickland with $87,450 and Secretary of State John Husted with $84,750. In Congress, the industry’s political giving heavily favors lawmakers who supported the 2005 Energy Policy Act, which exempted fracking from regulation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Current members who voted for the bill received an average of $73,433, while those who voted against the bill received an average of $10,894. The report comes as the Environmental Protection Agency is scheduled to publish new, preliminary findings in 2012 about the potential dangers of fracking. That gives the industry a powerful incentive to increase political spending now in an attempt to shape public opinion and the debate over fracking in Congress, as well as affect the outcome of the 2012 congressional elections. “Thanks to the Supreme Court and its Citizens United decision, the natural gas industry will be free to spend whatever it likes next year to elect a Congress that will do its bidding,” Edgar said. “The industry’s political investments already have largely freed it from government oversight. Controlling the flow of that money and other corporate spending on our elections is critical to protecting our environment for this and future generations.”

#### Plan’s bipartisan – perceived as green energy

Murray 10 – Matthew Murray, staff of Roll Call, Capitol Hill Newspaper, October 14th, 2010, "Natural Gas Lobby Drills for Democratic Allies" www.rollcall.com/issues/56\_38/-50704-1.html

Natural gas firms are lobbying Members for federal investment incentives such as the Promoting Natural Gas and Electric Vehicles Act, a bill that is scheduled for a Nov. 17 cloture vote.¶ Ahead of its new advocacy push, the industry has enlisted nontraditional political allies, such as Democratic Congressional leaders, and its companies have formed a new trade group. The industry has also been giving more campaign contributions to the majority party.¶ A Democratic lobbyist who works on energy legislation said **new technological advances have “broadened the field” on the political front for natural gas companies**. The companies have also been successful at playing up the commodity’s green reputation among Democrats.¶ “There has certainly been a lot more interest,” the lobbyist said. “There are a lot of Democrats who definitely think natural gas is a lot more environmentally friendly alternative.”¶ The American Gas Association has been more generous to the party, giving $120,000 to Democrats since 2009, including contributions to House Energy and Commerce Chairman Henry Waxman (Calif.), House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (Md.), Energy and Commerce Chairman Emeritus John Dingell (Mich.) and Senate Rules Chairman Charles Schumer (N.Y.).¶ According to CQ MoneyLine, contributions to Democrats represented 46 percent of AGA’s overall political giving this cycle, a dramatic increase from the previous two-year period. In 2007-08, the trade group gave 36 percent of its campaign gifts to Democrats and gave 28 percent in the previous cycle, campaign records show.¶ The trade association represents large utility companies such as Ameren Corp. and Nicor Inc.¶ AGA lobbyist Charles Fritts said the industry is “lucky” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid is putting so much attention on natural gas. The utilities lobby also is supporting the Nevada Democrat’s bill that would create incentives for developing natural-gas-fired vehicles, a product line that is unlikely to come to market without a federal government investment, Fritts said.¶ “The natural gas vehicle market hasn’t cracked into the big time,” he said. “It’s been a very hard sell.”¶ ¶ Switching Loyalties¶ For the first time in 16 years, a trade group representing natural gas pipeline providers has shifted the majority of its campaign contributions to Democrats. According to CQ MoneyLine, the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America has given $33,500 to Democrats this cycle, which is almost 60 percent of its total political giving.¶ Campaign finance records show the trade association gave 51 percent of its donations in the last cycle to Republican candidates and political action committees, the same ratio of contributions to the GOP that the organization’s PAC has averaged since 1980.¶ “We’re looking for allies on both sides of the aisle,” INGAA lobbyist Martin Edwards said. “In a Democratic Congress, it’s important to look for allies on the Democratic side of the aisle. We’ve certainly done that, and we tend to focus our contributions to folks who have been proven supporters on gas-related issues.”¶ Edwards also credited the “improbable relationship” between T. Boone Pickens and Reid as a major boon for the natural gas industry. In 2008, the Texas oilman launched his “Pickens Plan,” an energy blueprint that encourages lawmakers to move national energy consumption away from foreign oil in favor of natural gas and electric vehicles.¶ Once a prominent Republican donor, Pickens told reporters last week that he has pledged not to make federal campaign contributions and to work with Members of both parties. Pickens also said Reid will be able to move an alternative fuels subsidy bill during the lame-duck session, in part because of the promise.¶ Pickens declined through a spokeswoman to be interviewed for this article.¶ Regan Lachapelle, a Reid spokeswoman, said in an e-mail Wednesday that “Democrats recognize that the responsible development and use of our significant domestic natural gas resources can make our nation more secure and provide a good bridge to a job-creating, clean energy future.”¶ ¶ Tapping Democrats’ Support¶ America’s Natural Gas Alliance, which represents independent producers, is also attempting to make its pitch to Members from both parties. The organization registered a PAC this summer but is not expected to make any contributions until after Election Day.¶ “We feel that the compelling benefits of natural gas have strong bipartisan appeal,” spokesman Daniel Whitten said in a statement. “So we feel that the advantages natural gas offers, not just for transportation, but also power generation and industrial uses, crosses partisan lines and is an essential component of any forward-looking energy policy.”¶ Unlike with oil and coal, **environmental groups are tepidly blessing legislation that would encourage investment in natural gas facilities, undoubtedly making it easier for Democrats to offer their support**.

#### Won’t pass – gridlock

Barno 11/7— retired Lieutenant General of the United States Army. Master’s in National Security and Strategic Studies from Georgetown University—Dr. Nora Bensahel is Deputy Director of Studies and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security—AND Joel Smith and Jacob Stokes; Research Assistants at the Center for a New American Security (Brace Yourself, [www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace\_yourself?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace_yourself?page=full))

Although structural factors seem to favor a deal, the 112th Congress's political gridlock -- it has passed the fewest laws of any session since World War II -- as well as the extremely short time available to forge a large, complicated piece of legislation almost certainly means that Congress and the president will not strike a grand bargain before January 2.¶ At first glance, the prospects for such a deal seem higher than at any point during the past two years. President Obama's bargaining power has increased now that he has received a clear mandate for the next four years. Additionally, allowing tax breaks to expire means that taxes will increase, which many Republicans oppose. For their part, Democrats want to prevent large cuts to domestic discretionary spending, and they have an incentive to cut a big deal before the nation hits the debt ceiling again, likely early in 2013. Leaders from both parties oppose the sequestration defense cuts. And, of course, neither side wants the country to plunge back into recession.¶ The fundamental problem is that most Republicans do not support any tax increases and most Democrats do not support significant cuts to government services. What's more, even if Congress were inclined to compromise, the logistics of passing a grand bargain are daunting. There are only seven weeks until this congressional session ends. Some time will be taken up preparing for the 113th Congress, and many departing members will focus on making arrangements for their post-Congress lives rather than legislating. In that context, Congress would have to draft legislation; debate and pass it in committees; debate and pass it in both houses; come up with a compromise agreement between the two chambers; redraft the compromise; and then pass the conference report. Then the president would have to sign that bill into law.¶ Barring an unforeseen change, the cumulative effect of partisan gridlock and a lack of time should squelch expectations for a grand bargain in the lame duck.