# Round 2

## 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.

#### A competitive chemical industry is key to sustainability, and solves extinction

ICCA 2 – ICCA (International Council of Chemical Associations), June 20, 2002, “SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY,” online: http://www.cefic.be/position/icca/pp\_ic010.htm

Sustainability in economic terms means the efficient management of scarce resources as well as a prospering industry and economy. Sustainability in the environmental sense means not placing an intolerable load on the ecosphere and maintaining the natural basis for life. Seen from society's viewpoint, sustainability means that human beings are the centre of concern. In view, particularly, of the population increase worldwide, there needs to be provided as large a measure of equal opportunities, freedom, social justice and security as possible. ¶ The chemical industry views Sustainable Development as a challenge put before all parts of society. In the advances made in its own operations, its improved performance and in the improvements to the human condition made through its products, the chemical industry sees cause for optimism and believes that Sustainable Development can be the intellectual framework around which the chemical industry, other industries and other sectors of society can reach consensus on how to improve living standards and the environment. ¶ The main challenges facing the world include:- ¶ \* Optimizing the benefits obtained from depleting resources¶ \* Assuring against excessive strains placed on the eco-system¶ \* The dynamic growth of the world population¶ \* Remedying social and economic inequalities¶ These are challenges on a global scale. It follows, therefore, that the attainment of Sustainable Development will call for action on the part of the people, governments, businesses and organisations around the world. The global chemical industry has realized this challenge. ¶ CONTRIBUTION OF THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ The chemical industry is a key industry. Its products and services are instrumental in meeting the needs of mankind. It is present in all areas of life, from food and clothing, housing, communications, transport - right through to leisure activities. In addition, it helps to solve the problems of other sectors of industry, such as the energy sector, information technologies, environmental industries and the waste disposal sector, as examples.¶ Due to its size, the chemical industry is an important supplier to a broad range of downstream industries and is, as well, a customer of a broad range of products and services from other industries. It follows, therefore, that the chemical industry plays a major role in providing/ supporting performance improvements, research and development progress and, last but not least, employment in other industries.¶ In itself, it is a large-scale provider of jobs and makes a significant contribution to wealth creation and, hence, to the financing of both public works and the exercise of public responsibilities. Since living standards are determined to a large degree by material considerations, it is clear that the chemical industry with its unique capabilities is in a position to make a decisive contribution to Sustainable Development.¶ Commitment by the world chemical industry to the concept of Sustainable Development requires words to be transposed into company-specific action programmes in order to provide a framework for all those working in the sector. Its "Responsible Care" initiative, self-monitoring systems and other voluntary programmes such as Sustainable Technology (SUSTECH), Education-Industry Partnerships, Energy Efficiency Programmes are also part of this framework. Thereby, companies are also confronted with new challenges and must act responsibly. They must take account of the consequences of their actions upon society and future generations.¶ The global chemical industry believes that the key to improving the performance of the industry is both its commitment to achieving environmentally sound Sustainable Development and improved performance and transparency. Under the concept ¶ environment, to seek continuous improvement in performance, to educate all staff and work with customers and communities regarding product use and overall operation. Through these efforts the industry is improving its efficiency, reducing risks to health and the environment and making better products which, in turn, help individual and industry customers.¶ THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY's LEADERSHIP IN INNOVATION¶ The very notion of Sustainable Development will require new approaches in a number of areas. Innovation at all levels and in all fields of activity is the most effective instrument for ensuring that the economic, and environmental goals, as well as those of society, are being advanced.¶ The chemical industry's contribution is to continue innovation of new products that meet customer needs and manufacturing processes that reduce risks to health and the environment. This contribution is based upon the knowledge and experience the industry has acquired from applying innovation not only to making, handling and use of chemical compounds, but also to reprocessing, recycling and solving environmental problems. The challenge facing the chemical industry is to maximize innovation, which can contribute to society meeting its goals for Sustainable Development. ¶ The chemical industry is firmly convinced that leadership in innovation represents the best way of attaining Sustainable Development. For the individual company, this means:- ¶ \* a consistent orientation towards products, technologies and solutions which offer the greatest promise for the future¶ \* development of new integrated environmental technologies¶ \* a close cooperation with the customers of the chemical industry¶ \* adaptation to the conditions of global competition¶ \* bringing the most promising products quickly on the market¶ \* strengthening the R&D effort which requires resources which can only be financed from profitable earnings¶ \* actively contributing ideas and suggestions to the policy debates taking place in society¶ \* improving process yield (efficiency).¶ APPROACH TO THE ECONOMIC GOAL OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ The internationalization of the economy at large, in conjunction with a growing trend towards global competition, is becoming more and more apparent. This is being manifested by:- ¶ \* an increase of imports and exports of goods as well as services¶ \* growing outward and inward flows of direct investment¶ \* an ever increasing exchange of technology transfers¶ \* globalization of monetary and financial schemes. ¶ The inter-relation of economic systems is complex, with a variety of relationships among countries. Multi-national chemical companies apply common standards in spreading investment capital and stimulating markets around the globe, thus setting the scene for the world market. What they need, in order to play a constructive role in Sustainable Development, is, first and foremost, freedom and fairness in international trade. Trade as an engine of economic growth is essential for Sustainable Development. A climate needs to be fostered within which such growth may take place on the basis of a clear set of rules with predictable consequences, by which investors may be guided in their long-term decision-making process. This includes bringing to a halt the growing intervention by governments in industry and their ever increasing demands to raise income by taxation, thus imposing a disproportionate load on the business community.¶ Wealth creation and **profits are fundamental to Sustainable Development**. They sustain economies (not just the chemical industry), and contribute, via re-investment and R&D, to new technologies and environmental improvements. Profits are needed to create flexible company structures oriented towards economic, environmental and society-related requirements.¶ The chemical industry is a major industrial sector and an essential contributor to welfare and employment on a global scale. In order to maintain this position under the imperative of Sustainable Development, the long-term future of the industry must be rooted in a dynamic policy, whereby continual innovation and re-engineering of companies result in an increase of productivity and, thus, keeping up international competitiveness as a pre-requisite of sustainable job creation.

#### Volatility wrecks the fertilizer industry

IECA 3 [Industrial Energy Consumers of America, nonprofit organization created to promote the interests of manufacturing companies for which the availability, use and cost of energy, power or feedstock play a significant role in their ability to compete, July 22 2003, “IMPACT OF THE U.S. NATURAL GAS CRISIS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN NITROGEN FERTILIZER INDUSTRY,” http://www.ieca-us.com/wp-content/uploads/072203Fertilizerbriefing.pdf]

Natural gas is the principal and only economically feasible feedstock raw material used for producing anhydrous ammonia, the building block product for nitrogen fertilizer. The fertilizer industry accounts for approximately three percent of the total natural gas consumed in the United States, while natural gas costs at current price levels account for nearly 90 percent of the cost to produce ammonia. ¶ Natural gas is the primary feedstock in the production of virtually all commercial nitrogen fertilizers in the United States. It is important to be very clear about this: natural gas is not simply an energy source for us; it is the raw material from which nitrogen fertilizers are made. The production process involves a catalytic reaction between ¶ elemental nitrogen derived from the air with hydrogen derived from natural gas. The primary product from this reaction is anhydrous ammonia (NH3). Anhydrous ammonia is used directly as a commercial fertilizer or as the basic building block for producing virtually all other forms of nitrogen fertilizers such as urea, ammonium nitrate and nitrogen solutions, as well as diammonium phosphate and mono-ammonium phosphate.¶ The volatility and high level of U.S. natural gas prices, virtually unprecedented in the history of our country, has resulted in the permanent closure of almost 20 percent of U.S. nitrogen fertilizer capacity and the idling of an additional 25 percent. ¶ By the end of December 2000, the U.S. nitrogen operating rate fell to below 70 percent of capacity. By the end of January 2001, operating rates dropped to an all-time low of only 46 percent. To put this into perspective, the average U.S. operating rate during the 1990s was 92 percent. ¶ During the gas spike in late February and early March of 2003, working capital requirements for one Mid-Western nitrogen manufacturer to buy gas for its operations nearly doubled--an increase of nearly $40 million in one month.2¶ Impact on U.S. Farmers¶ Natural gas prices began to steadily increase during calendar year 2000, rising from an average of $2.36 per MMBtu in January to over $6.00 per MMBtu in December 2000 and to a record $10 per MMBtu in January 2001 (Figure 3). In turn, this forced fertilizer production costs to unprecedented levels. Ammonia production costs, for example, spiked up from approximately $100 per ton to $170 per ton by June 2000, to $220 per ton in December 2000, and to an average of over $350 per ton in January 2001. ¶ The sharp rise in natural gas prices and the resulting curtailment of U.S. fertilizer production also has had a dramatic impact on fertilizer prices throughout the marketing chain and, in particular, at the farm level. Nitrogen prices at the farm level, for example, jumped this year to near-record high levels. According to U.S. Department of Agriculture data, the U.S. average farm-level price for ammonia jumped this spring to $373 per ton compared to an average spring price last year of $250. Similarly, urea prices have climbed from $191 to $261 and UAN prices from $127 to $161 in the same time period. This translates into an increase in cost to a typical Midwest corn farmer of $10 to $15 per acre. It is important to understand that most U.S. nitrogen fertilizer is consumed within a very short time frame in the fall and spring application seasons.

#### Solves food crises

The Fertilizer Institute 9 [Trade Group representing the fertilizer industry, “The U.S. Fertilizer Industry and Climate Change Policy,” April 2 2009, http://www.kochfertilizer.com/pdf/TFI2009ClimateChange.pdf]

Fertilizer nutrients – nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium – are all naturally occurring elements that are “fed” to plants and crops for healthy and abundant food and fiber production. They are currently responsible for 40 to 60 percent of the world’s food supply. Harvest after harvest, fertilizers replenish our soils by replacing the nutrients removed by each season’s crop. Each year, the world’s population grows by 80 million and fertilizers – used in an environmentally sensitive way – are critical to ensuring that our nation’s farmers grow an adequate supply of nutritious food for American and international consumers.¶ As consumers around the world demand improved diets, the global demand for fertilizers is growing rapidly. Under these circumstances, U.S. farmers compete with farmers from around the world for a limited supply of nutrients. For example, over 85 percent of our potash and over 50 percent of the nitrogen used on U.S. farms is now imported from other countries.¶ The United States needs a strong domestic fertilizer industry to ensure this valuable resource is available for a stable food production system. Today, the world’s food supply, as represented by the grain stocks-to-use ratio, is near its lowest level in 35 years. In six of the last seven years, consumption of grains and oilseeds has exceeded production. Many experts believe that we are just one natural disaster or substandard world harvest away from a full-scale food crisis.

## Energy Leverage

#### US production frees up Middle East exports for Europe

Hulbert 12 – Matthew Hulbert, writer for Forbes, July 5th, 2012, "Why America Can Make or Break A New Global Gas World" [www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/08/05/why-america-can-make-or-break-a-new-global-gas-world/print/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/08/05/why-america-can-make-or-break-a-new-global-gas-world/print/)

With that in mind, we’ll start off by taking a brief look at the ‘climatic conditions’ that have made global gas convergence a serious debate, examining reduced OECD demand and meteoric unconventional gains in the US. That’s freed up vast swathes of LNG tankers from the Middle East **that should have hit US ports to find their way to European hubs instead.** European utilities contracted to expensive Russian pipeline gas have been bleeding customers and cash ever since, constantly being undercut by new market entrants using spot purchases to good effect over term prices. As a result, European wholesale hubs are seriously challenging Russo-German border prices, and as yet, no conclusive winner has emerged given conflicting ‘fundamentals’ in play. But this battle over pricing models isn’t just being waged in Europe; it increasingly divides Asia as well. To add the Pacific dimension, we then turn to China: Beijing has been notoriously stubborn signing oil-indexed contracts over the past two years, irrespective of the vendors involved. It’s put itself in a great pricing position as it has plenty of options to source its gas. Nobody is going to make a dud move signing up overpriced contracts with the prospect of new export giants emerging in the next five to ten years: Least of all, the Middle Kingdom.

#### Russian gas leverage kills NATO

Ghlaeb 11 – Alexander Ghaleb, director of the Strategic Securities Institute, holds a B.BA. in international business from George Washington University, an M.A. in strategic security studies from the National Defense University ,and he is an energy security Ph.D. student in the Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy at the Central European University. Ghaleb is a U.S. Army captain who has studied at top European universities in Germany, France, and Hungary. October 18th, 2011, "Natural Gas as an Instrument of Russian State Power" [www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1088](http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1088)

The slow re-emergence of Russia as a world power **despite its weak military force** is of critical significance for the strategic interests of the United States in Europe. Since the Cold War, Russia has been perceived as a broken nation that no longer represents a threat to the North Atlantic Alliance. This monograph emphasizes that Russia overcame this major vulnerability by developing the capacity to use unilateral economic sanctions in the form of gas pricing and gas disruptions against many European North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member states. It agrees with many scholars and politicians alike who fear that Russia will leverage its monopoly of natural gas to gain political concessions. The author suggests it is only a matter of time **until Russia will use natural gas as an instrument of coercion to** disrupt NATO’s decisionmaking process.¶ A key aim of this monograph is to explain why the rapid global transition from oil to natural gas will redefine the way policymakers and strategic security scholars look at the scarcity of natural gas in Europe. What is unique about this monograph is that it analyzes the oil and gas markets separately and illustrates, with examples, why in Europe natural gas is a more potent instrument of coercion than oil. Despite these revelations, only 1 month after the German Government announced its plans to abandon nuclear power by 2022, in July 2011 German Chancellor Angela Merkel disclosed that Germany will need to import more Russian natural gas to make up for the loss of over 10 gigawatts of generation capacity. Almost simultaneously, Germany’s largest energy utilities group, RWE, and the Russian state-controlled gas giant, Gazprom, have agreed to form a strategic partnership. The author argues that situations like these create a delicate state of affairs that will ultimately undermine the de facto power of NATO in the contemporary security environment, particularly vis-àvis Russia, unless the dependency on Russian natural gas is promptly addressed.

#### NATO prevents global nuclear war

Brzezinski 9 – Zbigniew Brzezinski 9, former U.S. National Security Advisor, the Robert E. Osgood Professor of American Foreign Policy at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies, September/October 2009, “An Agenda for NATO,” Foreign Affairs

And yet, it is fair to ask: Is NATO living up to its extraordinary potential? NATO today is without a doubt the most powerful military and political alliance in the world. Its 28 members come from the globe’s two most productive, technologically advanced, socially modern, economically prosperous, and politically democratic regions. Its member states’ 900 million people account for only 13 percent of the world’s population but 45 percent of global GDP. ¶ NATO’s potential is not primarily military. Although NATO is a collective-security alliance, its actual military power comes predominantly from the United States, and that reality is not likely to change anytime soon. NATO’s real power derives from the fact that it combines the United States’ military capabilities and economic power with Europe’s collective political and economic weight (and occasionally some limited European military forces). Together, that combination makes NATO globally significant. It must therefore remain sensitive to the importance of safeguarding the geopolitical bond between the United States and Europe as it addresses new tasks.¶ The basic challenge that NATO now confronts is that there are historically unprecedented risks to global security. Today’s world is threatened neither by the militant fanaticism of a territorially rapacious nationalist state nor by the coercive aspiration of a globally pretentious ideology embraced by an expansive imperial power. The paradox of our time is that the world, increasingly connected and economically interdependent for the first time in its entire history, is experiencing intensifying popular unrest made all the more menacing by the growing accessibility of weapons of mass destruction - not just to states but also, potentially, to extremist religious and political movements. Yet there is no effective global security mechanism for coping with the growing threat of violent political chaos stemming from humanity’s recent political awakening.¶ The three great political contests of the twentieth century (the two world wars and the Cold War) accelerated the political awakening of mankind, which was initially unleashed in Europe by the French Revolution. Within a century of that revolution, spontaneous populist political activism had spread from Europe to East Asia. On their return home after World Wars I and II, the South Asians and the North Africans who had been conscripted by the British and French imperial armies propagated a new awareness of anticolonial nationalist and religious political identity among hitherto passive and pliant populations. The spread of literacy during the twentieth century and the wide-ranging impact of radio, television, and the Internet accelerated and intensified this mass global political awakening. ¶ In its early stages, such new political awareness tends to be expressed as a fanatical embrace of the most extreme ethnic or fundamentalist religious passions, with beliefs and resentments universalized in Manichaean categories. Unfortunately, in significant parts of the developing world, bitter memories of European colonialism and of more recent U.S. intrusion have given such newly aroused passions a distinctively anti-Western cast. Today, the most acute example of this phenomenon is found in an area that stretches from Egypt to India. This area, inhabited by more than 500 million politically and religiously aroused peoples, is where NATO is becoming more deeply embroiled. ¶ Additionally complicating is the fact that the dramatic rise of China and India and the quick recovery of Japan within the last 50 years have signaled that the global center of political and economic gravity is shifting away from the North Atlantic toward Asia and the Pacific. And of the currently leading global powers—the United States, the EU, China, Japan, Russia, and India—at least two, or perhaps even three, are revisionist in their orientation. Whether they are “rising peacefully” (a self-confident China), truculently (an imperially nostalgic Russia) or boastfully (an assertive India, despite its internal multiethnic and religious vulnerabilities), they all desire a change in the global pecking order. The future conduct of and relationship among these three still relatively cautious revisionist powers will further intensify the strategic uncertainty.¶ Visible on the horizon but not as powerful are the emerging regional rebels, with some of them defiantly reaching for nuclear weapons. North Korea has openly flouted the international community by producing (apparently successfully) its own nuclear weapons - and also by profiting from their dissemination. At some point, its unpredictability could precipitate the first use of nuclear weapons in anger since 1945. Iran, in contrast, has proclaimed that its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes but so far has been unwilling to consider consensual arrangements with the international community that would provide credible assurances regarding these intentions. In nuclear-armed Pakistan, an extremist anti-Western religious movement is threatening the country’s political stability.

## Topicality

#### We meet---the plan text immediately lessens the restrictions. The restrictions have been passed now and are on the books---companies have to fully comply by 2015.

**We meet---we make the restrictions lower---that’s all their evidence says**

#### Counter-interpretation – restrictions are government actions that make production more difficult or expensive---we meet because our 1AC evidence says the restrictions are ALREADY hurting production and creating uncertainty

LVM Institute 96 – Ludwig Von Mises Institute Original Book by Ludwig Von Mises, Austrian Economist in 1940. Evidence is cut from fourth edition copyright Bettina B. Greaves, “Human Action” http://mises.org/pdf/humanaction/pdf/ha\_29.pdf

Restriction of production means that the government either forbids or makes more difficult or more expensive the production, transportation, or distribution of definite articles, or the application of definite modes of production, transportation, or distribution. The authority thus eliminates some of the means available for the satisfaction of human wants. The effect of its interference is that people are prevented from using their knowledge and abilities, their labor and their material means of production in the way in which they would earn the highest returns and satisfy their needs as much as possible. Such interference makes people poorer and less satisfied.¶ This is the crux of the matter. All the subtlety and hair-splitting wasted in the effort to invalidate this fundamental thesis are vain. On the unhampered market there prevails an irresistible tendency to employ every factor of production for the best possible satisfaction [p. 744] of the most urgent needs of the consumers. If the government interferes with this process, it can only impair satisfaction; it can never improve it.¶ The correctness of this thesis has been proved in an excellent and irrefutable manner with regard to the historically most important class of government interference with production, the barriers to international trade. In this field the teaching of the classical economists, especially those of Ricardo, are final and settle the issue forever. All that a tariff can achieve is to divert production from those locations in which the output per unit of input is higher to locations in which it is lower. It does not increase production; it curtails it.

#### Prefer our interpretation---the aff should be allowed to repeal restrictions that haven’t hit the compliance date yet---otherwise there are no restrictions affs because things like Coal and Natural Gas restrictions don’t have to be complied with yet.

**We don’t explode limits---we don’t let the aff reduce hypothetical restrictions---they have to been passed already.**

**We solve ground---our evidence says the restrictions already are decreasing production so they can get natural gas DA’s**

**Reasonability---competing interpretations cause a race to the bottom arbitrarily excludes the aff.**

## Memo CP

### CP triggers endless litigation---destroys signal and makes rollback likely

David L. Franklin 10, Professor of Law at DePaul, November 2010, “ARTICLE: Legislative Rules, Nonlegislative Rules, and the Perils of the Short Cut,” The Yale Law Journal, 120 Yale L.J. 276, p. lexis

There is perhaps no more vexing conundrum in the field of administrative law than the problem of defining a workable distinction between legislative and nonlegislative rules. The problem is relatively easy to state. Under standard doctrine, these two types of rules differ from one another in both a substantive and a procedural sense. Substantively, legislative rules are designed to have binding legal effect on both the issuing agency and the regulated public; procedurally, the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) requires such rules to undergo the expensive and time-consuming process known as notice-and-comment rulemaking before being promulgated. n1 Nonlegislative rules, by contrast, are not meant to have binding legal effect, and are exempted from notice and comment by the APA as either "interpretative rules" or "general statements of policy." n2

So far, so good. The problem arises when we leave the airy realm of theory and enter the untidy arena of litigation. Here is the usual sequence of events: a federal agency issues some sort of pronouncement - a guidance, a circular, an advisory - without using notice and comment; parties that believe that they are adversely affected by the new pronouncement go to court, perhaps before it has even been enforced against anyone; the challengers argue that the pronouncement is in fact a legislative rule and is therefore procedurally invalid for failure to undergo notice and comment.

Even by the standards of administrative law - a field in which uniform, predictable rules of black-letter law are hard to come by - the resulting litigation is considered notoriously difficult. The problem is not just that the Supreme Court has not supplied a test for distinguishing between the two types of rules, or that the APA does not define the exempt categories of interpretative rules and general statements of policy. The problem runs deeper: it turns out to be maddeningly hard to devise a test that reliably determines which rules are legislative in nature and which are not. Currently, courts do their best by examining the text, structure, and history of the rule, its relationship to existing statutes and rules, and the manner in which it has been enforced (if at all) in an effort to ascertain whether the rule was intended to have binding legal effect or instead was merely designed to clarify existing law or to inform the public and lower-level agency employees about the agency's intentions. Given the amount of indeterminacy built into this inquiry, it is no wonder that courts have labeled the distinction between legislative and [\*279] nonlegislative rules "tenuous," "baffling," and "enshrouded in considerable smog." n3

### The EPA will rollback the CP---and it doesn’t sovle perception advantages

Anthony 92 THEIR AUTHOR (Robert A., Foundation Professor of Law – George Mason University School of Law, “Interpretive Rules, Policy Statements, Guidances, Manuals, And The Like Should Federal Agencies Use Them To Bind The Public?”, Duke Law Journal, June, 41 Duke L.J. 1311, Lexis)

To countenance nonlegislative documents that bind is inevitably to expand the agency's discretion in a most undesirable way. Although the public is bound the agency is not bound, as it would be had it used legislative rules. 29 It is easier for the agency to deviate from or change positions taken in policy statements, memoranda and the like than it is to deviate from or change those adopted through legislative processes. 30 Additionally, it may be observed generally that nonlegislative documents often are less clear and definite than legislative rules, and may enable the agency to operate at a lower level of visibility, with greater discretion and with **fewer checks** from the public and the courts.

### The Court will roll back the CP regardless of whether EPA interprets it as non-binding

Kalen 8 THEIR AUTHOR (Sam, Visiting Assistant Professor – Penn State University, “The Transformation of Modern Administrative Law: Changing Administrations and Environmental Guidance Documents”, Ecology Law Quarterly, 35 Ecology L.Q. 657, Lexis)

Appalachian Power involved EPA's issuance of one of many guidance documents necessary to help inform the administration of the CAA. In 1992, EPA issued regulations requiring that certain air permits contain requirements for "periodic monitoring" of emissions. 81 The regulations left a number of issues unresolved and created uncertainty about the insertion of periodic monitoring requirements in CAA permits. Released in 1998, EPA's "Periodic Monitoring Guidance" (PMG) document sought to address the ambiguities in [\*679] the 1992 regulations. 82 Petitioners argued that EPA had impermissibly attempted to prescribe substantive rules through the guise of a guidance document, which had not been adopted in accordance with notice-and-comment rulemaking. 83 EPA responded by objecting to any challenge, claiming that the court lacked jurisdiction to hear the case because the guidance document was not a final rule. 84

**\*\*\*MSU’s CARD STARTS HERE\*\*\***

Early in the opinion, Judge Randolph foreshadowed the tenor of the court's decision. Before discussing the merits, he observed:

The phenomenon we see in this case is familiar. Congress passes a broadly worded statute. The agency follows with regulations containing broad language, open-ended phrases, ambiguous standards and the like. Then as years pass, the agency issues circulars or guidance or memoranda, explaining, interpreting, defining and often expanding the commands in the regulations. One guidance document may yield another and then another and so on. Several words in a regulation may spawn hundreds of pages of text as the agency offers more and more detail regarding what its regulations demand of regulated entities. Law is made, without notice and comment, without public participation, and without publication in the Federal Register or the Code of Federal Regulations. 85

**\*\*\*MSU’S CARD ENDS HERE\*\*\*\***

With that, it is not surprising that the court then held that it could review the document under CAA's procedures for allowing judicial review of "nationally applicable," "final actions" by the EPA. 86 The court dismissed EPA's contention that the document was not final because it was not binding. 87 It explained how documents such as the PMG could be binding in a practical sense and rejected EPA's suggestion to the contrary, noting that the challenged part of the guidance document consisted of the agency's settled position - one that would need to be followed in future circumstances. 88

But the court added that merely because something may be binding does not necessarily mean it is final. 89 The court identified two elements for finality: first, the action "must mark the consummation of the agency's decision-making process," and second, it must be one that determines "rights or obligations" from "which "legal consequences will flow.'" 90 It found both elements present. [\*680] The document was not a draft and it contained mandatory commands. 91 In rejecting boilerplate language in the document that it was not final and could not be relied upon to create any enforceable rights, the court noted that the "entire Guidance, from beginning to end - except the last paragraph - reads like a ukase. It commands, it requires, it orders, it dictates." 92

Having established its jurisdiction, the court then examined whether the PMG altered EPA's existing periodic monitoring rule or reflected a valid interpretation of the existing rule. 93 Believing that the guidance document "significantly broadened" EPA's existing regulation, the court set aside the document as impermissible rulemaking contrary to the rulemaking requirements under the statute. 94 Conspicuously absent from any part of this opinion is any discussion about deference to EPA's interpretation of its existing regulation.

### CP is binding --- justifies perm do the CP --- Court precedent holds agency guidance documents are binding if they so much as represent a “settled” agency position

Kalen 8 THEIR AUTHOR (Sam, Visiting Assistant Professor – Penn State University, “The Transformation of Modern Administrative Law: Changing Administrations and Environmental Guidance Documents”, Ecology Law Quarterly, 35 Ecology L.Q. 657, Lexis)

Appalachian Power involved EPA's issuance of one of many guidance documents necessary to help inform the administration of the CAA. In 1992, EPA issued regulations requiring that certain air permits contain requirements for "periodic monitoring" of emissions. 81 The regulations left a number of issues unresolved and created uncertainty about the insertion of periodic monitoring requirements in CAA permits. Released in 1998, EPA's "Periodic Monitoring Guidance" (PMG) document sought to address the ambiguities in [\*679] the 1992 regulations. 82 Petitioners argued that EPA had impermissibly attempted to prescribe substantive rules through the guise of a guidance document, which had not been adopted in accordance with notice-and-comment rulemaking. 83 EPA responded by objecting to any challenge, claiming that the court lacked jurisdiction to hear the case because the guidance document was not a final rule. 84

**\*\*\*MSU’s CARD STARTS HERE\*\*\***

Early in the opinion, Judge Randolph foreshadowed the tenor of the court's decision. Before discussing the merits, he observed:

The phenomenon we see in this case is familiar. Congress passes a broadly worded statute. The agency follows with regulations containing broad language, open-ended phrases, ambiguous standards and the like. Then as years pass, the agency issues circulars or guidance or memoranda, explaining, interpreting, defining and often expanding the commands in the regulations. One guidance document may yield another and then another and so on. Several words in a regulation may spawn hundreds of pages of text as the agency offers more and more detail regarding what its regulations demand of regulated entities. Law is made, without notice and comment, without public participation, and without publication in the Federal Register or the Code of Federal Regulations. 85

**\*\*\*MSU’S CARD ENDS HERE\*\*\*\***

With that, it is not surprising that the court then held that it could review the document under CAA's procedures for allowing judicial review of "nationally applicable," "final actions" by the EPA. 86 The court dismissed EPA's contention that the document was not final because it was not binding. 87 It explained how documents such as the PMG could be binding in a practical sense and rejected EPA's suggestion to the contrary, noting that the challenged part of the guidance document consisted of the agency's settled position - one that would need to be followed in future circumstances. 88

### Links to politics---their ev doesn’t assume divided government---and the Court will roll it back

Lisa Schultz Bressman 7, Professor of Law and Co-Director, Regulatory Program, Vanderbilt University Law School, “ARTICLE: PROCEDURES AS POLITICS IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW,” Columbia Law Review, December 2007, 107 Colum. L. Rev. 1749, p. lexis

Administrative law, by fortifying administrative procedures, works to ensure that that the White House will consider congressional preferences in a number of practical ways. Consider the possible consequences if the White House decides to proceed alone. First, Congress may alert the press that the White House is acting in a way that disserves legislative or public preferences. The media serves an important disciplining function in keeping the White House in line. Second, a reviewing court might be disinclined to uphold an agency policy in the face of congressional opposition. This is the ultimate role of the courts in mediating disputes between the political branches. Finally, Congress may have sufficient votes to cut the agency's budget or amend the agency's statutory mandate in response to an objectionable White House interpretation. This is the ultimate congressional tool. The administration might be willing to run these risks, winning some battles and losing others. n339 The point is that, [\*1811] as result of administrative law, the White House must calculate the cost of unilateral action.

Administrative law, viewed in this manner, is rooted in the political reality that Congress and the President often compete for control of agency action. Especially in times of divided government, Congress and the President are expected to be adversaries or at least wary partners. n340 Indeed, such competition is evident in the very design of regulatory statutes. Political scientists have shown that Congress is more likely to delegate authority when the President is from the same party. n341 During periods of divided government, Congress is less likely to delegate, and when it does delegate, it imposes more constraints on agency discretion and more limits on presidential control, passing power to independent commissions. n342 Administrative law operates on the assumption that political alignments may shift over time and that congressional preferences may diverge from presidential ones.

## EIS CP

#### Perm do both – shields the link to politics

#### Perm do the counterplan – the counterplan is not competitive – 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

#### **Should is not mandatory**

Atlas Collaboration 99

Use of shall, should, may can,” <http://rd13doc.cern.ch/Atlas/DaqSoft/sde/inspect/shall.html> ¶ In the expression of the requirements, shall describes something that is mandatory ; should is weaker. It describes something that might not be satisfied in the final product, but that is desirable enough that any non−compliance shall be explicitly justified ; may grants permission to do something, and makes only a weak statement.

#### Resolved is not part of the resolution

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing 2k [http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm]

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

#### Resolved can be an opinion not necessarily a determination

Webster’s 98 – Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary, 1998 [dictionary.com]

**Resolved:**¶5. To express, as an opinion or determination, by resolution and vote; to declare or decide by a formal vote; -- followed by a clause; as, the house resolved (or, it was resolved by the house) that no money should be apropriated (or, to appropriate no money).

#### Counterplan does not solve the case – no proof it will result in the plan – the EIS will not approve it

#### Counterplan causes years of delay

Greenwire 9 (3/24, http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2009/03/24/2)

If the economy flounders despite the massive stimulus package, don't blame the federal law that forces government agencies to review their projects' environmental impacts. So say National Environmental Policy Act experts like Nicholas Yost, who led the drafting of NEPA regulations during the Carter administration. The preparation of environmental impact statements under NEPA takes almost three-and-a-half years -- much longer than Yost and others say is needed. The process, they say, can be sped up with strict deadlines, strong leadership from agency chiefs and increased resources and personnel to do reviews.

#### No solvency – no authority

Rosenbaum 5 – Rosenbaum, Professor of Political Science at Univ of Florida, 5

[Walter A, Environmental Policymaking, Ed. Hatch, p202-203]

The impact of the EIS process on federal policymaking has been diminished by both Congress and the White House when political expediency and opportunity were compelling. Indeed, political intervention has been an important reason for federal circumvention of the NEPA process over the last several decades. This political intervention assumes several forms. For instance, legislators have increasingly used appropriations riders in the last decade to overturn federal public lands policies negotiated through the NEPA process among federal agencies, private interests, and state governments (Zellmer, 1997). President Clinton, in turn made numerous public land decisions, including National Park and National Monument designations, during his terms in office under authority of the American Antiquities Act (1906), which he asserted exempted the agencies with jurisdiction over such land from requirements of the NEPA process. Additionally, all federal agencies have rejected the nation – with consistent presidential approval – that the NEPA process should apply to their overseas actions as well as their domestic decisions. Thus, Department of Defense military installations pollute soil and groundwater throughout Europe without any NEPA review and, elsewhere abroad, “other federal agencies support actions such as hydroelectric development, mining, and pesticide spraying without informing the public – or learning themselves – of the environmental damages.

#### EIS causes public backlash, links to elections

Rosenbaum 5 – Professor of Political Science at Univ of Florida (Walter A, Environmental Policymaking, Ed. Hatch, p200-201)

In many instances, the EIS process is an early warning system for environmental advocacy and science communities, even though public involvement in the process is often more restrictive than its authors intended. The statutory and regulatory requirements for early public disclosure and review of the agency EIS statements often **provide interested and affected parties** with a translation of agency programs into comprehensible and relevant language which, in turn, incites political mobilization. This public disclosure is valuable not only to the Washington-based national organizations (that sometimes employ specialized staff for EIS oversight) but **especially to smaller state and local organizations otherwise lacking the resources** to acquire and interpret the complex and often (deliberately) mystifying, bureaucratic, syntax-adorning program descriptions.

#### Conflating national security with the EIS crushes environmentalism

Vest 1 (Gary, Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security – United States, Arms Control and the Environment, Ed. Guruswamy and Grillot, p. 235-236)

War is bad for the environment. Battlefields remain dangerous decades after combat. French and Belgian farmers still find unexploded ordnance from the First World War. The production of weapons affects the environment just as the production of other industrial products does. Modern weapons and other by-products of war can leave poi­sonous residue, with effects that last for years. Trying to achieve envi­ronmental or other goals through subterfuge will not, and ought not, work. The CTBT or some other treaty that constrains or flies in the face of the right of self-defense will fail. Historically, states have accepted defeat and occupation when the costs of fruitless fighting seemed too great. Sometimes, a different choice seemed better after the fact. 12 But no example comes to mind of a country refusing to engage in self-defense in order to avoid damaging the environment or refusing to use or manufacture a weapon, thought to be indis­pensable for defense, because it was environmentally destructive. Countries like the United States have the luxury of more choice in this regard than a poorer, smaller, technologically less advanced state having, nonetheless, precisely the same right to defend itself. Accordingly, one should continue to work to find appropriate, real­istic balances between the requirements of national security and those of environmental protection. Pursuing unrealistic goals, such as requir­ing environmental impact assessments in every case involving national security, will lead to ridicule and potentially important setbacks to the effort to encourage worldwide sensitivity to the need to protect the environment.

#### Obama is Velcro – he’ll get blame for the CP

Nicholas & Hook 10 Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro.¶ Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**.¶ Hoping to **better insulate Obama**, White House aides have sought to **give other Cabinet officials a higher profile** and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ **But Obama remains the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape¶ What's **not sticking to Obama** is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. **Political dividends** from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill **have been fleeting**.¶ Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."¶ Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration.¶ Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants.¶ Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole.¶ "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said.¶ But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish.¶ Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal."¶ Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise.¶ A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year.¶ At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways.¶ Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower.¶ Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize.¶ Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in.¶ "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit.¶ **Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible**. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. **Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss**.¶ But **the Obama administration is about one man**. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. **No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate**. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end.¶ So, **more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him**. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding.¶ Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times.¶ "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen."¶ A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions.¶ But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda.

#### Presidential leadership is key

Lugar 7 Richard, US Senator, “U.S. Energy Security and the 2008 Presidential Election,” 12/18,

http://www.brookings.edu/events/2007/~/media/files/events/2007/1218\_lugar/20071218\_lugar.pdf

Congress and private enterprise can make evolutionary energy advancements, but revolutionary national progress in the energy field probably is dependent on presidential action. Our energy dependence is perpetuated by a lack of national will and focus. Only the President has the visibility to elevate a cause to national status, and only the President can leverage the buying power, regulatory authority, and legislative leadership of an administration behind solving a problem that is highly conducive to political procrastination and partisanship.

## Farm Bill DA

#### High food prices are non-unique and empirically denied

Breaking Views 8 (4/15, Higher food prices will reduce poverty, http://www.livemint.com/2008/04/15235340/Higher-food-prices-will-reduce.html, AG)

Food prices have certainly seen a meteoric rise. The food price index calculated by the Food and Agriculture Organization, a United Nations body, shot up by 37% between December 2006 and December 2007. The World Bank estimates that global food prices have soared by 83% in the last three years. Some markets, notably for rice, have been seriously disrupted. The increases are a special shock because real food prices have fallen over the last 30 years. Several forces have driven prices up. Soaring energy prices have raised the cost of agricultural inputs such as fuel and fertilizers, and indirectly the price of equipment. Natural disasters such as drought in Australia have stretched markets further. Diversion of crops from food to ethanol production may have forced prices up as well.

#### Fiscal cliff is top of the docket after the election

Mak 10/24 Tim is a writer at Politico. “W.H.: Sequester talks after election,” <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1012/82845.html>

President Barack Obama wants to get into negotiations to resolve sequestration and the fiscal cliff **“right after the election,”** a senior White House adviser told reporters on Wednesday, following up on the president’s assertion that Washington could reach a “grand bargain” in “six months.”¶ Adviser David Plouffe told reporters on the campaign trail about Obama’s ambitions in response to follow-up questions about an interview the president gave the Des Moines Register, in which he said he thought Washington could resolve the “fiscal cliff” early in a potential second term.¶ "The good news is that there's going to be a forcing mechanism to deal with what is the central ideological argument in Washington right now ... when you combine the Bush tax cuts expiring, the sequester in place, the commitment of myself and my opponent ... we're going to be in a position where I believe in the first six months we are going to solve that big piece of business," Obama said.

#### Cyber-security pounds the link

Martinez 10-25-12, Jennifer, The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/hillicon-valley/technology/264149-cybersecurity-legislation-makes-panettas-lame-duck-to-do-list

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta on Thursday said passing cybersecurity legislation is one of the top priorities on his congressional to-do list during the lame-duck session, according to The Hill's Defcon Hill blog.¶ Speaking to reporters at the Pentagon, Panetta noted that the "full agenda" he outlined requires bipartisan cooperation. But cybersecurity legislation faces long odds of moving this year: Congress has been gridlocked on the issue since Senate Republicans blocked a sweeping cybersecurity bill in August. ¶ During a speech in New York to the Business Executives for National Security conference earlier this month, Panetta warned that the cyber threat facing the United States "is a pre-9/11 moment" and that a "destructive cyber-terrorist attack could virtually paralyze the nation."¶ Days after Panetta's comments, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said he wanted to take another shot at passing cybersecurity legislation this year and he plans to bring a bill to the floor in November. While both parties want to get a bill done on cybersecurity, they still haven't reached a compromise on legislation after the Senate bill failed this summer.

#### 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).

#### The House farm bill undoes all the benefits of the Senate bill and is ineffective

Tatham 12 – J ustin Tatham is the Senior Washington representative for the Food & Environment program, specializing in agriculture, food, and farm bill policy. Mr. Tatham served as the assistant director of government relations for the National Audubon Society. He has a B.A. in political science from the George Washington University. July 12th, 2012, "House Farm Bill Fails to Support Healthy Food and Farms,"www.ucsusa.org/news/press\_release/house-farm-bill-fails-to-support-healthy-farms-1373.html

"The House version of the Farm Bill negates the significant progress made in the Senate. Instead, the bill continues to perpetuate farm policies that disproportionately lavish subsidies on large-scale commodity crop producers and heavily processed foods, feed, and fuel instead of healthy food. The bill reverses progress on subsidy reform and instead allows even more generous subsidy payments for farmers instead of ratcheting down these payments as has been the trend.¶ "In terms of crop insurance, which primarily benefits commodity crops, the House bill weakened the new whole farm revenue insurance program that would benefit diversified, organic and healthy food farmers – who are critically important for expanding the production of healthy food. The bill also pulled funding for important rural development programs that help farmers produce food in local and regional markets.¶ "Organic agriculture is also unfairly singled out in this bill. The House bill would eliminate the National Organic Certification Cost Share Program, a program that provides much-needed assistance to organic farmers. Further, the bill fails to address the unnecessary insurance premium surcharge placed on organic producers.¶ "The bill backtracks on conservation by deepening cuts to important conservation programs, namely the Conservation Stewardship Program. It also fails to reestablish conservation compliance requirements for crop and revenue insurance programs, the main subsidy program for large scale, conventional agriculture in the Farm Bill."

#### No impact – empirically denied

The Gazette 10-1 – The Gazette, October 1st, 2012, "Expiration of farm bill should have little impact on Iowans" thegazette.com/2012/10/01/expiration-of-farm-bill-should-have-little-impact-on-iowans/

The expirationof the federal farm bill will be unpredictable for Iowa farmers. It will also be a hardship and an unnecessary burden.¶ But it won’t be new.¶ Twice before in recent history, in 1996 and 2007, Congress has failed to renew the bill, which expires every five years. The current bill expired on Sunday.¶ Congress adjourned Sept. 19 without renewing the bill, and won’t return to work until after the Nov. 6 election for a lame-duck session.¶ Congress had considered a short-term extension of the bill, between three months and a year, but the Republican-controlled House couldn’t even agree on that.

## Renewables DA

#### **Wind and solar are competitive despite low gas prices**

Lacey 12 – Stephen Lacey is a reporter for Climate Progress, where he writes on clean energy policy, technologies, and finance. Before joining CP, he was an editor/producer with RenewableEnergyWorld.com. He received his B.A. in journalism from Franklin Pierce University. February 21st, 2012, "Top Three Reasons Cheap Natural Gas Won't Kill Renewable Energy," thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/02/21/421319/top-three-reasons-cheap-natural-gas-wont-kill-renewable-energy/

The industry clearly took the challenge seriously. Today, due to bigger turbines, more reliable equipment and better materials, the cost of wind has dropped to record lows. In fact, some developers are even signing long-term power purchase agreements in the 3 cents a kilowatt-hour range. And last fall, Bloomberg New Energy Finance projected that wind would be “fully competitive with energy produced from combined-cycle gas turbines by 2016″ under fair wind conditions.¶ The same technological improvements and maturation in project development in wind are driving down the cost of solar PV as well. For example, in California, solar developers have signed contracts for power below the projected price of natural gas from a 500-MW combined cycle power plant. (That projection does include a carbon price).

#### **Cheap abundant natural gas is key to a renewables transition**

Doran 8-13 – Kevin Doran is an institute fellow and assistant research professor at the Renewable and Sustainable Energy Institute (RASEI), a joint institute of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and the University of Colorado at Boulder AND\*\*\* Adam Reed is a research associate at RASEI, August 13th, 2012, "Natural Gas and Its RoleIn the U.S.’s Energy Endgame" e360.yale.edu/feature/natural\_gas\_role\_in\_us\_energy\_endgame/2561/

Third, we should take advantage of cheap gas to **lower** the **integration costs of renewable energy**. We’ve all heard that the wind doesn’t blow and the sun doesn’t shine all the time. The rest of the power grid must be flexible enough to accommodate these energy sources when available. In other words, conventional, controllable generation should be able to **adjust its output to keep the grid balanced** when, for example, wind power output rises or falls. Natural gas is an excellent generation asset for this role. Indeed, it is a model “grid citizen” — **flexible, accommodating, and abundant**. Provided renewable energy maintains a strong presence in the generation portfolio, gas will automatically assume this role due to its low cost and high flexibility.¶ Renewable energy is often criticized as expensive and undependable, and thus undeserving of public support and subsidization. But the presence of abundant natural gas mitigates both of these factors ably. With cheap gas replacing coal, power system costs should decline over time anyway, leaving a chunk of savings that could be applied to renewables

MARK

investment with relatively low impact on consumer rates. The presence of additional gas-powered, system-balancing resources will further lower these costs, as well as **account for renewable energy’s natural variability**. Moreover, increasing concentrations of renewable energy will actually reduce its overall variability, since the net variability of a collection of many wind farms is lower than the variability of a single wind farm.

#### Asia pollution offsets any US action – global warming is inevitable

Knappenberger 12 – Mr. Paul Knappenberger is the Assistant Director of the Cato Institute’s Center for the Study of Science. He holds an M.S. degree in Environmental Sciences (1990) from the University of Virginia as well as a B.A. degree in Environmental Sciences (1986) from the same institution.His over 20 years of experience as a climate researcher have included 10 years with the Virginia State Climatology Office and 13 years with New Hope Environmental Services, Inc. June 7th, 2012, "Asian Air Pollution Warms U.S More than Our GHG Emissions (More futility for U.S. EPA)" www.masterresource.org/2012/06/asian-air-pollution-warming/

“The whims of foreign nations, not to mention Mother Nature, can completely offset any climate changes induced by U.S. greenhouse gas emissions reductions…. So, what’s the point of forcing Americans into different energy choices?”¶ A new study provides evidence that air pollution emanating from Asia will warm the U.S. as much or more than warming from U.S. greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The implication? **Efforts by the** U.S. **Environmental Protection Agency** (and otherwise) **to mitigate anthropogenic climate change is** moot.¶ If the future temperature rise in the U.S. is subject to the whims of Asian environmental and energy policy, then what sense does it make for Americans to have their energy choices regulated by efforts aimed at mitigating future temperature increases across the country—efforts which will have less of an impact on temperatures than the policies enacted across Asia?¶ Maybe **the EPA should reconsider the perceived effectiveness of its greenhouse gas emission regulations**—at least when it comes to impacting temperatures across the U.S.¶ New Study¶ A new study just published in the scientific journal Geophysical Research Letters is authored by a team led by Haiyan Teng from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, in Boulder, Colorado. The paper is titled “Potential Impacts of Asian Carbon Aerosols on Future US Warming.”¶ Skipping the details of this climate modeling study and cutting to the chase, here is the abstract of the paper:¶ This study uses an atmosphere-ocean fully coupled climate model to investigate possible remote impacts of Asian carbonaceous aerosols on US climate change. We took a 21st century mitigation scenario as a reference, and carried out three sets of sensitivity experiments in which the prescribed carbonaceous aerosol concentrations over a selected Asian domain are increased by a factor of two, six, and ten respectively during the period of 2005–2024.¶ The resulting enhancement of atmospheric solar absorption (only the direct effect of aerosols is included) over Asia induces tropospheric heating anomalies that force large-scale circulation changes which, averaged over the twenty-year period, **add as much as an** additional 0.4°C warming **over the eastern US during winter** and over most of the US during summer. Such remote impacts are confirmed by an atmosphere stand-alone experiment with specified heating anomalies over Asia that represent the direct effect of the carbon aerosols.¶ Usually, when considering the climate impact from carbon aerosol emissions (primarily in the form of black carbon, or soot), the effect is thought to be largely contained to the local or regional scale because the atmospheric lifetime of these particulates is only on the order of a week (before they are rained out). Since Asia lies on the far side of the Pacific Ocean—a distance which requires about a week for air masses to navigate—we usually aren’t overly concerned about the quality of Asian air or the quantity of junk that they emit into it. By the time it gets here, it has largely been naturally scrubbed clean.¶ But in the Teng et al. study, the authors find that, according to their climate model, the local heating of the atmosphere by the Asian carbon aerosols (which are quite good at absorbing sunlight) can **impart changes to the character of the larger-scale atmospheric circulation patterns.** And these changes to the broader atmospheric flow produce an effect on the weather patterns in the U.S. and thus induce a change in the climate here characterized by “0.4°C [surface air temperature] warming on average over the eastern US during winter and over almost the entire US during summer” averaged over the 2005–2024 period.¶ While most of the summer warming doesn’t start to kick in until Asian carbonaceous aerosol emissions are upped in the model to 10 times what they are today, the winter warming over the eastern half of the country is large (several tenths of a °C) even at twice the current rate of Asian emissions.¶ Now let’s revisit just how much “global warming” that stringent U.S. greenhouse gas emissions reductions may avoid averaged across the country.¶ In my Master Resource post “Climate Impacts of Waxman-Markey (the IPCC-based arithmetic of no gain)” I calculated that a more than 80% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. by the year 2050 would result in a reduction of global temperatures (from where they otherwise would be) of about 0.05°C. Since the U.S. is projected to warm slightly more than the global average (land warms faster than the oceans), a 0.05°C of global temperature reduction probably amounts to about 0.075°C of temperature “savings” averaged across the U.S., by the year 2050.¶ Comparing the amount of warming in the U.S. saved by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions by some 80% to the amount of warming added in the U.S. by increases in Asian black carbon (soot) aerosol emissions (at least according to Teng et al.) and there is no clear winner. Which points out the anemic effect that U.S. greenhouse gas reductions will have on the climate of the U.S. and **just how easily the whims of foreign nations, not to mention Mother Nature, can completely offset any climate changes induced by our greenhouse gas emissions reductions**.¶ And even if the traditional form of air pollution (e.g., soot) does not increase across Asia (a slim chance of that), greenhouse gases emitted there certainly will. For example, at the current growth rate, new greenhouse gas emissions from China will completely subsume an 80% reduction in U.S. greenhouse gas emission in just over a decade. Once again, pointing out that a reduction in domestic greenhouse gases is for naught, at least when it comes to mitigating climate change.¶ So, what’s the point, really, of forcing Americans into different energy choices? As I have repeatedly pointed out, nothing we do here (when it comes to greenhouse gas emissions) will make any difference either domestically, or globally, when it comes to influences on the climate. What the powers-that-be behind emissions reduction schemes in the U.S. are hoping for is that 1) it doesn’t hurt us too much, and 2) that China and other large developing nations will follow our lead.¶ Both outcomes seem dubious at time scales that make a difference.

#### No impact – warming will take centuries and adaptation solves

Mendelsohn 9 – Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

# Round 4

## Off

### 2AC FW

#### Anti-nuclear opposition is directly responsible for the spread of lethal coal fired plants throughout the US and the world; their alternative attempts to be the arbiter and enforcer of environmental purity which simply re-affirms the structural forces that make “black trash” possible in the form of Coal pollution and the looming risk of global warming

King ‘9 - Host and Executive Producer of “White House Chronicle” — a news and public affairs program airing on PBS

After 40 Years, Environmentalists Start To See the Nuclear Light, Llewellyn King, November 25, 2009 – 8:47 pm

Although very little happened, Nov. 24 was a red letter day for the nation’s nuclear power industry. No new nuclear reactors were purchased, no breakthrough in treating nuclear waste was announced, and the Obama administration did not declare that it would pay for new reactors.¶ Instead, the source of the industry’s happiness was The Washington Post leading Page One with an article that detailed how the environmental movement, after 40 years of bitter opposition, now concedes that nuclear power will play a role in averting further harm from global warming.¶ Mind you, not every environmental group has come around, but the feared and respected Natural Resources Defense Council has allowed that there is a place for nuclear power in the world’s generating mix and Stephen Tindale, a former anti-nuclear activist with Friends of the Earth in the United Kingdom, has said, yes, we need nuclear.¶ For the nuclear industry which has felt itself vilified, constrained and damaged by the ceaseless and sometimes pathological opposition of the environmental movement, this changing attitude is manna from on high.¶ No matter that the environmentalists, in opposing nuclear since the late 1960s, have critically wounded the U.S. reactor industry and contributed to the construction of scores of coal and gas-fired plants that would not have been built without their opposition to nuclear.¶ In short, the environmental movement contributed in no small way to driving electric utilities to the carbon fuels they now are seeking to curtail.¶ Nuclear was such a target of the environmental movement that it embraced the “anything but nuclear” policy with abandon. Ergo its enthusiasm for all forms of alternative energy and its spreading of the belief —still popular in left-wing circles — that wind and solar power, with a strong dose of conservation, is all that is needed.¶ A third generation of environmental activists, who have been preoccupied with global climate change, have come to understand that a substantial amount of new electric generation is needed. Also some environmentalists are beginning to be concerned about the visual impact of wind turbines, not to mention their lethality to bats and birds.¶ Of all of the deleterious impacts of modern life on the Earth, it is reasonable to ask why the environmentalists went after nuclear power. And why they were opposed to nuclear power even before the 1979 accident at Three Mile Island in Pennsylvania and the catastrophic 1986 Chernobyl reactor failure in Ukraine. Those deserved pause, but the movement had already indicted the entire nuclear enterprise.¶ Having written about nuclear energy since 1969, I have come to believe that the environmental movement seized on nuclear first because it was an available target for legitimate anger that had spawned the movement in the ’60s. The licensing of nuclear power plants gave the protesters of the time one of the only opportunities to affect public policy in energy. They seized it; at first timorously, and then with gusto.¶ The escalation in environmental targets tells the story of how the movement grew in confidence and expertise; and how it added political allies, like Ralph Nader and Rep. Ed Markey, D-Mass.¶ The first target was simply the plants’ cooling water heating up rivers and estuaries. That was followed by wild extrapolations of the consequences of radiation (mutated children). Finally, it settled on the disposition of nuclear waste; that one stuck, and was a lever that turned public opinion easily. Just mention the 240,000-year half-life of plutonium without mentioning how, as an alpha-emitter, it is easily contained.¶ It is not that we do not need an environmental movement. We do. It is just that sometimes it gets things wrong.¶ In the days of the Atomic Energy Commission, the environmental groups complained that it was policeman, judge and jury. Indeed.¶ But environmental groups are guilty of defining environmental virtue and then policing it, even when the result is a grave distortion, as in the nuclear imbroglio. Being both the arbiter of environmental purity and the enforcer has cost the environment 40 years when it comes to reducing greenhouse gases.

### 2AC – Warming

#### Global warming movements are coming now thanks to a decline in identity politics --- their strategy crushes those movements --- causes extinction

George Monbiot, English Writer and Environmental and Political Activist, 9-4-2008, “Identity Politics in Climate Change Hell,” http://www.celsias.com/article/identity-politics-climate-change-hell/

If you want a glimpse of how the movement against climate change could crumble faster than a summer snowflake, read Ewa Jasiewicz’s article , published on the Guardian’s Comment is Free site. It is a fine example of the identity politics that plagued direct action movements during the 1990s, and from which the new generation of activists has so far been mercifully free. Ewa rightly celebrates the leaderless, autonomous model of organising that has made this movement so effective. The two climate camps I have attended – this year and last – were among the most inspiring events I’ve ever witnessed. I am awed by the people who organised them, who managed to create, under extraordinary pressure, safe, functioning, delightful spaces in which we could debate the issues and plan the actions which thrust Heathrow and Kingsnorth into the public eye. Climate camp is a tribute to the anarchist politics that Jasiewicz supports. But in seeking to extrapolate from this experience to a wider social plan, she makes two grave errors. The first is to confuse ends and means. She claims to want to stop global warming, but she makes that task 100 times harder by rejecting all state and corporate solutions. It seems to me that what she really wants to do is to create an anarchist utopia, and use climate change as an excuse to engineer it. Stopping runaway climate change must take precedence over every other aim. Everyone in this movement knows that there is very little time: the window of opportunity in which we can prevent two degrees of warming is closing fast. We have to use all the resources we can lay hands on, and these must include both governments and corporations. Or perhaps she intends to build the installations required to turn the energy economy around - wind farms, wave machines, solar thermal plants in the Sahara, new grid connections and public transport systems - herself? Her article is a terryifying example of the ability some people have to put politics first and facts second when confronting the greatest challenge humanity now faces. The facts are as follows. Runaway climate change is bearing down on us fast. We require a massive political and economic response to prevent it. Governments and corporations, whether we like it or not, currently control both money and power. Unless we manage to mobilise them, we stand a snowball’s chance in climate hell of stopping the collapse of the biosphere. Jasiewicz would ignore all these inconvenient truths because they conflict with her politics. “Changing our sources of energy without changing our sources of economic and political power”, she asserts, “will not make a difference. Neither coal nor nuclear are the “solution”, we need a revolution.” So before we are allowed to begin cutting greenhouse gas emissions, we must first overthrow all political structures and replace them with autonomous communities of happy campers. All this must take place within a couple of months, as there is so little time in which we could prevent two degrees of warming. This is magical thinking of the most desperate kind. If I were an executive of E.On or Exxon, I would be delighted by this political posturing, as it provides a marvellous distraction from our real aims. To support her argument, Jasiewicz misrepresents what I said at climate camp. She claims that I “confessed not knowing where to turn next to solve the issues of how to generate the changes necessary to shift our sources of energy, production and consumption”. I confessed nothing of the kind. In my book Heat I spell out what is required to bring about a 90% cut in emissions by 2030. Instead I confessed that I don’t know how to solve the problem of capitalism without resorting to totalitarianism. The issue is that capitalism involves lending money at interest. If you lend at 5%, then one of two things must happen. Either the money supply must increase by 5% or the velocity of circulation must increase by 5%. In either case, if this growth is not met by a concomitant increase in the supply of goods and services, it becomes inflationary and the system collapses. But a perpetual increase in the supply of goods and services will eventually destroy the biosphere. So how do we stall this process? Even when usurers were put to death and condemned to perpetual damnation, the practice couldn’t be stamped out. Only the communist states managed it, through the extreme use of the state control Ewa professes to hate. I don’t yet have an answer to this conundrum. Does she? Yes, let us fight both corporate power and the undemocratic tendencies of the state. Yes, let us try to crack the problem of capitalism and then fight for a different system. But let us not confuse this task with the immediate need to stop two degrees of warming, or allow it to interfere with the carbon cuts that have to begin now. Ewa’s second grave error is to imagine that society could be turned into a giant climate camp. Anarchism is a great means of organising a self-elected community of like-minded people. It is a disastrous means of organising a planet. Most anarchists envisage their system as the means by which the oppressed can free themselves from persecution. But if everyone is to be free from the coercive power of the state, this must apply to the oppressors as well as the oppressed. The richest and most powerful communities on earth - be they geographical communities or communities of interest - will be as unrestrained by external forces as the poorest and weakest. As a friend of mine put it, “when the anarchist utopia arrives, the first thing that will happen is that every Daily Mail reader in the country will pick up a gun and go and kill the nearest hippy.” This is why, though both sides furiously deny it, the outcome of both market fundamentalism and anarchism, if applied universally, is identical. The anarchists associate with the oppressed, the market fundamentalists with the oppressors. But by eliminating the state, both remove such restraints as prevent the strong from crushing the weak. Ours is not a choice between government and no government. It is a choice between government and the mafia. Over the past year I have been working with groups of climate protesters who have changed my view of what could be achieved. Most of them are under 30, and they bring to this issue a clear-headedness and pragmatism that I have never encountered in direct action movements before. They are prepared to take extraordinary risks to try to defend the biosphere from the corporations, governments and social trends which threaten to make it uninhabitable. They do so for one reason only: that they love the world and fear for its future. It would be a tragedy if, through the efforts of people like Ewa, they were to be diverted from this urgent task into the identity politics that have wrecked so many movements.

#### Allowing warming to continue perpetuates racist inequalities

Hoerner 8**—**Former director of Research at the Center for a Sustainable Economy, Director of Tax Policy at the Center for Global Change at the University of Maryland College Park, and editor of Natural Resources Tax Review. He has done research on environmental economics and policy on behalf of the governments of Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United States. Andrew received his B.A. in Economics from Cornell University and a J.D. from Case Western Reserve School of Law—AND—Nia Robins—former inaugural Climate Justice Corps Fellow in 2003, director of Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative (J. Andrew, “A Climate of Change African Americans, Global Warming, and a Just Climate Policy for the U.S.” July 2008, http://www.ejcc.org/climateofchange.pdf)

Everywhere we turn, the issues and impacts of climate change confront us. One of the most serious environmental threats facing the world today, climate change has moved from the minds of scientists and offices of environmentalists to the mainstream. Though the media is dominated by images of polar bears, melting glaciers, flooded lands, and arid desserts, there is a human face to this story as well. Climate change is not only an issue of the environment; it is also an issue of justice and human rights, one that dangerously intersects race and class. All over the world people of color, Indigenous Peoples and low-income communities bear disproportionate burdens from climate change itself, from ill-designed policies to prevent it, and from side effects of the energy systems that cause it. A Climate of Change explores the impacts of climate change on African Americans, from health to economics to community, and considers what policies would most harm or benefit African Americans—and the nation as a whole. African Americans are thirteen percent of the U.S. population and on average emit nearly twenty percent less greenhouse gases than non-Hispanic whites per capita. Though far less responsible for climate change, African Americans are significantly more vulnerable to its effects than non- Hispanic whites. Health, housing, economic well-being, culture, and social stability are harmed from such manifestations of climate change as storms, floods, and climate variability. African Americans are also more vulnerable to higher energy bills, unemployment, recessions caused by global energy price shocks, and a greater economic burden from military operations designed to protect the flow of oil to the U.S. Climate Justice: The Time Is Now Ultimately, accomplishing climate justice will require that new alliances are forged and traditional movements are transformed. An effective policy to address the challenges of global warming cannot be crafted until race and equity are part of the discussion from the outset and an integral part of the solution. This report finds that: Global warming amplifies nearly all existing inequalities. Under global warming, injustices that are already unsustainable become catastrophic. Thus it is essential to recognize that all justice is climate justice and that the struggle for racial and economic justice is an unavoidable part of the fight to halt global warming. Sound global warming policy is also economic and racial justice policy. Successfully adopting a sound global warming policy will do as much to strengthen the economies of low-income communities and communities of color as any other currently plausible stride toward economic justice. Climate policies that best serve African Americans also best serve a just and strong United States. This paper shows that policies well-designed to benefit African Americans also provide the most benefit to all people in the U.S. Climate policies that best serve African Americans and other disproportionately affected communities also best serve global economic and environmental justice. Domestic reductions in global warming pollution and support for such reductions in developing nations financed by polluter-pays principles provide the greatest benefit to African Americans, the peoples of Africa, and people across the Global South. A distinctive African American voice is critical for climate justice. Currently, legislation is being drafted, proposed, and considered without any significant input from the communities most affected. Special interests are represented by powerful lobbies, while traditional environmentalists often fail to engage people of color, Indigenous Peoples, and low-income communities until after the political playing field has been defined and limited to conventional environmental goals. A strong focus on equity is essential to the success of the environmental cause, but equity issues cannot be adequately addressed by isolating the voices of communities that are disproportionately impacted. Engagement in climate change policy must be moved from the White House and the halls of Congress to social circles, classrooms, kitchens, and congregations. The time is now for those disproportionately affected to assume leadership in the climate change debate, to speak truth to power, and to assert rights to social, environmental and economic justice. Taken together, these actions affirm a vital truth that will bring communities together: Climate Justice is Common Justice. African Americans and Vulnerability In this report, it is shown that African Americans are disproportionately affected by climate change. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Climate Change and Global Warming Co-Pollutants ¶ • The six states with the highest African American population are all in the Atlantic hurricane zone, and are expected to experience more intense storms resembling Katrina and Rita in the future. ¶ • Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of heat waves or extreme heat events. African Americans suffer heat death at one hundred fifty to two hundred percent of the rate for non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Seventy-one percent of African Americans live in counties in violation of federal air pollution standards, as compared to fifty-eight percent of the white population. Seventy-eight percent of African Americans live within thirty miles of a coal-fired power plant, as compared to fifty-six percent of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Asthma has strong associations with air pollution, and African Americans have a thirty-six percent higher rate of incidents of asthma than whites. Asthma is three times as likely to lead to emergency room visits or deaths for African Americans. ¶ • This study finds that a twenty-five percent reduction in greenhouse gases—similar to what passed in California and is proposed in major federal legislation—would reduce infant mortality by at least two percent, asthma by at least sixteen percent, and mortality from particulates by at least 6,000 to 12,000 deaths per year. Other estimates have run as high as 33,000 fewer deaths per year. A disproportionate number of the lives saved by these proposed reductions would be African American. African Americans Are Economically More Vulnerable to Disasters and Illnesses ¶ • In 2006, twenty percent of African Americans had no health insurance, including fourteen percent of African American children—nearly twice the rate of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • In the absence of insurance, disasters and illness (which will increase with global warming) could be cushioned by income and accumulated wealth. However, the average income of African American households is fifty-seven percent that of non-Hispanic whites, and median wealth is only one-tenth that of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Racist stereotypes have been shown to reduce aid donations and impede service delivery to African Americans in the wake of hurricanes, floods, fires and other climate-related disasters as compared to non-Hispanic whites in similar circumstances. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Energy Price Shocks ¶ • African Americans spend thirty percent more of their income on energy than non-Hispanic whites. • Energy price increases have contributed to seventy to eighty percent of recent recessions. The increase in unemployment of African Americans during energy caused recessions is twice that of non-Hispanic whites, costing the community an average of one percent of income every year. • Reducing economic dependence on energy will alleviate the frequency and severity of recessions and the economic disparities they generate. African Americans Pay a Heavy Price and a Disproportionate Share of the Cost of Wars for Oil • Oil company profits in excess of the normal rate of profit for U.S. industries cost the average household $611 in 2006 alone and are still rising. • The total cost of the war in Iraq borne by African Americans will be $29,000 per household if the resulting deficit is financed by tax increases, and $32,000 if the debt is repaid by spending cuts. This is more than three times the median assets of African American households. A Clean Energy Future Creates Far More Jobs for African Americans • Fossil fuel extraction industries employ a far lower proportion of African Americans on average compared to other industries. Conversely, renewable electricity generation employs three to five times as many people as comparable electricity generation from fossil fuels, a higher proportion of whom are African American. ¶ • Switching just one percent of total electricity generating capacity per year from conventional to renewable sources would result in an additional 61,000 to 84,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030. ¶ • A well-designed comprehensive climate plan achieving emission reductions comparable to the Kyoto Protocol would create over 430,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030, reducing the African American unemployment rate by 1.8 percentage points and raising the average African American income by 3 to 4 percent.

### Perm do both

#### Continued reliance on coal kills 13,000 people every year and spreads hazardous pollution

Zelman 11 Joanna, The Huffington Post, "Power Plant Air Pollution Kills 13,000 People Per Year, Coal-Fired Are Most Hazardous: ALA Report", 3/15, www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/14/power-plant-air-pollution-coal-kills\_n\_833385.html

The American Lung Association (ALA) recently released a new report on the dramatic health hazards surrounding coal-fired power plants.¶ The report, “Toxic Air: The Case For Cleaning Up Coal-Fired Power Plants,” reveals the dangers of air pollution emitted by coal plants.¶ One of the starkest findings in the report claims, “Particle pollution from power plants is estimated to kill approximately 13,000 people a year.”¶ So what's the biggest culprit?¶ “Coal-fired power plants that sell electricity to the grid produce more hazardous air pollution in the U.S. than any other industrial pollution sources.” According to the report details, over 386,000 tons of air pollutants are emitted from over 400 plants in the U.S. per year. Interestingly, while most of the power plants are located in the Midwest and Southeast, the entire nation is threatened by their toxic emissions.¶ An ALA graph shows that while pollutants such as acid gases stay in the local area, metals such as lead and arsenic travel beyond state lines, and fine particulate matter has a global impact. In other words, while for some workers the pollution may be a tradeoff for employment at a plant, other regions don’t reap the same benefits, but still pay for the costs to their health.¶ The report connected specific pollutants with their health effects. According to the ALA, 76% of U.S. acid gas emissions, which are known to irritate breathing passages, come from coal-fired power plants. Out of all industrial sources, these plants are also the biggest emitter of airborne mercury, which can become part of the human food chain through fish and wildlife -- high mercury levels are linked to brain damage, birth defects, and damage to the nervous system. Overall, air pollutants from coal plants can cause heart attacks, strokes, lung cancer, birth defects, and premature death.¶ The American Lung Association isn’t the only group to connect coal plants with death and illness. A recent study released in the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences found that, due in large part to health problems, coal costs the U.S. $500 billion per year. Specifically, the study found that the health costs of cancer, lung disease, and respiratory illnesses connected to pollutant emissions totaled over $185 billion per year.

#### Coal fired power plants perpetuate eco-racism all across our communities in Chicago – speaking out about the health consequences of coal pollution is essential to persuade our neighbors about the risks of coal

Arriaga ‘11 – Greenpeace Volunteer and Local Chicagoan

Faces of Chicago's coal fight, August 5, 2011, This is a guest blog by Luis Arriaga, a Greenpeace volunteer leader in Chicago

http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/news-and-blogs/campaign-blog/faces-of-chicagos-coal-fight/blog/36253/

Growing up next to a state park was a blessing. I got to experience nature first hand, but there is something off about Silver Springs State Park. Giant power line towers went up through the park sometime in my childhood. Power lines that can most likely be traced back to one of Chicago's two coal power plants. While I got the benefit of relatively clean air, the children who live around where those power lines start didn't.¶ My name is Luis Arriaga. I grew up in the far southwest suburbs of Chicago. I am a 23-year-old journalism student at Columbia College entering my last semester. I chose to get involved with Greenpeace in Chicago to actively engage others in the fight against the dirty air every Chicagoan breathes. It's one thing to write about the battle for clean air and another to actually be at the forefront speaking to people one on one about the root causes of the dangerous quality of air entire communities in Chicago are forced to bear.¶ Being a first time volunteer for Greenpeace at such a crucial moment in the history of Chicago has left me thankful. Thankful for Greenpeace and the grassroots organizations in Chicago that have fought the Crawford and Fisk power plants for so long.¶ Last week, sitting through a city hall meeting with 150 people in support of the Clean Power Ordinance was inspiring. People in green tee shirts showed up in droves to show support for shutting down these dirty old coal plants and build a healthier future in Chicago.¶ I was inspired by people my age like Stephanie Dunn, who has committed to a five-day hunger strike for the ordinance. She was on day three of her strike in Chicago's Daley Plaza when I spoke with her for the first time.¶ She isn't out there representing any one organization; she's out on her own terms. She has set her own agenda. Dunn has lived in both Pilsen and Little Village; the two neighborhoods home to Chicago's Crawford and Fisk coal power plants. She knows just how severe the health consequences of having two coal-powered plants are for the communities they inhabit. She believes that allowing them to continue at full capacity would be to continue a form of eco-racism.

### Wilderson

#### Blacks aren’t ontologically dead and Wilderson offers no alternative

SAËR MATY BÂ, teaches film at Portsmouth University, September 2011 "The US Decentred: From Black Social Death to Cultural Transformation" book review of Red, Black & White: Cinema and the Structure of US Antagonisms and Mama Africa: Reinventing Blackness in Bahia, Cultural Studies Review volume 17 number 2 http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/csrj/index pp. 381–91

Red, White and Black is particularly undermined by Wilderson’s propensity for exaggeration and blinkeredness. In chapter nine, ‘“Savage” Negrophobia’, he writes:¶ The philosophical anxiety of Skins is all too aware that through the Middle Passage, African culture became Black ‘style’ ... Blackness can be placed and displaced with limitless frequency and across untold territories, by whoever so chooses. Most important, there is nothing real Black people can do to either check or direct this process ... Anyone can say ‘nigger’¶ because anyone can be a ‘nigger’. (235)7¶ Similarly, in chapter ten, ‘A Crisis in the Commons’, Wilderson addresses the issue of ‘Black time’. Black is irredeemable, he argues, because, at no time in history had it been deemed, or deemed through the right historical moment and place. In other words, the black moment and place are not right because they are ‘the ship hold of the Middle Passage’: ‘the most coherent temporality ever deemed as Black time’ but also ‘the “moment” of no time at all on the map of no place at all’. (279)¶ Not only does Pinho’s more mature analysis expose this point as preposterous (see below), I also wonder what Wilderson makes of the countless historians’ and sociologists’ works on slave ships, shipboard insurrections and/during the Middle Passage,8 or of groundbreaking jazz‐studies books on cross‐cultural dialogue like The Other Side of Nowhere (2004). Nowhere has another side, but once Wilderson theorises blacks as socially and ontologically dead while dismissing jazz as ‘belonging nowhere and to no one, simply there for the taking’, (225) there seems to be no way back. It is therefore hardly surprising that Wilderson ducks the need to provide a solution or alternative to both his sustained bashing of blacks and anti‐ Blackness.9 Last but not least, Red, White and Black ends like a badly plugged announcement of a bad Hollywood film’s badly planned sequel: ‘How does one deconstruct life? Who would benefit from such an undertaking? The coffle approaches with its answers in tow.’ (340)

### USFG Simulation Good

#### State focused nuclear power solutions key

Nordhaus 11, chairman – Breakthrough Instiute, and Shellenberger, president – Breakthrough Insitute, MA cultural anthropology – University of California, Santa Cruz, 2/25/‘11

(Ted and Michael, <http://thebreakthrough.org/archive/the_long_death_of_environmenta>)

Tenth, we are going to have to get over our suspicion of technology, especially nuclear power. There is **no credible path** to reducing global carbon emissions without an enormous expansion of nuclear power. It is the only low carbon technology we have today with the demonstrated capability to generate large quantities of centrally generated electrtic power. It is the low carbon of technology of choice for much of the rest of the world. Even uber-green nations, like Germany and Sweden, have reversed plans to phase out nuclear power as they have begun to reconcile their energy needs with their climate commitments. Eleventh, we will need to embrace again the role of the state as a direct provider of public goods. The modern environmental movement, borne of the new left rejection of social authority of all sorts, has embraced the notion of state regulation and even creation of private markets while largely rejecting the generative role of the state. In the modern environmental imagination, government promotion of technology - whether nuclear power, the green revolution, synfuels, or ethanol - almost always ends badly. Never mind that virtually the entire history of American industrialization and technological innovation is the story of government investments in the development and commercialization of new technologies. Think of a transformative technology over the last century - computers, the Internet, pharmaceutical drugs, jet turbines, cellular telephones, nuclear power - and what you will find is government investing in those technologies at a scale that private firms simply cannot replicate. Twelveth, big is beautiful. The rising economies of the developing world will continue to develop whether we want them to or not. The solution to the ecological crises wrought by modernity, technology, and progress will be more modernity, technology, and progress. The solutions to the ecological challenges faced by a planet of 6 billion going on 9 billion will not be decentralized energy technologies like solar panels, small scale organic agriculture, and a drawing of unenforceable boundaries around what remains of our ecological inheritance, be it the rainforests of the Amazon or the chemical composition of the atmosphere. Rather, these solutions will be: large central station power technologies that can meet the energy needs of billions of people increasingly living in the dense mega-cities of the global south without emitting carbon dioxide, further intensification of industrial scale agriculture to meet the nutritional needs of a population that is not only growing but eating higher up the food chain, and a whole suite of new agricultural, desalinization and other technologies for gardening planet Earth that might allow us not only to pull back from forests and other threatened ecosystems but also to create new ones. The New Ecological Politics The great ecological challenges that our generation faces demands an ecological politics that is **generative, not restrictive.** An ecological politics capable of addressing global warming will require us to reexamine virtually every prominent strand of post-war green ideology. From Paul Erlich's warnings of a population bomb to The Club of Rome's "Limits to Growth," contemporary ecological politics have consistently embraced green Malthusianism despite the fact that the Malthusian premise has persistently failed for the better part of three centuries. Indeed, the green revolution was exponentially increasing agricultural yields at the very moment that Erlich was predicting mass starvation and the serial predictions of peak oil and various others resource collapses that have followed have continue to fail. This does not mean that Malthusian outcomes are impossible, but neither are they inevitable. **We do have a choice** in the matter, but it is not the choice that greens have long imagined. The choice that humanity faces is not whether to constrain our growth, development, and aspirations or die. It is whether we will continue to innovate and accelerate technological progress in order to thrive. Human technology and ingenuity have repeatedly confounded Malthusian predictions yet green ideology continues to cast a suspect eye towards the very technologies that have allowed us to avoid resource and ecological catastrophes. But such solutions will require environmentalists to abandon the "small is beautiful" ethic that has also characterized environmental thought since the 1960's. We, the most secure, affluent, and thoroughly modern human beings to have ever lived upon the planet, must abandon both the dark, zero-sum Malthusian visions and the idealized and nostalgic fantasies for a simpler, more bucolic past in which humans lived in harmony with Nature.

**Reform the state solves their turns—rejection fails**

**Habermas 98** [Jürgen Habermas teaches philosophy at the University of Frankfurt, “The European Nation-State: On the Past and Future of Sovereignty and Citizenship,” Public Culture10(2): 397–416]

Talk of overcoming the nation-state is ambiguous. On one reading—let us call it the postmodern—the end of the nation-state also marks the end of the project of civic autonomy, which, on this view, has in any case hopelessly overdrawn its credit. According to the other, nondefeatist reading, the project of a society that is capable of learning and of consciously shaping itself through its political will is still viable even after the demise of a world of nation-states. The dispute concerns the normative self-understanding of the democratic constitutional state. Can we still identify with it in an era of globalization, or must we renounce it as a cherished, though obsolete, relic of the old Europe? If not only the nation-state has run its course but along with it all forms of political integration, then individual citizens are abandoned to a world of anonymously interconnected networks in which they must choose between systemicallygenerated options in accordance with their preferences. In this postpolitical world, the multinational corporation becomes the model for all conduct. The impotence of a normatively guided politics in the face of an increasingly independent global economic system appears, from a systems-theoretical perspective at any rate, only as a special case of a more general development. Its vanishing point is a completely decentered world society that splinters into a disordered mass of self-reproducing and self-steering functional systems. Like Hobbesian individuals in the state of nature, these systems form environments for one another. They no longer speak a common language. Lacking a universe of intersubjectively shared meanings, they merely observe one another and behave toward one another in accordance with imperatives of self-preservation. J. M. Guéhenno depicts this anonymous world from the perspective of individual citizens who have become detached from the obsolete solidarity of democratic communities and must now orient themselves in the chaotic bustle of mutually adapting functional systems. These “new” human beings have sloughed off the illusory self-understanding of modernity. The neoliberal inspiration of this Hellenistic vision is all too clear. The autonomy of the citizen is unceremoniously stripped of the moral components of democratic self-determination and pared back to private autonomy: “Like the Roman citizen of the time of Caracalla, the citizen of the imperial age of the networks deﬁnes himself less and less by his participation in the exercise of sovereignty and more and more by the possibility he has to act in a framework in which the procedures obey clear and predictable rules. . . . It matters little whether a norm is imposed by a private enterprise or by a committee of bureaucrats. It is no longer the expression of sovereignty but simply something that reduces uncertainties, a means of lowering the cost of transactions, of increasing transparency.”11Through a perverse play on Hegel’s polemic against the administrative state (Not- und Verstandesstaat), the democratic state is replaced by a “state of law deprived of all philosophical reference to natural law, reduced to an ensemble of rules with no other basis than the daily administered proof of its smooth functioning.”12 Norms that are both effective andresponsive to expectations of popular sovereignty and human rights are replaced—under the guise of a “logic of networks”—by the invisible hand of supposedly spontaneously regulated processes of the global economy. However, these mechanisms, which are insensitive to external costs, do not exactly inspire conﬁdence. This is true at any rate of the two best-known examples of global self-regulation. The “balance of powers” on which the international system was based for three hundred years collapsed between the First and Second World Wars, if not before. Without an international court and a supranational sanctioning power, international law could not be invoked and enforced like state law. However, conventional morality and the “ethics” of dynastic relations ensured a certain level of normative regulation of warfare. In the twentieth century, total war has destroyed even this weak normative framework. The advanced state of weapons technology, the arms buildup, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction have made abundantly clear the risks inherent in this anarchy of powers unregulated by any invisible hand.13The founding of the League of Nations was the ﬁrst attempt at least to domesticate the unpredictable dynamic of power relations within a collective security system. With the foundation of the United Nations, a second attempt was made to set up supranational political agencies responsible for instituting peace on a global scale. With the end of the bipolar balance of terror, the prospect of a “global domestic politics” (Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker) seems to have opened up, in spite of all the setbacks in the ﬁeld of international human rights and security policy. The failure of the anarchistic balance of power has at least made evident the desirability of political interventions and arrangements. Similar observations hold true for the other prime example of spontaneous self-regulation. Obviously, even the global market cannot be managed exclusively by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund if the asymmetrical interdependence between the OECD countries and the marginalized countries that have not yet developed self-sustaining economies is to be overcome. The conclusion reached by the recent U.N. global summit on social problems in Copenhagen is unsettling. There is a lack of competent agencies on the international level which would have the power to agree on the necessary arrangements, procedures, and political frameworks. Not only the disparities between north and south call for such cooperation but also the drop in standards of living in the wealthy North Atlantic countries, where social policies restricted to the nation-state are powerless to deal with the effects of lower wages on globalized and rapidly expanding labor markets. The lack of supranational agencies is especially acute when it comes to dealing with the ecological problems that were addressed from a global perspective at the Earth Summit in Rio. A more peaceful and just political and economic world order is unthinkable without international institutions capable of taking initiatives, and above all without harmony among the continental regimes that are today just emerging, and without the kind of policies that could only be carried out under pressure from a mobilized global civil society. This tends to support the competing reading according to which the nationstate should be “**transformed” rather than abolished**. But could its normative content then be preserved, too? The optimistic vision of supranational agencies that would empower the United Nations and its regional organizations to institute a new political and economic world order is clouded by the troubling question of whether democratic opinion- and will-formation could ever achieve a binding force that extends beyond the level of the nation-state.

Political systems historically constituted by white supremacy are not inevitably oppressive and don’t require abolishing America---setting the goal of the alternative as ending America and white supremacy entirely is politically ineffective---reforming whiteness to resolve the impacts of oppression is better

Sullivan 8 – Shannon Sullivan, Head of Philosophy and Professor of Philosophy, Women's Studies, and African and African American Studies at Pennsylvania State University, Spring 2008, “Whiteness as Wise Provincialism: Royce and the Rehabilitation of a Racial Category,” Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society: A Quarterly Journal in American Philosophy, Vol. 44, No. 2

It is commonly acknowledged today, at least in academic circles, that racial essences do not exist. Racial categories, including whiteness, are historical and political products of human activity, and for that reason the human racial landscape has changed [End Page 236] over time and likely will continue to change in the future. In the wake of this acknowledgement, critical race theorists and philosophers of race debate whether whiteness must be eliminated for racial oppression to be ended. Given whiteness’s history as a category of violent racial exclusion, eliminativists and “new abolitionists” have argued that it must be abolished. If “whiteness is one pole of an unequal relationship, which can no more exist without oppression than slavery could exist without slaves,” then as long as whiteness endures, so does racial oppression.2 In contrast, critical conservationists have claimed even though it has an oppressive past, whiteness could entail something other than racism and oppression. Moreover, since lived existential categories like whiteness cannot be merely or quickly eliminated, white people should work to transform whiteness into an anti-racist category.

I count myself as a critical conservationist, but I also acknowledge the force of eliminativist arguments. If whiteness necessarily involves racist oppression, then attempting to transform whiteness into an anti-racist category would be a fool’s game at best, and a covert continuance of white supremacy at worst. My goal here is not to rehearse the disagreement between new abolitionists and critical conservationists; excellent work explaining the details of their positions already exists.3 I instead approach that disagreement by asking the pragmatic question of whether a rehabilitated version of whiteness can be worked out concretely. What would a non-oppressive, anti-racist whiteness look like? What difference would or could it make to the lives of white and non-white people? If the question of how to transform whiteness cannot be answered in some practical detail—if it’s not a difference that makes a difference—then critical conservatism would amount to a hopeful, but ultimately harmful abstraction that makes no difference in lived experience and that damages anti-racist movements. In that case, abolitionism would appear to be the only alternative to ongoing white supremacy and privilege.

I propose turning to Josiah Royce for help with these issues, more specifically to his essay on “Provincialism.”4 This turn is not as surprising as it might initially seem given that Royce wrote explicitly about race in “Race Questions and Prejudices.”5 In that essay, Royce issued an anti-racist, anti-essentialist challenge to then-current scientific studies of race, especially anthropology and ethnology, which claim to prove the superiority of white people, and he even briefly but explicitly names whiteness a possible threat to the future of humanity. 6 I focus here on “Provincialism,” however, because even though the essay never explicitly discusses race, it can help explain the ongoing need for the category of whiteness and implicitly offers a wealth of useful suggestions for how to transform it. “Provincialism” is an exercise in critical conservation of the concept of provincialism, and while not identical, provincialism and whiteness share enough in common that “wise” provincialism can serve [End Page 237] as a model for developing “wise” whiteness.7 Royce’s essay thus can be of great help to critical philosophers of race wrestling with questions of whether and how to transformatively conserve whiteness. Exploring similarities and differences between wise provincialism and wise whiteness, I use Royce’s analyses of provincialism to shed light on why whiteness should be rehabilitated rather than discarded and how white people today might begin living whiteness as an anti-racist category.

### Ethics

#### Putting ethics above politics replicates imperialism of old – it means ethical principles become the basis for violent interventions. Only a prioritization of ethics above politics enables us to kill for our principles.

Robert Meister, Professor of Politics at UC-Santa Cruz, 2005, Postmodern Culture, Vol. 15, No. 2

Since the fall of communism, there has been a growing literature on the responsibility of the "world community" to "never again" stand by while neighbors commit atrocities against neighbors (Power, "Never Again").[1](file:///C:\\Documents%20and%20Settings\\Jeff%20Buntin\\My%20Documents\\Texts%20-%20Articles\\Agamben%20and%20Biopolitics\\Meister%20-%20Agamben,%20Levinas,%20Badiou%20and%20Humanitarianism.htm" \l "foot1#foot1) This literature has yet to be reformulated as a comprehensive political theory of the recent fin de siècle, but it is already clear that such a theory would base a global politics of human rights on an ethical commitment to view local cruelties, and especially the infliction of physical suffering, as an uncontestable evil, the prevention of which can justify external intervention in ways that earlier forms of imperialism did not. The interstate system still exists, of course, and is supported by a United Nations charter that prohibits unilateral invasions of one state by another. But from the standpoint of the advancing theory of humanitarian intervention this is now merely a practical obstacle, making it advisable (but not essential) for a state intervening in another on purely ethical grounds to claim the support of a multilateral coalition as a proxy for the world community itself. At the level of theory, if not yet of practice, the subject matter of global politics is already focused on humanitarian intervention to stop atrocities committed at the local level. Thus the primacy of the global over the local (which was once the basis of political imperialism) is now ostensibly humanized and offset by the primacy of the ethical over the political: an ethics that concerns the cruelties that groups inflict on others in close proximity, and a politics surrounding the responsibility of third parties to intervene in response to those cruelties.

I am not here making the point that such humanitarian interventions can involve violence committed at a distance, though they often do. The intervention to prevent the proximate violence by Kosovar Serbs against their Albanian neighbors consisted largely of the NATO bombing of Serbian cities. Both the ethnic cleansing of neighbors and the aerial bombardment of cities are prima facie violations of modern humanitarian law, and both are the subject of separate trials now underway in The Hague. These trials demonstrate the twentieth-century paradox that bombing is both the quintessential means of intervention to stop barbarity at a local level and the paradigm of barbarity inflicted at a distance (see Lindqvist, A History of Bombing).

My topic is not whether the "world community" should have (at least) bombed Auschwitz or Rwanda when the genocides there became known, but rather the conception of ethics and politics that underlies such dilemmas. According to this conception, bombing (like foreign occupation) can be a justifiable form of political intervention by third parties when preceded by gross ethical barbarities occurring among neighbors. The ethical condemnation of atrocity, if not the atrocity itself, must here precede political intervention. Contemporary humanitarian practice requires such a sequence because it is based on the premise that, in theory too, ethics comes before politics. The opposing position--putting politics before ethics--is now commonly derided as the error shared by right and left throughout the twentieth century, an era of revolution and counterrevolution in which individuals were exquisitely sensitive to the suffering of their comrades and insensitive to pain inflicted on their foes (see Glover and Rummel). This is what politics is, Carl Schmitt argues--a selective antidote to humanitarian pathos that makes it ultimately possible to kill (and die) for the sake of countrymen or comrades (Concept of the Political 71). The emergent literature on human rights implicitly shares Schmitt's "concept of the political," and for this very reason gives primacy to the ethical as a refusal to withhold one's empathy selectively on political grounds.

## Case

#### SMRs are a significant safety upgrade---no need for outside electricity, deals with earthquakes and better waste storage

Rosner and Goldberg 11 Robert, William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics, and Physics, and the College; Senior Fellow, Computation Institute; Director, Energy Policy Institute; Enrico Fermi Institute; Harris School of Public Policy and Stephen, Special Assistant to the Director, Argonne National Laboratory, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago The Harris School of Public Policy Studies, "Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.", November, https://epic.sites.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/EPICSMRWhitePaperFinalcopy.pdf

While the focus in this paper is on the business case for SMRs, the safety case also is an important element of the case for SMRs. Although SMRs (the designs addressed in this paper) use the same fuel type and the same light water cooling as gigawatt (GW)-scale light water reactors (LWRs), there are significant enhancements in the reactor design that contribute to the upgraded safety case. Appendix A provides a brief overview of the various technology options for SMRs, including the light water SMR designs that are the focus of the present analysis. Light water SMR designs proposed to date incorporate passive safety features that utilize gravity-driven or natural convection systems – rather than engineered, pump-driven systems – to supply backup cooling in unusual circumstances. These passive systems should also minimize the need for prompt operator actions in any upset condition. The designs rely on natural circulation for both normal operations and accident conditions, requiring no primary system pumps. In addition, these SMR designs utilize integral designs, meaning all major primary components are located in a single, high-strength pressure vessel. That feature is expected to result in a much lower susceptibility to certain potential events, such as a loss of coolant accident, because there is no large external primary piping. In addition, light water SMRs would have a much lower level of decay heat than large plants and, therefore, would require less cooling after reactor shutdown. Specifically, in a post-Fukushima lessons-learned environment, the study team believes that the current SMR designs have three inherent advantages over the current class of large operating reactors, namely:¶ 1. These designs mitigate and, potentially, eliminate the need for back-up or emergency electrical generators, relying exclusively on robust battery power to maintain minimal safety operations.¶ 2. They improve seismic capability with the containment and reactor vessels in a pool of water underground; this dampens the effects of any earth movement and greatly enhances the ability of the system to withstand earthquakes.¶ 3. They provide large and robust underground pool storage for the spent fuel, drastically reducing the potential of uncovering of these pools.¶ These and other attributes of SMR designs present a strong safety case. Differences in the design of SMRs will lead to different approaches for how the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) requirements will be satisfied. Ongoing efforts by the SMR community, the larger nuclear community, and the NRC staff have identified licensing issues unique to SMR designs and are working collaboratively to develop alternative approaches for reconciling these issues within the established NRC regulatory process. These efforts are summarized in Appendix B; a detailed examination of these issues is beyond the scope of this paper.

### AT: Safety – General

#### SMRs are safer---passive cooling and automatic shutdown

Dillow 11 Clay, Popular Science, 3/17, "Can Next-Generation Reactors Power a Safe Nuclear Future?", www.popsci.com/technology/article/2011-03/beyond-fukushima-daiichi-can-better-reactors-provide-safe-nuclear-powered-future

Truly safe, secure nuclear power requires plants that simply cannot melt down, and that means going smaller rather than bigger. Podowski thinks one potential future relies on many smaller, distributed nuclear plants--so-called small modular reactors--that would contain a small amount of nuclear material, power a small area of the grid, and be protected by a smattering of passive mechanisms.¶ Because these reactors don’t concentrate too much heat in one place, no active cooling systems would be necessary to cool them--excess heat would be dispersed in the ambient air. By definition, Podowski says, these small reactors will be safer.¶ “The small reactors are inherently safe because nothing can happen at the small reactors,” Podowski says. “If something goes wrong they will be shut down automatically, the heat will be dispersed, and it will bring itself basically to a neutral state where there will be nothing coming in or out.”

#### SMRs are safe

Freed et al 10 Josh, Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Elizabeth Horwitz, Policy Advisor at Third Way’s Clean Energy Program, and Jeremy Ershow, formerly a Policy Advisor at Third Way, September, "Thinking Small On Nuclear Power", content.thirdway.org/publications/340/Third\_Way\_Idea\_Brief\_-\_Thinking\_Small\_On\_Nuclear\_Power.pdf

Small Reactors aren’t safe.¶ Small light water reactors will be as safe as existing reactors, **which have the safest operational record of any single energy source in the United States**.26 SMRs are to be buried underground with extensive containment barriers, and they will have gravity-based triggers to automatically shut-down the reactor in the event of a malfunction.27

#### SMRs are safer than current nuclear---new designs and not appealing targets for attack

Magwood 1 William D, Director at the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, May, "Report to Congress on Small Modular Nuclear Reactors", [www.ne.doe.gov/pdfFiles/Cong-Rpt-may01.pdf](http://www.ne.doe.gov/pdfFiles/Cong-Rpt-may01.pdf)

To simplify the designs and to reduce or eliminate potential accident consequences, the SMRs all make greater use of inherent safety features than do existing larger commercial plants. For example, inherent safety may be achieved through fuel designs that are able to withstand extreme temperatures without loss of the fuel’s integrity. Almost all of the designs and concepts rely on natural circulation of the coolant in emergency modes and many SMRs additionally rely on natural circulation for cooling of the core during normal operation.¶ Since most of the SMRs studied use small inventories of low enriched uranium (LEU)-based fuels (defined as less than 20 percent U235 content of the total uranium), **the power plants would not be appealing targets for sabotage or diversion**. Diversion resistance of the spent fuel is supported by the accumulation of highly radioactive fission products formed during reactor operation.

# Round 6

### Iran

## 2AC Guar DA

#### **Prices are low now**

Vasundhara Industries 10-26 – Vasundhara Industries, guar gum supplier since 1976, October 12th, 2012, "Guar prices crashed to a new low last month" [www.guargumsupplier.com/guar-prices-crashed-to-a-new-low-last-month/](http://www.guargumsupplier.com/guar-prices-crashed-to-a-new-low-last-month/)

The prices of Guar Gum Powder has fall drastically from Rs. 1200 per kg to Rs. 200 per kg in the Jodhpur spot market. The commodity market was on fire last year due to a leap of 1000% in Guar Gum Futures, which resulted farmers to grow this crop on a very large scale this year. The farmers brought more and more seeds on loans to cultivate as much as they can. But the sudden fall in price of Guar Gum has left the cultivators nervous about the repayment of loans and advances.¶ The famers say there was a shortage of seeds in market, they brought the seed at 10 times higher prices than last year and a large amount of crop was expected this year in comparison to last year. But he prices are going down day by day; it has crashed to Rs. 70 from Rs. 300 in last few months.

#### No US demand for Indian guar

Vasundhara Industries 10-26 – Vasundhara Industries, guar gum supplier since 1976, October 12th, 2012, "Guar prices crashed to a new low last month" [www.guargumsupplier.com/guar-prices-crashed-to-a-new-low-last-month/](http://www.guargumsupplier.com/guar-prices-crashed-to-a-new-low-last-month/)

India exported around 9 lakh tons of guar gum for over Rs. 16,000 crore last year. This year a bumper crop is expected since the farmers turned to cultivate guar more and more. However, the **exports are already on the weaker side due to dried up demands from US** trading agents. Oil drilling companies, which accounts for the maximum consumption of Guar Gum, have already made up a huge inventory due to an abnormal price fluctuation of Guar Gum from Rs. 70 per kg to Rs. 1200 per kg. “They are expected to use the inventory till the prices normalise,” said Purshotam Hisaria, president of the Indian Guar Gum Manufacturers Association.

#### **No impact**

NGA 12 – Natural Gas Americas, June 21st, 2012, "The Impact of Soaring Guar Gum Prices" [www.naturalgasamericas.com/the-impact-of-soaring-guar-gum-prices-7340](http://www.naturalgasamericas.com/the-impact-of-soaring-guar-gum-prices-7340)

Viable synthetic alternatives will eventually establish a ceiling on guar gum prices, but in the interim, consumers will be subject to market pressures. Increasing Indian production will help satiate global demand, but as with all agro-commodities, **supplies will be vulnerable to** unpredictable weather patterns. Significant long-term development of existing small-scale guar bean production in the US, Australia and Africa – if commercially viable – could geographically diversify guar gum sources and mitigate supply chain risk. For the foreseeable future, seeking to better understand and mitigate supply chain risk may be the most effective course of action for guar gum consumers.

#### Not key to the food in developing countries

Goldfarb 12 – Will Goldfarb 12, chef guy, owner of WillPowder.com, purveyor of molecular gastronomy hydrocolloids, whose shit isn’t quite as good as ModernistPantry.com’s, according to Buntin, 2012, “Thickening: Guar Gum,” http://willpowder.com/guarGum.html

Guar gum and its “sister,” locust bean gum (the artist formerly known as carob), are both from the family of seed gums. Both gums are produced by removing the outer coating of a seed, and grinding its endosperm. LBG, as it is commonly referred to, and guar are non-ionic galactomannans, which function as reserve carbohydrates in the cell walls of their parent seeds. Both are efficient thickening agents in water, hence falling into the category of hydrocolloids, or things that help water stick to itself. ¶ Both guar and locust bean gum are invaluable in commercial applications such as ice cream, soft drinks, fruit juices, bread and pastry, preserves, instant pudding…and of course, baby food. The yet to be developed commercially, “pocket flan,” would no doubt utilize both of their star power. ¶ Key bed buddies:¶ • Guar gum exhibits synergy with xanthan gum to increase viscosity. ¶ • Locust bean gum makes elastic gels with xanthan gum and fortifies the strength and elasticity of both kappa carrageenan and agar agar.¶ Guar Gum key attributes:¶ Willpowder Guar is powered by patented pre hydrated technology, allowing it to be, well, hydrated in cold water. Dosages as little as .1% up to 1% (1 to 10 grams per kilo of formula), provide viscosity with limited agitation. This makes guar especially useful in dry mixes. ¶ Guar gum fun facts:¶ The guar plant, like me, thrives in a hot and dry climate. Four in five of you will be using guar from India, with 7 out of 10 of those using guar from Rajasthan, whose inhabitants initially repelled the Mughals. In addition to Guar, Rajasthan is India’s largest wool-producing state, and its main opium producer. So, feel free to make an honorary garnish to the following meringue recipe with lamb or heroin.

### Impact---Food Prices

#### Volatility wrecks the fertilizer industry

IECA 3 [Industrial Energy Consumers of America, nonprofit organization created to promote the interests of manufacturing companies for which the availability, use and cost of energy, power or feedstock play a significant role in their ability to compete, July 22 2003, “IMPACT OF THE U.S. NATURAL GAS CRISIS ON THE NORTH AMERICAN NITROGEN FERTILIZER INDUSTRY,” http://www.ieca-us.com/wp-content/uploads/072203Fertilizerbriefing.pdf]

Natural gas is the principal and only economically feasible feedstock raw material used for producing anhydrous ammonia, the building block product for nitrogen fertilizer. The fertilizer industry accounts for approximately three percent of the total natural gas consumed in the United States, while natural gas costs at current price levels account for nearly 90 percent of the cost to produce ammonia. ¶ Natural gas is the primary feedstock in the production of virtually all commercial nitrogen fertilizers in the United States. It is important to be very clear about this: natural gas is not simply an energy source for us; it is the raw material from which nitrogen fertilizers are made. The production process involves a catalytic reaction between ¶ elemental nitrogen derived from the air with hydrogen derived from natural gas. The primary product from this reaction is anhydrous ammonia (NH3). Anhydrous ammonia is used directly as a commercial fertilizer or as the basic building block for producing virtually all other forms of nitrogen fertilizers such as urea, ammonium nitrate and nitrogen solutions, as well as diammonium phosphate and mono-ammonium phosphate.¶ The volatility and high level of U.S. natural gas prices, virtually unprecedented in the history of our country, has resulted in the permanent closure of almost 20 percent of U.S. nitrogen fertilizer capacity and the idling of an additional 25 percent. ¶ By the end of December 2000, the U.S. nitrogen operating rate fell to below 70 percent of capacity. By the end of January 2001, operating rates dropped to an all-time low of only 46 percent. To put this into perspective, the average U.S. operating rate during the 1990s was 92 percent. ¶ During the gas spike in late February and early March of 2003, working capital requirements for one Mid-Western nitrogen manufacturer to buy gas for its operations nearly doubled--an increase of nearly $40 million in one month.2¶ Impact on U.S. Farmers¶ Natural gas prices began to steadily increase during calendar year 2000, rising from an average of $2.36 per MMBtu in January to over $6.00 per MMBtu in December 2000 and to a record $10 per MMBtu in January 2001 (Figure 3). In turn, this forced fertilizer production costs to unprecedented levels. Ammonia production costs, for example, spiked up from approximately $100 per ton to $170 per ton by June 2000, to $220 per ton in December 2000, and to an average of over $350 per ton in January 2001. ¶ The sharp rise in natural gas prices and the resulting curtailment of U.S. fertilizer production also has had a dramatic impact on fertilizer prices throughout the marketing chain and, in particular, at the farm level. Nitrogen prices at the farm level, for example, jumped this year to near-record high levels. According to U.S. Department of Agriculture data, the U.S. average farm-level price for ammonia jumped this spring to $373 per ton compared to an average spring price last year of $250. Similarly, urea prices have climbed from $191 to $261 and UAN prices from $127 to $161 in the same time period. This translates into an increase in cost to a typical Midwest corn farmer of $10 to $15 per acre. It is important to understand that most U.S. nitrogen fertilizer is consumed within a very short time frame in the fall and spring application seasons.

#### Solves food crises

The Fertilizer Institute 9 [Trade Group representing the fertilizer industry, “The U.S. Fertilizer Industry and Climate Change Policy,” April 2 2009, http://www.kochfertilizer.com/pdf/TFI2009ClimateChange.pdf]

Fertilizer nutrients – nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium – are all naturally occurring elements that are “fed” to plants and crops for healthy and abundant food and fiber production. They are currently responsible for 40 to 60 percent of the world’s food supply. Harvest after harvest, fertilizers replenish our soils by replacing the nutrients removed by each season’s crop. Each year, the world’s population grows by 80 million and fertilizers – used in an environmentally sensitive way – are critical to ensuring that our nation’s farmers grow an adequate supply of nutritious food for American and international consumers.¶ As consumers around the world demand improved diets, the global demand for fertilizers is growing rapidly. Under these circumstances, U.S. farmers compete with farmers from around the world for a limited supply of nutrients. For example, over 85 percent of our potash and over 50 percent of the nitrogen used on U.S. farms is now imported from other countries.¶ The United States needs a strong domestic fertilizer industry to ensure this valuable resource is available for a stable food production system. Today, the world’s food supply, as represented by the grain stocks-to-use ratio, is near its lowest level in 35 years. In six of the last seven years, consumption of grains and oilseeds has exceeded production. Many experts believe that we are just one natural disaster or substandard world harvest away from a full-scale food crisis.

### Manufacturing

#### No job skills gap

McCue 10-18 – TJ McCue, writer for Forbes Magazine, October 18th, 2012, "Manufacturing Jobs Changing But No Severe Job Skills Gap In USA" [www.forbes.com/sites/tjmccue/2012/10/18/manufacturing-jobs-changing-but-no-severe-job-skills-gap-in-usa/print/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/tjmccue/2012/10/18/manufacturing-jobs-changing-but-no-severe-job-skills-gap-in-usa/print/)

American Manufacturing Jobs Rebounding¶ **Manufacturing jobs stand poised for a rebound as jobs get reshored from China — creating** 2.5 million to 5 million U.S. jobs in manufacturing and support jobs. Worries about a severe job skills gap are largely misreported according to results from a Boston Consulting Group (BCG) analysis – part of the firm’s ongoing series entitled Made in America, Again. ¶ Despite recent stories at NPR this week that state manufacturing jobs are not coming back, BCG believes that a rebound is not only possible, but likely, by the end of the decade.¶ NPR reported that “only 9 percent of Americans work in manufacturing. That’s not nothing. And, in fact, **the sector has been adding jobs recently after getting hammered during the recession.**”¶ BCG estimates that the U.S. is short some 80,000 to 100,000 highly skilled manufacturing workers. **That shortage represents less than 1 percent of the nation’s 11.5 million manufacturing workers and less than 8 percent of its 1.4 million highly skilled manufacturing workers.** What’s more, only seven states—six of which are in the bottom quartile of U.S. state manufacturing output—show significant or severe skills gaps. **The** shortages are local, not nationwide, in nature and reflect imbalances driven by both location and job classes.¶ Reuters posted that **the labor market is slowly healing.** Other data shows a modest rebound in factory activity in the U.S. mid-Atlantic region. CNN Money reports that **The number of job openings for skilled factory workers has increased** 38% since 2005, according to numbers from the Conference Board that measure labor demand across industries. The jobless claims reports are accurate, of course, but there’s hope on the horizon. It is just that horizon is sometimes changing faster than our awareness or attitudes. Manufacturing jobs might require higher level skills, but so do most jobs.¶ NPR also reported that the “long-run picture is clear. Manufacturing jobs will never again hold the central place in our economy that they once did. At the same time lots of other sectors — health care, professional services — will continue to become more important, and will continue to offer good, middle-class jobs. But those jobs will not, for the most part, be open to high school dropouts.”¶ While I’m a fan of NPR and its work, what I believe is missing is the awareness that manufacturing is changing, getting redefined. Can we say that a high-tech process like 3D printing, or laser cutting, or laser sintering, or pick any new tech, is not manufacturing for a new age? Many small companies are now able to compete and offer one or two specific parts to a larger manufacturer. Small urban manufacturing is one of the new terms for this phenomenon.¶ Sure, the skills required might be different than the traditional definition of manufacturer, but it doesn’t mean we won’t have jobs in that sector. It doesn’t mean we cannot have small businesses with 10-20 employees that make something and require skills that you can get out of high school or maybe even in high school, as the BCG report suggests. Can you drop out of high school and find a good job? Maybe not, but possibly via an advanced on-the-job training program, you could.¶ Unemployment is on the rise faster in some states than others, jobless claims are up, but the New York Times reported that entrepreneurs are starting up with fewer employees. But they are starting something. They are contracting with workers. The employment landscape is shifting and it does point to a more flexible workforce, that is, contractors, versus full time employees.

## 2AC Water 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 water consumption or cause trade-offs in other countries

#### No natural gas impact on water

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

While there may be temporary **impacts** on local resources, **the overall impact is small**, as can be seen when the volumes are placed in the context of total water usage. Table 2.6 looks at water usage for shale gas operations as a fraction of total water usage in a number of major shale plays — in all cases shale development water usage represents less than 1% of total water usage in the affected areas.¶ Indeed, the “water intensity” of shale gas development, at around 1 gallon of water consumed for every MMBtu of energy produced, is low compared to many other energy sources. By way of contrast, several thousand gallons of water per MMBtu of energy produced can be used in the irrigation of corn grown for ethanol.

#### **Companies recycle fracking water – solves shortages**

Loris 8-29 – Nicolas D. Loris is the Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, August 29th, 2012, "Hydraulic Fracturing: Critical for Energy Production, Jobs, and Economic Growth," [www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=75622&pageid=&pagename](http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=75622&pageid=&pagename)=

Myth #3: Wastewater from hydraulic fracturing is dangerous and unregulated.¶ Fact: Companies dispose of, and recycle, wastewater using many different methods, all of which are compliant with existing federal and state laws.¶ Companies typically use around 4 million gallons of water—what a golf course uses in one week—to fracture a well by using water from lakes, rivers, or municipal supplies. Much of that water remains in the ground; about 15 percent to 20 percent of the water returns to the surface by flowing back through the well. The flowback water contains the chemicals used in the fracking process and can also collect other naturally harmful substances in the ground. This water is never used for drinking and the disposal is subject to federal and state regulations. States have different regulations for disposal, and companies employ a variety of methods including temporary storage of wastewater in steel tanks or contained pits. More companies are recycling or reusing the flowback water because it makes both economic and environmental sense. Other disposal methods include storing wastewater underground in injection wells that states regulate individually, and the EPA regulates under the Safe Water Drinking Act. The demand for wastewater disposal and recycling is creating opportunities for new companies with emerging technologies to treat wastewater.¶ There have been concerns, in Pennsylvania for instance, that treating wastewater at sewage treatment plants that discharge into rivers supplying drinking water would contaminate drinking water with radioactive material. But Pennsylvania’s Department of Environmental Protection found levels of radioactivity well within federal and state standards. Norm Zellers, manager of the Sunbury Generation treatment facility in Synder County, Pennsylvania, emphasized that “[y]ou can have more radioactivity on a bunch of bananas in the store or on a granite countertop.” Wastewater management is another aspect of the fracking process that has been well regulated **by** existing **federal and state laws**, and the increased demand for wastewater treatment has driven the process to be **cleaner and cheaper**.¶

#### No contamination

Lawson 12 – General Richard Lawson (USAF), May 2012, "Fueling America and the Energy Water Nexus: How and Why it Impacts the Nexus and What Next" www.acus.org/files/EnergyEnvironment/062212\_EEP\_FuelingAmericaEnergyWaterNexus.pdf

However, there is at present little or no evidence **of groundwater contamination** from hydraulic fracturing of shales at normal depths. Although claims have been made that “out-of-zone” fracture propagation or intersection with natural fractures, could occur, this study found no instances where either of these has actually taken place. In the long term after fracturing is completed, **the fluid flow is toward (not away from) the well** as gas enters the well bore during production. Some allegations indicate a relatively small risk to water supplies from individual well fracturing operations, but that a large number of wells (in the Marcellus shale) has a higher likelihood of negative impacts. However, the evidence for this risk is not clearly defined. **No evidence of chemicals** from hydraulic fracturing fluid has been found in aquifers as a result of fracturing operations. ...[I]t appears that the risk of such chemical additives is greater from surface spills of undiluted chemicals than from actual fracturing activities.44¶ To date, evidence does not point to groundwater contamination by fracking fluids from drilled wells, which are almost uniformly located far below the groundwater aquifers. Contamination of groundwater due to surface operation accidents are a separate issue and are discussed below.

#### No water wars – based on faulty Malthusian arguments

Allouche 11 – Jeremy Allouche, Institute of Development Studies, UK, January 2011, "The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global tradestar, open," Food Policy, Volume 36, Supplement 1, January 2011, Pages S3-S8, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306919210001272

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable.

### Impact---Water Wars

#### Satellites are key to cooperation to prevent water wars

Prathapar & Bastiaanssen 2k(S.A. Prathapar, Associate Professor and the Head at the Department of Soils, Water and Agricultural Engineering, College of Agricultural and Marine Sciences, Sultan Qaboos University, W.G.M. Bastiaanssen, International Water Management Institute, “Satellite Observations of International River Basins for All,” International Archives of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Vol. 33, Part B7, 2000, http://www.isprs.org/proceedings/XXXIII/congress/part7/439\_XXXIII-part7.pdf)

Trust and faith in international river basin water resources management increases if rainfall, diverted water, soil moisture, crop evapotranspiration and plant growth data is collected at a range of scales, is adequate, available and accessible. It must be admitted that in a relatively short time span, hydrologists cannot diagnose the water accounts at the regional scale if hydrological data is improper or incomplete. It requires several months or even years by professionals to thoroughly quantify or model the hydrological processes and cycles in a river basin using other parties data. Satellite data can form an attractive alternative to numerical models. Satellites provide objective data for database building, which is politically neutral and cannot be manipulated. Satellite measurements reflect the land surface features and the observable landscape patterns culminated from socio-economical development, prevailing jurisdiction, agricultural practices, hydrological processes and irrigation management, apart from its original geological formation processes. Because of being direct measurements, satellite observations are often more reliable than secondary data. For instance, the irrigated area in the Gediz River Basin in Western Turkey appeared from the satellite images to be 60% larger than from the secondary data collected from governmental statistics. Another example of dubious secondary data is from Pakistan, where different soil salinity surveys resulted in more than 500 % between the lowest and the highest estimate of soil salinity occurrence in Pakistan. It is obvious that if such type of secondary data is used in establishing intra-basin water cooperations, disputes and conflicts can potentially worsen and trust will fade away.

## Add-Ons

### Impact---Russia War

#### Aerospace is key to tracking space debris

National Aerospace Week 11 – National Aerospace Week, September 11-17, 2011. “Aerospace and Defense: Second to None,”

http://www.nationalaerospaceweek.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/whitepaper.pdf

Space is certainly becoming more contested, congested and competitive. More than 60 nations are engaged in space efforts and tens of thousands of man-made objects orbit the Earth. In January 2007, the Chinese used a ballistic missile to destroy an aging weather satellite. This anti-satellite test demonstrated the very real ability of a foreign power to attack and destroy space assets and resulted in a dangerous debris cloud. In addition, the February 2009 collision of a commercial U.S. satellite and Russian satellite showed that space systems not only face disruption from intentional attack, but are also at risk from unintentional events in an increasingly crowded environment. Using systems developed by America’s aerospace industry, the Defense Department currently tracks more than 21,000 man-made objects in the Earth’s orbit — many of which could threaten civil and national security space systems, as well as our nation’s efforts to increase the commercial use of space. 16 In such an environment, investments in rapid reconstitution, sensors, tracking, threat assessment and other space protection and situational awareness capabilities are needed to mitigate the impacts of an unexpected catastrophic space system failure. The cost and difficulty involved in developing and deploying space systems as well as the severe consequences of their loss necessitates that our nation’s space infrastructure be adequately protected. Part of ensuring robust space capabilities means that America must routinely replace and update its space infrastructure. It is highly problematic — if not infeasible — to perform maintenance or even refuel them. Space systems have limited life spans and, at today’s pace of technology, can quickly become obsolete. Critical space systems that provide missile warning, global communications, positioning, navigation and timing and weather are in need of upgrade at a time when other nations are rapidly modernizing their own space infrastructure. The United States must remain a leader in human and robotic space — a position that is perishable if not properly supported. Research aboard the International Space Station and human and robotic exploration beyond low Earth orbit must remain national priorities. These activities demonstrate global leadership, sharpen our expertise for future long-range space travel, add to our scientific knowledge and inspire our youth to pursue engineering and science disciplines.

#### That solves Russia nuclear war

Lewis 4 (Jeffrey Lewis, postdoctoral fellow in the Advanced Methods of Cooperative Study Program; worked in the office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, Center for Defense Information, “What if Space were Weaponized?” July 2004, http://www.cdi.org/PDFs/scenarios.pdf)

This is the second of two scenarios that consider how U.S. space weapons might create incentives for America’s opponents to behave in dangerous ways. The previous scenario looked at the systemic risk of accidents that could arise from keeping nuclear weapons on high alert to guard against a space weapons attack. This section focuses on the risk that a single accident in space, such as a piece of space debris striking a Russian early-warning satellite, might be the catalyst for an accidental nuclear war. As we have noted in an earlier section, the United States canceled its own ASAT program in the 1980s over concerns that the deployment of these weapons might be deeply destabiliz- ing. For all the talk about a “new relationship” between the United States and Russia, both sides retain thousands of nuclear forces on alert and configured to fight a nuclear war. When briefed about the size and status of U.S. nuclear forces, President George W. Bush reportedly asked “What do we need all these weapons for?”43 The answer, as it was during the Cold War, is that the forces remain on alert to conduct a number of possible contingencies, including a nuclear strike against Russia. This fact, of course, is not lost on the Rus- sian leadership, which has been increasing its reliance on nuclear weapons to compensate for the country’s declining military might. In the mid-1990s, Russia dropped its pledge to refrain from the “•rst use” of nuclear weapons and conducted a series of exercises in which Russian nuclear forces prepared to use nuclear weapons to repel a NATO invasion. In October 2003, Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov reiter- ated that Moscow might use nuclear weapons “preemptively” in any number of contingencies, including a NATO attack.44 So, it remains business as usual with U.S. and Russian nuclear forces. And business as usual includes the occasional false alarm of a nuclear attack. There have been several of these incidents over the years. In September 1983, as a relatively new Soviet early-warning satellite moved into position to monitor U.S. missile •elds in North Dakota, the sun lined up in just such a way as to fool the Russian satellite into reporting that half a dozen U.S. missiles had been launched at the Soviet Union. Perhaps mindful that a brand new satel- lite might malfunction, the of•cer in charge of the command center that monitored data from the early-warning satellites refused to pass the alert to his superiors. He reportedly explained his caution by saying: “When people start a war, they don’t start it with only •ve missiles. You can do little damage with just •ve missiles.”45 In January 1995, Norwegian scientists launched a sounding rocket on a trajectory similar to one that a U.S. Trident missile might take if it were launched to blind Russian radars with a high altitude nuclear detonation. The incident was apparently serious enough that, the next day, Russian President Boris Yeltsin stated that he had activated his “nuclear football” – a device that allows the Russian president to communicate with his military advisors and review his options for launching his arsenal. In this case, the Russian early-warning satellites could clearly see that no attack was under way and the crisis passed without incident.46 In both cases, Russian observers were con•-dent that what appeared to be a “small” attack was not a fragmentary picture of a much larger one. In the case of the Norwegian sounding rocket, space-based sensors played a crucial role in assuring the Russian leadership that it was not under attack. The Russian command sys-tem, however, is no longer able to provide such reliable, early warning. The dissolution of the Soviet Union cost Moscow several radar stations in newly independent states, creating “attack cor-ridors” through which Moscow could not see an attack launched by U.S. nuclear submarines.47 Further, Russia’s constellation of early-warn-ing satellites has been allowed to decline – only one or two of the six satellites remain operational, leaving Russia with early warning for only six hours a day. Russia is attempting to reconstitute its constellation of early-warning satellites, with several launches planned in the next few years. But Russia will still have limited warning and will depend heavily on its space-based systems to provide warning of an American attack.48 As the previous section explained, the Penta- gon is contemplating military missions in space that will improve U.S. ability to cripple Russian nuclear forces in a crisis before they can execute an attack on the United States. Anti-satellite weapons, in this scenario, would blind Russian reconnaissance and warning satellites and knock out communications satellites. Such strikes might be the prelude to a full-scale attack, or a limited ef- fort, as attempted in a war game at Schriever Air Force Base, to conduct “early deterrence strikes” to signal U.S. resolve and control escalation.49 By 2010, the United States may, in fact, have an arsenal of ASATs (perhaps even on orbit 24/7) ready to conduct these kinds of missions – to coerce opponents and, if necessary, support preemptive attacks. Moscow would certainly have to worry that these ASATs could be used in conjunction with other space-enabled systems – for example, long-range strike systems that could attack targets in less than 90 minutes – to disable Russia’s nuclear deterrent before the Rus- sian leadership understood what was going on. What would happen **if a piece of space debris were to disable a Russian early-warning satellite** under these conditions? Could the Russian military distinguish between an accident in space and the first phase of a U.S. attack? Most Russian early-warning satellites are in elliptical Molniya orbits (a few are in GEO) and thus dif•cult to attack from the ground or air. At a minimum, Moscow would probably have some tactical warn-ing of such a suspicious launch, but given the sorry state of Russia’s warning, optical imaging and signals intelligence satellites there is reason to ask the question. Further, the advent of U.S. on-orbit ASATs, as now envisioned50 could make both the more dif•cult orbital plane and any warning systems moot. The unpleasant truth is that the Russians likely would have to make a judgment call. No state has the ability to de•nitively deter-mine the cause of the satellite’s failure. Even the United States does not maintain (nor is it likely to have in place by 2010) a sophisticated space surveillance system that would allow it to distinguish between a satellite malfunction, a debris strike or a deliberate attack – and Russian space surveillance capabilities are much more limited by comparison. Even the risk assessments for col-lision with debris are speculative, particularly for the unique orbits in which Russian early-warning satellites operate. During peacetime, it is easy to imagine that the Russians would conclude that the loss of a satellite was either a malfunction or a debris strike. But how con•dent could U.S. planners be that the Russians would be so calm if the accident in space occurred in tandem with a second false alarm, or occurred during the middle of a crisis? What might happen if the debris strike oc-curred shortly after a false alarm showing a mis-sile launch? False alarms are appallingly common – according to information obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, the U.S.-Canadian North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) experienced 1,172 “moderately seri-ous” false alarms between 1977 and 1983 – an average of almost three false alarms per week. Comparable information is not available about the Russian system, but there is no reason to believe that it is any more reliable.51 Assessing the likelihood of these sorts of co- incidences is dif•cult because Russia has never provided data about the frequency or duration of false alarms; nor indicated how seriously early- warning data is taken by Russian leaders. More- over, there is no reliable estimate of the debris risk for Russian satellites in highly elliptical orbits.52 The important point, however, is that such a coincidence would only appear suspicious if the United States were in the business of disabling satellites – in other words, there is much less risk if Washington does not develop ASATs. The loss of an early-warning satellite could look rather ominous if it occurred during a period of major tension in the relationship. While NATO no longer sees Russia as much of a threat, the same cannot be said of the converse. Despite the warm talk, Russian leaders remain wary of NATO expansion, particularly the effect expan- sion may have on the Baltic port of Kaliningrad. Although part of Russia, Kaliningrad is separated from the rest of Russia by Lithuania and Poland. Russia has already complained about its decreas- ing lack of access to the port, particularly the uncooperative attitude of the Lithuanian govern- ment.53 News reports suggest that an edgy Russia may have moved tactical nuclear weapons into the enclave.54 If the Lithuanian government were to close access to Kaliningrad in a •t of pique, this would trigger a major crisis between NATO and Russia. Under these circumstances, the loss of an early-warning satellite would be extremely suspi-cious. It is any military’s nature during a crisis to interpret events in their worst-case light. For ex- ample, consider the coincidences that occurred in early September 1956, during the extraordinarily tense period in international relations marked by the Suez Crisis and Hungarian uprising.55 On one evening the White House received messages indicating: 1. the Turkish Air Force had gone on alert in response to unidentified aircraft penetrat- ing its airspace; 2. one hundred Soviet MiG-15s were •ying over Syria; 3. a British Canberra bomber had been shot down over Syria, most likely by a MiG; and 4. The Russian fleet was moving through the Dardanelles. Gen. Andrew Goodpaster was reported to have worried that the confluence of events “might trigger off … the NATO operations plan” that called for a nuclear strike on the Soviet Union. Yet, all of these reports were false. The “jets” over Turkey were a flock of swans; the Soviet MiGs over Syria were a smaller, routine escort returning the president from a state visit to Mos- cow; the bomber crashed due to mechanical dif•culties; and the Soviet fleet was beginning long-scheduled exercises. In an important sense, these were not “coincidences” but rather different manifestations of a common failure – human er- ror resulting from extreme tension of an interna- tional crisis. As one author noted, “The detection and misinterpretation of these events, against the context of world tensions from Hungary and Suez, was the first major example of how the size and complexity of worldwide electronic warning systems could, at certain critical times, create momentum of its own.” Perhaps most worrisome, the United States might be blithely unaware of the degree to which the Russians were concerned about its actions and inadvertently escalate a crisis. During the early 1980s, the Soviet Union suffered a major “war scare” during which time its leadership concluded that bilateral relations were rapidly declining. This war scare was driven in part by the rhetoric of the Reagan administration, fortified by the selective reading of intelligence. During this period, NATO conducted a major command post exercise, Able Archer, that caused some elements of the Soviet military to raise their alert status. American officials were stunned to learn, after the fact, that the Kremlin had been acutely nervous about an American first strike during this period.56 All of these incidents have a common theme – that confidence is often the difference between war and peace. In times of crisis, **false alarms** can have a momentum of their own. As in the second scenario in this monograph, the lesson is that commanders rely on the steady flow of reli-able information. When that information flow is disrupted – whether by a deliberate attack or an accident – confidence collapses **and** the result is panic and escalation. Introducing ASAT weapons into this mix is all the more dangerous, because such weapons target the elements of the command system that keep leaders aware, informed and in control. As a result, the mere presence of such weapons is corrosive to the con•dence that allows national nuclear forces to operate safely.

### Offcase

## Topicality

### 2AC Restrictions Topicality

#### We meet – we reduce restrictions – these restrictions reduce production

#### The EPA regulations are restrictions

Reade 8 – LINDA R. READE, District Court Judge, Opinion in UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. RONALD L. COLEMAN, Defendant.No. 07-CR-66-LRRUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA, CEDAR RAPIDS DIVISION545 F. Supp. 2d 854; 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26803April 1, 2008, DecidedApril 2, 2008, Filed, lexis

. . . . Although [§ 802(44)] does not define what constitutes a "restriction," reference to Webster's dictionary provides adequate elucidation of its ordinary meaning. In Webster's, a "restriction" is defined as "a regulation that restricts or restrains," or "a limitation on the use or enjoyment of property or a facility." Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary 1006 (9th ed. 1991).

#### Counter-interpretation – restrictions are government actions that make production more difficult or expensive

LVM Institute 96 – Ludwig Von Mises Institute Original Book by Ludwig Von Mises, Austrian Economist in 1940. Evidence is cut from fourth edition copyright Bettina B. Greaves, “Human Action” http://mises.org/pdf/humanaction/pdf/ha\_29.pdf

Restriction of production means that the government either forbids or makes more difficult or more expensive the production, transportation, or distribution of definite articles, or the application of definite modes of production, transportation, or distribution. The authority thus eliminates some of the means available for the satisfaction of human wants. The effect of its interference is that people are prevented from using their knowledge and abilities, their labor and their material means of production in the way in which they would earn the highest returns and satisfy their needs as much as possible. Such interference makes people poorer and less satisfied.¶ This is the crux of the matter. All the subtlety and hair-splitting wasted in the effort to invalidate this fundamental thesis are vain. On the unhampered market there prevails an irresistible tendency to employ every factor of production for the best possible satisfaction [p. 744] of the most urgent needs of the consumers. If the government interferes with this process, it can only impair satisfaction; it can never improve it.¶ The correctness of this thesis has been proved in an excellent and irrefutable manner with regard to the historically most important class of government interference with production, the barriers to international trade. In this field the teaching of the classical economists, especially those of Ricardo, are final and settle the issue forever. All that a tariff can achieve is to divert production from those locations in which the output per unit of input is higher to locations in which it is lower. It does not increase production; it curtails it.

#### On means “toward an activity”

Dictionary.com - <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on>

on¶    [on, awn] Show IPA¶ preposition¶ 1.¶ so as to be or remain supported by or suspended from: Put your package down on the table; Hang your coat on the hook.¶ 2.¶ so as to be attached to or unified with: Hang the picture on the wall. Paste the label on the package.¶ 3.¶ so as to be a covering or wrapping for: Put the blanket on the baby. Put aluminum foil on the lamb chops before freezing them.¶ 4.¶ in connection, association, or cooperation with; as a part or element of: to serve on a jury.¶ 5.¶ so as to be a supporting part, base, backing, etc., of: a painting on canvas; mounted on cardboard; legs on a chair.¶ EXPAND¶ adverb¶ 31.¶ in, into, or onto a position of being supported or attached: Sew the buttons on.¶ 32.¶ in, into, or onto a position of covering or wrapping: Put your raincoat on.¶ 33.¶ fast to a thing, as for support: Hold on!¶ 34.¶ toward a place, point, activity, or object: to look on while others work.¶ 35.¶ forward, onward, or along, as in any course or process: further on.

#### Prefer it

#### Limits – no restrictions aff would be topical because no policy mandates a decrease in production

#### Aff ground outweighs – there are very few solvency mechanisms – everyone is just running SMRs

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

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

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

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

## 2AC Reg Neg CP

#### Perm do both – shields the links to politics

#### Perm do the counterplan – the counterplan is not competitive – 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

#### Should is not mandatory

Atlas Collaboration 99

Use of shall, should, may can,” <http://rd13doc.cern.ch/Atlas/DaqSoft/sde/inspect/shall.html> ¶ In the expression of the requirements, shall describes something that is mandatory ; should is weaker. It describes something that might not be satisfied in the final product, but that is desirable enough that any non−compliance shall be explicitly justified ; may grants permission to do something, and makes only a weak statement.

#### Resolved can be an opinion not necessarily a determination

Webster’s 98 – Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary, 1998 [dictionary.com]

**Resolved:**¶5. To express, as an opinion or determination, by resolution and vote; to declare or decide by a formal vote; -- followed by a clause; as, the house resolved (or, it was resolved by the house) that no money should be apropriated (or, to appropriate no money).

#### It links MORE to politics – the counterplan would have HUGE PUBLIC NEGOTIATIONS with MASSIVE INVOLVEMENT

#### Massive delays

Daniel Selmi 5, Prof Law at Loyola, 35 Envtl. L. 415, lexis

1. Time as a False Indicator¶ An ongoing point of contention in the literature is whether regulatory negotiation saves time in comparison to traditional rulemaking. Such savings were originally cited as a principal justification for undertaking the negotiation process. 253 **Recently, however**, critics have contended that time savings do not occur. 254 Moreover, observations made by participants in negotiated rulemakings **confirm that negotiations require a greater time commitment** than anticipated at their outset. 255¶ The metal-finishing rulemaking **unquestionably fit the time-consuming pattern**. During negotiations, both industry and environmentalists requested a sufficiently slow pace to allow for the compilation of additional technical information. 256 If a negotiation includes a process to facilitate data exchanges and resolve outstanding technical issues, as this negotiation did, parties must expect that negotiations will lengthen substantially.

#### Every citizen’s a stakeholder --- notification consumes resources

Camacho 5 – Alejandro Camacho 5, Associate Prof of Law at Notre Dame, 24 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 269, lexis

Though achieving collaboration and consensus is certainly possible in administrative regulatory contexts, the prospect of achieving a multilateral, participatory agreement on a proposed national rule **can be daunting**. 220 Because of their scope, federal administrative rules tend to be made over long periods of time, involve many negotiating sessions, 221 and impact hundreds if not **thousands of parties from different regions** of the country. Simply notifying all of these parties that a given issue is being considered for a potential rulemaking is in **itself a logistical challenge**. Even if all relevant parties become involved, the interests affected by the rule may **be too numerous** or varied for the multilateral process to be manageable or for participation to be meaningful. Furthermore, participating in a long-term, nationwide forum can be **time consuming and expensive**, especially for smaller, poorer, or less organized parties. 222 Indeed, some of the parties with the biggest stakes in the outcome of national administrative law are large but diffuse groups (**such as consumers in a product safety rulemaking**) that frequently are poorly represented in the negotiation process. Even some proponents of federal regulatory negotiation concede that it may be under-inclusive because the most active stakeholder groups tend not to be representative of the general consumer or median voter. 223 Finally, the wide spectrum of interests and concerns at stake **increases the risk of gridlock**, [\*324] making agreement formation and implementation that **much more difficult.**

#### Agencies will circumvent implementation

Harter 97 – Phillip J. Harter 97, expert in administrative law at Univ. of Vermont, April 1997, 46 Duke L.J. 1389

A negotiated rulemaking forces the parties to bring an enormous amount of practical information to the table and hence expands the data base on which to build a regulation. The practical insight contributed by those with first-hand experience also allows agency staff to focus resources on areas with the greatest potential payback. While these may seem to be considerable benefits of the process, a fair number of agency personnel feel it is inconsistent with their prerogative to share the decision with others around the table. 104 For example, the Steel Erection Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee (SENRAC) at OSHA developed a rule addressing the erection of steel buildings and other structures. 105 When the rulemaking started, the primary, indeed virtually the only issue in contention was how high an ironworker could climb before having to be secured or otherwise protected from falls. It became clear as the negotiations progressed that many other factors would contribute significantly to a safer work place. Although the fall protection scheme in SENRAC's recommendation is based on an earlier standard developed by OSHA itself, and in many ways is more stringent than that standard for comparable work, the standard has been opposed internally by OSHA staff. This opposition has arisen despite the fact that OSHA had representatives on the committee (one formally, the other as counsel) through whom its staff could have voiced its concerns, and despite the fact that senior officials and committee members who strongly advocated safety concurred in the standard. The staff has delayed adoption of the standard by 18 months, just as they did in OSHA's previous reg neg on MDA. This is certainly not an example of the staff's being frozen out of the decisionmaking process, since it could have fully participated both in internal caucuses and in the negotiating sessions.

#### Perm do the counterplan in the world in which the reg neg says yes

#### Causes more uncertainty

Cary Coglianese 1, associate professor of public policy at Harvard & chair of the Regulatory Policy Program at the Center for Business and Government, “Assessing The Advocacy of Negotiated Rulemaking: A Response to Philip Harter”, Kennedy School of Government Faculty Research Working Paper Series, May, http://www.hks.harvard.edu/m-rcbg/research/c.coglianese\_new.york\_assessing.advocacy.pdf

Despite nearly twenty years of experimentation, negotiated rulemaking has yet to achieve a demonstrable reduction in the time it takes to develop regulations nor in the frequency or intensity of subsequent litigation over those regulations. Indeed, the empirical record shows that negotiated rulemaking actually demands more effort and results in more litigation than other comparable rulemaking processes. Had it not been for several decades worth of enthusiastic advocacy of negotiated rulemaking. these results would probably neither be surprising nor contested. After all, it is bound to take an **intensive effort** to develop a consensus among multiple interests on a proposed rule, even for those rules that agencies find more predisposed to success and which are for that reason selected for negotiation in the first place. It is similarly unrealistic to expect that negotiation will stave off subsequent litigation, especially when negotiated processes themselves raise expectations and **generate conflicts over who participates** in the negotiation **and over what the terms** (and silences) in the negotiated agreements **mean.**¶ The finding that negotiated rulemaking neither reduces rulemaking time nor prevents litigation could conceivably be viewed as somewhat less of a failure if it could be shown that negotiated rulemaking systematically led to significantly better quality rules. Harter makes such an assertion, but it too is unsupported by the available body of empirical research. The results of the Langbein and Kerwin study cited by Harter are not easy to interpret. but at best they can be said to show only that participants in negotiated rulemakings tend to perceive the conventional rulemaking process in terms better than those who file comments perceive the conventional rulemaking process. Perceptions on the part of participants in negotiated rulemaking, formed as they are after involvement in quite intensive processes, are likely explained by factors other than genuine, underlying policy improvements. Indeed, there are good reasons to doubt that negotiated rulemaking will in fact lead to any systematic improvement at all in regulatory policy. Making consensus a precondition for policymaking will only likely exacerbate problems such as ambiguity. lowest common denominator results. and an undue emphasis on tractability. More significantly, whatever benefits negotiated rulemaking might presumably hold in terms [\*447]of generating information and dialogue over regulatory policy, these benefits appear to be just as achievable through alternative processes that encourage public participation but which do not demand consensus. Negotiated rulemaking's failure to achieve its goals of reducing rulemaking time and preventing litigation is simply not offset by any demonstrated improvements in the quality of regulatory policy when compared with other ways of developing regulations.

## 2AC Oil DA

#### Prices will fall

Cohen 10/25/12 [Lior Cohen, runs Trading NRG, a blog about gold, silver, natural gas and oil, "Will Oil Price Fall Below $80?" seekingalpha.com/article/950541-will-oil-price-fall-below-80]

Therefore, the demand for oil in the U.S and other leading counties hasn't risen by much; the supply in the U.S has risen while the OPEC oil production remained nearly unchanged. This analysis suggests the oil market has loosened up a bit in recent weeks.¶ What's the bottom line?¶ The recent drop in the price of oil may continue in the weeks to follow. The elections in the U.S and Israel are likely to hold back any development in the Middle East, unless, of course Iran will decide to act on it threat and lower its exports; this scenario, however, doesn't seem likely considering Iran's GDP is mostly comprised of exporting oil. The stable OPEC oil production, the ongoing rise in U.S's oil supply, and the expected low growth in the demand for oil suggest the oil market has loosened and may continue on this path in the months to follow. My guess is that the price of oil will continue to dwindle to the low 80s in the weeks to follow.

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

#### **Natural gas and oil prices are decoupled**

Webber 12 – Michael Webber is the Josey Centennial Fellow in Energy Resources, Co-Director of the Clean Energy Incubator at the Austin Technology Incubator, and Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at The University of Texas at Austin. He has authored more than 150 scientific articles, columns, books and book chapters. Michael's education includes a B.A. with High Honors (Plan II Liberal Arts) and B.S. with High Honors (Aerospace Engineering) from The University of Texas at Austin, and an M.S. (Mechanical Engineering) and Ph.D. (Mechanical Engineering, Minor in Electrical Engineering) from Stanford University, where he was a National Science Foundation Fellow from 1995-1998. May 2012, "The Looming Natural Gas Transition in the United States," www.c2es.org/docUploads/natural-gas-transition-us.pdf

One of the most important recent trends has been the decoupling of natural gas and petroleum prices. Figure 4 shows the U.S. prices for natural gas and petroleum (wellhead, and WTI Cushing, respectively) from 1988 to 2012.4 5 While natural gas and petroleum prices have roughly tracked each other in the U.S. for decades, their **trends started to diverge in 2009 as global oil supplies remained tight, yet shale gas production increased.** This recent divergence has been particularly stark, as it’s driven by the simultaneous downward swing in natural gas prices and upward swing in petroleum prices. For many years, the ratio in prices (per million BTU, or MMBTU) between petroleum and natural gas oscillated nominally in the range of 1–2, averaging 1.6 for 2000– 2008. However, after the divergence began in 2009, this spread became much larger, averaging 4.2 for 2011 and, remarkably, achieving ratios greater than 9 spanning much of the first quarter of 2012 (for example, natural gas costs approximately $2/MMBTU today, whereas petroleum costs $18/MMBTU).

#### Non-unique – domestic oil drilling now

Bernton 12 Hal Bernton, writer for the Seattle Times, June 18, 2012, “Arctic drilling could contribute to US oil resurgence”, http://bangordailynews.com/2012/06/18/business/arctic-drilling-could-contribute-to-us-oil-resurgence/

The push into the Arctic comes amid a major resurgence of a U.S. oil industry that once appeared stuck in long-term decline. Within the past five years, new technologies exploiting oil fields in North Dakota, Texas and other states have contributed to a 15 percent rise in U.S. production since 2008.¶ Producing oil in the offshore Arctic could provide another significant boost.¶ Federal estimates of the potential oil reserves in the Beaufort and Chukchi seas off Alaska’s North Slope indicate there could be 25 billion barrels, an amount greater than the crude produced at the giant Prudhoe Bay onshore field during the past 30 years.

#### No impact on world oil prices

Nordhaus 11 William D, Sterling Professor of Economics; Cowles Foundation, Yale University, October 27, “Energy: Friend or Enemy?,” http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2011/oct/27/energy-friend-or-enemy/?pagination=false

If we look at both the rhetoric and substance of oil policy, particularly oil dependency, much thinking is misguided because of misconceptions about the nature of oil dependency. We can usefully think of the oil market as a single integrated world market—like a giant bathtub of oil. In the bathtub view, there are spigots from Saudi Arabia, Russia, and other producers that introduce oil into the inventory. And there are drains from which the United States, China, and other consumers draw oil. Nevertheless, the dynamics of the price and quantity are determined by the sum of these demands and supplies, and are independent of whether the faucets and drains are labeled “US,” “Russia,” or “China.” In other words, prices are determined by global supply and demand, and the composition of supply and demand is irrelevant.7¶ Why is crude oil an integrated world market? The reasons are that the costs of transporting oil are low, different crude oils are largely interchangeable, and the different crudes can be blended. This means that crude oil is fungible,
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like dollar bills. A shortfall in one region can be made up by shipping a similar oil there from elsewhere in the world. US oil policies make no more sense than trying to lower the water level in one end of the bathtub by taking a few cups of water from that end.¶ We know that the world oil market is unified because there is a single price of crude oil that holds no matter what the source. For example, we can look at whether prices (with corrections for gravity and sulfur) in fact move together. A good test of this view would be to ask whether a benchmark crude price predicts the movement of other prices. Looking at crude oil from twenty-eight different regions around the world from 1977 to 2009, I found that a 10.00 percent change in the price of the “Brent” crude oil—a blend of crude often used as a benchmark for price—led to a 9.99 percent change in the price of other crude oils. These correlations among crude oil prices are markedly higher than are observed for virtually any other traded good or service.¶ The implication of the bathtub view is profound. It means that virtually no important oil issue involves US dependency on foreign oil. Whether we consider pollution, macroeconomic impacts, price volatility, supply interruptions, or Middle East politics, our vulnerability depends upon the global market. It does not depend upon the fraction of our consumption that is imported.¶ I will use two examples to illustrate this point. A first hardy perennial is the idea that we should limit our consumption to oil from “secure sources.” This might mean concentrating on Canada and Mexico, or perhaps relying only on our own output, or we might even exclude Alaska lest it someday decide to secede.¶ These policies make no sense in an integrated world oil market. Suppose that the United States limited its imports to completely reliable sources—ones that would never, ever cut off supplies—and specifically prohibited imports from unreliable country A. This would lead country A to send its oil to other countries. In an integrated world market, the result would be simply to reallocate production from non-A countries to the United States to make up the shortfall here and eliminate the excess there. Unless a country actually changes its flow into the world bathtub, there will be no impact on the United States of sourcing imports from secure regions only.

## 2AC Obama Good Elections

### …

#### Romney win now – national polls

Horowitz 10/26—writes for the Madison Project (Daniel, A Wide Electoral/Popular Vote Split Won’t Happen, [www.redstate.com/2012/10/26/a-wide-electoralpopular-vote-split-wont-happen/](http://www.redstate.com/2012/10/26/a-wide-electoralpopular-vote-split-wont-happen/))

There is an emerging narrative percolating throughout the political world; the prospect that Romney could win the popular vote but lose the Electoral College. The theory is predicated on the seemingly contradictory data between state and national polls. National polls seem to show Romney with a consistent 2-4% lead, while state polls show the candidates tied or Obama slightly ahead in Ohio, Iowa, and Wisconsin.¶ Some analysts are attempting to harmonize the state and national polls by theorizing that Romney’s national lead is driven by historic gains among whites in red states and a strong showing in Pennsylvania and Michigan. They suggest that ultimately the Electoral College boils down to Ohio (or Wisconsin, if Romney loses Ohio), a state where Obama’s much-vaunted ground game and oversaturation of ads could flip the state and the entire election to Obama.¶ This analysis is dead wrong. Either the state polls are correct, and this is a dog fight, or the national polls are correct, and this is a Romney win. The both cannot reflect reality.¶ It’s not just that the national polls show Romney ahead by 3%; it’s that 3 respected, yet diverse, national polls converged yesterday on the exact same number in one day – Romney 50% Obama 47% (today Gallup is Romney +5 and ABC/WaPost is Romney +1). So Romney is at 50% and the incumbent is at 47% (how ironic!) with undecided voters likely to break against him in an election defined by the stagnating economy. But it’s more than that. The Washington Post poll has Romney leading by 19-20 among Independents; Rasmussen shows him with a 17-point lead. Romney is now crushing Obama on the economy and even leading in favorability. It is almost impossible to lose the Electoral College under normal circumstances when leading by more than 1% nationally. It’s certainly impossible to lose when polling this well in all the internals.¶ In order for Romney to win by such margins in the popular vote, yet lose the Electoral College, he would have to outperform Bush in a number of non-swing-states, though he is unlikely to do so.¶ The math doesn’t add up.¶ Bush won the popular vote by 2.46% in 2004. In order to assume that Romney wins by roughly the same margin as Bush (or probably more, based on the internal numbers of the national polls), yet loses the Electoral College, one has to find a number of places where Romney outperforms Bush. But look around the map. Bush did really well in red states and probably won a number of them by more than Romney will. Bush won Montana by 21 points – something Romney will not do. The latest Rasmussen poll had him up just 8.¶ What about the blue states? People forget that Bush did pretty well in many Democrat states. He came within 7.6 in Delaware; 6.7 in NJ, 4 in Oregon, 3.5 in MN, and 9 in Maine. Heck, he only lost California by 10 points – a somewhat unlikely outcome for Romney.¶ What about the swing states? He won CO by 4.5; VA by 8; FL by 5; and NC by a whopping 13. He even won New Mexico – a state that Romney will not come close to winning (unless the Gallup national poll is correct).¶ What about Romney dramatically overperforming in Wis, MI, and PA, yet still losing? Well, that’s already baked into Bush’s 2.46% national margin. He lost Wis. by the slimmest of margins, PA by 2.5, and MI by 3.5.¶ Across the board, this is a much better showing in many states than Romney is expected to win, even in the best case scenario. Yet, he still only won the popular vote by 2.46% overall. So the idea that Romney could match this margin or even more nationally, yet lose the Electoral College, but make up the difference by overperfroming Bush in a number of areas, is crazy talk. Where would those votes come from?¶ Bottom line: if Romney wins the popular vote by 2-3%, he will clearly run the table on all the swing states, and possibly come very close in MI or PA, if not win them outright. Oh, and what’s all that talk of ads running in Minnesota?¶ So what about the state polls? If you look at most of the samples, they are more Democratic than the 2008 turnout model. It’s becoming clear that the early voting, which is disproportionately comprised of Democrats, is distorting the likely voter screens of most state polls. That’s why they are all showing a high D turnout, despite the ubiquitous enthusiasm gap.¶ Additionally, notice how Romney’s surge has stalled out in the state polls even as it continues in the national polls. He has even stalled in some Colorado and Virginia polls, states where Obama is clearly losing. The stagnation in all the state polls began right around the time when early voting picked up in earnest. If we are to believe the national polls, which are hard to disregard due to the convergence, the only plausible theory about the divergence of state polling is that they are inflating Democrat strength by 2-4% due to early voting.¶ If you reconstruct a turnout model that is only slightly more favorable for Republicans than 2008, Romney is ahead in most of the important states. Take this Gravis Marketing poll of Iowa, for example. They show Obama up 4 points, but the party ID is D +6 (D 41, R 35, I 24). In 2008, it was D +1 (D 34, R 33, I 33), and in 2004 it was R +2 (D 34, R 36, I 30). Here’s the kicker: the poll shows Romney leading by 12 among independents. Remember that of all swing states, Republicans improved their voter registration edge the most in Iowa. Additionally, there is a tremendous enthusiasm gap. Yet, if we merely reconstruct the 2008 turnout, which was evenly split among all three affiliations, a 12-point Indy win would clearly tip the state to Romney.¶ We’re seeing the same thing with the latest ARG poll in Ohio. They have Obama up 49-47, yet Romney is winning Independents by a gargantuan 21 points. The sample is D+9, even though it was D+5 in 2008.¶ It’s becoming clear that the national polls could easily work with the state polling data if we adjust for the likely turnout distortions from early voting. To a certain extent, we are seeing a reflection of the national polling in the Rasmussen state polls that factor in respondents who are certain to vote. However, whether this theory is correct or not, one thing is certain: Romney will not win Independents nationally by 15-19 points and lose the Electoral College.

#### No disease extinction

Posner 5—Senior Lecturer, U Chicago Law. Judge on the US Court of Appeals 7th Circuit. AB from Yale and LLB from Harvard. (Richard, Catastrophe, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease.

#### **Link does not turn the case – fiat solves – state regulations mean no backlash – that’s Loris**

#### **Only a risk of a link turn**

LeVine 12 – Steve LeVine is the author of The Oil and the Glory and a longtime foreign correspondent. June 13th, 2012, "How dirty is Romney prepared to get to win election?"oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how\_dirty\_is\_romney\_prepared\_to\_get\_to\_win\_election

**Is Barack Obama sufficiently dirty to win re-election?** Not according to presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney, who says the president is too spic and span.¶ Calculating that clean energy is passé among Americans more concerned about jobs and their own pocketbooks, Romney is gambling that he can tip swing voters his way by embracing dirtier air and water if the tradeoff is more employment and economic growth.¶ Romney's gamble is essentially a bet on the demonstrated disruptive potency of shale gas and shale oil, which over the last year or so have shaken up geopolitics from Russia to the Middle East and China. Now, Romney and the GOP leadership hope they will have the same impact on U.S. domestic politics, and sweep the former Massachusetts governor into the White House with a strong Republican majority in Congress.¶ A flood of new oil and natural gas production in states such as North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas is changing the national and global economies. U.S. oil production is projected to reach 6.3 million barrels a day this year, the highest volume since 1997, the Energy Information Agency reported Tuesday. In a decade or so, U.S. oil supplies could help to shrink OPEC's influence as a global economic force. Meanwhile, a glut of cheap U.S. shale gas has challenged Russia's economic power in Europe and is contributing to a revolution in how the world powers itself.¶ But Romney and the GOP assert that Obama is slowing the larger potential of the deluge, and is not up to the task of turning it into what they say ought to be a gigantic jobs machine. The president's critics say an unfettered fossil fuels industry could produce 1.4 million new jobs by 2030. They believe that American voters won't be too impressed with Obama's argument that he is leading a balanced energy-and-jobs approach that includes renewable fuels and electric cars.¶ The GOP's oil-and-jobs campaign -- in April alone, 81 percent of U.S. political ads attacking Obama were on the subject of energy, according to Kantar Media, a firm that tracks political advertising -- is a risk that could backfire. Americans could decide that they prefer clean energy after all. Or, as half a dozen election analysts and political science professors told me, energy -- even if it seems crucial at this moment in time -- may not be a central election issue by November.¶ Yet if the election is as close as the polls suggest, the energy ads could prove a pivotal factor. "Advertising is generally not decisive. Advertising matters at the margins. ... But ask Al Gore if the margin matters," said Ken Goldstein, president of the Campaign Media Analysis Group at Kantar Media. "This is looking like an election where the margin may matter."¶ Romney is hardly the first major U.S. presidential candidate to embrace Big Oil. The politics of clean go back to Lady Bird Johnson's war on litter and Richard Nixon's embrace of environmentalism. But both presidents Bush came from the oil industry, and former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin, the last GOP vice presidential nominee, gleefully led chants of "Drill, baby, drill" in 2008. Yet President George W. Bush also famously declared that "America is addicted to oil" in his 2006 State of the Union address, and initiated most of the energy programs for which Obama is currently under fire. And Palin's drumbeat in the end seemed to fall flat.¶ The Republican efforts appear to go beyond any modern campaign in their brash embrace of what is dirty, and their scorn of what is not. And the times seem to favor them. In 2009, the GOP, backed by heavy industry lobbying, knocked back environmentalists on their heels by crushing global warming legislation. Other previously central issues -- Afghanistan, Iraq, health care -- are still debated in the campaign, but not as centrally nor as viscerally as energy, said Frank Maisano, an energy and political analyst at Bracewell & Giuliani, a Houston-based law firm.¶ Obama advisors have said rightly that energy is only one component of a much broader American and global economy, but the GOP appears to have at least partially successfully injected the oil and gas boom as a defining feature of the economic discourse. In a Sunday op-ed in the New York Times entitled "America's New Energy Reality," industry consultant Daniel Yergin remarked that while Obama's 2010 State of the Union address focused on clean-energy jobs, the president pivoted this year to talk as much about oil and natural gas. "His announcement that ‘American oil production is the highest it has been in eight years' turned out to be an applause line," Yergin noted.¶ Romney grants that Obama is not precisely Mr. Clean -- while the president has championed clean energy technologies, he has also stewarded over the greatest buildup in U.S. fossil fuel production since the 1990s. But Romney insists he will be dirtier: He vows to open more land to oil and gas drilling, approve the import of more Canadian oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries, and allow more coal mining. As for Obama, Romney recently told a Colorado coal community, he isn't dirty enough to deserve a second presidential term. The president has "made it harder to get coal out of the ground; **he's made it harder to get natural gas out of the ground**; he's made it harder to get oil out of the ground," Romney said.¶ The approach aligns with a campaign by the American Petroleum Institute, the U.S. oil industry's main lobbying arm, called "Vote4Energy." The API campaign, which consists of big political events and advertisements, targets 15 or so mostly swing states, those that both Obama and Romney will most need to muster the 270 electoral votes required to win.¶ Marty Durbin, executive vice president at API, told me that the Vote4energy campaign is deliberately not backing any specific candidate or party, but attempting to centrally fix the subject of greater fossil-fuel drilling in voters' minds. "We're using this to highlight the importance of energy to the broader policy, that with the right energy policies we can have job creation, economic growth, energy security, government revenue. If voters have these realities in their mind when they go to the ballot box, that's what is going to move us forward in having a more rational national energy policy," he said. Already, he said, "the energy conversation is no longer just production and energy security. This is about job creation on a state-by-state level."¶ Notwithstanding Durbin's disclaimer, the API campaign seems to weave seamlessly into the GOP strategy. And Maisano told me that he sees grist for GOP success in the targeted states. "Energy plays a huge role in those states, and I see it as a huge problem for Obama," he said. "It's going to be hard for him to win these states that he has to win, like North Carolina, like Florida and Michigan and Ohio and Missouri and Wisconsin. Energy undercuts him in those economies."¶ Some analysts think the dirty campaign will ultimately fizzle. "The Romney campaign has positioned itself to beat the job-creation drum better than the Obama campaign has," said Kyle Saunders, a professor at Colorado State University, but an improvement in job numbers could undermine the GOP narrative. In addition, said John Sides, a professor at George Washington University, Obama's incorporation of fossil fuels in his energy policy may muddle the picture for voters. "I'm not sure that there is a lot of daylight between Obama and Romney," Sides told me.¶ Yet my own impression is that the Republican strategy may be working, at least partly and at least for now. Given the stakes, Obama and the main environmental lobby seem more lethargic than they might be. When I sought comment for this story, API responded almost immediately with an offer to speak with Durbin. Not so much the Sierra Club, the principal bulwark of U.S. environmentalists. A spokeswoman missed a couple of emails sent over a couple of days, then by phone said she would try to scare up someone to speak. Finally, I finally received a message: "I haven't been able to track down our political team today." In an election that may be decided on the margins, advantage: fossil fuels.

#### **Plan’s key to Ohio and Pennsylvania**

Snyder 9-3 – Jim Snyder, reporter for Bloomberg, September 3rd, "Ohio’s Gas-Fracking Boom Seen Aiding Obama in Swing State" [www.bloomberg.com/news/print/2012-09-04/ohio-s-gas-fracking-boom-seen-aiding-obama-in-swing-state.html](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/print/2012-09-04/ohio-s-gas-fracking-boom-seen-aiding-obama-in-swing-state.html)

Today, the energy industry is one of the main engines of job growth and the U.S. is the closest it has been in almost 20 years to meeting its own needs. Yet the transformation -- driven by a surge in oil and natural gas production -- isn’t primarily green and has little connection to the president’s plans.¶ “We’re moving to energy independence by accident,” said Philip Verleger, who directed the U.S. Treasury office of energy policy under President Jimmy Carter and is now an industry consultant. “Energy policy had nothing to do with it.”¶ The boom in oil and natural gas is setting up an **election- year irony: a** green-energy president **who is** getting a boost from fossil fuels**.**¶ Oil and natural gas output is on the rise largely because of hydraulic fracturing, which has given drillers access to reserves in shale rock formations once too costly to produce. The so-called fracking injects millions of gallons of water, sand and chemicals thousands of feet below the surface to free fossil fuels trapped there, a process that Obama’s environmentalist allies say increases air and water pollution.¶ Fracking is unlocking oil in North Dakota and Texas. More important to Obama’s re-election chances, it’s **aiding natural gas production -- and Obama’s poll ratings -- in Ohio and Pennsylvania, swing states with 38 electoral votes combined**.¶ Job Growth¶ Ohio’s unemployment rate was 7.2 percent in July, the lowest since September 2008 and below the nationwide 8.3 percent. Job growth there is the fourth-fastest in the U.S., federal data show. Pennsylvania’s jobless rate is 7.9 percent, down from a high of 8.7 percent in March 2010.¶ The president has done little to stall the expansion of fracking, even with pressure from within his Democratic Party.¶ “There’s so many different ways in which this is feeding into various sectors of the economy,” said Philip Sharp, a former Democratic House member from Indiana who heads Resources for the Future, a Washington-based environmental research group. “The administration looks to me like they’ve come to recognize its importance and they have not jumped on the anti-fracking bandwagon.

#### **Environmentalists not key**

Politico 12 – Darren Samuelsohn, writer for Politico, June 18th, 2012, "Greens give Obama wilting enthusiasm," dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=A89E603A-7C5C-4E57-9DB8-FB3AE331776F

Environmentalists are furious at President Barack Obama — he failed on cap and trade, his energy message has turned into the more GOP-friendly “all of the above” and he’s all but done talking about global warming.¶ But he’s racking up the endorsements anyway.¶ This is life for Democratic-aligned interest groups in the 2012 presidential campaign — Obama’s term has been full of disappointments, but it’s a tight election and there’s **fear of just how opposed to their agendas Mitt Romney would be.** So the message is simple: Shut up and fall in line.¶ The latest gripe comes via the administration’s approach to the Earth Summit that starts Wednesday in Rio de Janeiro.¶ (Also on POLITICO: Obama needed at Earth Summit)¶ Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is going, but with 130 countries sending their presidents and prime ministers, greens see her presence as the perfect metaphor of Obama’s interest and commitment falling short.¶ And it’s a fresh reminder of just how little they’ve got to show for the first 3½ years of the Obama presidency — other leaders are coming with plans and records but Clinton is coming with promises and talk.¶ Obama aides insist the United States is making strides as the biggest development donor in the world. Obama’s decision not to go to Rio, they add, shouldn’t be seen as a snub.¶ “Look, I am not able to speak to the president’s schedule, but we are coming at a level which is quite comparable to a great many other countries,” Todd Stern, the top U.S. climate envoy, told reporters last week.¶ All that history explains Obama’s less-than-gushing endorsements from the Sierra Club, League of Conservation Voters, Environment America and Clean Water Action.¶ “Elections are about choices, and this choice was clear and simple both because President Obama understands why we need to take action and just as important, a President Romney would be the first climate denier president in our nation’s history,” said LCV President Gene Karpinski.¶ Karpinski pointed to upcoming Environmental Protection Agency moves to finalize standards for new power plants and fuel economy, identifying them as key accomplishments of Obama’s global warming agenda. “Those are the real decisions that cut carbon pollution,” he said.¶ Sierra Club Executive Director Michael Brune said his group “is proud to endorse President Obama” and would “work hard to give the president a mandate to continue to protect our air and water and accelerate the transition to clean energy in a second term.”¶ “We see stark differences between Romney and the president on climate and nearly every environmental issue, and we hope the president will accentuate those differences as the campaign progresses,” Brune added.¶ As governor, Romney initially backed cap-and-trade policies, but he declared during the GOP primary campaign: “My view is that we don’t know what’s causing climate change on this planet.” If elected, Romney has promised to push legislation that would overturn the Supreme Court’s landmark 2007 decision allowing the EPA to advance climate regulations.

#### **Plan causes vote switching to Obama**

Oil Daily 12 “US Consumers Warm to Fossil Fuels,” 4/11, Lexis

US consumers hold more favorable attitudes toward fossil fuels than they did six months ago and are more likely to rank affordable energy as a greater priority than the environment, according to a poll released by the University of Texas at Austin on Tuesday.¶ Support for expanded domestic energy production was cited as a critical factor influencing the votes of the nearly 2,400 adults surveyed last month.¶ Expanded natural gas development had the most support -- 61% -- when respondents were asked whether this issue would influence the candidate they select in the November elections ( OD Mar.22'12 ).¶ That compares to 59% who say they would be more likely to support a presidential candidate who supports additional financial incentives for renewable energy technologies.¶ More people indicated support for expanded oil drilling than opposition. For example, 38% said they back drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), compared to 32% who are against it.¶ UT-Austin conducts polls twice a year on consumer perceptions of energy issues. Some of the questions remain the same, while others are adjusted to account for emerging policy issues or upcoming elections.¶ "We see a significant trend of increased pricing concerns and more support for domestic energy production across the board in this survey," researchers at the university's business school said in an analysis of the results. "Significantly fewer consumers say they are willing to pay much higher prices to protect the environment, at 30% compared with 38% last fall."

#### No way democrats let a repeal happen

Lizza 8-28 (Ryan, The New Yorker’s Washington correspondent, “WHY ROMNEY WON’T REPEAL OBAMACARE”, http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2012/06/why-romney-wont-repeal-obamacare.html#ixzz1zCIy8dbv)

Mitt Romney, speaking just before noon today, declared that on his first day in office, “I will act to repeal Obamacare.” I think he chose his words carefully. As President, he may indeed “act” to repeal it on Day One, but I don’t believe he will actually be able to overturn the law. If Romney were to win in November, the first matter he’d have to deal with would be the fallout from the so-called fiscal cliff of December 31st, the day when some five hundred billion dollars worth of tax increases and spending reductions take effect, which could put the economy into another recession (if it’s not already in recession by then). This moment would perhaps be Romney’s greatest chance at repeal. Because the fiscal-cliff negotiations will be an enormous fight over the size and scope of the federal government, every government policy will theoretically be open to debate—including, Romney might insist, repeal of the A.C.A. But it’s a fantasy. The negotiations would be dead before they started if Republicans demanded repeal as a price for a Grand Bargain on taxes, spending, and entitlements. The fiscal-cliff negotiations will undoubtedly include a great deal of horse-trading that will infuriate and cheer partisans on both sides. But there is literally nothing Republicans could offer Democrats in return for repealing the Party’s greatest achievement since the Johnson Administration. Assuming that Romney comes through this period of his transition and Presidency with a deal that settles the tax and spending issues brought about by the fiscal cliff (and the related debt-ceiling vote that will likely happen weeks later), he could then return to his domestic agenda, which, he declared today, includes repeal of the A.C.A. as the first priority. But he would immediately face a set of political circumstances similar to the ones that made health care such a difficult issue for Obama in 2009. Absent the Senate Democratic Caucus being found to be running a crack house or chid-prostitution ring, there is no prospect whatsoever of the Republicans winning a sixty-vote, filibuster-proof majority in the Senate this year. The most likely outcome is the Democrats narrowly retaining control, though Republican control is certainly within the realm of possibility. Assuming that Romney comes to Washington without a sixty-vote majority in the Senate, the task of repeal will be nearly insurmountable. First of all, the Congressional Budget Office, which “scores” all legislation—and which so frustrated Obama in 2009 that he refused to mention its name in White House meetings, demanding instead that aides call it “banana”—would now be the A.C.A.’s best friend. The last time the C.B.O. weighed in on the matter, it reported that repeal of the A.C.A. would cost the government almost three hundred billion dollars. Republicans dispute that, but they’d still be under pressure to explain where they would come up with that money. The bigger problem, of course, would be in the Senate. Remember the weeks that the Senate Finance Committee spent arguing over health care? The committee would need to return for a repeat performance. If Democrats still controlled the committee, Republicans would have to somehow force it to debate repeal and find at least one Democratic vote to send repeal legislation to the full Senate. This is unlikely to happen. But if it does, in order to become law, Romney’s repeal of the A.C.A. would face a battery of three separate tests requiring sixty Senate votes: one to bring the legislation to the floor, one to start the debate, and one to end the debate. The filibuster, the G.O.P.’s favorite parliamentary device of the Obama era, would now be the Party’s great enemy. Many Republicans, especially in the blog and talk-radio swamps, would cry, “Use reconciliation!” Readers familiar with the congressional debates of 2009-2010 will remember that this procedure allows certain budgetary measures to pass through the Senate with a simple majority. (After Ted Kennedy died and was replaced by the Republican Scott Brown, Obama and congressional Democrats used the reconciliation process to make some final, crucial changes to the health-care law.) But reconciliation wouldn’t work here—the process can only be used for policies that have budgetary effects and a C.B.O. score. Much of the A.C.A., such as the insurance exchanges and subsidies, would fall under these categories. But a lot of it, including the hated individual mandate, does not. Repealing the exchanges and subsides without repealing the mandate and the other regulations and cost controls in the law would create a health-care Frankenstein that a President Romney would be rather nuts to support. If the Supreme Court had gutted the law today by throwing out the mandate and the regulations and several of the other “non-scoreable” items, a President Romney with a G.O.P. Congress might have had a relatively easy time finishing the job of killing Obama’s law, even without sixty votes in the Senate. But today the Court did two things that make repeal of the A.C.A. nearly impossible now: it has given its not-inconsequential stamp of legitimacy to the law, and it has made the parliamentary path of repeal through Congress highly unlikely and probably impossible, at least in the near future. Far-sighted conservatives always thought that their great hope for toppling Obama’s most important legislative achievement was through the courts. They were correct.

### Impact---Science Diplomacy

#### US leadership in science and tech’s key to effective diplomacy --- solves global cooperation on threats

Federoff 8 – ina Fedoroff 8, Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary of State and the Administrator of USAID, Testimony Before the House Science Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, 4/2, <http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/rm/102996.htm>

Chairman Baird, Ranking Member Ehlers, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss science diplomacy at the U.S. Department of State. The U.S. is recognized globally for its leadership in science and technology. Our scientific strength is both **a** tool of “soft power” – part of our strategic diplomatic arsenal – and a basis for creating partnerships with countries as they move beyond basic economic and social development. Science diplomacy is a central element of the Secretary’s transformational diplomacy initiative, because science and technology are essential to achieving stability and strengthening failed and fragile states. S&T advances have immediate and enormous influence on national and global economies, and thus on the international relations between societies. Nation states, nongovernmental organizations, and multinational corporations are largely shaped by their expertise in and access to intellectual and physical capital in science, technology, and engineering. Even as S&T advances of our modern era provide opportunities for economic prosperity, some also challenge the relative position of countries in the world order, and influence our social institutions and principles. America must remain at the forefront of this new world by maintaining its technological edge, and leading the way internationally through science diplomacy and engagement. The Public Diplomacy Role of Science Science by its nature facilitates diplomacy because it strengthens political relationships, embodies powerful ideals, and creates opportunities for all. The global scientific community embraces principles Americans cherish: transparency, meritocracy, accountability, the objective evaluation of evidence, and broad and frequently democratic participation. Science is inherently democratic, respecting evidence and truth above all. Science is also a common global language, able to bridge deep political and religious divides. Scientists share a common language. Scientific interactions serve to keep open lines of communication and cultural understanding. As scientists everywhere have a common evidentiary external reference system, members of ideologically divergent societies can use the common language of science to cooperatively address both domestic and the increasingly trans-national and global problems confronting humanity in the 21st century. There is a growing recognition that science and technology will increasingly drive the successful economies of the 21st century. Science and technology provide an immeasurable benefit to the U.S. by bringing scientists and students here, especially from developing countries, where they see democracy in action, make friends in the international scientific community, become familiar with American technology, and contribute to the U.S. and global economy. For example, in 2005, over 50% of physical science and engineering graduate students and postdoctoral researchers trained in the U.S. have been foreign nationals. Moreover, many foreign-born scientists who were educated and have worked in the U.S. eventually progress in their careers to hold influential positions in ministries and institutions both in this country and in their home countries. They also contribute to U.S. scientific and technologic development: According to the National Science Board’s 2008 Science and Engineering Indicators, 47% of full-time doctoral science and engineering faculty in U.S. research institutions were foreign-born. Finally, some types of science – particularly those that address the grand challenges in science and technology – are inherently international in scope and collaborative by necessity. The ITER Project, an international fusion research and development collaboration, is a product of the thaw in superpower relations between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. This reactor will harness the power of nuclear fusion as a possible new and viable energy source by bringing a star to earth. ITER serves as a symbol of international scientific cooperation among key scientific leaders in the developed and developing world – Japan, Korea, China, E.U., India, Russia, and United States – representing 70% of the world’s current population. The recent elimination of funding for FY08 U.S. contributions to the ITER project comes at an inopportune time as the Agreement on the Establishment of the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project had entered into force only on October 2007. The elimination of the promised U.S. contribution drew our allies to question our commitment and credibility in international cooperative ventures. More problematically, it jeopardizes a platform for reaffirming U.S. relations with key states. It should be noted that even at the height of the cold war, the United States used science diplomacy as a means to maintain communications and avoid misunderstanding between the world’s two nuclear powers – the Soviet Union and the United States. In a complex multi-polar world, relations are more challenging, the threats perhaps greater, and the need for engagement more paramount. Using Science Diplomacy to Achieve National Security Objectives The welfare and stability of countries and regions in many parts of the globe require a concerted effort by the developed world to address the causal factors that render countries fragile and cause states to fail. Countries that are unable to defend their people against starvation, or fail to provide economic opportunity, are susceptible to extremist ideologies, autocratic rule, and abuses of human rights. As well, the world faces common threats, among them climate change, energy and water shortages, public health emergencies, environmental degradation, poverty, food insecurity, and religious extremism. These threats can undermine the national security of the United States, both directly and indirectly. Many are blind to political boundaries, becoming regional or global threats. The United States has no monopoly on knowledge in a globalizing world and the scientific challenges facing humankind are enormous. Addressing these common challenges demands common solutions and necessitates scientific cooperation, common standards, and common goals. We must increasingly harness the power of American ingenuity in science and technology through strong partnerships with the science community in both academia and the private sector, in the U.S. and abroad among our allies, to advance U.S. interests in foreign policy. There are also important challenges to the ability of states to supply their populations with sufficient food. The still-growing human population, rising affluence in emerging economies, and other factors have combined to create unprecedented pressures on global prices of staples such as edible oils and grains. Encouraging and promoting the use of contemporary molecular techniques in crop improvement is an essential goal for US science diplomacy. An essential part of the war on terrorism is a war of ideas. The creation of economic opportunity can do much more to combat the rise of fanaticism than can any weapon. The war of ideas is a war about rationalism as opposed to irrationalism. Science and technology put us firmly on the side of rationalism by providing ideas and opportunities that improve people’s lives. We may use the recognition and the goodwill that science still generates for the United States to achieve our diplomatic and developmental goals. Additionally, the Department continues to use science as a means to reduce the proliferation of the weapons’ of mass destruction and prevent what has been dubbed ‘brain drain’. Through cooperative threat reduction activities, former weapons scientists redirect their skills to participate in peaceful, collaborative international research in a large variety of scientific fields. In addition, new global efforts focus on improving biological, chemical, and nuclear security by promoting and implementing best scientific practices as a means to enhance security, increase global partnerships, and create sustainability.

# Round 7

### AT: Bataille

#### Resources are limited and finite---as such all human action is motivated by self-interest and rationality

Shughart 6 William F. Shughart II F. A. P. Barnard Distinguished Professor of Economics The University of Mississippi, "Terrorism in rational choice perspective" No date listed, latest citation from 2006 home.olemiss.edu/~shughart/Terrorism%20in%20rational%20choice%20perspective.pdf

In the economist's model of rational human behavior, all individuals are assumed to be motivated by self-interest. They seek to maximize their senses of personal well-being, or utility, an objective that includes not only the satisfaction derived from consuming goods and services purchased on the market, but also the psychic pleasure associated with the attainment of any other desired end. What is of chief importance here is that self-interest is not to be understood narrowly as selfishness; the aim of economically rational economic man (or woman) is not solely to maximize private income or wealth. Other-regarding preferences indulged by actions such as providing aid and comfort to family and friends, bestowing charity on strangers or supporting a revolutionary cause fall within the ambit of the rational-choice model. So, too, does striving to gain entree to a believed-in afterlife. Faced with a limited budget and unlimited wants, the problem confronting abstract economic (hu)man simply is to select the particular combination of market and non-market goods that, in the chooser's own judgment, yields the greatest possible level of satisfaction.

Terrorists are rational actors on that definition. Rationality in the spirit of Homo economicusis not necessarily to be found in terrorists' stated intentions, though. Indeed, living in a "fantasy world" (Laqueur 1999, p. 28), the Red Army Faction (Baader-Meinhof Group), Italy's Brigate Rosse, France's Action Directe and other left-wing terror groups of the 1960s and 1970s generally had no well-articulated purposes beyond "destruction of the current Western system" of liberal democracy (Kellen 1990, p. 55) and no practical plans for replacing it, except perhaps, as in the pipedreams of their Russian nihilist forebears, with a "universally all-human social republic and harmony" (Dostoevsky [1872] 1994, p. 53).

But terrorists are rational in two important means-ends senses. First, while the globe is terrorist-target-rich, the resources commanded by individual terrorists and terrorist groups unavoidably are limited. Every terrorist faces a budget constraint and, whether acting alone or in concert with others, consequently must deploy money, munitions and manpower cost-effectively, allocating the available resources over time and space so as to maximize terrorism's net returns, in whatever form those returns are expected to materialize. Second, terrorists respond rationally to measures taken to counter them. When some targets are hardened, they shift attention to softer ones. If a country elevates its counterterrorist efforts, terrorists move their operations to less vigilant states. Terrorists, in short, behave as if they are guided by the same rational-choice calculus that animates human action in more ordinary settings. They evaluate the alternatives available to them and choose the option that promises the largest expected benefit relative to cost; they respond, moreover, "in a sensible and predictable fashion to changing risks" (Enders and Sandler 2006, p. 11) and, one might add, to changing rewards. Many of the causes and consequences of terrorism are, in short, amenable to explanation by the economist's model of demand and supply.

#### The neg’s abdication of the theory of profit maximization through allocating scarce resources devastates their intellectual strategy

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.

#### Energy obviously isn’t infinite so reveling is impossible

Krauss & Starkman 99 Lawrence M. Krauss and Glenn D. Starkman 1999 Department of Physics and Astronomy Case Western Reserve University Life, The Universe, and Nothing: Life and Death in an Ever-Expanding Universe Google Scholar

Our universe could end in one of two ways. Either the observed expansion could terminate and be followed by collapse and a Big Crunch or the expansion could continue forever. The evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the latter possibility. Indeed recent direct [1, 2] and indirect [3, 4, 5] measurements suggest that the expansion is accelerating, implying that it is driven by an energy density which at least mimics vacuum energy, a so-called cosmological constant.

As dramatic as this result may be for our understanding of fundamental processes underlying the Big Bang, it has equally important consequences for the long-term quality of life of any conscious beings that may survive the more mundane challenges of daily existence. In an eternally-expanding universe life might, at least in principle, endure forever [6]. While global warming, nuclear war and asteroid impacts may currently threaten human civilization, one may hope that humanity will overcome these threats, expand into the Universe, and perhaps even encounter other intelligent life-forms. In any case, if intelligent life is ubiquitous in the Universe, it is reasonable to expect that no local threats can ever wipe the slate entirely clean. But are there global constraints on the perdurability or on the quality of conscious life in our Universe? These are the questions we examine here. We find that the future is particularly discouraging if we live in a cosmological- constant-dominated universe. In this case, very soon, on a cosmic time-scale, our ability to gather information on the large scale structure of the universe will begin to forever decrease. The decreasing information base in the observable universe is associated with **a finite and decreasing supply of accessible energy.** Life’s long term prospects are only slightly less dismal in any other cosmology, however. We argue that the total energy that any civilization can ever recover and metabolize is finite, as is the recoverable information content, independent of the geometry or expansion history of the universe.

Faced with this inevitable long term energy crisis, life **must eventually identify a strategy for reduced energy consumption or cease to exist**. In a cosmological-constant dominated universe, the de Sitter temperature fixes a minimum temperature below which life cannot operate without energy-consuming refrigerators. In any cosmology, the need to dissipate excess heat may fix a minimum temperature at which a biological system can operate continuously. A minimum temperature in a biological system of fixed information-theoretic com- plexity implies a minimum metabolic rate. Faced with a minimum rate of energy consumption and a finite energy supply, increasingly long hibernation seems the obvious alternative. But, this requires perfectly reliable alarm clocks. Statistically all alarm clocks eventually fail. Furthermore, alarm clocks operating in thermal backgrounds have minimum power consumption requirements. The options: live for the moment in high-powered luxury, or progressively reduce the information theoretic complexity of life until it loses consciousness forever. The only remaining hope involves (almost) dissipationless computation. Under certain assumptions about the rate at which systems could in principle dissipate the heat generated during such computation**, it is possible to find a mathematical solution allowing an infinite number of computations with finite energy.**

### Sustainability

#### The plan’s key to the chemical industry

Brady 12 – Jeff Brady, writer for NPR, February 13, 2012, "Natural Gas Boom Energizing The Chemical Industry" [www.npr.org/2012/02/13/146803953/natural-gas-boom-energizing-the-chemical-industry](http://www.npr.org/2012/02/13/146803953/natural-gas-boom-energizing-the-chemical-industry)

Just outside of West Virginia's capital city, Charleston, on the banks of the Kanawha River, sits the Institute Industrial Park. Chemical plants have operated here continuously since World War II, when the local factories cranked out synthetic rubber. Today there are industrial pipes, tanks and buildings stretching in just about every direction.¶ Soon, there could be more.¶ U.S. chemical companies are the latest beneficiaries of the nation's natural gas drilling boom. Long focused on cheap gas sources elsewhere in the world, companies are now looking to expand here. **A surplus of natural gas has pushed down prices, making it more attractive for chemical companies** that use lots of gas to reopen shuttered plants and build new ones.¶ Sleepy rural communities across the country are turning into industrial zones — and that worries people who live nearby. But the boom is good news for manufacturers that need cheap, plentiful supplies of natural gas.¶ The natural gas drilling boom near Charleston has local business boosters lobbying for a huge new chemical plant, called an ethane cracker, which could bring jobs to the state.¶ "It will take approximately 2,000 construction workers two years just to build the facility," says Matthew Ballard, president and chief executive officer of the Charleston Area Alliance. "Once up and running, there will be several hundred jobs at that cracking facility."¶ The plant would "crack" ethane — break it down at the molecular level — and turn it into ethylene. Kevin DiGregorio, executive director of the Chemical Alliance Zone in Charleston, says ethylene is used to produce all sorts of things, from the cushions we sit on to the clothes we wear.¶ "Everything that's not wood, or maybe brick, is made with chemicals, certainly. But probably 40 to 60 percent of it is made from ethylene," DiGregorio says. "It's very, very important to our daily lives."¶ States Compete For Plants, Jobs¶ The Marcellus Shale, from which nearby drillers are pulling natural gas, is particularly ethane-rich. Most natural gas contains anywhere from 2 to 8 percent of ethane, DiGregorio says, but "Marcellus natural gas contains as much as 14 to 16 percent" of ethane.¶ Bayer CropScience, the company that operates the industrial park near Charleston, is talking with companies interested in building ethane crackers in the region. No official announcement has been made, but business leaders here are keeping their fingers crossed.¶ The same is true elsewhere around northern Appalachia. Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia are competing to lure a new ethane cracker that the oil company Shell plans to build. Firms in Canada also see opportunity in the Marcellus Shale.¶ Economy¶ Project's Promise Of Jobs Has Appalachia Seeing Stars¶ "We wouldn't have to go back very far — literally just seven or eight years — and the picture for the industry here in North America was pretty uncertain," says Randy Woelfel, CEO of NOVA Chemicals in Calgary, Alberta.¶ He says high oil prices sent a lot of petrochemical manufacturing overseas to the Middle East and Asia. But now, low natural gas prices and the ethane-rich Marcellus Shale have changed everything.¶ "That means ... that we'll be back in the hiring business, rather than the consolidation and survival/cost-cutting mode that NOVA was clearly in for much of the last decade," Woelfel says.

#### A competitive chemical industry is key to sustainability, and solves extinction

ICCA 2 – ICCA (International Council of Chemical Associations), June 20, 2002, “SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY,” online: http://www.cefic.be/position/icca/pp\_ic010.htm

Sustainability in economic terms means the efficient management of scarce resources as well as a prospering industry and economy. Sustainability in the environmental sense means not placing an intolerable load on the ecosphere and maintaining the natural basis for life. Seen from society's viewpoint, sustainability means that human beings are the centre of concern. In view, particularly, of the population increase worldwide, there needs to be provided as large a measure of equal opportunities, freedom, social justice and security as possible. ¶ The chemical industry views Sustainable Development as a challenge put before all parts of society. In the advances made in its own operations, its improved performance and in the improvements to the human condition made through its products, the chemical industry sees cause for optimism and believes that Sustainable Development can be the intellectual framework around which the chemical industry, other industries and other sectors of society can reach consensus on how to improve living standards and the environment. ¶ The main challenges facing the world include:- ¶ \* Optimizing the benefits obtained from depleting resources¶ \* Assuring against excessive strains placed on the eco-system¶ \* The dynamic growth of the world population¶ \* Remedying social and economic inequalities¶ These are challenges on a global scale. It follows, therefore, that the attainment of Sustainable Development will call for action on the part of the people, governments, businesses and organisations around the world. The global chemical industry has realized this challenge. ¶ CONTRIBUTION OF THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ The chemical industry is a key industry. Its products and services are instrumental in meeting the needs of mankind. It is present in all areas of life, from food and clothing, housing, communications, transport - right through to leisure activities. In addition, it helps to solve the problems of other sectors of industry, such as the energy sector, information technologies, environmental industries and the waste disposal sector, as examples.¶ Due to its size, the chemical industry is an important supplier to a broad range of downstream industries and is, as well, a customer of a broad range of products and services from other industries. It follows, therefore, that the chemical industry plays a major role in providing/ supporting performance improvements, research and development progress and, last but not least, employment in other industries.¶ In itself, it is a large-scale provider of jobs and makes a significant contribution to wealth creation and, hence, to the financing of both public works and the exercise of public responsibilities. Since living standards are determined to a large degree by material considerations, it is clear that the chemical industry with its unique capabilities is in a position to make a decisive contribution to Sustainable Development.¶ Commitment by the world chemical industry to the concept of Sustainable Development requires words to be transposed into company-specific action programmes in order to provide a framework for all those working in the sector. Its "Responsible Care" initiative, self-monitoring systems and other voluntary programmes such as Sustainable Technology (SUSTECH), Education-Industry Partnerships, Energy Efficiency Programmes are also part of this framework. Thereby, companies are also confronted with new challenges and must act responsibly. They must take account of the consequences of their actions upon society and future generations.¶ The global chemical industry believes that the key to improving the performance of the industry is both its commitment to achieving environmentally sound Sustainable Development and improved performance and transparency. Under the concept ¶ environment, to seek continuous improvement in performance, to educate all staff and work with customers and communities regarding product use and overall operation. Through these efforts the industry is improving its efficiency, reducing risks to health and the environment and making better products which, in turn, help individual and industry customers.¶ THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY's LEADERSHIP IN INNOVATION¶ The very notion of Sustainable Development will require new approaches in a number of areas. Innovation at all levels and in all fields of activity is the most effective instrument for ensuring that the economic, and environmental goals, as well as those of society, are being advanced.¶ The chemical industry's contribution is to continue innovation of new products that meet customer needs and manufacturing processes that reduce risks to health and the environment. This contribution is based upon the knowledge and experience the industry has acquired from applying innovation not only to making, handling and use of chemical compounds, but also to reprocessing, recycling and solving environmental problems. The challenge facing the chemical industry is to maximize innovation, which can contribute to society meeting its goals for Sustainable Development. ¶ The chemical industry is firmly convinced that leadership in innovation represents the best way of attaining Sustainable Development. For the individual company, this means:- ¶ \* a consistent orientation towards products, technologies and solutions which offer the greatest promise for the future¶ \* development of new integrated environmental technologies¶ \* a close cooperation with the customers of the chemical industry¶ \* adaptation to the conditions of global competition¶ \* bringing the most promising products quickly on the market¶ \* strengthening the R&D effort which requires resources which can only be financed from profitable earnings¶ \* actively contributing ideas and suggestions to the policy debates taking place in society¶ \* improving process yield (efficiency).¶ APPROACH TO THE ECONOMIC GOAL OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ The internationalization of the economy at large, in conjunction with a growing trend towards global competition, is becoming more and more apparent. This is being manifested by:- ¶ \* an increase of imports and exports of goods as well as services¶ \* growing outward and inward flows of direct investment¶ \* an ever increasing exchange of technology transfers¶ \* globalization of monetary and financial schemes. ¶ The inter-relation of economic systems is complex, with a variety of relationships among countries. Multi-national chemical companies apply common standards in spreading investment capital and stimulating markets around the globe, thus setting the scene for the world market. What they need, in order to play a constructive role in Sustainable Development, is, first and foremost, freedom and fairness in international trade. Trade as an engine of economic growth is essential for Sustainable Development. A climate needs to be fostered within which such growth may take place on the basis of a clear set of rules with predictable consequences, by which investors may be guided in their long-term decision-making process. This includes bringing to a halt the growing intervention by governments in industry and their ever increasing demands to raise income by taxation, thus imposing a disproportionate load on the business community.¶ Wealth creation and **profits are fundamental to Sustainable Development**. They sustain economies (not just the chemical industry), and contribute, via re-investment and R&D, to new technologies and environmental improvements. Profits are needed to create flexible company structures oriented towards economic, environmental and society-related requirements.¶ The chemical industry is a major industrial sector and an essential contributor to welfare and employment on a global scale. In order to maintain this position under the imperative of Sustainable Development, the long-term future of the industry must be rooted in a dynamic policy, whereby continual innovation and re-engineering of companies result in an increase of productivity and, thus, keeping up international competitiveness as a pre-requisite of sustainable job creation.

**You take Bataille’s theories too far - we have to prevent indiscriminant violence from starvation- he agrees**

Kenneth **ITZKOWITZ**, 19**99**, Associate Professor of Philosophy – Marietta College, “To witness spectacles of pain: The hypermorality of Georges Bataille” College Literature, Winter

Yet in our lives there are also limits. It is unlikely that Bataille would applaud Manson for the same reason he ultimately rejects Sade. They are both indiscriminate; they both go too far. "Continuity is what we are after," Bataille confirms, but generally only if that continuity which the death of discontinuous beings can alone establish is not the victor in the long run. What we desire is to bring into a world founded on discontinuity all the continuity such a world can sustain. De Sade's aberration exceeds that limit. (Bataille 1962, 13) In other words, our wasteful consumption must also have limits. To actually approve of our own self-destruction goes too far. Later on in Death and Sensuality, Bataille continues, Short of a paradoxical capacity to defend the indefensible, no one would suggest that the cruelty of the heroes of Justine and Juliette should not be wholeheartedly abominated. It is a denial of the principles on which humanity is founded. We are bound to reject something that would end in the ruin of all our works. If instinct urges us to destroy the very thing we are building we must condemn those instincts and defend ourselves from them. (Bataille 1962, 179-80) This passage is crucial for understanding Bataille's ethics. Usually Bataille writes on behalf of the violence that remains unaffected by absolute prohibitions. Prohibitions cannot obviate this transformative violence. There is always ample motive to produce the experiences of sacred transformation, i.e., to transgress the prohibitions. Yet self-preservation is also a fundamental value for Bataille; there is also ample motive to resist the violence that denies the value of the well being of life itself. As he says in the second of the above passages, we must condemn what threatens to destroy us; our sovereign aspirations can be taken too far. In another passage he speaks of our need "to become aware of . . . [ourselves] and to know clearly what . . . [our] sovereign aspirations are in order to limit their possibly disastrous consequences" (1962, 181). It is when we are ignorant of these aspirations that we are most vulnerable to them, enacting them anyway, albeit inattentively.

**Bataille’s argument no longer is necessary and causes nuclear war and destruction of the biosphere - extinction**

Allan **Stoekl**, 20**07,** Professor of French and Comparative Literature – Penn State University, “Excess and Depletion: Bataille’s Surprisingly Ethical Model of Expenditure” in Reading Bataille Now edited by Shannon Winnubst, p. 253-4

Humans waste not only the energy accumulated by other species, but, just as important, their own energy, because humans themselves soon hit the limits to growth. Human society cannot indefinitely reproduce: soon enough what today is called the “carrying capacity” of an environment is reached.3 Only so many babies can be born, homes built, colonies founded. Then limits are reached. Some excess can be used in the energy and population required for military expansion (the case, according to Bataille, with Islam {1976a, 83-92; 1988, 81-91}), but soon that too screeches to a halt. A steady state can be attained by devoting large numbers of people and huge quantities of wealth and labor to useless activity: thus the large numbers of unproductive Tibetan monks, nuns, and their lavish temples (1976a, 93-108; 1988, 93-110). Or, most notably, one can waste wealth in military buildup and constant warfare. No doubt this solution kept populations stable in the past (one thinks of constant battles between South American Indian tribes), but in the present (i.e., 1949) the huge amounts of wealth devoted to military armament, worldwide, can only lead to nuclear holocaust (1976a, 159-60; 1988, 169-71). This final point leads to Bataille’s version of a Hegelian “Absolute Knowing,” one based not so much on the certainty of a higher knowledge as on the certainty of a higher expenditure, improperly conceived, can threaten the very existence of society. Bataille’s theory, then, is a profoundly ethical one: we must somehow distinguish between versions of excess that are “on the scale of the universe,” and whose recognition-implementation guarantees the survival of society (and human expenditure), and other versions that entail blindness to the real role of expenditure and thereby threaten man’s, not to mention the planet’s, survival. This, in very rough outline, is the main thrust of Bataille’s book. By viewing man as waster rather than conserver, Bataille manages to invert the usual order of economics: the moral imperative, so to speak, is the furthering of a “good” expenditure, which we might lose sight of if we stress an inevitably selfish model of conservation or utility. For if conservation is put first, inevitably the bottled-up forces will break loose, but in unforeseen and in, so to speak, untheorized ways. We should focus our attention, not on conservation, maintenance, and the steady state – which can lead only to mass destruction and the ultimate wasting of the world – but instead on the modes of waste in which we, as human animals, should engage. But how does one go about privileging waste in an era in which waste seems to be the root of all evil? Over fifty years after the publication of The Accursed Share, we live in an era in which nuclear holocaust no longer seems the main threat. But other dangers lurk, ones just as terrifying and definitive: global warming, deforestation, and the depletion of resources – above all, energy resources: oil, coal, even uranium. How can we possibly talk about valorizing waste, when waste seems to be the principle evil threatening the continued existence of the biosphere on which we depend? Wouldn’t it make more sense to stress conservation, sustainability, downsizing, rather than glorious excess?

**Expenditure is not transgressive - limitless consumption is useless and doesn’t solve**

Paul **Mann**, 19**99,** “The Exquisite Corpse of Georges Bataille” in Masocriticism, p. 67-9

I would like at one and the same time to affirm this model and to dismiss it as the most desperate alibi of all. For “sacrificial consumption” can never become an explicit critical motive.13 At the moment it presents itself as a proper element of some critical method, it degenerates into another useful trope, another bit of intellectual currency, another paper-thin abyss, another proxy transgression; and the force of transgression moves elsewhere, beneath a blinder spot in the critical eye.14 Questions of motive or understanding, the fact that one might be self-critical or at least aware of recuperation, are immaterial: what is at stake here is not self-consciousness but economics, material relations of appropriation and exclusion, assimilation and positive loss. Whatever transgression occurs in writing on Bataille does so only through the stupid recuperation and hence evacuation of the whole rhetoric and dream of transgression, only insofar as the false profundity of philosophy or theory evacuates the false profundities it apes. To justify this as the sublime loss of loss is merely to indulge a paradoxical figure. Excess is not a project but a by-product of any discourse; the interest of Bataillean discourse lies chiefly in the compulsive and symptomatic way it plays with its feces. The spectacle of critics making fools of themselves does not reveal the sovereign truth of death: it is only masocritical humiliation, a pathological attempt to disavow the specter of death. As for the present essay, it makes no claims to any redeeming sacrifice. Far from presenting you with a truer Bataille, far from speaking in his voice more clearly than his other readers, this essay pleads guilty to the indictment against every appropriation. Until philosophy and theory squeal like a pig before Bataille’s work, as he claims to have done before Dali’s canvases, there will be no knowledge of Bataille. In the end, one might have to take and even stricter view: there is no discourse of transgression, either on or by Bataille. None at all. It would be necessary to write a “Postscript to Transgression” were it not for the fact that Foucault already wrote it in his “Preface,” were it not for the fact that Bataille himself wrote it the moment before he first picked up his pen. It makes no difference whether one betrays Bataille, because one lip syncs Bataille’s rhetoric or drones on in the most tedious exposition. All of these satellite texts are not heliotropic in relation to the solar anus of Bataille’s writing, of the executioners he hoped (really?) would meet him in the Bois de Boulogne, or depensives in spite of themselves. It would be sentimental to assign them such privileges. They merely fail to fail. They are symptoms of a discourse in which everyone is happily transgressing everyone else and nothing ever happens, traces of a certain narcissistic pathos that never achieves the magnificent loss Bataille’s text conveniently claims to desire, and under whose cover it can continue to account for itself, hoarding its precious debits in a masocriticism that is anything but sovereign and gloriously indifferent. What is given to us, what is ruinously and profitably exchanged, is a lie. Heterology gives the lie to meaning and discourse gives the lie to transgression, in a potlatch that reveals both in their most essential and constitutive relation. Nothing is gained by this communication except profit-taking from lies. We must indict Bataille as the alibi that allows all of this writing to go on and on, pretending it is nothing it is not, and then turn away from Bataille as from a sun long since gone nova, in order to witness the slow freezing to death of every satellite text. The sacrificial consumption of Bataille has played itself out; the rotten carcass has been consumed: no more alibis. What is at stake is no longer ecstatic sexuality or violent upheavals or bloody sacrifices under the unblinking eye of the sun; nor was it ever, from the very beginning of Bataille’s career. These are merely figures in the melodramatic theater of what is after all a “soft expenditure” (Hollier 1989, xv), a much more modest death, a death much closer to home. It has never been more than a question of the death of the theory and of theory itself as death. Of theory-death. A double fatality.

### 2AC

#### **Omission is not exclusion: NO discursive act can include everything; this doesn't mean we reject or marginalize these concerns**

Rorty ‘2 (Professor of Comparative Literature @ Stanford, `02 (Richard, Peace Review, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 152-153)

I have no quarrel with Cornell's and Spivak's claim that "what is missing in a literary text or historical narrative leaves its mark through the traces of its expulsion." For that seems simply to say that any text will presuppose the existence of people, things, and institutions that it hardly mentions. So the readers of a literary text will always be able to ask themselves questions such as: "Who prepared the sumptuous dinner the lovers enjoyed?" "How did they get the money to afford that meal?" The reader of a historical narrative will always be able to wonder about where the money to finance the war came from and about who got to decide whether the war would take place. "Expulsion," however, seems too pejorative a term for the fact that no text can answer all possible questions about its own background and its own presuppositions. Consider Captain Birch, the agent of the East Indian Company charged with persuading the Rani of Sirmur not to commit suicide. Spivak is not exactly "expelling" Captain Birch from her narrative by zeroing in on the Rani, even though she does not try to find out much about Birch's early days as a subaltern, nor about the feelings of pride or shame or exasperation he may have experienced in the course of his conversations with the Rani. In the case of Birch, Spivak does not try to "gently blow precarious ashes into their ghostly shape," nor does she speculate about the possible sublimity of his career. Nor should she. S.ivak has her own fish to and her own witness to bear just as Kipling had his when he spun tales of the humiliations to which newly arrived subalterns were subjected in the regimental messes of the Raj. So do all authors of literary texts and historical narratives, and such texts and narratives should not always be read as disingenuous exercises in repression. They should be read as one version of a story that could have been told, and should be told, in many other ways.

**You take Bataille’s theories too far - we have to prevent indiscriminant violence from starvation- he agrees**

Kenneth **ITZKOWITZ**, 19**99**, Associate Professor of Philosophy – Marietta College, “To witness spectacles of pain: The hypermorality of Georges Bataille” College Literature, Winter

Yet in our lives there are also limits. It is unlikely that Bataille would applaud Manson for the same reason he ultimately rejects Sade. They are both indiscriminate; they both go too far. "Continuity is what we are after," Bataille confirms, but generally only if that continuity which the death of discontinuous beings can alone establish is not the victor in the long run. What we desire is to bring into a world founded on discontinuity all the continuity such a world can sustain. De Sade's aberration exceeds that limit. (Bataille 1962, 13) In other words, our wasteful consumption must also have limits. To actually approve of our own self-destruction goes too far. Later on in Death and Sensuality, Bataille continues, Short of a paradoxical capacity to defend the indefensible, no one would suggest that the cruelty of the heroes of Justine and Juliette should not be wholeheartedly abominated. It is a denial of the principles on which humanity is founded. We are bound to reject something that would end in the ruin of all our works. If instinct urges us to destroy the very thing we are building we must condemn those instincts and defend ourselves from them. (Bataille 1962, 179-80) This passage is crucial for understanding Bataille's ethics. Usually Bataille writes on behalf of the violence that remains unaffected by absolute prohibitions. Prohibitions cannot obviate this transformative violence. There is always ample motive to produce the experiences of sacred transformation, i.e., to transgress the prohibitions. Yet self-preservation is also a fundamental value for Bataille; there is also ample motive to resist the violence that denies the value of the well being of life itself. As he says in the second of the above passages, we must condemn what threatens to destroy us; our sovereign aspirations can be taken too far. In another passage he speaks of our need "to become aware of . . . [ourselves] and to know clearly what . . . [our] sovereign aspirations are in order to limit their possibly disastrous consequences" (1962, 181). It is when we are ignorant of these aspirations that we are most vulnerable to them, enacting them anyway, albeit inattentively.

**Bataille’s argument no longer is necessary and causes nuclear war and destruction of the biosphere - extinction**

Allan **Stoekl**, 20**07,** Professor of French and Comparative Literature – Penn State University, “Excess and Depletion: Bataille’s Surprisingly Ethical Model of Expenditure” in Reading Bataille Now edited by Shannon Winnubst, p. 253-4

Humans waste not only the energy accumulated by other species, but, just as important, their own energy, because humans themselves soon hit the limits to growth. Human society cannot indefinitely reproduce: soon enough what today is called the “carrying capacity” of an environment is reached.3 Only so many babies can be born, homes built, colonies founded. Then limits are reached. Some excess can be used in the energy and population required for military expansion (the case, according to Bataille, with Islam {1976a, 83-92; 1988, 81-91}), but soon that too screeches to a halt. A steady state can be attained by devoting large numbers of people and huge quantities of wealth and labor to useless activity: thus the large numbers of unproductive Tibetan monks, nuns, and their lavish temples (1976a, 93-108; 1988, 93-110). Or, most notably, one can waste wealth in military buildup and constant warfare. No doubt this solution kept populations stable in the past (one thinks of constant battles between South American Indian tribes), but in the present (i.e., 1949) the huge amounts of wealth devoted to military armament, worldwide, can only lead to nuclear holocaust (1976a, 159-60; 1988, 169-71). This final point leads to Bataille’s version of a Hegelian “Absolute Knowing,” one based not so much on the certainty of a higher knowledge as on the certainty of a higher expenditure, improperly conceived, can threaten the very existence of society. Bataille’s theory, then, is a profoundly ethical one: we must somehow distinguish between versions of excess that are “on the scale of the universe,” and whose recognition-implementation guarantees the survival of society (and human expenditure), and other versions that entail blindness to the real role of expenditure and thereby threaten man’s, not to mention the planet’s, survival. This, in very rough outline, is the main thrust of Bataille’s book. By viewing man as waster rather than conserver, Bataille manages to invert the usual order of economics: the moral imperative, so to speak, is the furthering of a “good” expenditure, which we might lose sight of if we stress an inevitably selfish model of conservation or utility. For if conservation is put first, inevitably the bottled-up forces will break loose, but in unforeseen and in, so to speak, untheorized ways. We should focus our attention, not on conservation, maintenance, and the steady state – which can lead only to mass destruction and the ultimate wasting of the world – but instead on the modes of waste in which we, as human animals, should engage. But how does one go about privileging waste in an era in which waste seems to be the root of all evil? Over fifty years after the publication of The Accursed Share, we live in an era in which nuclear holocaust no longer seems the main threat. But other dangers lurk, ones just as terrifying and definitive: global warming, deforestation, and the depletion of resources – above all, energy resources: oil, coal, even uranium. How can we possibly talk about valorizing waste, when waste seems to be the principle evil threatening the continued existence of the biosphere on which we depend? Wouldn’t it make more sense to stress conservation, sustainability, downsizing, rather than glorious excess?

**Expenditure is not transgressive - limitless consumption is useless and doesn’t solve**

Paul **Mann**, 19**99,** “The Exquisite Corpse of Georges Bataille” in Masocriticism, p. 67-9

I would like at one and the same time to affirm this model and to dismiss it as the most desperate alibi of all. For “sacrificial consumption” can never become an explicit critical motive.13 At the moment it presents itself as a proper element of some critical method, it degenerates into another useful trope, another bit of intellectual currency, another paper-thin abyss, another proxy transgression; and the force of transgression moves elsewhere, beneath a blinder spot in the critical eye.14 Questions of motive or understanding, the fact that one might be self-critical or at least aware of recuperation, are immaterial: what is at stake here is not self-consciousness but economics, material relations of appropriation and exclusion, assimilation and positive loss. Whatever transgression occurs in writing on Bataille does so only through the stupid recuperation and hence evacuation of the whole rhetoric and dream of transgression, only insofar as the false profundity of philosophy or theory evacuates the false profundities it apes. To justify this as the sublime loss of loss is merely to indulge a paradoxical figure. Excess is not a project but a by-product of any discourse; the interest of Bataillean discourse lies chiefly in the compulsive and symptomatic way it plays with its feces. The spectacle of critics making fools of themselves does not reveal the sovereign truth of death: it is only masocritical humiliation, a pathological attempt to disavow the specter of death. As for the present essay, it makes no claims to any redeeming sacrifice. Far from presenting you with a truer Bataille, far from speaking in his voice more clearly than his other readers, this essay pleads guilty to the indictment against every appropriation. Until philosophy and theory squeal like a pig before Bataille’s work, as he claims to have done before Dali’s canvases, there will be no knowledge of Bataille. In the end, one might have to take and even stricter view: there is no discourse of transgression, either on or by Bataille. None at all. It would be necessary to write a “Postscript to Transgression” were it not for the fact that Foucault already wrote it in his “Preface,” were it not for the fact that Bataille himself wrote it the moment before he first picked up his pen. It makes no difference whether one betrays Bataille, because one lip syncs Bataille’s rhetoric or drones on in the most tedious exposition. All of these satellite texts are not heliotropic in relation to the solar anus of Bataille’s writing, of the executioners he hoped (really?) would meet him in the Bois de Boulogne, or depensives in spite of themselves. It would be sentimental to assign them such privileges. They merely fail to fail. They are symptoms of a discourse in which everyone is happily transgressing everyone else and nothing ever happens, traces of a certain narcissistic pathos that never achieves the magnificent loss Bataille’s text conveniently claims to desire, and under whose cover it can continue to account for itself, hoarding its precious debits in a masocriticism that is anything but sovereign and gloriously indifferent. What is given to us, what is ruinously and profitably exchanged, is a lie. Heterology gives the lie to meaning and discourse gives the lie to transgression, in a potlatch that reveals both in their most essential and constitutive relation. Nothing is gained by this communication except profit-taking from lies. We must indict Bataille as the alibi that allows all of this writing to go on and on, pretending it is nothing it is not, and then turn away from Bataille as from a sun long since gone nova, in order to witness the slow freezing to death of every satellite text. The sacrificial consumption of Bataille has played itself out; the rotten carcass has been consumed: no more alibis. What is at stake is no longer ecstatic sexuality or violent upheavals or bloody sacrifices under the unblinking eye of the sun; nor was it ever, from the very beginning of Bataille’s career. These are merely figures in the melodramatic theater of what is after all a “soft expenditure” (Hollier 1989, xv), a much more modest death, a death much closer to home. It has never been more than a question of the death of the theory and of theory itself as death. Of theory-death. A double fatality.

#### 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.

### 2AC Capitalism Kritik

#### Capitalism is sustainable---self-correcting

Seabra 12 (Leo, has a background in Communication and Broadcasting and a broad experience which includes activities in Marketing, Advertising, Sales and Public Relations, 2/27, “Capitalism can drive Sustainability and also innovation,” http://seabraaffairs.wordpress.com/2012/02/27/capitalism-can-drive-sustainability-and-also-innovation/)

There are those who say that if the world does not change their habits, even the end of economic growth, and assuming alternative ways of living, will be a catastrophe. “Our lifestyles are unsustainable. Our expectations of consumption are predatory.Either we change this, or will be chaos”. Others say that the pursuit of unbridled economic growth and the inclusion of more people in consumption is killing the Earth. We have to create alternative because economic growth is pointing to the global collapse. “What will happen when billions of Chinese decide to adopt the lifestyle of Americans?” I’ll disagree if you don’t mind… **They might be** wrong. Completely wrong .. Even very intelligent people wrongly interpret the implications of what they observe when they lose the perspective of time. In the vast scale of time (today, decades, not centuries) it is the opposite of what expected, because they start from a false assumption: the future is the extrapolation of this. But not necessarily be. How do I know? Looking at history. What story? The history of innovation, this thing generates increases in productivity, wealth, quality of life in an unimaginable level. **It is innovation that will defeat pessimism as it always did**. It was innovation that made life today is incomparably better than at any other time in human history. And will further improve. Einstein, who was not a stupid person, believed that capitalism would generate crisis, instability, and growing impoverishment. He said: “The economic anarchy of capitalist society as it exists today is, in my opinion, the true source of evil.” The only way to eliminate this evil, he thought, was to establish socialism, with the means of production are owned by the company. A centrally controlled economy would adjust the production of goods and services the needs of people, and would distribute the work that needed to be done among those in a position to do so. This would guarantee a livelihood to every man, women and children. Each according to his possibilities. To each according to their needs. And guess what? What happened was the opposite of what Einstein predicted. Who tried the model he suggested, impoverished, screwed up. Peter Drucker says that almost of all thinking people of the late nineteenth century thought that Marx was right: there would be increased exploitation of workers by employers. They would become poorer, until one day, the thing would explode. Capitalist society was considered inherently unsustainable. It is more or less the same chat today. **Bullshit. Capitalism, with all appropriate regulations, self-corrects. It is an adaptive system that learns and changes by design. The design is just for the system to learn and change.** There was the opposite of what Einstein predicted, and held the opposite of what many predict, but the logic that “unlike” only becomes evident over time. It wasn’t obvious that the workers are those whom would profit from the productivity gains that the management science has begun to generate by organizing innovations like the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone .. to increase the scale of production and cheapen things. The living conditions of workers today are infinitely better than they were in 1900. They got richer, not poorer .. You do not need to work harder to produce more (as everyone thought), you can work less and produce more through a mechanism that is only now becoming apparent, and that brilliant people like Caetano Veloso still ignores. The output is pursuing growth through innovation, growth is not giving up. More of the same will become unsustainable to the planet, but most of it is not what will happen, will happen more different, than we do not know what is right. More innovative. Experts, such as Lester Brown, insist on statements like this: if the Chinese also want to have three cars for every four inhabitants, as in the U.S. today, there will be 1.1 billion cars there in 2030, and there is no way to build roads unless ends with the whole area used for agriculture. You will need 98 million barrels of oil per day, but the world only produces about 90 million today, and probably never produce much more. The mistake is to extrapolate today’s solutions for the future. We can continue living here for 20 years by exploiting the same resources that we explore today? Of course not. But the other question is: how can we encourage the stream of innovations that will enable the Chinese, Indians, Brazilians, Africans .. to live so as prosperous as Americans live today? Hey, wake up … what can not stop the engine of innovation is that the free market engenders. This system is self correcting, that is its beauty. We do not need to do nothing but ensure the conditions for it to work without distortion. The rest he does himself. It regulates itself.

#### Capitalism’s not the root cause of anything

Larrivee 10— PF ECONOMICS AT MOUNT ST MARY’S UNIVERSITY – MASTERS FROM THE HARVARD KENNEDY SCHOOL AND PHD IN ECONOMICS FROM WISCONSIN, 10 [JOHN, A FRAMEWORK FOR THE MORAL ANALYSIS OF MARKETS, 10/1, <http://www.teacheconomicfreedom.org/files/larrivee-paper-1.pdf>]

The Second Focal Point: Moral, Social, and Cultural Issues of Capitalism Logical errors abound in critical commentary on capitalism. Some critics observe a problem and conclude: “I see X in our society. We have a capitalist economy. Therefore capitalism causes X.” They draw their conclusion by looking at a phenomenon as it appears only in one system. Others merely follow a host of popular theories according to which capitalism is particularly bad. 6 The solution to such flawed reasoning is to be comprehensive, to look at the good and bad, in market and non-market systems. Thus the following section considers a number of issues—greed, selfishness and human relationships, honesty and truth, alienation and work satisfaction, moral decay, and religious participation—that have often been associated with capitalism, but have also been problematic in other systems and usually in more extreme form. I conclude with some evidence for the view that markets foster (at least some) virtues rather than undermining them. My purpose is not to smear communism or to make the simplistic argument that “capitalism isn’t so bad because other systems have problems too.” The critical point is that certain people thought various social ills resulted from capitalism, and on this basis they took action to establish alternative economic systems to solve the problems they had identified. That they failed to solve the problems, and in fact exacerbated them while also creating new problems, implies that capitalism itself wasn’t the cause of the problems in the first place, at least not to the degree theorized.

#### Cap solves war—capitalist peace theory

Harrison 11 (Mark, Department of Economics, University of Warwick, Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Birmingham, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, “Capitalism at War”, Oct 19 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/academic/harrison/papers/capitalism.pdf)

Capitalism’s Wars America is the world’s preeminent capitalist power. According to a poll of more than 21,000 citizens of 21 countries in the second half of 2008, people tend on average to evaluate U.S. foreign policy as inferior to that of their own country in the moral dimension. 4 While this survey does not disaggregate respondents by educational status, many apparently knowledgeable people also seem to believe that, in the modern world, most wars are caused by America; this impression is based on my experience of presenting work on the frequency of wars to academic seminars in several European countries. **According to the evidence, however, these beliefs are mistaken**. We are all aware of America’s wars, but they make only a small contribution to the total. Counting all bilateral conflicts involving at least the show of force from 1870 to 2001, it turns out that the countries that originated them come from all parts of the global income distribution (Harrison and Wolf 2011). Countries that are richer, measured by GDP per head, **such as America do not tend to start more conflicts**, although there is a tendency for countries with larger GDPs to do so. Ranking countries by the numbers of conflicts they initiated, the United States, with the largest economy, comes only in second place; third place belongs to China. In first place is Russia (the USSR between 1917 and 1991). What do capitalist institutions contribute to the empirical patterns in the data? Erik Gartzke (2007) has re-examined the hypothesis of the “democratic peace” based on the possibility that, **since capitalism and democracy are highly correlated across countries and time, both democracy and peace might be products of the same underlying cause, the spread of capitalist institutions**. It is a problem that our historical datasets have measured the spread of capitalist property rights and economic freedoms over shorter time spans or on fewer dimensions than political variables. For the period from 1950 to 1992, Gartzke uses a measure of external financial and trade liberalization as most likely to signal robust markets and a laissez faire policy. **Countries that share this attribute of capitalism above a certain level, he finds, do not fight each other, so there is capitalist peace as well as democratic peace**. Second, economic liberalization (of the less liberalized of the pair of countries) is a more powerful predictor of bilateral peace than democratization, controlling for the level of economic development and measures of political affinity.

#### Cap solves environmental destruction---property rights create financial incentives for conservation

Veer 12(Pierre-Guy, Independent journalist writing for the Von Mises Institute, 5/2, “Cheer for the Environment, Cheer for Capitalism,” http://www.mises.ca/posts/blog/cheer-for-the-environment-cheer-for-capitalism/)

No Ownership, No Responsibility How can such a negligence have happened? It’s simple: **no one was the legitimate owner of the resources** (water, air, ground). When a property is state-owned – as was the case under communism – **government has generally little incentive to sustainably exploit it**. In communist Europe, governments wanted to industrialize their country in order, they hoped, to catch up with capitalist economies. Objectives were set, and they had to be met no matter what. This included the use of brown coal, high in sulfur and that creates heavy smoke when burned[4], and questionable farming methods, which depleted the soil. This lack of vision can also be seen in the public sector of capitalist countries. In the US, the Department of Defense creates more dangerous waste than the top five chemical product companies put together. In fact, pollution is such that cleanup costs are estimated at $20 billion. The same goes for agriculture, where Washington encourages overfarming or even farming not adapted for the environment it’s in[5]. Capitalism, the Green Solution In order to solve most of the pollution problems, there exists a simple solution: **laissez-faire capitalism, i.e.** **make sure property rights and profitability can be applied**. The latter helped Eastern Europe; when communism fell, capitalism made the countries seek profitable – and not just cheap – ways to produce, which greatly reduced pollution[6]. As for the former, it proved its effectiveness, notably with the Love Canal[7]. Property rights are also thought of in order to protect some resources, be it fish[8] or endangered species[9]. Why such efficiency? Because an owner’s self-interest is directed towards the maximum profitability of his piece of land. By containing pollution – as Hooker Chemicals did with its canal – he keeps away from costly lawsuit for property violation. At the same time, badly managed pollution can diminish the value of the land, and therefore profits. Any entrepreneur with a long-term vision – and whose property is safe from arbitrary government decisions – thinks about all that in order to protect his investment. One isn’t foolish enough to sack one’s property! In conclusion, I have to mention that I agree with environmentalists that it is importance to preserve the environment in order to protect mother nature and humans. However, I strongly disagree with their means, i.e. government intervention. Considering it very seldom has a long-term vision, it is the worst thing that can happen. In fact, one could says that most environmental disasters are, directly or indirectly, caused by the State, mainly by a lack of clear property rights. Were they clearer, they would let each and everyone of us, out of self-interest, protect the environment in a better manner. That way, everyone’s a winner.

#### 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?**

### Politics Good/Perm (S)

#### Refusing political planning and utility just establishes uselessness as the new foundation for totalitarianism --- We must instead become conscious of the interconnection between planning and waste embodied in (the plan/our framework).

**Stoekl** 19**90**

Allan, Truman's Apotheosis: Bataille, "Planisme," and Headlessness, Yale French Studies, No. 78, On Bataille (1990), pp. 181-205

In both of these cases-the Aztec priest and the gangster-one notes that the figure's violence and subversion is doubled by erection centrality, and order; the Aztec's pyramid, the skyscraper associated with the gangster, are the organizing principles, the metonyms, of societies that are brutal and deliriously forceful, even if in decline. And one could say exactly the same thing about the "acephale": "he" is a figure that bears death, but at the same time "he" is a perfectly coherent and traditional "sacred figure" around which a society, albeit one of conspirators, can be established. "He" is not only the figure of an order, but (like the pyramid or skyscraper) a principle of order. One sees the representation of this political ambivalence-for want of a better word-in the famous "Acephale" drawing of 1936, by Andre Masson (VE, 180): while the head is clearly missing, the stars (nipples), bowels and death's head (genitals) only go to create another face, another "figure humaine." Further, the death's head itself has a miniature face.... The "acephale," in other words, has lost a head, a principle of organization and order, only to mutate and develop an- other, more hypnotic, doubled and doubling (replicating) face. It is no coincidence that, after the outbreak of the war, Bataille gave up the "whim" of starting a new religion and a new "order."22 As we see from the American example, "sacred figures and myths" seem to have a way of reversing themselves and turning into icons of centrality and oppression. Bataille's later fragmentary writings, in the Somme Atheologique, bear witness to his recognition of the need to disrupt any coherent movement, doctrine, or representation, no matter how "acephalic" it might be. But a renunciation of the marginal or elite "order" in Bataille's case returns him, surprisingly enough, in the last chapter of The Accursed Share (1949), to a certain affirmation of "planisme," and specifically to a celebration of the very culture that his Aztec priests and Chicago mobsters had seemed in principle to subvert: the planned American economy of the "New Deal." Does this mean that Bataille was simply jumping from one proto- fascism to another? After all, as Zeev Sternhell has shown, the links between "planisme," Lagardelle (the editor of Plans), "Ordre Nouveau," Henri de Man and, finally, collaboration with the Nazis are clear enough. By jettisoning democratic safeguards, and valorizing a conciliatory social "fusion" at the expense of the proletariat and the class struggle, "socialist" thinkers (and political leaders) like Henri de centrally directed as a de Man would have wished, whose net effect was to involve the government actively on the side of poor workers and farmers, thereby coopting (as the European "planistes" hoped to do) "harder core" Socialists and Communists. Thus the New Deal was much more interested in class cooperation than class conflict: the directors of the famous FSA photographic project, for example, sent Walker Evans and many others out into the field-literally-to record southern poverty, and the photographs they made were then seen by northern workers, with the resulting (at least hoped-for) bond of fraternity motivating both groups to vote for Roosevelt. The important thing, here, is that they would vote: the New Deal was never as authoritarian or as centralized as the "Plans" of the de Mans and Dandieus; some form of representative democracy was retained. Of course at the time many groups on both the left and the right in Europe considered post-1933 Washington, D.C. to be just another fascist, or at least totalitarian, capital.24 The very haphazardness of Roosevelt's "try anything" approach, however, and the retention and even strengthening of democracy by the New Deal and its avatars (the Voting Rights Act of 1965) disproved that. Pace Sternhell, then, a "planisme" could be, and was, developed in the prewar period that did not necessarily lead to fascism, that was "centralized" but was not authoritarian. One can argue that there is nothing intrinsically "fascist" in "planisme"; it can just as easily be "acephalic" as rigidly hierarchical. Indeed it was Roosevelt's successor, Truman, who, after the war, came to replace the "acephale" for Bataille as the figure of political and economic (disiorganization. "end" of planning is planlessness, the "self-consciousness" that has "nothing as its object," that is the "nothing of pure expenditure" (AS, 190). Bataille here, at the end of the chapter, reiterates the argument from "The Psychological Structure of Fascism": accumulation is sub-ordination to some future goal. (It is, in the terms of that essay, homo- geneous.) But Bataillean self-consciousness is a "becoming conscious of the decisive meaning of an instant in which increase (the acquisition of something) will resolve into expenditure" (AS, 190). Just as the most elaborately conceived planning is inseparable from potlatch, so too the most integrated, nonindividuated consciousness (the consciousness that arises at the end of history, through an impossible "awareness" of the [non] "object" of the Marshall Plan) is indissociable from the nothingness it "knows." At this point one can see how Bataille's economic project folds back into the secular mystical experience of the Somme Atheologique.

### Politics Good --- No Alternative

#### The (alternative/affirmative) fails to fail --- The minute any of their argument forms coherence it becomes worthless self-indulgence.

**Mann** 19**99**

Paul, *Masocriticism*, pg 67-69

I would like at one and the same time to affirm this model and to dismiss it as the most desperate alibi of all. For “sacrificial consumption’” can never become an explicit critical motive. At the moment it presents itself as a proper element of some critical method, it degenerates into another useful trope, another bit of intellectual currency, another paper-thin abyss, another proxy transgression; and the force of transgression moves elsewhere, beneath a blinder spot in the critical eye. Questions of motive or understanding, the fact that one might be self-critical or at least aware of recuperation, are immaterial: what is at stake here is not self-consciousness but economics, material relations of appropriation and exclusion, assimilation and positive loss. Whatever transgression occurs in writing on Bataille does so only through the stupid recuperation and hence evacuation of the whole rhetoric and hence evacuation of the whole rhetoric and dream of transgression, only insofar as the false profundity of philosophy or theory evacuates the false profundities it apes. To justify this as the sublime loss of loss is merely to indulge a paradoxical figure. **Excess is not a project but a by-product of *any* discourse**; the interest of Bataillean discourse lies chiefly in the compulsive and symptomatic way it plays with its feces. The spectacle of critics making fools of themselves does not reveal the sovereign truth of death: it is only masocritical humiliation, a pathological attempt to disavow the specter of death. As for the present essay, it makes no claims to any redeeming sacrifice. Far from presenting you with a truer Bataille, far from speaking in his voice more clearly than his other readers, this essay pleads guilty to the indictment against every appropriation. Until philosophy and theory *squeal like a pig* before Bataille’s work, as he claims to have done before Dali’s canvases, there will be no *knowledge* of Bataille. In the end, one might have to take an even stricter view: there is no discourse of transgression, either on or by Bataille. None at all. It would be necessary to write a “Postscript to Transgression” were it not for the fact that Foucault already wrote it in his “Preface,” were it not for the fact that Bataille himself wrote it the moment before he first picked up his pen. It makes no difference whether one betrays Bataille, because one is hip to heterology or does it by accident, whether one lip syncs Bataille’s rhetoric or drones on in the most tedious exposition. All of these satellite texts are not heliotropic in relationto the solar anus of Bataille’s writing, or the executioners he hoped (really?) would meet him in the Bois de Boulogne, or *depensives* in spite of themselves. It would be sentimental to assign them such privileges. They merely fail to fail. They are symptoms of a discourse in which everyone is happily transgressing everyone else and nothing ever happens, traces of a certain narcissistic pathos that never achieves the magnificent loss. Bataille’s text conveniently claims to desire, and under whose cover it can continue to account for itself, hoarding its precious debits in a masocriticism that is anything but sovereign and gloriously indifferent. What is given to us, what is ruinously and profitably exchanged, is a lie. Heterology gives the lie to meaning and discourse gives the lie to transgression, in a potlatch that reveals both in their most essential and constitutive relation. Nothing is gained by this communication except profit-taking from lies.

### Politics Good --- Cede the Political

#### Bataille’s celebration of violence for violence sake is a form of anthropological romanticism that surrenders the political to fascism.

**Wolin** 19**96**

Richard, LEFT FASCISM: GEORGES BATAILLE AND THE GERMAN IDEOLOGY, Constellations Volume 2, Number 3, <http://courses.ucsd.edu/nbryson/Graduate%20Readings/BatailleLeftFascism.pdf>

In the worldview of both Bataille and that of German young conservatives, war plays an essential, positive role. It serves as a means of dissolving the principium individuationis: the principle of bourgeois subjectivity, on which the homogeneous order of society - a world of loneliness and fragmentation - depends. For, according to Bataille, “the general movement of life is . . . accomplished beyond the demands of individual^."^^ It is in precisely this spirit that he celebrates the non-utilitarian nature of “combat” or “war” as a type of aestheticist end in itself: “Glory . . . expresses a movement of senseless frenzy, of measureless expenditure of energy, which the fervor of combat presupposes. Combat is glorious in that it is always beyond calculation at some moment.”33 For the same reasons, Bataille eulogizes those premodern “wamer societies in which ure, uncalculated violence and ostentatious forms of combat held sway.” For under such conditions, war was not made subservient to the vulgar ends of enterprise and accumulation, as is the case for modern-day imperialism, but served as a glorious end in itself. Yet, in the early 1930s, it was precisely this aestheticist celebration of “violence for violence’s sake,” or “war for war’s sake,” that Benjamin viewed as the essence of modem fascism. As he remarks in a well known passage : “Fiat arspereat mundus,” says fascism, and, as Marinetti admits, expects war to supply the artistic gratification of a sense perception that has been changed by technology. . . . Mankind, which in Homer’s time was an object of contemplation for the Olympian gods, now is one for itself. Its self-alienation has reached such a degree that it can experience its own destruction as an aesthetic pleasure of the first order. This is the situation of politics which fascism is rendering ae~thetic.~’ In Bataille’s thought war serves as the harbinger of a cultural transfiguration in which the primacy of self-subsistent subjectivity would be replaced by the values of an “unavowable” or “ecstatic community”: that is, a community that would no longer be governed by the goals of a “visual culture” - transparency, self-identity, etc. - but instead, those of self-laceration, difference, and finitude. In fact, this Bataille-inspired program of an ecstatic community has been quite explicitly carried forth and explored in the political writings of Maurice Blanchot (La Communautk inavouable; 1983) and Jean-Luc Nancy (La Communautk dboeuvrke; 1985). Via his theory of “general economics” - which stands opposed to the “restricted,” rational-purposive orientation of a capitalist economy - Bataille, too, embraces a type of vitalism. In The Accursed Share, for example, he speaks confidently from the standpoint of “the exuberance of life,” of “the exuberance of living matter as a whole.”36 Yet, his is less a philosophical vitalism than that of a theorist of culture who allows himself to be guided by a certain anthropological romanticism: by a tendency to project anachronistically contemporary society’s need for wholeness and unity upon premodern forms of life that are on this account viewed in a quasi-utopian light. Bataille’s understanding of the prospects for a return of the sacred is relatively pluralistic. The revitalization of any one of a number of rites and occult practices that have been summarily banned by the rise of modernity’s “instrumentally rationalist culture” (Weber) will do. Thus, in Bataille’s theory of “expenditure” (dkpense), war is only one of a number of possibilities for radical cultural transgression; other possibilities include: luxury, mourning, war, cults, the construction of sumptuary monuments, games, spectacles, arts, perverse sexual activity (i.e., deflected from genital finality)” - all of these are, according to Bataille, “activities which, at least in primitive circumstances, have no end beyond themselve~.”~~ Yet, in addition to his endorsement of varieties of non-purposive ritual, Bataille is of sorts a disciple of negative theology. As a counterweight to modernity he is in favor of generalized profanation: any practice that furthers the ends of a “general” rather than “restricted economy” (where “economy” is anthropologically defined in terms of the general circulationof persons, goods, and symbols) will do. All instances of profanation that gratuitously disrupt the smooth functioning of productive consumption - the reign of the Tuuschprinzip - are eagerly welcomed. Hence, in Bataille’s work “the heterogeneous” (along with “sovereignty”) can best be defined ex negativo: as whatever stands opposed to or helps to undermine our modern cult of the homogeneous: contemporary capitalism and its anodyne cultural analogues (such as “art for art’s sake”), which know no wanton expenditure, but instead adhere to the bourgeois principle of equivalent exchange. However, as a result of the ethos of transgression that is propagated in Bataille’s work - a quasi-aestheticist valorization of transgression for transgression’s sake - one encounters serious normative lacunae. One might even go so far as to say, echoing Tony Judt, that aspects of Bataille’s thought are redolent of a more general and long-standing “vacuum at the heart of public ethics in France,” “the marked absence of a concern with public ethics or political morality.”38 I have already spoken of his work as an unsurpassable normative point of reference for much of post-structuralism. Here, “anti-normativism” itself becomes “normative,” insofar as rejection of the “norm” becomes itself a source of normativity. In recent years, as poststructuralists have begun meditating on the problem of how one would go about constituting a non-totalitarian political community - a communautk inavouable (Blanchot) or dksoeuvrke (J-L. Nancy), as it has been called - it is, unsurprisingly, to Bataille’s work that they have immediately turned.39 Yet, as Bernard-Henri LCvy has cautioned in relation to this avowedly illiberal, new “organicism” or “communitarianism”: Organicism. Naturalism. Refusal of universal values. Denial of values purely and simply. . . . It is on these bases, on this mute foundation, that one deploys a cover of horror that is more somber and infinitely more clamorous. . . . I will have attained my objective when I have succeeded in convincing that fascism is not in the first instance barbarism; that is it not essentially and to begin with the apocalypse; that it does not always and of necessity mean storms of iron and blood. Instead, it is in the first instance a type of society, a model of community, a manner of thinking and of organizing the social bond.40 It is precisely Bataille’s ecstatic model of community, his manner of “thinking and of organizing the social bond,” that I wish to call into question. It is a model that, fundamentally and undeniably, seeks to establish the normative basis of social action on an aesthetic foundation. As such its guiding ethos would be an aesthetics of transgression. Bataille’s ecstatic community would also be an aesthetic community: it would be a community in which the type of social action that would be valued above all would be action that yielded “no return,” action that - in the manner of art for art’s sake - had no end beyond itself. In the last analysis, the celebration of transgression for transgression’s sake remains unnuanced, unqualified, and uncritical. In lieu of a conceptual articulation of how one would begin to differentiate between, shall we say, salutary and retrograde instances of transgression, we are left with an ethos of shock, rupture, and disruption, purely and simply. In essence, Bataille - and those who have followed in his footsteps - seeks to ground an ethics of postmodernity in an avant-garde cultural practice that draws heavily on precapitalist forms of social life, precisely those forms that have been scorned and tabooed by the process of modernization. Indeed, the very desideratum of an adequate “conceptual articulation” of Bataillesque concepts such as “sovereignty,” “heterogeneity,” “expenditure,” and so forth would amount to a contrudictio in adjecto. In Bataille’s sense, the very call for principled legitimation would stand convicted a priori of indebtedness to the logic of “productive consumption,” to the values of a society predicated on instrumental reason and equivalent exchange. Such considerations return us to Habermas’s claim concerning the affinities between poststructuralism and the “young conservatives.” Both “transpose the spontaneous power of the imagination, the experience of self and affectivity, into the remote and the archaic; and in Manichean fashion, they counterpose to instrumental reason a principle only accessible via ‘evocation’: be it the will to power or sovereignty, Being or the Dionysian power of the poetic.” In other words, both “ground an intransigent antimodernism through a modernist attitude.”

### Utility Good --- a2 Sacrifice

#### No link & turn --- Modern subjectivity makes sacrifice redundant and their obsession with combining secular society with premodern material violence is the foundation for Nazism.

**Zizek** 19**96**

Slavoj, The indivisible remainder: an essay on Schelling and related matters, pg 124-125

This notion of the modern, Cartesian subject *qua* the radical negativity of the double (self-relating) sacrifice also enables us to demarcate the paradoxical place of the theories of Georges Bataille, that is, of Bataille’s fascination with the ‘real,’ material sacrifice, with the different forms of holocaust and of the excessive destruction of (economic, social, etc.) reality. On the one hand, of course, Bataille’s topic is modern subjectivity, the radical negativity implied in the position of the pure transcendental subject. On the other hand, Bataille’s universe remains the pre-Newtonian universe of balanced circular movement or – to put it in a different way – his notion of subjectivity is definitely pre-Kantian: Bataille’s ‘subject’ is not yet the pure void (the transcendental point of self-relating negativity), but remains an *inner-worldly*, *positive force*. Within these co-ordinates, the negativity which characterizes the modern subject can express itself only in the guise of a violent destruction which throws the entire circuit of nature off the rails. It is as if, in a kind of unique short circuit, *Bataille* *projects the negativity of the modern subject backwards, into the ‘closed’ pre modern Aristotelian universe of balanced circular movement, within which this negativity can materialize itself only as an ‘irrational’, excessive, non-economical expenditure*. In short, what Bataille fails to take note of is that the modern (Cartesian) subject no longer needs to sacrifice goat’s intestines, his children, and so on, since *his very existence already entails the most radical (redoubled, self-relating) sacrifice, the sacrifice of the very kernel of his being*. Incidentally, this failure of Bataille also throws a new light on the sacrificial violence, the obsession with the ultimate twilight of the universe, at work in Nazism: in it, we also encounter the reinscription of the radical negativity characteristic of the modern subject into the closed ‘pagan’ universe in which the stability of the social order is guaranteed by some kind of repeated sacrificial gesture – what we encounter in the libidinal economy of Nazism is *the modern subjectivity perceived from the standpoint of the pre-modern ‘pagan’ universe.*