# Round 1 – Neg V ASU CM

## 1NC

**T**

***A) Interpretation – The Federal Government is the one in D.C.***

**Dictionary of American politics**, 2nd edition, 19**68**.

Federal government: in the united states: the government which, from its capital in the district of Columbia, directly legislates, administers, and exercises jurisdiction over matters assigned to it in the constitution and exerts considerable influence, by means of grants-in-aid and otherwise, over matters reserved to the state governments.

***B. Violation – The aff does not defend the federal government acting, and is the opposite of the resolution --- their argument is energy production bad***

***C. Reasons to prefer -***

***predictable limits – we are prepared to debate the USFG acting – allowing individual actions or independent criticisms of status quo policies justifies an infinite amount of aff cases.***

***predictable ground – USFG action is key to stable research base for the negative and core neg arguments like disads and counterplans.***

***fairness – allowing the affirmative to stand here and negate a policy makes it impossible for the neg to garner offense in the 1nc.***

***Extra Topicality – Even if they claim to “defend” their plan – they skirt discussion of its merits by arguing the benefits derived from their advocacy outweigh. This is a voting issue because we’re forced to win framework just to get back to equal footing – extra topicality also proves the resolution insufficient and explodes aff ground.***

**K**

***Identifying capitalism as an effect of technological thought discourages criticism of capitalism and upholds the prohibition on thought that makes resistance to it impossible. A God will not save us, and the 1ac’s retreat into the realm of the ontic dooms the anti-capitalist project***

**Sinnerbrink ’10** (Robert, PhD & Chair of the Australasian Society for Continental Philosophy, International Journal of Zizek Studies, Volume 4 Number 2, “Goodbye Lenin? Žižek on Neoliberal Ideology and Post-Marxist Politics”,

Despite the Marxist political posturing, Žižek’s political philosophy remains, in various ways, stubbornly Hegelian. What we face, he observes, is a crisis of “determinate negation”: the abandonment of the (Hegelian-Marxist) notion that the immanent antagonisms or contradictions within an existing order generates the seeds of the new, that is, of a more just or egalitarian or universal social and political order (Žižek 2008a: 337 ff.). Beginning with the Frankfurt School of the 1950s and 60s, the abandonment of determinate negation also saw the rise of the “wholly Other”: the overcoming of capitalism was no longer sought in the immanent antagonisms of the system but could only come, rather, “from an unmediated Outside” (Žižek 2008a: 337). **Global capitalism has since become naturalised as the unquestioned background against which all other forms of social, cultural, and political debate can occur, provided that the economic realm is cordoned off from political critique.** Notwithstanding the ‘revolutionary’ rhetoric of the neoconservatives and neoliberals alike, **the critique of political economy, in its fully critical sense, has been all but silenced. So how has the “contemporary Left” reacted to the “full hegemony of global capitalism and its political supplement, liberal democracy”**? (Žižek 2008a: 337) Žižek lists the following, overlapping developments (2008a: 337-338): 1. Full acceptance of the framework of global capitalism while continuing to fight for emancipation *within* its rules (Third Way social democracy); 2. Acceptance of this framework but as something to be resisted by withdrawing from the reach of the state and operating from its ‘interstices’ (Simon Critchley’s ethical anarchism); 3. **Acceptance of the all-encompassing character of this framework, which coincides with its opposite** (the logic of the camp, the permanent ‘state of exception’), **and thus renders all political struggles futile; all that can be done is to wait for the outburst of something like** (Benjamin’s) **‘divine violence’** (late Adorno, **Heidegger’s ‘only a god can save us’**, Giorgio Agamben); 4. **Construing global capitalism as the ontic effect of a deeper ontological principle, whether the world-historical dominance of “instrumental reason” or the destinal sending of Being as modern technics** (**late Adorno, Heidegger**). 5. The ‘postmodern’ shift from anti-capitalist struggle to “the multiple forms of the political-ideological struggle for hegemony,” which is “conceptualised as a contingent process of discursive rearticulation” (of norms, discourses, signifiers) (Ernesto Laclau); 6. The wager that the Marxist gesture of the ‘determinate negation’ of capitalism can be repeated at the “postmodern” level thanks to the rise of “cognitive work,” the contradiction between social production and capitalist relations having reached such a pitch that the immanent power of the “multitudes” might finally make possible the advent of an “absolute democracy” (Hardt and Negri). All of **these responses to the contemporary political situation share a common premise: that global capitalism is now a permanent condition of historical, social, cultural and political existence. Hence whatever political responses one may envisage must operate within the prevailing ideological consensus, which is defined by the disavowal of the economic and hence social antagonisms underlying our social, cultural, and political institutions**. How, then, to respond to this situation?

***Rejecting technological control is capitalist opiate.***

**ZIZEK 01**[Slavoj, Senior Researcher @ U of Ljubljana, On Belief, <http://www.lacan.com/zizek-self.htm>]

The recourse to Taoism or Buddhism offers a way out of this predicament which definitely works better than **the desperate escape into old traditions: instead of trying to cope with** the accelerating rhythm of **technological progress** and social changes**, one should rather renounce the very endeavor to retain control over what goes on, rejecting it as the expression of the modern logic of domination - one should, instead, “let oneself go**,” drift along, while retaining an inner distance and indifference towards the mad dance of this accelerated process, a distance based on the insight that all this social and technological upheaval is ultimately just a non-substantial proliferation of semblances which do not really concern the innermost kernel of our being … **One is almost tempted to resuscitate here the old infamous Marxist cliché of religion as the “opium of the people,” as the imaginary supplement of the terrestrial misery: the** “Western Buddhist” **meditative stance is arguably the most efficient way, for us, to fully participate in the capitalist dynamic** while retaining the appearance of mental sanity. If Max Weber were alive today, he would definitely write a second, supplementary, volume to his Protestant Ethic, entitled The Taoist Ethic and the Spirit of Global Capitalism. 7

***The aff is wasted energy – fighting particular battles without changing the way the economy works means nothing really changes – the aff just obscures the logic of capitalism***

**Zizek, ’99** (Slavoj, Senior Researcher and professor at the Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana, The Ticklish Subject, page 352-355)

**The big news of today’s post-political age** of the ‘end of ideology’ **is** thus **the radical depoliticization of the sphere of the economy:** the way the economy functions (the need to cut social welfare, etc.) is accepted as a simple insight into the objective state of things. However, **as long as this fundamental depoliticization of the economic sphere is accepted, all the talk about active citizenship, about public discussion leading to responsible collective decisions, and so on, will remain limited to the ‘cultural’ issues of** religious, sexual, ethnic and other **way-of-life differences, without actually encroaching upon the level at which long-term decisions that affect us all are made.** In short, **the only way effectively to bring about a society in which risky long-term decisions would ensue from public debate involving all concerned is some kind of radical limitation of Capital’s freedom,** the subordinated of the process of production to social control – **the radical repoliticization of the economy.** That is to say: if the problem with today’s post-politics (‘administration of social affairs’) is that it increasingly undermines the possibility of a proper political act, this undermining is directly due to the depoliticization of economics, to the common acceptance of Capital and market mechanisms as neutral tools/ procedures to be exploited. We can now see why today’s **post-politics cannot attain** the properly political dimension of **universality; because it silently precludes the sphere of economy from politicization.** The domain of global capitalist market relations in the Other Scene of the so-called repoliticization of civil society advocated by the partisans of ‘identity politics’ and other postmodern forms of politicization: **all the talk about new forms of politics bursting out all over, focused on particular issues** (gay rights, **ecology,** ethnic minorities…), **all this incessant activity** of fluid, shifting identities, **of building multiple** *ad hoc* **coalitions,** and so on, has something inauthentic about it, and **ultimately resembles the obsessional neurotic who talks all the time and is otherwise frantically active precisely in order to ensure that something – what** *really matters* **– will** *not* **be disturbed, that it will remain immobilized.** 35 So, instead of celebrating the new freedoms and responsibilities brought about by the ‘second modernity’, **it is much more crucial to focus on what** *remains the same* **in this global fluidity and reflexivity, on what serves as the very motor of this fluidity: the inexorable logic of Capital.** The spectral presence of Capital is the figure of the big Other which not only remains operative when all the traditional embodiments of the symbolic big Other disintegrate, but even directly causes this disintegration: far from being confronted with the abyss of their freedom – that is, laden with the burden of responsibility that cannot be alleviated by the helping hand of Tradition or Nature – today’s subject is perhaps more than ever caught in an inexorable compulsion that effectively runs his life.

***The 1ac’s call for releasement and gelassenheit is pure fantasy --- it reduces humanity to a disembodied gaze and makes environmental collapse inevitable***

**Zizek ‘8**, (Slavoj, Institute for Social Sciences Ljubljana, Censorship Today: Violence, or Ecology as a New Opium for the Masses Part 2, http://www.lacan.com/zizecology2.htm)

The lesson to be fully endorsed is thus that of another environmental scientist who came to the result that, while one cannot be sure what the ultimate result of humanity's interventions into geo-sphere will be, one thing is sure: **if humanity were to stop abruptly its immense industrial activity and let nature on Earth take its balanced course, the result would have been a total breakdown, an imaginable catastrophe. "Nature" on Earth is already to such an extent "adapted" to human interventions, the human "pollutions" are already to such an extent included into the shaky and fragile balance of the "natural" reproduction on Earth, that its cessation would cause a catastrophic imbalance**. This is what it means that humanity has nowhere to retreat: not only "there is no big Other" (self-contained symbolic order as the ultimate guarantee of Meaning); there is also no Nature qua balanced order of self-reproduction whose homeostasis is disturbed, thrown off the rails, by the imbalanced human interventions. Indeed, what we need is ecology without nature: **the ultimate obstacle to protecting nature is the very notion of nature we rely on.** Alan Weisman's **The World Without Us is a vision of what would have happened if humanity** (and ONLY humanity) **were suddenly to disappear from the earth -** natural diversity blooming again, nature gradually regaining human artefacts. We, **humans**, are **reduced to a pure disembodied gaze** observing our own absence. (As Lacan pointed out, **this is** the fundamental subjective position of **fantasy**: to be reduced to **a**, the **gaze which observes the world in the condition of the subject's non-existence** - like the fantasy of witnessing the act of one's own conception, the parental copulation, or the act of witnessing one's own burial, like Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn. A jealous child likes to indulge in the fantasy of imagining how his parents would react to his own death, putting at stake his own absence.) "The world without us" is thus fantasy at its purest: witnessing the Earth itself retaining its pre-castrated state of innocence, before we humans spoiled it with our hubris. **The irony is that the most prominent example comes from the catastrophe of Chernobyl: the exuberant nature taking over the disintegrating debris of the nearby city Pripyat which was abandoned, left the way it was.**

***Vote neg on ethics - resisting this reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility***

**Zizek and Daly 2004**

(Slavoj, professor of philosophy at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana, and Glyn, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, Conversations with Zizek, page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world.** Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – **Zizek is arguing for a politics that** might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and **focuses** instead **on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality:** the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that **in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system.** What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that **the gentrification of global liberal capitalism** is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally **reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations.** In this way, **neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and,** in consequence, **social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that **this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect** (or misdirect) **social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.** Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this **Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale.** While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), **what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.**

***Extinction inevitable - capitalism’s domination over nature and culture is the root cause of all violence***

**Shiva, ’02** (Vandana, Alternative Nobel Laureate, Director of The Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Natural Resource Policy, a network of researchers specializing in sustainable agriculture and development, and Philosophy Ph.D., “Terrorism as Cannibalism,” January 23, <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/2002-01/23shiva.cfm>, bgm)

Humans are experiencing their religious spaces enclosed when militaries occupy sacred lands as in the Mid East. Humans are experiencing enclosure through occupation as in Palestine. The children in affluent America are also experiencing a closing of their lives, and are turning to mindless violence as in the case of shooting at St. Columbines. And **across the world, ecological, economic and political spaces are being enclosed through privatisation, liberalisation and globalisation. These multiple processes are breeding new insecurities, new anxieties, new stresses. Cultural security, economic security, ecological security, political security are all being rapidly eroded.** Could the violence being unleashed by humans against humans be similar to the violence pigs, chicken and cattle express when denied their freedom to roll in the mud, peck for worms, and roam outside the confines of animal factories? **Could the coercive imposition of a consumer culture worldwide, with its concomitant destruction of values, cultural diversity, livelihoods, and the environment be the invisible cages against which people are rebelling**, some violently, most non-violently. Could the “war against terrorism” be equivalent to the detoothing, debeaking, dehorning of pigs chickens and cattle by agribusiness industry because they are turning violent when kept under violent conditions? **Could the lasting solution to violence induced by the violence of captivity and enslavement for humans be the same as that for other animals – giving them back their space for spiritual freedom, ecological freedom, for psychological freedom and for economic freedom. The cages that humans are feeling tapped in are the new enclosures which are robbing communities of their cultural spaces and identities, and their ecological and economic spaces for survival. Globalisation is the overaching name for this enclosure.** **Greed and appropriation of other people’s share of the planet’s precious resources are at the root of conflicts, and the root of terrorism.** When President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair announced that the goal of **the global war on terrorism is** for the defense of he American and European “way of life”, they are declaring **a war against the planet**-its oil, its water, its biodiversity. **A way of life for the 20 percent of the earth’s people who use 80 percent of the planet’s resources will dispossess 80 percent of its people of their just share of resources and eventually destroy the planet. We cannot survive as a species if greed is privileged and protected and the economics of the greedy set the rules for how we live and die**. **If the past enclosures have already precipitated so much violence, what will be the human costs of new enclosures being carved out for privatisation of living resources** and water resources, the very basis of our species survival. **Intellectual property laws** and water privatisation **are new invisible cages trapping humanity.**

***Capital is the root cause of modernity’s obsession with technology and management – the aff cannot access our impact***

**Zizek 04** (Slavoj, Fantasy Transverser, BAMF and senior researcher, “The Ongoing “Soft Revolution’”, Critical Inquiry, jj)

More than ever, **capital is the "concrete universal" of our historical epoch**. What this means is that, while it remains a particular formation**, it overdetermines all alternative formations, as well as all noneconomic strata of social life**. The twentieth-century communist movement emerged, defining itself as an opponent of capitalism, and was defeated by it; Fascism emerged as an attempt to master capitalism's excesses, to build a kind of capitalism without capitalism. For this reason**, it is also much too simple, in a Heideggerian mood, to reduce capitalism to one of the ontic realizations of a more fundamental ontological attitude of** will to power and **technological domination** (claiming that the alternatives to it remain caught within this same ontological horizon). **Modern technological domination is inextricably intertwined with the social form of capital; it can only occur within this form, and, insofar as the alternative social formations display the same ontological attitude, this merely confirms that they are, in their innermost core, mediated by capital as their concrete universality, as the particular formation that colors the entire scope of alternatives, that is, that functions as the encompassing totality mediating all other particular formations**. In his new book on modernity, Fredric Jameson offers a concise critique of the recently fashionable theories of "alternate modernities": How then can the ideologues of 'modernity' in its current sense manage to distinguish their product–the information revolution, and globalized, free-market modernity–from the detestable older kind, without getting themselves involved in asking the kinds of serious political and economic, systemic questions that the concept of a postmodernity makes unavoidable? The answer is simple: you talk about 'alternate' or **'alternative' modernities. Everyone knows the formula by now: this means that there can be a modernity for everybody which is different from the standard** or hegemonic **Anglo-Saxon model. Whatever you dislike** about the latter, including the subaltern position it leaves you in, **can be effaced by the** reassuring and **'cultural' notion that you can fashion your own modernity differently, so that there can be a Latin-American kind, or an Indian kind or an African kind, and so on. . . . But this is to overlook the other fundamental meaning of modernity which is that of a worldwide capitalism itself**.[5](http://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/issues/v30/30n2.Zizek.html" \l "5)

***This round is a question of competing methodologies --- our alternative is to vote negative in favor of a universal opposition to capitalism through a class based pedagogy. Only by educating students in our classrooms and in our debate rounds about the exploitative nature of transnational capitalism can we begin to dismantle it. The aff’s fatalistic call to “let a god save us” is incompatible with our starting point***

**McLaren and Farahmandpur** 20**05** (Peter McLaren, professor of Education at UCLA and Ramin Farahmandpur, assistant professor of education at Portland state, “Teaching Against Global Capitalism,” pgs 90 – 92, 2005)

We agree with Moody that **leftist alternatives such as stakeholder capitalism and** civil **society**/third-sector **counterforce movements are not enough. We need an approach that prefigures a deeper and more international socialist politics**, such as social movement unionism. The new socialism needs to be more international, as Che Guevara envisioned, and should contribute actively to the recomposition of regional groups capable of opposing the internationalism of people to that of capital. We need focus on the differentiations occurring in the process of capitalist expansion, precisely at the interface between the global and the national aspects of this reality, and on the tension between general struggles and particular, regional efforts. In order to place liberation on the agenda of history again, we need to reenchant the project of critical education theory. As educationalists whose work is underwritten by critical pedagogy (McLaren, 1995, 1997b), **we need to conscript such a rethinking into the development of a critical pedagogy that is capable of devising a transition beyond capitalism.** The stakes in the debate are considerable**. In order to make possible the type of dialogue needed for strategizing within today’s global arena, the advancement beyond capitalism and toward universal socialism requires some important choices for the Left**. Samir Amin (1997) has suggested some important directions: charging the World Trade Organization with planning access to the use of major natural resources of the globe and with planning targets for interregional trade in industrial products, improving the incomes of disadvantages workers, and reconciling general competitiveness with distributional criteria favoring disadvantages regions of the globe. In addition, excess finance must be channeled toward productive investment in peripheral countries, accompanied by a rethinking of the international monetary system in the direction of regional monetary systems that guarantee the relative stability of exchange rates and so on**. A prerequisite requires that the bourgeois Left – largely inconscient of its own reactive theoretical moves – confront the contradictions inherent in the politics of its own theorizing.** **The inexorable downward spiral toward dystopian** resignation **brought about by the postmodernist assault on material reality and any radical attempts to change it must be confronted by radical hope. It must be confronted by a “contraband pedagogy” that conjugates hope with revolutionary struggle in the search for an alternative to capitalist social relations of exploitation**. One primary objective should be the translocation of past socialist struggles into the corridors of our historical imagination as a condition of possibility of transformative change and a necessary prelude to our own history-making activity. **Such an objective would be to overcome despair in the face of capital’s destructive and imperializing force by outbidding it with an affirmation of socialist solidarity. While mainstream pedagogy has conjured away the idea that education should playa central role in the struggle for social justice, contraband pedagogy rests on the twin notions that the macro structural frameworks of capitalism do not fully annihilate possibilities for resistance and revolution and that modernity has not been fully consummated. Contraband pedagogy is not reconciled to the postmodern insight that authentic agency has been eclipsed by the systems of symbolic mediation that create desires that can be only false or always already alienating.** We still remain loyal to the conviction that the responsibly, self-reflecting subject can exist and that self-knowledge can lead to self-determination and eventually revolutionary praxis. **Contraband pedagogy does not seek to help individuals empower themselves. Empowerment is a liberal option that enables people to gain control over the conditions of their daily lives. Contraband pedagogy is not about gaining control of the “always already” but is about struggling and transforming the conditions that delimit the horizons of the daily life and prohibit the acquisition of the material necessities that would enable a decent and just livelihood for all the toilers of the world. Contraband pedagogy’s deployment as a weapon in the fight against globalization can benefit from an engagement with the new wave of Marxist educational scholarship in Britain, particularly the work of educationalists Mike Cole, Tony Green, Dave Hill, and Glenn Rikowski.** While lacking the tradition of Marxist scholarship that has benefited education scholars in Great Britain, **the educational Left in the United State can nevertheless begin to revitalize educational reform efforts by assessing the limitations of prevailing leftist paradigms built around postmodernists forms of cultural critique. Given the exacerbating contradictions of capital – seen in the growing numbers of homeless in the streets of major U.S. cites, the increasing vulnerability of the middle class**, and the growth of the militarized, gated communities of the ruling class - **a socialist alternative may not seem as far-fetched as it does today among the vast majority of struggling U.S. workers.** Like many other educators and activists, we face a daunting challenge. In Los Angeles, where we live and labor, **we face a bourgeois-driven apathy from many of our colleagues as an overwhelmingly active despair has been exacerbated by the entrenched belief that the ideological hegemony and social practices of the U.S. capitalist class is impossible to resist (even though at some level most people recognize that all forms of hegemony are leaky).** Outraged by the vainglorious attempts of politicians to propagate the myth that the United States represents the best of all possible worlds and disgusted by the swelling numbers of U.S. citizens who are following in the ideological footsteps of Christian fundamentalist politicians such as Jerry Falwell (who claimed the terrorist attacks of September 11 were the result of Americans turning to the evils of fornication and homosexuality) or Pat Robertson (whose televised address to millions of U.S. citizens included a warning that a gay activist event held in Florida could provoke God to send an asteroid to destroy the earth and joins similar condemnations of public schooling as an un-American socialist enterprise that is antifamily and teaches students to reject God and the marketplace in favor of the perils of drugs, sexual promiscuity, homosexuality, and union membership), **our students are becoming more actively politicized, as much if not more so than during the latter years of the Vietnam War. White it is true that our own pedagogical work is taken more seriously in the Third World than it is in the hallowed halls of the North American academy, we believe that efforts to dismantle the exploitative relations of transnational capitalism have to begin here.** As one Central American campesino activist, Eliva Alvarado (1987), puts it, **“It’s hard to think of a change taking place in Central America without there first being changes in the United states.** As we say in Honduras, ‘Sin el perro, no hay rabia” **– without the dog, there wouldn’t be rabies.” So you Americans who really want to help the poor have to change your own government first. You Americans who want to see an end to hunger and poverty have to take a stand. You have to fight just like we’re fighting – even harder. You have to be ready to be jailed, to be abused, to be repressed. And you have to have the character, the courage, the morale, and the spirit to confront whatever comes your way.** If you say, “Oh, the United States is so big and powerful, there’s nothing we can do to change it,” then why bother talking about solidarity? If you think like that, you start to feel insignificant and your sprit dies. That’s very dangerous. For as long as we keep our sprits high, we continue to struggle. We campesinos are used to planting seeds and waiting to see if the seeds bear fruit. We’re used to working on harsh soil. And when our crops don’t grow, we’re used to planting again and again until they take hold. Like us, you must learn to persist. (144)” We are hard pressed to find a better clarion call for the contraband pedagogy we are advocating.

***Capitalism is the starting point for all other political considerations – class struggle is the universal antagonism that creates space for particular struggles like the 1ac. A political strategy that does not address capital will ensure that larger structures of oppression remain intact.***

**McLaren 06** (Peter, University of California, “Slavoj Žižek's Naked Politics: Opting for the Impossible, A Secondary Elaboration”, JAC, <http://www.jacweb.org/Archived_volumes/Text_articles/V21_I3_McLaren.htm>, jj)

Žižek challenges the relativism of the gender-race-class grid of reflexive positionality when he claims that class antagonism or struggle is not simply one in a series of social antagonisms—race, class, gender, and so on—but rather constitutes the part of this series *that sustains the horizon of the series itself*. In other words, class struggle is the specific antagonism that assigns rank to and modifies the particularities of the other antagonisms in the series. He notes that "the economy is at one and the same time the genus and one of its own species" (*Totalitarianism* 193). In what I consider to be his most important work to date, *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality* (coauthored with Judith Butler and Ernesto Laclau), Žižek militantly refuses to evacuate reference to historical structures of totality and universality and argues that class struggle itself enables the proliferation of new political subjectivities (albeit subjectivities that ironically relegate class struggle to a secondary role). As Marx argued, class struggle structures "in advance" the very terrain of political antagonisms. Thus, according to Žižek, class struggle is not "the last horizon of meaning, the last signified of all social phenomena, but the formal generative matrix of the different ideological horizons of understanding" ("Repeating" 16-17). In his terms, class struggle sets the ground for the empty place of universality, enabling it to be filled variously with contents of different sorts (ecology, feminism, anti-racism). He further argues that the split between the classes is even more radical today than during the times of industrial class divisions. He takes the position that post-Marxists have done an excellent job in uncovering the *fantasy* of capital (vis-à-vis the endless deferral of pleasure) but have done little to uncover its *reality*. Those post-Marxists who are advocates of new social movements (such as Laclau and Mouffe) want revolution without *revolution*; in contrast, Žižek calls for movements that relate to the larger totality of capitalist social relations and that challenge the very matter and antimatter of capital's social universe. His strategic focus on capitalist exploitation (while often confusing and inconsistent) rather than on racial, ethnic, gender, or sexual identity is a salutary one: "The problem is not how our precious particular identity should be kept safe from global capitalism. The problem is how to oppose global capitalism at an even more radical level; the problem is to oppose it universally, not on a particular level. This whole problematic is a false one" (Olson and Worsham 281). What Žižek sets himself against is the particular experience or political argument. An experience or argument that cannot be universalized is "always and by definition a conservative political gesture: ultimately everyone can evoke his unique experience in order to justify his reprehensible acts" ("Repeating" 4-5). Here he echoes Wood, who argues that capitalism is "not just another specific oppression alongside many others but an all-embracing compulsion that imposes itself on all our social relations" ("Identity" 29). He also echoes critical educators such as Paulo Freire, who argues against the position that experiences of the oppressed speak for themselves. All experiences need to be interrogated for their ideological assumptions and effects, regardless of who articulates them or from where they are lived or spoken. They are to be read with, against, and upon the scientific concepts produced by the revolutionary Marxist tradition. The critical pedagogical act of interro-gating experiences is not to pander to the autonomous subject or to individualistic practices but to see those experiences in relationship to the structure of social antagonisms and class struggle. History has not discharged the educator from the mission of grasping the "truth of the present" by interrogating all the existing structures of exploitation present within the capitalist system where, at the point of production, material relations characterize relations between people and social relations characterize relations between things. The critical educator asks: How are individuals historically located in systematic structures of economic relations? How can these structures—these lawless laws of capital—be overcome and transformed through revolutionary praxis into acts of freely associated labor where the free development of each is the condi-tion for the free development of all?

**Case**

***Their K is complicit in Heidegger’s Nazism---impact is extinction***

**Faye 09** (Emmanuel, associate professor at the University Paris – Ouest-Nanterre La Defense and an authority on Descartes, Translated by Michael B. Smith, professor emeritus of French and philosophy at Berry College, “HEIDEGGER: The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy”, pg xxiii-xxv, jj)

**We have not yet grasped the full significance of the propagation of Nazism and Hitlerism in the domain of thought and ideas**---that mounting tidal wave that sweeps up minds, dominates them, possesses them, and eventually overcomes all resistance. **Against it, the military victory was but the winning of a first battle**---a vital one, to be sure, and a costly one for humanity, since it took a world war. **Today a different battle, more protracted and sinister, is unfolding: a contest in which the future of the human race is at stake**. It calls for a heightened awareness in all areas of thought, from philosophy to law and history. Whether we are considering the case of Heidegger, Schmitt, Junger (in many respects), or Nolte, these main propagators of Nazism in the life of letters have taken the time to refine their strategy of reconquest after the defeat of the armies of Hitler’s Reich**. By an interplay of the obfuscation of real causes, the dilution of responsibilities in a globalization of approaches, the disqualification of humanistic thought and universal values, the mythologizing of self in the figure of the “shepard of being**,” the “Christian Epimetheus,” the “anarch,” the theoretician of the “historical right,” **these authors have scripted the roles of philosophy, law, letters, and history, enlisting them in the service of** the “revision” and ultimately of the rehabilitation of foundations of **Nazism**. **Some have progressively conquered a planetary audience with a public that most often does not realize what is at stake, in the long run, in this conquest of minds**. It is true that the front lines of the invasion are not found on any map. There is no geopolitics of the mind, although **the increasing number of apologetic or too complacent works in an indication of the magnitude of its propagation**. Nevertheless, centers of criticism and resistance have sprung up progressively in many countries. For **Heidegger**, the subject of this work, very incisive criticisms have been raised, both in Europe and on the American continent, since Karl Lowith perceived and reported as early as 1947 that he **was “more radical than Mr. Kriech and Mr. Rosenberg,” two pillars of the Nazi regime, but who, being less adroit and more trivial, did not see their reputations survive the defeat of the Third Reich.** Furthermore, **new documents and deeper research allow us today to see to what extent Heidegger devoted himself to putting philosophy at the service of legitimizing and diffusing the very bases of Nazism and Hitlerism**. That is why I want to make available to the public some of the most significant moments of the seminars taught between 1933 and 1935, taken from the archives of Heidegger’s unpublished manuscripts. A few of **these texts**, known to only a handful of researchers, **are** in fact **political education courses at the service of Hitler’s state and go so far as to** identify the ontological difference between being and individual entities with the political relationship between the state and the people, while other texts **explicitly explore the means of perpetuating the “spirit” of Nazism**. In making these excerpts public, my intention has been simply to exercise the right to historical and philosophical truth. **I have** also **based my work on the speeches, lectures, and courses over these same years that have recently appeared in Germany and can be consulted only by readers of German. These texts,** published in volumes 16, 36/37, and 38 of the so-called complete works, **are every bit as racist and virulently National Socialist as those of the official “philosophers” of Nazism,** such as Alfred Baeumler or Hans Heyse. **They surpass the others by the virulence of their Hitlerism, which no other “philosopher” of the regime has equaled. Despite that, these Hitlerian and Nazi Texts of Heidegger are to be found on the philosophy shelves of public libraries. The seriousness of that situation calls for a new and heightened awareness.** Without ever dissociating philosophical reflection from indispensable historical investigation, I have tried to bring together the establishment and analysis of historical and textual sources, as the historians Hugo Ott and Bernd Martin (as well as Guido Schneeberger and Victor Farias), with the philosophical critique, which has been developed by a series of authors as varied as Ernst Cassirer, Benedetto Croce, Karl Lowith, Theodor Adorno, Gunther Anders, Hans Blumenberg, Jurgen Habermas, Ernst Tugendhat, Eric Weil, Rainer Marten, Nicolas Tertulian, Jeffrey Barash, Domenico Losurdo, Arno Munster, Richard Wolin, Tom Rockmore, Thomas Sheehan, Herman Philipse, Hassan Givsan, Reinhard Linde, and Julio Quesada, to mention but a few of the most important names. But this book proposes a new understanding of what Heidegger brought about. With the help of texts little known outside the German-speaking world, some not even published, and taking into account those individuals with whom he chose to surround himself---the “philosopher” Erich Rothacker, the historian Rudolf Stadelmann, and the legal scholar Erik Wolf---I intend to prove that **the question of the relationship between Heidegger and National Socialism is not that of the personal commitment of a man temporarily gone astray and a philosophical work that remains almost unaffected, but rather that of the deliberate introduction of the foundations of Nazism and Hitlerism into philosophy** and its teaching. In showing this, it is not my desire to add to Heidegger’s renown by making it even more diabolical. I do not subscribe to the theory of a Heidegger “thinker” of Nazism, because rather than enlightening us, he has done nothing but blend the characteristic opacity of his teaching with the darkness of the phenomenon. **Far from furthering the progress of thought, Heidegger has helped to conceal the deeply destructive nature of the Hitlerian undertaking** by exalting its “grandeur.” **Far from enriching philosophy, he has worked to destroy it, by making it subservient to a movement that, by the murderous discrimination underlying it and the project of collective annihilation to which it leads, constitutes the radical negation of all humanity and all thought.** After the paroxysm of the Nazi and Hitlerian period, long elaborated in Heidegger’s writings even before 1933, and after the toxic spite often characterizing his courses taught in 1933-1934, **the diffusion of Heidegger’s works after the war slowly descends like ashes after an explosion---a gray cloud slowly suffocating and extinguishing minds**. Soon **the** 102 **volumes** of the so-called complete work (sixty-six volumes have appeared to date), in which the same assertions are repeated over and over through thousands of pages, will encumber by their sheer bulk the shelves reserved for twentieth century philosophy and **continue to spread the fundamental tenets of Nazism on a world-wide scale**.

***The first card in their 1ac argues that: “Agriculture is now the motorized food industry, in essence the same as the production of corpses in the gas chambers” --- this denies the specificity of the Nazi genocide by comparing it to the most banal instances of technology***

**Faye ‘09** (Emmanuel, associate professor at the University Paris – Ouest-Nanterre La Defense and an authority on Descartes, Translated by Michael B. Smith, professor emeritus of French and philosophy at Berry College, “HEIDEGGER: The Introduction of Nazism into Philosophy”, pg 303-304, jj)

And in fact, as we shall see, after 1945 **Heidegger abandons all that sets philosophy on a human foundation**. It is in the four Bremen Lectures of 1949, titled respectively “The Thing” (Das Ding), “The Frame” (Das Ge-stell), “The Danger” (Die Gefahr), and “The Turning” (Die Kehre), that Heidegger’s negation of the specificity of the Nazi genocide finds its extreme expression. Two passages require special attention. Heidegger took care not to publish them during his lifetime. The first text is from the lecture titled “The Frame,” delivered before the public of the “Bremen Club” on 2 December 1949 but omitted by Heidegger in the first edition he offered of the text in 1962. 203 It was not revealed until 1983, in a study published by Wolfgang Schirmacher. 204 The text finally appeared in 1994 in the Gesamtausgabe. In the same breath, **Heidegger launches into unbearable comparisons**. “**Agriculture today is a motorized industry of alimentation, the same thing in essence as the fabrication of corpses in the gas chambers and the death camps**, the same as blockading and the reducing of countries to famine, the same thing as the fabrication of hydrogen bombs.” 205 **By uttering such a sentence, Heidegger excludes himself from philosophy and shows that he has lost all humanity.** After having exalted, in his courses, the motorization of the Wehrmact as a “metaphysical” act---and we know that the first gassings took place in trucks--**-he now uses the planetary nature of modern technology to deny the irreducible specificity of the Nazi genocide and to associate it with one of the most banal manifestations of the technological transformation of existence---namely, the** transformation of agriculture into a mechanized **food industry**. **The deranged nature of that assertion is reinforced by the fact that he assimilates the programmed murder of millions of human beings to an industry intended to manufacture corpses, as if the SS had the intention of producing corpses mechanically as one might produce sugar, by annihilating millions of men, women, and children, completely cut off by them from the human species. So it is that the dehumanization by Nazism of the victims of the death camps is perpetuated in Heidegger’s statement. Heidegger knew perfectly well what he was doing in articulating that statement. That is why he decided to forgo publishing it during his lifetime**, leaving it to the Gesamtausgabe to share it with the public, which is what would have occurred had Wolfgang Schirmacher not decided to take action.

***Ontology not first --- must stop in the face of mass death***

**Davidson ’89**(Arnold I. coeditor of Critical Inquiry, Assoc Prof of Philosophy, U of Chicago, Critical Inquiry, Winter . p.426)

I understand Levinas’ work to suggest another path to the recovery of the human, one that leads through or toward other human beings: “The dimension of the divine opens forth from the human face… Hence metaphysics is enacted where the social relation is enacted- in our relations with men… The Other is not the incarnation of God, but precisely by his face, in which he is disincarnate, is the manifestation of the height in which God is revealed. It is our relations with men… that give to theological concepts the sole signification they admit of.” Levinas places ethics before ontology by beginning with our experience of the human face: and, in a clear reference to Heidegger’s idolatry of the village life of peasants, he associated himself with Socrates, who preferred the city where he encountered men to the country with its trees. In his discussion of skepticism and the problem of others, Cavell also aligns himself with this path of thought, with the recovery of the finite human self through the acknowledgement of others: “As long as God exists, I am not alone. And couldn’t the other suffer the fate of God?… I wish to understand how the other now bears the weight of God, shows me that I am not alone in the universe. This requires understanding the philosophical problem of the other as the trace or scar of the departure of God [CR, p.470].” The suppression of the other, the human, in Heidegger’s thought accounts, I believe, for the absence, in his writing after the war, of the experience of horror. Horror is always directed toward the human; every object of horror bears the imprint of the human will. So Levinas can see in Heidegger’s silence about the gas chambers and death camps “a kind of consent to the horror.” And Cavell can characterize Nazis as “those who have lost the capacity for being horrified by what they do.” Where was Heidegger’s horror? How could he have failed to know what he had consented to? Hannah Arendt associates Heidegger with Paul Valery’s aphorism, “Les evenements ne sont que l’ecume des choses’ (‘Events are but the foam of things’).” I think one understands the source of her intuition. The mass extermination of human beings, however, does not produce foam, but dust and ashes; and it is here that questioning must stop.

***Prior focus on ontology causes paralysis and is de-historicizing***

**Kratochwil**, professor of international relations – European University Institute, **‘8**

(Friedrich, “The Puzzles of Politics,” pg. 200-213)

The lesson seems clear. Even at the danger of “fuzzy boundaries”, when we deal with “practice” ( just as with the “pragmatic turn”), we would be well advised to rely on the use of the term rather than on its reference (pointing to some property of the object under study), in order to draw the bounds of sense and understand the meaning of the concept. My argument for the fruitful character of a pragmatic approach in IR, therefore, does not depend on a comprehensive mapping of the varieties of research in this area, nor on an arbitrary appropriation or exegesis of any specific and self-absorbed theoretical orientation. For this reason, in what follows, I will not provide a rigidly specified definition, nor will I refer exclusively to some prepackaged theoretical approach. Instead, I will sketch out the reasons for which a prag- matic orientation in social analysis seems to hold particular promise. These reasons pertain both to the more general area of knowledge appropriate for praxis and to the more specific types of investigation in the field. The follow- ing ten points are – without a claim to completeness – intended to engender some critical reflection on both areas.

Firstly, a pragmatic approach does not begin with objects or “things” (ontology), or with reason and method (epistemology), but with “acting” (prattein), thereby preventing some false starts. Since, **as historical beings placed in a specific situations, we do not have the luxury of deferring decisions until we have found the “truth”, we have to act and must do so always under time pressures and in the face of incomplete information.** Pre- cisely because the social world is characterised by strategic interactions, what a situation “is”, is hardly ever clear ex ante, because it is being “produced” by the actors and their interactions, and the multiple possibilities are rife with incentives for (dis)information. This puts a premium on quick diagnostic and cognitive shortcuts informing actors about the relevant features of the situ- ation, and on leaving an alternative open (“plan B”) in case of unexpected difficulties. Instead of relying on certainty and universal validity gained through abstraction and controlled experiments, we know that completeness and attentiveness to detail, rather than to generality, matter. To that extent, likening practical choices to simple “discoveries” of an already independently existing “reality” which discloses itself to an “observer” – or relying on optimal strategies – is somewhat heroic.

These points have been made vividly by “realists” such as Clausewitz in his controversy with von Bülow, in which he criticised the latter’s obsession with a strategic “science” (Paret et al. 1986). While Clausewitz has become an icon for realists, only a few of them (usually dubbed “old” realists) have taken seriously his warnings against the misplaced belief in the reliability and use- fulness of a “scientific” study of strategy. Instead, most of them, especially “neorealists” of various stripes, have embraced the “theory”-building based on the epistemological project as the via regia to the creation of knowledge. A pragmatist orientation would most certainly not endorse such a position.

Secondly, since acting in the social world often involves acting “for” some- one, special responsibilities arise that aggravate both the incompleteness of knowledge as well as its generality problem. Since we owe special care to those entrusted to us, for example, as teachers, doctors or lawyers, we cannot just rely on what is generally true, but have to pay special attention to the particular case. Aside from avoiding the foreclosure of options, we cannot refuse to act on the basis of incomplete information or insufficient know- ledge, and the necessary diagnostic will involve typification and comparison, reasoning by analogy rather than generalization or deduction. Leaving out the particularities of a case, be it a legal or medical one, in a mistaken effort to become “scientific” would be a fatal flaw. Moreover, there still remains the crucial element of “timing” – of knowing when to act. Students of crises have always pointed out the importance of this factor but, in attempts at building a general “theory” of international politics analogously to the natural sci- ences, such elements are neglected on the basis of the “continuity of nature” and the “large number” assumptions. Besides, “timing” seems to be quite recalcitrant to analytical treatment.

***Extinction comes before Being***

**Reilly 8**—26 year career in politics during which he founded the nation’s largest political consulting firm of its time. Reilly managed winning campaigns for a wide variety of high-profile candidates, including current Pelosi(Clint, “From Heidegger to the Environment: Californians Are in the World,” 19 August 2008, http://www.californiaprogressreport.com/2008/08/from\_heidegger.html,)

Even in today’s age of cutting-edge science and technology, it is important to remember that history can still be shaped by big ideas. In the 18th century, a philosophy of knowledge emboldened the Founding Fathers to build our democracy – a system of government based on the meritocracy of ideas, rights of the individual and a free press. Capitalism itself is rooted in an innate belief in the power of individual initiative rather than the supremacy of group action – which inspired Marxism and Communism. Philosophy can be mind numbingly boring. But it can help us more clearly see the path to a better world. The mid-20th century German philosopher Martin Heidegger had a favorite term, “Dasein,” which cannot be translated precisely into a single English word. The rough meaning is “being-in-the-world,” Heidegger’s description of human existence. Heidegger’s most important point was that it is impossible to separate a person from the earth. Without the “world,” a human being could not know, grow or even live. A person is like a tree planted in the earth; without the earth, the tree could not exist. But there is a second implication to Heidegger’s “being-in-the-world” bumper sticker. To be in the world is also to be “in common with other beings.” Whether we like it or not, we live in a natural state of dependence upon one another. Put another way, it is impossible to accurately define existence without affirming our dependence not only upon the earth, but also upon our fellow human beings. Was the German philosopher, who lived through World War II without standing up to Nazism’s atrocities, a closet environmentalist and a globalist before his time? Why is this somewhat obvious definition of human existence important to our world today? Many theories of human progress are rooted in a moral imperative. The Christian practice of charity is premised on the religious conviction that we are all God’s children and equal members of the human family. Therefore we are obligated to donate, assist and help others in need. Christians are also challenged to respect nature as God’s creation. This implies that charity and environmentalism are a sacrifice rather than a reflection of our collective self-interest. The truth is exactly the opposite. Protecting the earth and uniting the planet is the only logical political agenda of Dasein. In Jeffrey Sachs’ 2008 book “Common Wealth,” he argues that “the defining challenge of the 21st century will be to face the reality that humanity shares a common fate on a crowded planet.” Sachs, director of Columbia University’s Earth Institute, cites four imperatives for world leaders to address: 1) Pressure on the earth’s ecosystems will produce climate change and species extinction. 2) Population growth will tax the earth. 3) The unequal distribution of wealth across the world is untenable. 4) Failed institutions impair vital global cooperation and problem solving. Last week, Russia invaded Georgia, sparking fears of a reconstituted cold war. The assault belied the presumption that the world was moving beyond nationalism. Fundamental conflicts between Islamic and Western cultures still dominate global politics. Despite a growing consensus on the need for international efforts to curb emissions and develop clean energy, the earth still reels from pollution. Poverty and sickness in sub-Saharan Africa contradict the image of a world that has conquered disease and hunger. And thousands of nuclear bombs still have the unthinkable power to destroy the earth and the entire human race. Those who thought that war and hunger would be easily conquered by science are slowly realizing that our toughest challenges are ahead. Perhaps we need to be reminded of Heidegger’s truth: **No “world,” no “being,”** no “we,” no “I.”

***Can’t solve calc thought --- too entrenched***

**Riis 11**—Carlsberg Research Fellow and Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Science Studies at Roskilde University, Ph.D. from Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Søren, 8 February 2011, “Towards the origin of modern technology: reconfiguring Martin Heidegger’s thinking,”)

Moreover, Heidegger maintains: ‘‘Readiness-to-hand is the way in which entities as they are ‘in themselves’ are defined ontologico-categorially.’’47 According to Heidegger’s fundamental phenomenology, which he unfolds in detail in Being and Time and reaffirms a decisive part of in ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology,’’ nature is ‘‘primally’’ revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-;’’ that is to say, ‘‘nature’’ is a resource long before the actual rise of modern and ancient technology, namely **simultaneously with the very origin of human beings**. That something is primordially revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-’’ does not imply that it is actually used or serves accordingly, but that it is revealed as standing ready to be utilized in the corresponding context. As such, it is revealed as ‘‘standing-reserve.’’ This, for example, also corresponds to the empirical fact that prehistoric humans settled close to woods and rivers. In these areas they always had stockpiles of timber, power for transportation, and easy access to drinking water. Based on ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and completed through references to Being and Time, we now have an interpretation of the origin of the essence of modern technology, which traces back the characteristic revealing of das Gestell to the beginning of humankind.48 This does not imply that prehistoric technology is identical with contemporary technology; rather the third genealogy of the rule of das Gestell suggests that when ‘‘we still more primally’’ try to consider the origin of the challenging revealing characterizing the rule of das Gestell, we in fact rediscover that it is **connected to being human**. The rule of das Gestell has challenged humans as long as they have existed. In this sense, humans first and foremost exist under the rule of das Gestell.49 This also entails a revision and precision of Heidegger’s renowned formula characterizing the world-connectedness of human existence: being-in-the-world. Based on the comparison of ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and Being and Time, human existence is better described as being-under-the-spell-of-das-Gestell.

***Abandoning management causes extinction***

**Soulé 95** – Natural Resources Professor, California (Michael and Gary Lease, Reinventing Nature?, p 159-60, AG)

The decision has already been made in most places. Some of the ecological myths discussed here contain, either explicitly or implicitly, the idea that nature is self-regulating and capable of caring for itself. This notion leads to the theory of management known as benign neglect—nature will do fine, thank you, if human beings just leave it alone. Indeed, a century ago, a hands-off policy was the best policy. Now it is not. Given nature's current fragmented and stressed condition, neglect will result in an accelerating spiral of deterioration. Once people create large gaps in forests, isolate and disturb habitats, pollute, overexploit, and introduce species from other continents, the viability of many ecosystems and native species is compromised, resiliency dissipates, and diversity can collapse. When artificial disturbance reaches a certain threshold, even small changes can produce large effects, and these will be compounded by climate change.' For example, a storm that would be considered normal and beneficial may, following widespread clearcutting, cause disastrous blow-downs, landslides, and erosion. If global warming occurs, tropical storms are predicted to have greater force than now. Homeostasis, balance, and Gaia are dangerous models when applied at the wrong spatial and temporal scales. Even fifty years ago, neglect might have been the best medicine, but that was a world with a lot more big, unhumanized, connected spaces, a world with one-third the number of people, and a world largely unaffected by chain saws, bulldozers, pesticides, and exotic, weedy species. The alternative to neglect is active caring—in today's parlance, an affirmative approach to wildlands: to maintain and restore them, to become stewards, accepting all the domineering baggage that word carries. Until humans are able to control their numbers and their technologies, **management is the only viable alternative** to massive attrition of living nature.

***Earth is so over-run with human control that relinquishing management now wouldn’t solve – it would be impossible for nature to take its course***

**Katz ’99** (Eric, Science, Technology, and Society Program, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Winter, Environmental Ethics, Vol 21, “A Pragmatic Reconsideration of Anthropocentrism,” jj)

What about the nonanthropocentric argument regarding beach replenishment? A nonanthropocentric argument, by definition, will not consider as primary the benefits that humans will obtain from a particular policy—so many of the reasons just listed cannot be considered. **From a perspective of nonanthropocentric ecological holism, we should let natural processes take their course for the good of the overall ecological community**. **If the beach erodes, the erosion is part of the normal natural dynamics of the shoreline ecosystem. Indeed, most of the sand is not lost to the system; it simply shifts its location**, for undeveloped and unprotected barrier islands have a tendency to move landward over the course of time. Sand moves from the ocean side of the island to the bay side. The movement and displacement of sand would result in the loss of houses, especially along the immediate ocean waterfront, but this loss would not be a negative impact for the natural ecosystem. In addition, letting the natural erosion process continue without interference might lead to the possible reemergence or resurgence of those species that have been harmed by human housing development along the shore—such as the piping plover and the least and roseate terns. Thus, **a nonanthropocentric perspective would lead to a policy in which the shoreline would continue to erode as sands naturally shift.** The beach would be “restored” in a sense to a more natural state. On first examination, thus, there is a clear pragmatic difference between anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism. One position favors a policy of beach replenishment and the other does not. However, **there is a major complication to this analysis** that I want to consider. **The idea that we can let nature take its course in this case is problematic.** On my view, **the beaches** of Fire Island **are now an artifactual system, considerably modified by human development**—particularly bulkheading and jetties. Except for the wilderness areas, almost the entire north side of Fire Island is bulkheaded, with docks and artificially dredged harbors and boat slips. Thus, **the natural movement of sand by water currents has been disrupted** for about a hundred years, and indeed part of the erosion problem is caused by the fact that the sand, when it migrates to the bay side of the island, has no place to land—the bulkheading acts like a seawall and prevents the accumulation of sand dropped by the smaller estuarine waves of the Great South Bay. Sand migrating over the island by wind, waves, and tidal surges is also prevented from a natural buildup by the humanmade physical structures and human activity. (One of the common early spring chores is to sweep the winter’s accumulation of sand off the main sidewalks. But the sand’s movement to the north is relentless—the sidewalks have to be swept weekly during the summer months.) **Given the current state of development on the island it would be impossible to let nature take its course**; the island no longer has a natural configuration. (Of course, there would be one radical way to solve this problem: the park service could condemn all the private homes on the island, destroy them, and rip out all human-made physical structures. The economic cost of this plan would be astronomical, both in outof- pocket expenses and in the lost revenue from tourism and real-estate taxes.) Thus, if the beach is an artifactual system, the question to be asked changes: What is the pragmatic difference between anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism regarding the policy of beach replenishment for a nonnatural artifactual beach system? **The anthropocentric argument appears essentially to be the same as before. We still want to promote human interests by saving and preserving the beach— only now we recognize that it is not a natural beach, but an artifactual one**. We are still going to preserve the island for human benefits and human interests. We still want to protect the private homes and provide a recreational beach. We can even argue that the artifactual beach system is necessary to protect the relatively undisturbed wilderness area that lies on the landward side of the dunes. The anthropocentric argument thus does not change. However, **the nonanthropocentric ecological holistic argument is now largely irrelevant, for we are only dealing with an artifactual system**, or at best a hybrid of natural and artifactual. **Such a system is essentially human-based, so that human interests and concerns dominate any evaluation**. I have previously analyzed the difference between artifacts and natural entities—and I will not repeat arguments I have made in some detail in other places.23 I have argued that it is the presence of human intentionality in a natural system that irrevocably modifies nature and establishes an artifactual system. The introduction of human purpose is the key to understanding the difference between artifactual and natural systems. The reason why we create artifacts, why we interfere in natural processes, is to further human goals and interests. We tend to evaluate the worth of our artifacts and human-made systems by their success in achieving our human-centered aims. Thus, we will value the Fire Island system to the extent that it meets our aims and goals. **We cannot return** Fire Island **to a “natural” state**. **Thus, we cannot use what is beneficial to the overall ecological community as the sole guide to environmental decision-making. We must consider the satisfaction of human interests in the evaluation of** environmental **policies** on Fire Island. As an artifactual system—or as a hybrid of the natural and the artifactual—Fire Island must be evaluated from a perspective that includes anthropocentrism. Thus, Fire Island will have to be managed— perhaps preserved in terms of long-range sustainability—so that it best achieves the human goals that have been incorporated into its development. In this case, pragmatism as a methodology—as a means of testing theoretical ideas for their “cash-value” in terms of practical consequences—teaches us that a **simplistic reliance on theoretical concepts such as anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism will fail to address adequately the complexities of the policy situation.** Pragmatism endorses a vision beyond the facile dualisms of nonanthropocentrism and anthropocentrism, natural and artifactual. Without resorting to the substantive content of pragmatism as a moral philosophy, **we can see the need for flexibility, compromise, and a pluralism of values in the analysis of concrete environmental policy decisions. When dealing with a hybrid system of humanity and nature, we need to use all of the relevant theoretical concepts, crossing and recrossing the boundaries that separate anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism**. Pragmatism cannot, in the end, tell us how to effect the compromise; it cannot tell us what specific policies we should adopt in all situations. **Pragmatism** simply **reminds us to be open to a wide range of possibly relevant and meaningful values in the formation and justification of policy.**

***Turn - Waiting for a new ontology is a strategy that dooms us to nuclear omnicide and makes all the aff and neg impacts inevitable.***

**Santoni ‘85** (Ronald E., Philosophy Professor @ Denison, Nuclear War, ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-7)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to omnicide. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often-stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we Simultaneously act to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about out disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be too permissive in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be an early accomplice to the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its annihilation. The Nuremburg tradition calls not only for a new way of thinking, a “new internationalism” in which we all become co-nurturers of the whole planet, but for resolute actions that will sever our complicity with nuclear criminality and the genocidal arms race, and work to achieve a future which we can no longer assume. We must not only “come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought” (Fox) but must act now - with a “new consciousness” and conscience - to prevent the unthinkable, by cleansing the earth of nuclear weaponry. Only when that is achieved will ultimate violence be removed as the final arbiter of our planet’s fate.

***Turning inward for ontological questioning makes ethics and politics impossible.***

**Biskowski ’95** (Lawrence J., Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Georgia, Politics Versus Aesthetics: Arendt’s Critiques of Nietzsche and Heidegger, The Review of Politics, Vol. 57, No. 1, Winter 1995, pg 64-66)

This turn inward and toward the self, surely the product of liberating insights, **is not without its dangers**. To the extent that the aesthetic supersession of morality means that individuals are thrown back on themselves or their impulses as their only grounds for practical choices**, they are left in a state of indeterminacy and unfreedom**, ultimately unable to determine even their own identities except in one rather limited way. In the absence of legitimate moral criteria of any source or kind, they are in effect **controlled by changing whims and arbitrary impulses;** they confront **other people and the world** in much the same way that a sculptor confronts a block of marble, that is, as (at least) potential **sources of aesthetic enjoyment**, as potential sources of resistance to the realization of one's project(s), and ultimately as something that exists solely or mainly as a medium for self-expression. As Hegel described an earlier version of this doctrine: [t]his type of subjectivism not merely substitutes a void for the whole of ethics, rights, duties, and laws ...but in addition its form is a subjective void, i.e., it knows itself as this contentless void and in this knowledge knows itself as absolute. 13 For Hegel, **freedom under these conditions was emptied of all direction and purpose**. Perhaps more startling yet are the other political (and moral) implications: Laws, rights, duties, and obligations, but also people, institutions, things, and the world itself can become our playthings, little more than media for our im-pulses and caprices lionized as self-expression.

***Ontology doesn’t come first—human existence is a prerequisite for being***

**Zimmerman, professor of philosophy @ Tulane, 1994** (Michael, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 109, Kel)

Unlike animals, humans can encounter as *entities* because humans can apprehend the “ontological difference” between being and entities. “Being” does not name a superentity, a metaphysical ground, a primal source, or a divine creator. Radically other than any entity, being names the event of presencing (*Anwesen*) by which an entity presents, reveals, or shows itself. Human existence constitutes the temporal, historical, lingusitc clearing, or absencing (*Abwesen)* in which the being (presencing, self-manifesting) of entities can occur. Without human existence, things could not be manifest and in this sense could not “be” at all.

***Our impacts come first – existence is a prerequisite to ontology***

**Storl, Professor of Philosophy at Augustana College, ‘8** (Heidi, October, “Heidegger in Woolf’s Clothing” Philosophy and Literature, Vol 32 No 2, p 303-314, Project Muse)

While the strength and pervasiveness of "how one finds oneself" cannot be over-estimated, **the being of the human being can be extinguished** [End Page 310] **only by death**. **As long as human activity occurs** (even when dull and dim), **being is, and disclosing and projecting remain as possibilities**. It is here that Heidegger offers a way out of our modern predicament and the ever-deepening normative void. The door slams. We "come to," gasp, encounter. **Though nothingness is everywhere and nowhere**, has swallowed up the anchors of our daily existence, **and has left scarcely any trace of body and mind—our embodied and embedded being—we do grasp something and in so doing, we care**. "If Da-sein explicitly discovers the world and brings it near, if it discloses its authentic being itself, this discovering of 'world' and disclosing of Da-sein always comes about by clearing away coverings and obscurities, by breaking up the disguises with which Da-sein cuts itself off from itself " (p. 121). According to Heidegger, Dasein ultimately is driven to discover and disclose its embodied and embedded being due to some form of uncanniness. It is this which "fetches Da-sein out of its entangled absorption in the 'world'" (p. 176). **Everyday familiarity collapses. The door slams, and we arrive. And, even if for just a moment, we care.**

***Creates an aesthetics of self-fascination which allows external coercion.***

**Biskowski ’95** (Lawrence J., Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Georgia, Politics Versus Aesthetics: Arendt’s Critiques of Nietzsche and Heidegger, The Review of Politics, Vol. 57, No. 1, Winter 1995, pg 64-66)

Style, however, is not beauty. Even aesthetics insofar as it was formerly concerned with supposedly objective, public, or at least widely shared standards of beauty is undermined among contemporary intellectuals by the same radical historicism which, by undermining other logics, institutions, understandings, and so forth, provided the conditions for its expansion and elevation. **Standards of beauty are no more objective and universal than standards of justice, virtue, and truth; their adoption is always an imposition underwritten by some manifestation of power**. With all such public standards discredited, individuals are thrown back on themselves or, rather, on their **will and**, more typically, on their **impulses**, as their **only grounds for practical choices**. Coupled with an increasing recognition of how identity is formed and stabilized, this experience leads to a diminished sense of the unity and consistency of the self," which in turn leads to the enormous surge in interest among contemporary theorists in the politics of identity, the nature of the self, and the political and moral implications of a de-centered subjectivity. Thus in at least some significant respects, and for good or for ill, the aestheticism being proffered in somewhat different ways in both public and intellectual life is an aestheticism of self fascination and self-absorption. The self, understood as a multiplicity, must be at the center of all authentic choices and values (which may, of course, be contradicted at any time), or the criteria for such choices at least should come from within. Moral or aesthetic or political criteria **imposed upon the individual from the outside** cannot be legitimate. Of paramount concern, therefore, **are the forces of external coercion**, including, especially, the surreptitious and intrusive socialization technologies by which the self and its various understandings and values have heretofore been shaped, and the means by which these technologies may be overcome so that one may finally be free to be what one authentically is, if indeed one believes this goal remains within the realm of the possible.

***Turns their impact—turns people into passive objects of manipulation and administration. Only the perm can recognize the ontological importance of political action.***

**Biskowski ’95** (Lawrence J., Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Georgia, Politics Versus Aesthetics: Arendt’s Critiques of Nietzsche and Heidegger, The Review of Politics, Vol. 57, No. 1, Winter 1995, pg 64-66)

Arendt believed that one of the chief problems facing the modern world was its growing inability to make sense of, experience, and talk about what once was considered to be freedom. This incapacity, she feared, might eventually result in the **loss of what has distinctively human about human beings. Such a loss would mean the complete subjection of human beings to the logics of economic, biological, a****nd other types of processes, and consequently their transformation from potentially acting, choosing, and willing subjects into merely passive objects of manipulation, administration, and various forces beyond their conscious control.**  A very similar concern is, of course, an integral part of the contemporary appeal of aestheticized politics, and Arendt herself has recourse to Kantian aesthetics in formulating her theory of political judgment, but only as an illustration of an alternative to customary or traditional thinking about judgment. **Political judgment resembles aesthetic judgment** in several regards, most importantly in that it often is not determinate or subsumptive, but the former, Arendt makes abundantly clear, cannot simply be reduced to the latter. 14 Thus it is not Arendt's claim (nor mine on her behalf) that aesthetics is irrelevant to politics." The problem, rather, resides in the collapsing of one category into the other. From Arendt's perspective, the conflation of aesthetics and politics is only the latest manifestation of a **growing modern alienation** from what she considered to be authentic politics, another indication of our increasing **incapacity even to recognize the vital and distinctive ontological elements and possibilities present in political action and freedom**. Postmodern aestheticism is an alternative to modern ways of thinking about politics and freedom, 16 but an alternative that would be unacceptable to Arendt, insofar as this way of thinking is based at best on only a dim semi-awareness of the authentically political relationship between self, others, and world. As such, it also brings with it a host of dangers.

## Block

**2nc Link**

***The 1ac’s kritik of subject/object metaphysics and call to rethink conceptual distinctions in hopes of altering material conditions replaces concrete universals with subjective individualism—this evaporates class binaries which makes revolution impossible***

**Defazio 12** Machine-Thinking and the Romance of Posthumanism Kimberly DeFazio, Red Critique, http:~/~/redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/htm

A broader point that needs to be made here is that, **while for Heidegger the problem is the subject/object binary**, **and for posthumanists it is the human/animal distinction, what they all reject as metaphysical thinking is the logic of the "binary" which is the structuring principle of class society**. **Class societies**, in which a few control the labor and products of others and thus have control over the lives of the majority, **necessarily create cultural and conceptual divisions which codify these class relations**. **Conceptual divisions have their material roots not in the mind but in the world which the mind reflects**, through more or less complex mediations. **This is one of the basic principles of materialism: ideas are not the product of the (individual) mind; rather, social consciousness is shaped by social existence**. **Therefore changing how people think and thus act** (whether to oneself, other humans, animals or the environment) **requires changing the material divisions that produce othering. Philosophy which simply does away with conceptual distinctions in thinking, as Heidegger and other romantics do, not only gets rid of the very concepts (like "class," "exploitation," "determination") needed to understand the structuring principles of class society, but, in effect, displaces material change of objective conditions onto the subjective change of the individual**. This is the essential politico-cognitive work that neoromantic theory does for capital. Whether through such concepts as Keats' "negative capability" Kant's "sublime," Heidegger's "Being" or "the question of the animal" that is the more recent focus of such writers as Derrida, Wolfe, and Calarco, **romantic machine-thinking celebrates the dissolution of boundaries: between self and other, subject and object, philosophy and poetry, rich and poor, the social (as city) and nature**. It constructs a post-rational linguistic realm of higher values which exceed restricting social codes and conventions. Boundaries, in romanticism, are viewed as the imposition of cultural codes and linguistic conventions that rigidly delineate, not as material (as effects of labor relations). It is through the replacement of "mechanical" concepts with speculative ones that **romanticism blurs social boundaries and epistemological distinctions in an effort, not to transform capitalism, but to find a freer mode of thinking within it**. As Wordsworth puts it in his Preface to Lyrical Ballads, it involves taking familiar incidents and "throw[ing] over them a certain colouring of imagination"—or, in the updated idiom of posthumanism, a "revolution in language and thought" (Calarco, Zoographies 6).

**Heideggerian pre-reflective experience**, like "the question of the animal**," is in short the space in which "abstract" binaries like class (not to mention other social differences) evaporate**. By blurring lines, romantic theory seeks, as Heidegger puts it, "the liberation of language from grammar" ("Letter on Humanism" 218), rather than social transformation. To liberate language from grammar is of course to free up thinking (from cultural bounds), to suspend the social structures of language and, according to Heidegger, to come closer to understanding Being. Grammarless language is thus the fantasy of the plentitude of meaning outside of the social. No matter how adamantly posthumanism condemns Heidegger's human-centered thinking, the very de-essentializing strategies it deploys to challenge human-animal distinctions are informed by the (Heideggerian) desire to escape existing social conventions, through the relay of the animal.

***They preclude a dynamic view of history and cause powerlessness***

**Stahl 75** The Jargon of Authenticity: An Introduction to a Marxist Critique of Heidegger Gerry Stahl Associate Professor College of Information Science and Technology, Drexel University boundary 2 Vol. 3, No. 2 (Winter, 1975), pp. 489-498 Published by: Duke University Press Article Stable URL: http:~/~/www.jstor.org/stable/302135url:http://www.jstor.org/stable/302135

Adorno's philosophical interpretations proceed according to the same maxims. Heidegger's work is treated neither simplistically nor deterministically; it is neither rejected out of hand as mere bourgeois ideology nor uncritically accepted as autonomous contemplation. It is comprehended, rather, as an arena from which the forces at work throughout society are scarcely excluded and in which any truth which manages to make an appearance will necessarily be conditioned by these forces - in one way or another. Clearly, the penetration of social relations into Heidegger's system can only be revealed through a thorough grasp of the philosophical propositions, but these are not taken as ends in themselves: between the lines a social force-field must be reconstructed. In a tribute to his boyhood friend, Siegfried Kracauer, Adorno summarizes this approach to philosophical interpretation: "If I later, when reading the traditional philosophical texts, let myself be less impressed by their unity and systematic coherence, but rather concerned myself with the play of the forces which worked on one another under the surface of each closed doctrine and considered the codified philosophies as in each case force-fields, then it was certainly Kracauer who inspired me to it."10 More than anything else, this oblique approach to philosophies - especially apparent in Jargon, which relates Heidegger to society in terms of the medium of a politically loaded language-game - makes Adorno's critique of Heidegger difficult to grasp. III For years Adorno avoided the frontal attack on Heidegger anticipated in the early essays. The systematic approach of Dialectic of Enlightenment, probably to be attributed to Horkheimer, was uncharacteristic of Adorno. He spent his most productive years composing focused essays. Numerous references to Heidegger are sprinkled throughout these studies; the important discussions of Kafka (1953)11 and Beckett (1961),12 for instance, interpret their subject matter as poetic critiques of Heidegger, in explicit renunciation of the popular existentialist readings. When, near the end of his life, Adorno did present his conception of philosophy systematically, Heidegger was there front and center. Negative Dialectics (1967),13 the only extensive mature work completed (unless one counts the monograph on Alban Berg),14 devotes the first of its three parts to Adorno's "relation to ontology," a critique of Heidegger which provides the starting point for Adorno's own "anti-system." Perhaps the most significant contrast of Heidegger and Adorno would be one based on the latter's posthumously published Aesthetische Theorie.15 Such a study would, however, have few explicit connections to draw upon. Informed by the philosophical debates, it would have to note the shared rejection of subjectivistic aesthetics and evaluate the relation of art to society in the respective theories. Short of this, Negative Dialectics and its off-shoot, The Jargon of Authenticity, will have to be accepted as the definitive statements of Adorno's critique of Heidegger. According to the introduction to Negative Dialectics, the task of philosophy in our times is the transformation of subjectivistic thinking by means of the subjective strength of the critical individual. The subsequent priority of substance over the knowing subject would imply a primary concern with the concrete, which has been distorted under the demands of a coercive social totality. Although method would then be determined by the subject matter, analysis could still not proceed without concepts. This linguistic requirement demands a critique of the philosophical tradition, that is, of German idealism and of the inept criticism of idealism by positivism, phenomenology and existentialism. While these goals may also capture much of Heidegger's stated intention, Heidegger, according to Adorno's account, like Husserl before him, has in fact failed to deal adequately with the complexities involved in grasping the concrete. In Negative Dialectics Adorno suggests how the concrete is missed by Heidegger's simplistic scheme, which underlies and supports an elaborate obscurantism. The three poles of Heidegger's system - beings, human existence and Being - interpenetrate each other only formally, without taking into account their actual configuration, which defines their content. The concrete social history in which these poles, as dialectical, intertwine and develop according to Hegel and, in effect, Marx, disappears in Heidegger's presentation. Thereby their present forms are not clearly situated in history; as essential and eternal, they are, Adorno thinks, glorified and affirmed. The often bemoaned quietism of Heidegger's later writings is thus revealed by Adorno to be non-accidental: it is a consequence of the very approach of the ontological project, one which excludes social content from the start. This criticism is particularly interesting because Adorno has also been accused of praxis paralysis and because Heidegger can respond as Adorno has that his emphasis on contemplation is a reaction against a preponderance of thoughtless pragmatic activity in present society. The difference between the two philosophies is that receptivity becomes a dead-end in Heidegger's system, rather than a corrective moment which negates only the distortions and limitations of unreflected political action. The philosophical source of the difference is that Heidegger's approach reacts too simplistically to the dilemmas of post-Hegelian philosophy, attempting to skirt the problem of a non-idealistic mediation of subject and object, of thought and society, of theory and practice. Where Adorno radicalizes Hegel's dialectic, redefining it in terms of the non-identity of word and object and articulating the mediations involved more thoroughly than even Hegel, Heidegger falls behind Hegel, hypostatizing language along with Being outside the influence of that reality which they characterize, leaving the flow of history outside the realm of possible human influence. This theoretical point has practical consequences for Heidegger's philosophy in that he fails to reflect on the relation of his language to society. Heidegger's failure to deal adequately with the present social context of philosophy is perhaps Adorno's strongest indictment of him: Heidegger's ontology is an unfortunate response to social conditions in which men feel powerless. In the guise of a critique of subjectivistic will, it fetishizes the illusion of powerlessness and thereby serves those in power. Following a restorative thrust, Heidegger's formulation of a real felt need merely assumes a solution and thus serves to perpetuate the underlying problems. Strengthening conservative ideology, Heidegger's approach avoids those issues which point to the realm of society, an arena in which men could possibly exert some joint control.

***critiques of management distract and deny the possibility of challenging the larger forces of capitalism which underlie such managerialism.***

**Hudson, ’02** (Mark, completing his PhD in sociology at the University of Oregon, He holds a Bachelor of Arts (H) in economics from the University of Manitoba and a Masters in Environmental Studies from York University, Environments, December)

The second difficulty is that **critiques of management** per-se **distract from the profoundly anti-ecological logic and drives of the capitalist system, which orient, channel, and limit the purposes of management**. **Such critiques also deny the possibility of human organization in construction of a different set of social relations, which could provide the possibility of escaping the anti-ecological relations of capitalism**. As Szabo's work (this volume) so cogently demonstrates, critiques of modernity call into question the wisdom and possibility of engaging in any sort of ''social engineering.'' Bauman's work on the Holocaust convincingly demonstrates that the tools of modernity enable the capacity for atrocities on a grand scale (Bauman, 1989). Indeed, we need not look to such extreme cases to see the shadowy side of rationalization, attention to efficiency, planning, and co-ordination. As will be discussed below, Marx argues that these characteristics of ''modernity'' hold the promise of liberation from material want, yet their ''dark side'' becomes apparent when harnessed to capitalist relations of production and the necessities of accumulation. Rationality and scientific technique become shackles on the bulk of humanity, creating immiseration and alienation instead of liberation (Marx, [1867] 1976). For Marx, **it is the social relations of production specific to capitalism that produce oppression, rather than the generalized application of rationality, planning, and co-ordination - in other words - management**. This emphasis and distinction allows for the possibility of an organized political project to seize control of the forces of production and for the conscious transformation of the entire mode of production, encompassing objectives and techniques. If the conditioning influences of societal structures on the form and purpose of technique are neglected, then we are encouraged - if not forced completely - to abandon the possibility of consciously altering our environment. For example, **if we fail to recognize the influence that the capitalist mode of production and its need for accumulation has on management practices, we will fail to see the potential for intentionally changing our environment, including our natural environment, but also our social environment**; the social relations in which we live, work, recreate, and die.

***Particular struggles sap the energy from the criticism***

**Valentić 07** (Tonči, University of Zagreb, “Socialism reconsidered: Remarks on Žižek`s *Repeating Lenin”,* International Journal of Zizek Studies, <http://zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/view/47/92>)

Žižek`s assertion that the main failure of today's Left is the acceptance of the cultural wars (such as anti-racist or feminist) as the dominant terrain of the emancipatory politics is very easy to defend. There are basically two possible ways for the socio-political engagement: either to play the game of the system, i.e. to engage in the "long march through the institutions" or to get active in new social movements(such as feminism, ecology, antiracism, minority rights, etc.). Žižek rejects both of them, being mainly negative towards the second since they are not political in a strict sense of the word: they are not more that "single issue movements" with the lack of social totality, focused only on one group of people or one single social issue, thus rejecting the universalism as an important part of any struggle in the public sphere. Instead of a "right to narrate" one personal story or story from one particular point of viewof the so-called socially deprived groups, he emphasizes the "right to truth" as embodied in historical figure of St. Paul, calling on the traces of Alain Badiou for humanity beyond particular disintegration or abstract humanism, beyond pathetic brotherhood, instead based on the "politics of truth". He puts into play the role of Saint Paul because in the realm of political theology he aimed to ground a new collective that abandons and leaves behind both the "Roman" and "Jewish" way, i.e. false universalism of liberal democracy's discourse and orthodox right-wing fundamentalism. With his assertion of today's world seen as period of post-modern relativism where we should articulate the universal truth as prerequisite for emancipatory politics, he overwrites the Leninist notion of "politics of truth" claiming it still has to be reinvented and implied. Since Badoiu`s notion of Event tends to "emerge out of nowhere", the same goes for Leninism as radical gesture: it is the only way to cope with contemporary totalitarian liberal democracy, so this reference to Lenin serves as an effort to break the vicious circle of these false options, i.e. either to play the game in hope you can one day beat the system or to fight the system emphasizing social particularities. The statement is very clear and convincing: partial emancipation is possible only through universal emancipation, which means particular experience cannot be universalized and therefore denotes a conservative political gesture, such as an emphasis on minority rights, gay and lesbian organizations, etc. Žižek`s critical remarks on the contemporary dominant fetish of repressed "otherness" as well as a concept of social intolerance towards the Other become the battlefield for analysis of Other's intolerance towards us, which is not politically correct but is politically true. Just as radicalism often represents an empty gesture, by the same token it is also the case with the political correctness as well as fascination with victimized Other, which leads us to the new type of exclusion, the exclusion of those who do not play by those imposed rules and are a priori considered terrorists or oppressors if they belong to the majority group (for example, single white Anglo-American male in today's United States in contrast to black lesbian woman). The important step, or to put it more clearly, the main theoretical act, is precisely to define hegemonic ideological coordinates because if you act you are already in the game, playing by the rules. Regarding political Denkverbot mentioned before, Žižek humorously but nonetheless punctually paraphrases Max Horkheimer`s sentence "those who do not want to talk about fascism, should keep silent about capitalism" into "those who do not want to talk about global capitalism, should keep silent about socialism". Political activity is here accurately seen as an example of *political* *interpassivity*, i.e. doing things not to achieve something, but to prevent something from really changing, as in an unmentioned reference to famous Visconti`s phrase in one of his movies that "everything has to be changed in order to remain the same". The Return to Lenin has a quite different aim. Instead of playing the role of leftist intellectual who pretends to be critical towards capitalism discussing the transition from commodity fetishism to fetishism which is today itself commodified or to support the naïve belief in cyber communism as the possible way of resistance, he calls for repetition of Lenin's historical gesture with the famous question, once more brought into the intellectual debate: "Čto djelat?" or "What Is To Be Done?" Here it is crucial to emphasize the relevance of so called "high theory" today for the most concrete political struggle – as we remember from socialism, theoretical knowledge is not unimportant; quite contrary, as Žižek argues, it is the main incentive for the revolutionary act which follows it. Another author who uses Lenin as a crucial figure is Toni Negri (article "What to do with "What to do?" Or rather: The body of General Intellect"), who grippingly emphasized the biopolitical aspect of Leninism, (Lenin beyond Lenin), i.e. interpreting communist struggle as inevitably biopolitical struggle. Since the present ideologico-political constellation is characterized by the tendency to introduce moralistic reasoning into the political struggle, we are only a few steps away from a teleological explanation of liberal-democratic capitalism as the ultimate and eternal social order. The true problem with the democracy as *liberal* democracy is in its inherent paradox, since it is possible only in the conditions of its impossibility, and the major problem with the state from the socialist point of view is that it has always been seen as an instrument of oppression which can never be fully democratized. For that reason, socialist interventions pinpoint the dominant role of the state as well as democracy's insufficiencies.

**2nc ethics**

***There is no value to life under capitalism – people are reduced to their economic worth***

**Dillon ’99**(Michael, Professor of IR @ Lancaster, “Another Justice” *Political Theory*, Vol. 27, No. 2. April, pp. 165)

Quite the reverse. The subject was never a firm foundation for justice, much less a hospitable vehicle for the reception of the call of another Justice. It was never in possession of that self-possession which was supposed to secure the certainty of itself, of a self-possession that would enable it ultimately to adjudicate everything. The very indexicality required of sovereign subjectivity gave rise rather to a commensurability much more amenable to the expendability required of the political and material economies of mass societies than it did to the singular, invaluable, and uncanny uniqueness of the self. **The value of the subject became the standard unit of currency for the political arithmetic of States and the political economies of capitalism.** They trade in it still to devastating global effect. The technologisation of the political has become manifest and global. **Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability**.3s Thus no valuation without mensuration and no mensuration without indexation. **Once rendered calculable**, however, **units of account are necessarily submissible** not only to valuation but also, of course, **to devaluation. Devaluation, logically, can extend to the point of counting as nothing.** Hence, no mensuration without demensuration either. **There is nothing abstract about this: the declension of economies of value leads to the zero point of holocaust**. **However liberating and emancipating systems of value-rights-may claim to be, for example, they run the risk of counting out the invaluable. Counted out, the invaluable may then lose its purchase on life. Herewith, then, the necessity of championing the invaluable itself. For we must never forget that, "we are dealing always with whatever exceeds measure."**

**2nc RC**

***The material determinism of capital makes extinction inevitable—root cause of instrumentality***

**Dyer-Witherford** (professor of Library and Info. Sciences @ the Univ. of Western Ontarion) **‘99** Nick. Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism.

**For capitalism, the use of machines as organs of “will over nature” is an imperative**. The great insight of the Frankfurt School—an insight subsequently improved and amplified by feminists and ecologists—was that **capital’s dual project of dominating both humanity and nature was intimately tied to the cultivation of “instrumental reason” that systematically objectifies, reduces, quantifies and fragments the world for the purposes of technological control**. **Business’s systemic need to cheapen labor, cut the costs of raw materials, and expand consumer markets gives it an inherent bias toward the piling-up of technological power. This priority—enshrined in phrases such as “progress,” “efficiency,” “productivity,” “modernization,” and “growth”—assumes an automatism that is used to override any objection or alternative, regardless of the environmental and social consequences. Today, we witness global vistas of toxification, deforestation, desertification, dying oceans, disappearing ozone layers, and disintegrating immune systems, all interacting in ways that perhaps threaten the very existence of humanity and are undeniably inflicting social collapse, disease, and immiseration across the planet. The degree to which this project of mastery has backfired is all too obvious.**

***We control the root cause of technocratic energy policy ---- it’s product of capitalism’s attempt to increase productivity and profit. This allows for exploitative working conditions and leads to extinction.***

**ICC ’11** (Nuclear Energy, Capitalism and Communism, August 16, 2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear)

**The revolution in the form and quantity of energy available to humanity** underpinned the industrial revolution and opened the door from the realm of want to that of plenty. But this revolution **was driven by the development of capitalism whose purpose is not the satisfaction of human needs but the increase of capital based on the appropriation of surplus value produced by an exploited working class. Energy is used to drive the development of productivity but it is also a cost of production. It is part of the constant capital** alongside raw materials, machines and factories and, as such, tends to increase in relation to the variable capital that is the source of capitalism’s profits. It is this that dictates capitalism’s attitude to energy.

**Capitalism has no regard for the use of energy, for the destruction of finite resources, other than as a cost of production**. **Increased productivity** tends to **require increased energy, so the capitalists** (other than those in the oil industry) **are driven to try and reduce the cost of this energy**. On the one hand **this results in the profligate use of energy** for irrational ends, such as transporting similar commodities back and forth across the world and the ceaseless multiplication of commodities that meet no real human need but serve only as a means to extract and realise surplus value. On the other, **it leads to the denial of access to energy and to the products of energy for millions of humans who lack the money to be of interest to the capitalists. This is illustrated in Nigeria where Shell pumps out billions of dollars worth of oil while the local people go without or risk their lives by trying to illegally tap the oil from the pipeline. The price is also paid by those working in the energy industries in lives lost and bodies maimed or poisoned and by the environment and all that lives in it, from the polluted, toxic waters** of the Thames that characterised 19th century London **to the warming of the globe that threatens the future of humanity today.**

***Capitalism causes environmental collapse and extinction***

**Foster ‘10** [John Bellamy, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon in Eugene, Last updated and edited February 3, 2010, “Why Ecological Revolution”, <http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php>]

It is now universally recognized within science that humanity is confronting the prospect — if we do not soon change course — of a planetary ecological collapse. Not only is the global ecological crisis becoming more and more severe, with the time in which to address it fast running out, but the dominant environmental strategies are also forms of denial, demonstrably doomed to fail, judging by their own limited objectives. This tragic failure, I will argue, can be attributed to the refusal of the powers that be to address the roots of the ecological problem in capitalist production and the resulting necessity of ecological and social revolution. The term “crisis,” attached to the global ecological problem, although unavoidable, is somewhat misleading, given its dominant economic associations. Since 2008, we have been living through a world economic crisis — the worst economic downturn since the 1930s. This has been a source of untold suffering for hundreds of millions, indeed billions, of people. But insofar as it is related to the business cycle and not to long-term factors, expectations are that it is temporary and will end, to be followed by a period of economic recovery and growth — until the advent of the next crisis. Capitalism is, in this sense, a crisis-ridden, cyclical economic system. Even if we were to go further, to conclude that the present crisis of accumulation is part of a long-term economic stagnation of the system — that is, a slowdown of the trend-rate of growth beyond the mere business cycle — we would still see this as a partial, historically limited calamity, raising, at most, the question of the future of the present system of production.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn269) When we speak today of the world ecological crisis, however, we are referring to something that could turn out to be **final**, i.e., there is a high probability, if we do not quickly change course, of a **terminal crisis** — a death of the whole anthropocene, the period of human dominance of the planet. Human actions are generating environmental changes that threaten the extermination of most species on the planet, along with civilization, and conceivably our own species as well. What makes the current ecological situation so serious is that climate change, arising from human-generated increases in greenhouse gas emissions, is not occurring gradually and in a linear process, but is undergoing a dangerous acceleration, pointing to sudden shifts in the state of the earth system. We can therefore speak, to quote James Hansen, director of NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies, and the world’s most famous climate scientist, of “tipping points…fed by amplifying feedbacks.”[2](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn268) Four amplifying feedbacks are significant at present: (1) rapid melting of arctic sea ice, with the resulting reduction of the earth’s albedo (reflection of solar radiation) due to the replacement of bright, reflective ice with darker blue sea water, leading to greater absorption of solar energy and increasing global average temperatures; (2) melting of the frozen tundra in northern regions, releasing methane (a much more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide) trapped beneath the surface, causing accelerated warming; (3) recent indications that there has been a drop in the efficiency of the carbon absorption of the world’s oceans since the 1980s, and particularly since 2000, due to growing ocean acidification (from past carbon absorption), resulting in faster carbon build-up in the atmosphere and enhanced warming; (4) extinction of species due to changing climate zones, leading to the collapse of ecosystems dependent on these species, and the death of still more species.[3](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn267) Due to this acceleration of climate change, the time line in which to act before calamities hit, and before climate change increasingly escapes our control, is extremely short. In October 2009, Luc Gnacadja, executive secretary of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, reported that, based on current trends, close to 70 percent of the land surface of the earth could be drought-affected by 2025, compared to nearly 40 percent today.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn266) The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has warned that glaciers are melting throughout the world and could recede substantially this century. Rivers fed by the Himalyan glaciers currently supply water to countries with around 3 billion people. Their melting will give rise to enormous floods, followed by acute water shortages.[5](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn265) Many of the planetary dangers associated with current global warming trends are by now well-known: rising sea levels engulfing islands and low-lying coastal regions throughout the globe; loss of tropical forests; destruction of coral reefs; a “sixth extinction” rivaling the great die-downs in the history of the planet; massive crop losses; extreme weather events; spreading hunger and disease. But these dangers are heightened by the fact that climate change is not the entirety of the world ecological crisis. For example, independently of climate change, tropical forests are being cleared as a direct result of the search for profits. Soil destruction is occurring, due to current agribusiness practices. Toxic wastes are being diffused throughout the environment. Nitrogen run-off from the overuse of fertilizer is affecting lakes, rivers, and ocean regions, contributing to oxygen-poor “dead zones.” Since the whole earth is affected by the vast scale of human impact on the environment in complex and unpredictable ways, even more serious catastrophes could conceivably be set in motion. One growing area of concern is ocean acidification due to rising carbon dioxide emissions. As carbon dioxide dissolves, it turns into carbonic acid, making the oceans more acidic. Because carbon dioxide dissolves more readily in cold than in warm water, the cold waters of the arctic are becoming acidic at an unprecedented rate. Within a decade, the waters near the North Pole could become so corrosive as to dissolve the living shells of shellfish, affecting the entire ocean food chain. At the same time, ocean acidification appears to be reducing the carbon uptake of the oceans, speeding up global warming.[6](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn264) There are endless predictive uncertainties in all of this. Nevertheless, evidence is mounting that the continuation of current trends is unsustainable, even in the short-term. The only rational answer, then, is a radical change of course. Moreover, given certain imminent tipping points, there is no time to be lost. Catastrophic changes in the earth system could be set irreversibly in motion within a few decades, at most. The IPCC, in its 2007 report, indicated that an atmospheric carbon dioxide level of 450 parts per million (ppm) should not be exceeded, and implied that this was the fail-safe point for carbon stabilization. But these findings are already out of date. “What science has revealed in the past few years,” Hansen states, “is that the safe level of carbon dioxide in the long run is no more than 350 ppm,” as compared with 390 ppm today. That means that carbon emissions have to be reduced faster and more drastically than originally thought, to bring the overall carbon concentration in the atmosphere down. The reality is that, “if we burn all the fossil fuels, or even half of remaining reserves, we will send the planet toward the ice-free state with sea level about 250 feet higher than today. It would take time for complete ice sheet disintegration to occur, but a chaotic situation would be created with changes occurring out of control of future generations.” More than eighty of the world’s poorest and most climate-vulnerable countries have now declared that carbon dioxide atmospheric concentration levels must be reduced below 350 ppm, and that the rise in global average temperature by century’s end must not exceed 1.5°C.[7](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn263) Strategies of Denial The central issue that we have to confront, therefore, is devising social strategies to address the world ecological crisis. Not only do the solutions have to be large enough to deal with the problem, but also all of this must take place on a world scale in a generation or so. The speed and scale of change necessary means that what is required is an ecological revolution that would also need to be a social revolution. However, rather than addressing the real roots of the crisis and drawing the appropriate conclusions, the dominant response is to avoid all questions about the nature of our society, and to turn to technological fixes or market mechanisms of one sort or another. In this respect, there is a certain continuity of thought between those who deny the climate change problem altogether, and those who, while acknowledging the severity of the problem at one level, nevertheless deny that it requires a revolution in our social system. We are increasingly led to believe that the answers to climate change are primarily to be found in new energy technology, specifically increased energy and carbon efficiencies in both production and consumption. Technology in this sense, however, is often viewed abstractly as a **deus ex machina**, separated from both the laws of physics (i.e., entropy or the second law of thermodynamics) and from the way technology is embedded in historically specific conditions. With respect to the latter, it is worth noting that, under the present economic system, increases in energy efficiency normally lead to increases in the scale of economic output, effectively negating any gains from the standpoint of resource use or carbon efficiency — a problem known as the “Jevons Paradox.” As William Stanley Jevons observed in the nineteenth century, every new steam engine was more efficient in the use of coal than the one before, which did not prevent coal burning from increasing overall, since the efficiency gains only led to the expansion of the number of steam engines and of growth in general. This relation between efficiency and scale has proven true for capitalist economies up to the present day.[8](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn262) Technological fetishism with regard to environmental issues is usually coupled with a form of market fetishism. So widespread has this become that even a militant ecologist like Bill McKibben, author of **The End of Nature**, recently stated: “There is only one lever even possibly big enough to make our system move as fast as it needs to, and that’s the force of markets.”[9](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn261) Green-market fetishism is most evident in what is called “cap and trade” — a catch phrase for the creation, via governments, of artificial markets in carbon trading and so-called “offsets.” The important thing to know about cap and trade is that it is a proven failure. Although enacted in Europe as part of the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, it has failed where it was supposed to count: in reducing emissions. Carbon-trading schemes have been shown to be full of holes. Offsets allow all sorts of dubious forms of trading that have no effect on emissions. Indeed, the only area in which carbon trading schemes have actually been effective is in promoting profits for speculators and corporations, which are therefore frequently supportive of them. Recently, Friends of the Earth released a report entitled **Subprime Carbon**? which pointed to the emergence, under cap and trade agreements, of what could turn out to be the world’s largest financial derivatives market in the form of carbon trading. All of this has caused Hansen to refer to cap and trade as “the temple of doom,” locking in “disasters for our children and grandchildren.”[10](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn260) The masquerade associated with the dominant response to global warming is illustrated in the climate bill passed by the U.S. House of Representatives in late June 2009. The bill, if enacted, would supposedly reduce greenhouse gas emissions 17 percent relative to 2005 levels by 2020, which translates into 4-5 percent less U.S. global warming pollution than in 1990. This then would still not reach the target level of a 6-8 percent cut (relative to 1990) for wealthy countries that the Kyoto accord set for 2012, and that was supposed to have been only a minor, first step in dealing with global warming — at a time when the problem was seen as much less severe. The goal presented in the House bill, even if reached, would therefore prove vastly inadequate. But the small print in the bill makes achieving even this meager target unrealistic. The coal industry is given until 2025 to comply with the bill’s pollution reduction mandates, with possible extensions afterward. As Hansen observes, the bill “builds in approval of new coal-fired power plants!” Agribusiness, which accounts for a quarter of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, is entirely exempt from the mandated reductions. The cap and trade provisions of the House bill would give annual carbon dioxide emission allowances to some 7,400 facilities across the United States, most of them handed out for free. These pollution allowances would increase up through 2016, and companies would be permitted to “bank” them indefinitely for future use. Corporations would be able to fulfill their entire set of obligations by buying offsets associated with pollution control projects until 2027. To make matters worse, the Senate counterpart to the House bill, now under deliberation, would undoubtedly be more conservative, giving further concessions and offsets to corporations. The final bill, if it comes out of Congress, will thus be, in Hansen’s words, “worse than nothing.” Similar developments can be seen in the preparation for the December 2009 world climate negotiations in Copenhagen, in which Washington has played the role of a spoiler, blocking all but the most limited, voluntary agreements, and insisting on only market-based approaches, such as cap and trade.[11](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn259) Recognizing that world powers are playing the role of Nero as Rome burns, James Lovelock, the earth system scientist famous for his Gaia hypothesis, argues that massive climate change and the destruction of human civilization as we know it may now be irreversible. Nevertheless, he proposes as “solutions” either a massive building of nuclear power plants all over the world (closing his eyes to the enormous dangers accompanying such a course) — or geoengineering our way out of the problem, by using the world’s fleet of aircraft to inject huge quantities of sulfur dioxide into the stratosphere to block a portion of the incoming sunlight, reducing the solar energy reaching the earth. Another common geoengineering proposal includes dumping iron filings throughout the ocean to increase its carbon-absorbing properties. Rational scientists recognize that interventions in the earth system on the scale envisioned by geoengineering schemes (for example, blocking sunlight) have their own massive, unforeseen consequences. Nor could such schemes solve the crisis. The dumping of massive quantities of sulfur dioxide into the stratosphere would, even if effective, have to be done again and again, on an increasing scale, if the underlying problem of cutting greenhouse gas emissions were not dealt with. Moreover, it could not possibly solve other problems associated with massive carbon dioxide emissions, such as the acidification of the oceans.[12](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn258) The dominant approach to the world ecological crisis, focusing on technological fixes and market mechanisms, is thus a kind of denial; one that serves the vested interests of those who have the most to lose from a change in economic arrangements. Al Gore exemplifies the dominant form of denial in his new book, **Our Choice: A Plan to Solve the Climate Crisis**. For Gore, the answer is the creation of a “sustainable capitalism.” He is not, however, altogether blind to the faults of the present system. He describes climate change as the “greatest market failure in history” and decries the “short-term” perspective of present-day capitalism, its “market triumphalism,” and the “fundamental flaws” in its relation to the environment. Yet, in defiance of all this, he assures his readers that the “strengths of capitalism” can be harnessed to a new system of “sustainable development.”[13](http://monthlyreview.org/100101foster.php" \l "fn257)

**2nc Alt**

***The role of the ballot is to endorse the team whose advocacy best confronts global capitalism --- class based critical pedagogy empowers students to challenge capitalist exploitation and breakdown systems of domination-this produces the best scholarship***

**McLaren and Farahmandpur** 20**05** (Peter McLaren, professor of Education at UCLA and Ramin Farahmandpur, assistant professor of education at Portland state, “Teaching Against Global Capitalism,” pgs 53-54, 2005)

Paulo **Freire’s critique of capitalism**, in particular his critique of class exploitation, **has largely been ignored by critical educationalists operating within the precincts of postmodern theory and cultural studied. This is a lamentable situation,** especially **given Freire’s totemic status among progressive educators and the fact that his writings serve as the railhead of the critical educational tradition**. In his early work especially, **Freire** (1978**) positioned education as an ideological and political activity that intimately linked to social production. Critical education**, he argued, **empowers students and workers to organize and classify knowledge by differentiating between bourgeois ideology and working-class ideology, bourgeois culture and working-class culture, and ruling-class interests and working-class interests. As an offspring to Freirean pedagogy, critical pedagogy seeks to reclaim these distinctions identified by Freire as well as to transcend the existing antagonisms between manual and mental labor,** theory and practice, teaching and learning, and what is known and what can be known. In this respect, Freire (1978) raised important questions regarding the relationship between education and social production, such as, **“Why is anything produced? What should be produced? How should it be produced?”** (107). **We join Freire in arguing that, as part of a larger concerted effort of educating workers and students, critical pedagogy must also address the following questions: “What to know? How to know? In benefit of what and of whom to know?** Moreover, against what and whom to know?” (100). Following Freire’s (1978) lead, **critical pedagogy supports the practice of students and workers reflecting critically not only on their location in the world and against the world but also on their relationship with the world.** Freire maintained that **productive labor is the basis for critical knowledge and visa versa.** Subsequently**, a critical analysis of schooling begins by examining the relationship between productive labor and critical knowledge. That is, critical education is associated with productive labor, with labor that privileges use value over exchange value. While capitalist schooling provides students with basic knowledge and skills that increase their productivity and efficiency as future workers and that** subsequently **reproduce class relations, critical pedagogy works toward the revolutionary empowerment of students and workers by offering them opportunities to develop critical social skills that will assist them in gaining an awareness of** – and a resolve to transform **– the exploitative nature of capitalist social and economic relations of production. Worker and student empowerment requires teachers in urban schools to acknowledge and exploit critically the dialectical unity between theory and practice and action and reflection (**Friere 1978). **Reflection on one’s own social practice means being attentive to the concrete social and economic issues in the workplace and in schools. It further stipulates that workers and students gain a critical purchase of their social location. Freire referred to this as achieving a “radical form of being,”** which he associated with “beings that not only know, but know that they know” (24). **The revolutionary character of Freire’s approach is lucidly reflected in** Bertell **Ollman’s description of what constitutes a “dialectical understanding” of everyday life**. Ollman (1998b) argues that **a dialectical understanding of social life is “more indispensable now than ever before”** (342) **because he believes that the current stage of capitalism is characterized by far greater complexity and much faster change and interaction than at any time in human history**. In tracing the social, economic, and political antagonisms under capitalism, Marxist dialectics conceives of capitalism to be constituted by “intersecting and overlapping contradictions…Among the more important of these are the contradictions between use-value and exchange-value, between capital and labor in the production process (and between capitalists and workers in the class struggle), between capitalist forces and capitalist relations of production, between competition and cooperation, between science and ideology, between political democracy and economic servitude, and – perhaps most decisively – between social production and private appropriation (or what some have recast as the “logic of production vs. the logic of consumption”).” (350) Ollman (1998b) captures the essence of Marxian dialectical process when he writes, “Marx’s dialectics views reality as an internally related whole with temporal as well as spatial dimensions. Things that are separate and independent…cannot be in contradiction, since contradiction implies that an important change in any part will produce changes of a comparable magnitude throughout the system” (349). **In exposing they underlying contradictions inherent in the capitalist mode of production, socialist pedagogy encourages critical educators to employ a dialectical understanding of the social world in their classroom by creating conditions for students to explore how class exploitation, racism, and sexism constitute a set of complex social, cultural, political, and economic relationships in which every individual is implicated** (Ollman 1978). In underscoring the significance of the concept of “relations,” Ollman (1978) remarks, “The relations that people ordinarily assume to exist between things are viewed here as existing within (as a necessary part of) each thing in turn, now conceived of a relation (likewise, the changes which any “thing” undergoes). The peculiar notion of relation is the key to understanding the entire dialectic, and is used to unlock the otherwise mysterious notions of totality, abstraction, identity, law, and contradiction. (227-28)”

***It is not possible to solve any situation without solving them all – only a criticism which attacks the universal of capitalism can solve their impacts and the inevitable destruction of the earth and its people. This proves only the alt can solve the plan.***

**Zizek, ’89**

(Slavoj, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies, The Sublime Object of Ideology, page 3-4)

It is upon the unity of these two features that the Marxist notion of the revolution, of the revolutionary situation, is founded: a situation of metaphorical condensation in which it finally becomes clear to the everyday consciousness that it is not possible to solve any particular ques­tion without solving them all - that is, without solving the fundamental question which embodies the antagonistic character of the social totality. In a 'normal', pre-revolutionary state of things, everybody is fighting his own particular battles (workers are striking for better wages, feminists are fighting for the rights of women, democrats for political and social freedoms, ecologists against the exploitation of nature, participants in the peace movements against the danger of war, and so on). Marxists are using all their skill and adroimess of argument to convince the partici­pants in these particular struggles that the only real solution to their problem is to be found in the global revolution: as long as social relations are dominated by Capital, there will always be sexism in relations between the sexes, there will always be a threat of global war, there will always be a danger that political and social freedoms will be suspended, nature itself will always remain an object of ruthless exploitation. . . . The global revolution will then abolish the basic social antagonism, enabling the formation of a transparent, rationally governed society.

***Finally, the alt is a pre-requisite to the affirmative – capitalist ideology makes it impossible to adequately or accurately answer the questions of the affirmative. We must step outside of the current restrictions on thinking before we can begin to ponder where to go next.***

**Johnston ’04** (Adrian, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory, The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society)

The height of Zizek's philosophical traditionalism, his fidelity to certain lasting truths too precious to cast away in a postmodern frenzy, is his conviction that no worthwhile praxis can emerge prior to the careful and deliberate formulation of a correct conceptual framework. His references to the Lacanian notion of the Act (qua agent-less occurrence not brought about by a subject) are especially strange in light of the fact that he seemingly endorses the view that theory must precede practice, namely, that deliberative reflection is, in a way, primary. For Zizek, the foremost "practical" task to be accomplished today isn't some kind of rebellious acting out, which would, in the end, amount to nothing more than a series of impotent, incoherent outbursts. Instead, **given the contemporary exhaustion of the socio-political imagination under the hegemony of liberal-democratic capitalism,** he sees **the liberation of thinking itself from its present constraints as the first crucial step that must be taken if anything is to be changed for the better.** In a lecture given in Vienna in 2001, Zizek suggests that **Marx's call to break out of the sterile closure of abstract intellectual ruminations through direct, concrete action** (thesis eleven on Feuerbach--"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it") **must be inverted given the new prevailing conditions of late-capitalism. Nowadays, one must resist succumbing to the temptation to short-circuit thinking in favor of acting, since all such rushes to action are doomed; they either fail to disrupt capitalism or are ideologically co-opted by it.**

**Perm**

***Radical negation is key to open the space for our universal – only wiping the slate clean can solve***

**Zizek, ’99** (Slavoj, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana,The Ticklish Subject, page 91-92)

With regard to the opposition between abstract and concrete Universal­ity, this means that **the only way towards a truly 'concrete' universality leads through the full assertion of the** radical negativity **by means of which the universal negates its** entire particular content: despite misleading appearances, it is the 'mute universality’ of the neutral container of the particular content which is the predominant form of abstract universality. In other words, **the only way for a Universality to become 'concrete' is to stop being a neutral-abstract medium of its particular content, and to** *include itself among its particular subspecies.* What this means is that, paradox­ically, **the first step towards 'concrete universality ' is the radical negation of the entire particular content: only through such a negation does the Universal gain existence,** become visible 'as such'. Here let us recall Hegel's analysis of phrenology, which closes the chapter on 'Observing Reason' in his Phenomenology: Hegel resorts to an explicit phallic metaphor in order to explain the opposition of the two possible readings of the proposition 'the Spirit is a bone' (the vulgar-materialist 'reductionist' reading - the shape of our skull actually and directly determines the features of our mind - and the speculative reading - the spirit is strong enough to assert its identity with the most utterly inert stuff, and to 'sublate' it - that is to say, even the most utterly inert stuff cannot escape the Spirit's power of mediation). The vulgar-materialist reading is like the approach which sees in the phallus only the organ of urination, while the speculative reading is also able to discern in it the much higher function of insemination (i.e. precisely 'conception' as the biological anticipation of concept).

**Ontology 2nc**

***Ontology not first --- must stop in the face of mass death***

**Davidson ’89**(Arnold I. coeditor of Critical Inquiry, Assoc Prof of Philosophy, U of Chicago, Critical Inquiry, Winter . p.426)

I understand Levinas’ work to suggest another path to the recovery of the human, one that leads through or toward other human beings: “The dimension of the divine opens forth from the human face… Hence metaphysics is enacted where the social relation is enacted- in our relations with men… The Other is not the incarnation of God, but precisely by his face, in which he is disincarnate, is the manifestation of the height in which God is revealed. It is our relations with men… that give to theological concepts the sole signification they admit of.” Levinas places ethics before ontology by beginning with our experience of the human face: and, in a clear reference to Heidegger’s idolatry of the village life of peasants, he associated himself with Socrates, who preferred the city where he encountered men to the country with its trees. In his discussion of skepticism and the problem of others, Cavell also aligns himself with this path of thought, with the recovery of the finite human self through the acknowledgement of others: “As long as God exists, I am not alone. And couldn’t the other suffer the fate of God?… I wish to understand how the other now bears the weight of God, shows me that I am not alone in the universe. This requires understanding the philosophical problem of the other as the trace or scar of the departure of God [CR, p.470].” The suppression of the other, the human, in Heidegger’s thought accounts, I believe, for the absence, in his writing after the war, of the experience of horror. Horror is always directed toward the human; every object of horror bears the imprint of the human will. So Levinas can see in Heidegger’s silence about the gas chambers and death camps “a kind of consent to the horror.” And Cavell can characterize Nazis as “those who have lost the capacity for being horrified by what they do.” Where was Heidegger’s horror? How could he have failed to know what he had consented to? Hannah Arendt associates Heidegger with Paul Valery’s aphorism, “Les evenements ne sont que l’ecume des choses’ (‘Events are but the foam of things’).” I think one understands the source of her intuition. The mass extermination of human beings, however, does not produce foam, but dust and ashes; and it is here that questioning must stop.

***Prior focus on ontology causes paralysis and is de-historicizing***

**Kratochwil**, professor of international relations – European University Institute, **‘8**

(Friedrich, “The Puzzles of Politics,” pg. 200-213)

The lesson seems clear. Even at the danger of “fuzzy boundaries”, when we deal with “practice” ( just as with the “pragmatic turn”), we would be well advised to rely on the use of the term rather than on its reference (pointing to some property of the object under study), in order to draw the bounds of sense and understand the meaning of the concept. My argument for the fruitful character of a pragmatic approach in IR, therefore, does not depend on a comprehensive mapping of the varieties of research in this area, nor on an arbitrary appropriation or exegesis of any specific and self-absorbed theoretical orientation. For this reason, in what follows, I will not provide a rigidly specified definition, nor will I refer exclusively to some prepackaged theoretical approach. Instead, I will sketch out the reasons for which a prag- matic orientation in social analysis seems to hold particular promise. These reasons pertain both to the more general area of knowledge appropriate for praxis and to the more specific types of investigation in the field. The follow- ing ten points are – without a claim to completeness – intended to engender some critical reflection on both areas.

Firstly, a pragmatic approach does not begin with objects or “things” (ontology), or with reason and method (epistemology), but with “acting” (prattein), thereby preventing some false starts. Since, **as historical beings placed in a specific situations, we do not have the luxury of deferring decisions until we have found the “truth”, we have to act and must do so always under time pressures and in the face of incomplete information.** Pre- cisely because the social world is characterised by strategic interactions, what a situation “is”, is hardly ever clear ex ante, because it is being “produced” by the actors and their interactions, and the multiple possibilities are rife with incentives for (dis)information. This puts a premium on quick diagnostic and cognitive shortcuts informing actors about the relevant features of the situ- ation, and on leaving an alternative open (“plan B”) in case of unexpected difficulties. Instead of relying on certainty and universal validity gained through abstraction and controlled experiments, we know that completeness and attentiveness to detail, rather than to generality, matter. To that extent, likening practical choices to simple “discoveries” of an already independently existing “reality” which discloses itself to an “observer” – or relying on optimal strategies – is somewhat heroic.

These points have been made vividly by “realists” such as Clausewitz in his controversy with von Bülow, in which he criticised the latter’s obsession with a strategic “science” (Paret et al. 1986). While Clausewitz has become an icon for realists, only a few of them (usually dubbed “old” realists) have taken seriously his warnings against the misplaced belief in the reliability and use- fulness of a “scientific” study of strategy. Instead, most of them, especially “neorealists” of various stripes, have embraced the “theory”-building based on the epistemological project as the via regia to the creation of knowledge. A pragmatist orientation would most certainly not endorse such a position.

Secondly, since acting in the social world often involves acting “for” some- one, special responsibilities arise that aggravate both the incompleteness of knowledge as well as its generality problem. Since we owe special care to those entrusted to us, for example, as teachers, doctors or lawyers, we cannot just rely on what is generally true, but have to pay special attention to the particular case. Aside from avoiding the foreclosure of options, we cannot refuse to act on the basis of incomplete information or insufficient know- ledge, and the necessary diagnostic will involve typification and comparison, reasoning by analogy rather than generalization or deduction. Leaving out the particularities of a case, be it a legal or medical one, in a mistaken effort to become “scientific” would be a fatal flaw. Moreover, there still remains the crucial element of “timing” – of knowing when to act. Students of crises have always pointed out the importance of this factor but, in attempts at building a general “theory” of international politics analogously to the natural sci- ences, such elements are neglected on the basis of the “continuity of nature” and the “large number” assumptions. Besides, “timing” seems to be quite recalcitrant to analytical treatment.

**Other**

***Extinction comes before Being***

**Reilly 8**—26 year career in politics during which he founded the nation’s largest political consulting firm of its time. Reilly managed winning campaigns for a wide variety of high-profile candidates, including current Pelosi(Clint, “From Heidegger to the Environment: Californians Are in the World,” 19 August 2008, http://www.californiaprogressreport.com/2008/08/from\_heidegger.html,)

Even in today’s age of cutting-edge science and technology, it is important to remember that history can still be shaped by big ideas. In the 18th century, a philosophy of knowledge emboldened the Founding Fathers to build our democracy – a system of government based on the meritocracy of ideas, rights of the individual and a free press. Capitalism itself is rooted in an innate belief in the power of individual initiative rather than the supremacy of group action – which inspired Marxism and Communism. Philosophy can be mind numbingly boring. But it can help us more clearly see the path to a better world. The mid-20th century German philosopher Martin Heidegger had a favorite term, “Dasein,” which cannot be translated precisely into a single English word. The rough meaning is “being-in-the-world,” Heidegger’s description of human existence. Heidegger’s most important point was that it is impossible to separate a person from the earth. Without the “world,” a human being could not know, grow or even live. A person is like a tree planted in the earth; without the earth, the tree could not exist. But there is a second implication to Heidegger’s “being-in-the-world” bumper sticker. To be in the world is also to be “in common with other beings.” Whether we like it or not, we live in a natural state of dependence upon one another. Put another way, it is impossible to accurately define existence without affirming our dependence not only upon the earth, but also upon our fellow human beings. Was the German philosopher, who lived through World War II without standing up to Nazism’s atrocities, a closet environmentalist and a globalist before his time? Why is this somewhat obvious definition of human existence important to our world today? Many theories of human progress are rooted in a moral imperative. The Christian practice of charity is premised on the religious conviction that we are all God’s children and equal members of the human family. Therefore we are obligated to donate, assist and help others in need. Christians are also challenged to respect nature as God’s creation. This implies that charity and environmentalism are a sacrifice rather than a reflection of our collective self-interest. The truth is exactly the opposite. Protecting the earth and uniting the planet is the only logical political agenda of Dasein. In Jeffrey Sachs’ 2008 book “Common Wealth,” he argues that “the defining challenge of the 21st century will be to face the reality that humanity shares a common fate on a crowded planet.” Sachs, director of Columbia University’s Earth Institute, cites four imperatives for world leaders to address: 1) Pressure on the earth’s ecosystems will produce climate change and species extinction. 2) Population growth will tax the earth. 3) The unequal distribution of wealth across the world is untenable. 4) Failed institutions impair vital global cooperation and problem solving. Last week, Russia invaded Georgia, sparking fears of a reconstituted cold war. The assault belied the presumption that the world was moving beyond nationalism. Fundamental conflicts between Islamic and Western cultures still dominate global politics. Despite a growing consensus on the need for international efforts to curb emissions and develop clean energy, the earth still reels from pollution. Poverty and sickness in sub-Saharan Africa contradict the image of a world that has conquered disease and hunger. And thousands of nuclear bombs still have the unthinkable power to destroy the earth and the entire human race. Those who thought that war and hunger would be easily conquered by science are slowly realizing that our toughest challenges are ahead. Perhaps we need to be reminded of Heidegger’s truth: **No “world,” no “being,”** no “we,” no “I.”

***Can’t solve calc thought --- too entrenched***

**Riis 11**—Carlsberg Research Fellow and Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Science Studies at Roskilde University, Ph.D. from Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Søren, 8 February 2011, “Towards the origin of modern technology: reconfiguring Martin Heidegger’s thinking,”)

Moreover, Heidegger maintains: ‘‘Readiness-to-hand is the way in which entities as they are ‘in themselves’ are defined ontologico-categorially.’’47 According to Heidegger’s fundamental phenomenology, which he unfolds in detail in Being and Time and reaffirms a decisive part of in ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology,’’ nature is ‘‘primally’’ revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-;’’ that is to say, ‘‘nature’’ is a resource long before the actual rise of modern and ancient technology, namely **simultaneously with the very origin of human beings**. That something is primordially revealed in its ‘‘usability’’ and ‘‘serviceability-for-’’ does not imply that it is actually used or serves accordingly, but that it is revealed as standing ready to be utilized in the corresponding context. As such, it is revealed as ‘‘standing-reserve.’’ This, for example, also corresponds to the empirical fact that prehistoric humans settled close to woods and rivers. In these areas they always had stockpiles of timber, power for transportation, and easy access to drinking water. Based on ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and completed through references to Being and Time, we now have an interpretation of the origin of the essence of modern technology, which traces back the characteristic revealing of das Gestell to the beginning of humankind.48 This does not imply that prehistoric technology is identical with contemporary technology; rather the third genealogy of the rule of das Gestell suggests that when ‘‘we still more primally’’ try to consider the origin of the challenging revealing characterizing the rule of das Gestell, we in fact rediscover that it is **connected to being human**. The rule of das Gestell has challenged humans as long as they have existed. In this sense, humans first and foremost exist under the rule of das Gestell.49 This also entails a revision and precision of Heidegger’s renowned formula characterizing the world-connectedness of human existence: being-in-the-world. Based on the comparison of ‘‘The Question Concerning Technology’’ and Being and Time, human existence is better described as being-under-the-spell-of-das-Gestell.

***Abandoning management causes extinction***

**Soulé 95** – Natural Resources Professor, California (Michael and Gary Lease, Reinventing Nature?, p 159-60, AG)

The decision has already been made in most places. Some of the ecological myths discussed here contain, either explicitly or implicitly, the idea that nature is self-regulating and capable of caring for itself. This notion leads to the theory of management known as benign neglect—nature will do fine, thank you, if human beings just leave it alone. Indeed, a century ago, a hands-off policy was the best policy. Now it is not. Given nature's current fragmented and stressed condition, neglect will result in an accelerating spiral of deterioration. Once people create large gaps in forests, isolate and disturb habitats, pollute, overexploit, and introduce species from other continents, the viability of many ecosystems and native species is compromised, resiliency dissipates, and diversity can collapse. When artificial disturbance reaches a certain threshold, even small changes can produce large effects, and these will be compounded by climate change.' For example, a storm that would be considered normal and beneficial may, following widespread clearcutting, cause disastrous blow-downs, landslides, and erosion. If global warming occurs, tropical storms are predicted to have greater force than now. Homeostasis, balance, and Gaia are dangerous models when applied at the wrong spatial and temporal scales. Even fifty years ago, neglect might have been the best medicine, but that was a world with a lot more big, unhumanized, connected spaces, a world with one-third the number of people, and a world largely unaffected by chain saws, bulldozers, pesticides, and exotic, weedy species. The alternative to neglect is active caring—in today's parlance, an affirmative approach to wildlands: to maintain and restore them, to become stewards, accepting all the domineering baggage that word carries. Until humans are able to control their numbers and their technologies, **management is the only viable alternative** to massive attrition of living nature.

***Earth is so over-run with human control that relinquishing management now wouldn’t solve – it would be impossible for nature to take its course***

**Katz ’99** (Eric, Science, Technology, and Society Program, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Winter, Environmental Ethics, Vol 21, “A Pragmatic Reconsideration of Anthropocentrism,” jj)

What about the nonanthropocentric argument regarding beach replenishment? A nonanthropocentric argument, by definition, will not consider as primary the benefits that humans will obtain from a particular policy—so many of the reasons just listed cannot be considered. **From a perspective of nonanthropocentric ecological holism, we should let natural processes take their course for the good of the overall ecological community**. **If the beach erodes, the erosion is part of the normal natural dynamics of the shoreline ecosystem. Indeed, most of the sand is not lost to the system; it simply shifts its location**, for undeveloped and unprotected barrier islands have a tendency to move landward over the course of time. Sand moves from the ocean side of the island to the bay side. The movement and displacement of sand would result in the loss of houses, especially along the immediate ocean waterfront, but this loss would not be a negative impact for the natural ecosystem. In addition, letting the natural erosion process continue without interference might lead to the possible reemergence or resurgence of those species that have been harmed by human housing development along the shore—such as the piping plover and the least and roseate terns. Thus, **a nonanthropocentric perspective would lead to a policy in which the shoreline would continue to erode as sands naturally shift.** The beach would be “restored” in a sense to a more natural state. On first examination, thus, there is a clear pragmatic difference between anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism. One position favors a policy of beach replenishment and the other does not. However, **there is a major complication to this analysis** that I want to consider. **The idea that we can let nature take its course in this case is problematic.** On my view, **the beaches** of Fire Island **are now an artifactual system, considerably modified by human development**—particularly bulkheading and jetties. Except for the wilderness areas, almost the entire north side of Fire Island is bulkheaded, with docks and artificially dredged harbors and boat slips. Thus, **the natural movement of sand by water currents has been disrupted** for about a hundred years, and indeed part of the erosion problem is caused by the fact that the sand, when it migrates to the bay side of the island, has no place to land—the bulkheading acts like a seawall and prevents the accumulation of sand dropped by the smaller estuarine waves of the Great South Bay. Sand migrating over the island by wind, waves, and tidal surges is also prevented from a natural buildup by the humanmade physical structures and human activity. (One of the common early spring chores is to sweep the winter’s accumulation of sand off the main sidewalks. But the sand’s movement to the north is relentless—the sidewalks have to be swept weekly during the summer months.) **Given the current state of development on the island it would be impossible to let nature take its course**; the island no longer has a natural configuration. (Of course, there would be one radical way to solve this problem: the park service could condemn all the private homes on the island, destroy them, and rip out all human-made physical structures. The economic cost of this plan would be astronomical, both in outof- pocket expenses and in the lost revenue from tourism and real-estate taxes.) Thus, if the beach is an artifactual system, the question to be asked changes: What is the pragmatic difference between anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism regarding the policy of beach replenishment for a nonnatural artifactual beach system? **The anthropocentric argument appears essentially to be the same as before. We still want to promote human interests by saving and preserving the beach— only now we recognize that it is not a natural beach, but an artifactual one**. We are still going to preserve the island for human benefits and human interests. We still want to protect the private homes and provide a recreational beach. We can even argue that the artifactual beach system is necessary to protect the relatively undisturbed wilderness area that lies on the landward side of the dunes. The anthropocentric argument thus does not change. However, **the nonanthropocentric ecological holistic argument is now largely irrelevant, for we are only dealing with an artifactual system**, or at best a hybrid of natural and artifactual. **Such a system is essentially human-based, so that human interests and concerns dominate any evaluation**. I have previously analyzed the difference between artifacts and natural entities—and I will not repeat arguments I have made in some detail in other places.23 I have argued that it is the presence of human intentionality in a natural system that irrevocably modifies nature and establishes an artifactual system. The introduction of human purpose is the key to understanding the difference between artifactual and natural systems. The reason why we create artifacts, why we interfere in natural processes, is to further human goals and interests. We tend to evaluate the worth of our artifacts and human-made systems by their success in achieving our human-centered aims. Thus, we will value the Fire Island system to the extent that it meets our aims and goals. **We cannot return** Fire Island **to a “natural” state**. **Thus, we cannot use what is beneficial to the overall ecological community as the sole guide to environmental decision-making. We must consider the satisfaction of human interests in the evaluation of** environmental **policies** on Fire Island. As an artifactual system—or as a hybrid of the natural and the artifactual—Fire Island must be evaluated from a perspective that includes anthropocentrism. Thus, Fire Island will have to be managed— perhaps preserved in terms of long-range sustainability—so that it best achieves the human goals that have been incorporated into its development. In this case, pragmatism as a methodology—as a means of testing theoretical ideas for their “cash-value” in terms of practical consequences—teaches us that a **simplistic reliance on theoretical concepts such as anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism will fail to address adequately the complexities of the policy situation.** Pragmatism endorses a vision beyond the facile dualisms of nonanthropocentrism and anthropocentrism, natural and artifactual. Without resorting to the substantive content of pragmatism as a moral philosophy, **we can see the need for flexibility, compromise, and a pluralism of values in the analysis of concrete environmental policy decisions. When dealing with a hybrid system of humanity and nature, we need to use all of the relevant theoretical concepts, crossing and recrossing the boundaries that separate anthropocentrism and nonanthropocentrism**. Pragmatism cannot, in the end, tell us how to effect the compromise; it cannot tell us what specific policies we should adopt in all situations. **Pragmatism** simply **reminds us to be open to a wide range of possibly relevant and meaningful values in the formation and justification of policy.**

***Turn - Waiting for a new ontology is a strategy that dooms us to nuclear omnicide and makes all the aff and neg impacts inevitable.***

**Santoni ‘85** (Ronald E., Philosophy Professor @ Denison, Nuclear War, ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-7)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to omnicide. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often-stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we Simultaneously act to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about out disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be too permissive in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be an early accomplice to the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its annihilation. The Nuremburg tradition calls not only for a new way of thinking, a “new internationalism” in which we all become co-nurturers of the whole planet, but for resolute actions that will sever our complicity with nuclear criminality and the genocidal arms race, and work to achieve a future which we can no longer assume. We must not only “come face to face with the unthinkable in image and thought” (Fox) but must act now - with a “new consciousness” and conscience - to prevent the unthinkable, by cleansing the earth of nuclear weaponry. Only when that is achieved will ultimate violence be removed as the final arbiter of our planet’s fate.

# Round 4 – Neg V Mo State BR
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**T**

***A. Incentives are negotiated offers linked to a particular outcome – they are distinct from policies that motivate behavioral change***

**Grant, 02** - professor of political science at Duke University (Ruth, “THE ETHICS OF INCENTIVES: HISTORICAL ORIGINS AND CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDINGS,” Economics and Philosophy, 18 (2002) 111, proquest)

**We** are now in a position to **identify** **a core understanding** or a distinctive meaning of the concept **of incentives;** what we might call incentives `strictly speaking'. **Incentives are employed in a particular form of negotiation. An offer is made which is an extrinsic benefit** or a bonus, **neither the** natural or **automatic consequence of an action nor a deserved reward** or compensation. The offer is usually made in the context of an authority relationship - for example, adult/child, employer/employee, government/citizen or government/organization. **The offer is a discrete prompt expected to elicit a particular response**. Finally and most importantly, **the offer is intentionally designed to alter the status quo by motivating a person to choose differently than he or she would in its absence**. If the desired action would result naturally or automatically, no incentive would be necessary. **An incentive is the added element without which the desired action would not occur.** For this reason, it makes sense to speak of `institutional incentives' when referring to arrangements designed to encourage certain sorts of responses. `Perverse incentives' is also an expression that implies that incentives are meant to direct people's behavior in particular ways. Central to the core meaning of incentives is that they are an instrument of government in the most general sense. The emergence of the term historically within discourses of social control is illustrative of this point.

***B. Violation – Financial incentives include funding and loan guarantees; procurement is a non-financial incentive***

**Czinkota et al, 9** - Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books)

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. Fiscal incentives are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. **Financial incentives offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. Nonfinancial incentives include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements,** and investments in infrastructure facilities.

***C. This is a voting issue –***

***1. Limits – non financial incentives make the topic limitless crushing fairness***

***2. Negative ground – their interpretation means they don’t have to defend an increase in production --- nullifying core DA’s like oil prices and tradeoff***

### CP

#### The 50 states and all relevant territories should offer substantial competitive power purchase agreements for electricity from small modular nuclear reactors for domestic military installations in the United States.

#### States can assist DOD procurement in a laundry list of ways—DOD is interested in partnerships with all 50 states

Douglas 6 – Governor of Vermont (Jim and Earl Ray Tomblin, THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS RESOLUTION ON RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS <http://www.csg.org/policy/documents/DoDRenewableEnergyResolution.pdf>)

Opportunities for collaboration with DoD installations may exist for states seeking to

encourage renewable energy development. In its March 2006 Renewable Energy

Assessment Status Report Update to Congress, the DoD stated that it is interested in

facilitating renewable energy projects on its lands, where compatible with missions,

through lease arrangements and the use of alternative financing with private sector

partners. DoD installations typically are reliable and stable consumers of electricity as

well as dependable contributors to states’ economies. By coordinating renewable energy

portfolio development with the DoD as a major energy consumer, states could reap

economic benefits.

State governments can help encourage the development of renewable energy projects in

many ways: (1) through financial incentives such as grants, loans, rebates, industry

recruitment, bond programs, tax incentives and production incentives; (2) through

regulatory incentives such as public benefits funds, renewable portfolio standards, net

metering, extension analysis, generation disclosure, contractor licensing, equipment

certification, solar/wind access laws, construction and design standards, required utility

green power options and green power purchasing/aggregation policies. Because energy costs greatly impact the military as well as the citizens of each state, and

because many state and local economies depend on revenues directly and indirectly flowing from military facilities and personnel, encouraging renewable energy projects in

cooperation with DoD installations is in the best interests of the states and the nation.

Management Directives

ƒ Management Directive #1: Encourage governors, state legislatures, and the

Department of Defense to engage in discussions about how best to promote

renewable energy use and development in states and at Department of Defense

installations throughout the United States.

ƒ Management Directive #2: The Council of State Governments will send this

resolution to the governors and adjutant generals of all 50 states, the Secretary of

defense, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and each member of the U.S.

Congress.

### 1nc

#### Comprehensive immigration reform will pass now --- gun control and fiscal issues don’t crowd it out

Gonzalez & Nowicki 1-4 Daniel González and Dan Nowicki, The Republic | azcentral.com, ‘Cliff’ fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight, Jan 4, 2013, <http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130103immigration-reform-at-crossroads.html>, jj

Republican and Democratic members of Arizona’s congressional delegation who support immigration reform agree it faces an uphill battle. But they remain optimistic that Congress can come to a deal over immigration reform despite competition from the looming fight over spending cuts, gun control and any other issues that may emerge.

“I think we can walk and chew gum at the same time,” said Rep. Raúl Grijalva, D-Ariz.

Grijalva said immigration reform has been put off long enough.

“That’s what happened to immigration the last time. We kept putting it on the back burner because something else had come up,” he said. “Having learned that lesson, we on the Democratic side are very much committed not to allow this one to slide to the back burner.”

However, Rep. Ed Pastor, D-Ariz., warned that the coming “economic tsunami” could swamp efforts to enact immigration reform.

Pastor said upcoming battles in the next few months will be over the federal debt ceiling, spending cuts and the continuing resolution to keep the government funded. Partisan tensions already are high, and the continued bitter fighting over fiscal issues could bruise more feelings and egos on Capitol Hill, which would make bipartisan cooperation less likely on other big issues, he said.

“What we saw New Year’s Day ... is probably a mild storm compared to what is going to happen in Phase 2, Phase 3 and Phase 4,” Pastor said.

But he said the outlook in the House “looks better for immigration reform” than for gun control.

Sen. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., who took office Thursday, said he believes the bipartisan urgency to pass immigration reform that emerged after the election is still there.

“I think everyone recognizes that it has to be done this year,” said Flake, who is part of a bipartisan group of senators who have already started laying the groundwork for an immigration bill.

“You can’t wait on an issue like this until an election year, and it really has to be done, or started, in the first part of the year,” he said. “I do sense that on both sides of the aisle there is a willingness, for different reasons, to get it done and get it behind us.”

***Conflicting priorities means nuclear costs PC --- the debate is stalemated now***

**Bryce ‘10**

Robert Bryce, has been writing about energy for nearly two decades. His articles have appeared in dozens of publications ranging from The Atlantic Monthly to The Guardian, and The Nation to The American Conservative. He is the author of Pipe Dreams: Greed, Ego, and the Death of Enron, and Cronies: Oil, the Bushes, and the Rise of Texas, America’s Superstate. Bryce is a fellow at the Institute for Energy Research, as well as the managing editor of Energy Tribune and a contributing writer for The Texas Observer.

“Power Hungry: The Myths of "Green" Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future” pg 269-270, jj

The answers are here. **What’s lacking aren’t answers, but political will**. **That’s not to say the challenge of handling nuclear waste can be solved easily or cheaply.** **Coming up with a long-term solution will take** years of work, lots of money, and **sustained support from Congress**. And that’s the crux of the problem: **Nuclear power requires strong governmental involvement**. One analyst summed it up well when he told me, “**The Re publicans like nuclear, but they hate government. The Democrats like government but they hate nuclear power** **And those conflicting views have contributed to the stalemate on nuclear power development in the United States.**

**That stalemate is most obvious when it comes to dealing with nu clear waste**. In 2009, the Obama administration—bowing to pressure from Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, who hails from Nevada— decimated funding for the waste disposal site at Yucca Mountain. Ad ministration officials said they were abandoning the project and would begin looking for other waste sites.3 **Reids political power play has left the United States without a long-term program** or even the beginnings of one to deal with its spent nuclear fuel.4 **Reid’s NIMBY posturing may be handy politics** for Nevada, but it effectively renders moot a two- decade-old federal law that requires the federal government to take pos session of the high-level waste produced by the country’s nuclear power plants. It also means that the two decades and $13.5 billion of taxpayers’ money that has been spent researching and developing the site at Yucca Mountain (which is ready for use and only awaits licensing) has effec tively gone up in smoke— thereby adding just a bit more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere.5

#### Obama’s PC key to reform that includes a path to citizenship

St. Augustine 12/6/12 Perspective: Obama must push for immigration reform <http://staugustine.com/opinions/2012-12-05/perspective-obama-must-push-immigration-reform#.UNUW5uSx-So>, jj

Immigration reform is not easy because there are many in Congress who oppose amnesty for the estimated eleven million undocumented immigrants who live here. During the Bush administration he tried several times in 2007 to have a reform passed. Senators Edward Kennedy and John McCain prepared a good bill that was never passed, the resistance of many members of the Republican Party prevailed and nothing was done.

Everyone agrees that the issue of a comprehensive immigration reform can no longer be postponed. It is a question of beginning to work on it immediately, as soon as the next Congress is in session, perhaps building on prior efforts, to try to reach a solution that is satisfactory to all. The legal status of eleven million individuals has to be defined in some way. A considerable number of them are decent persons useful to society. Borders must be secured to prevent illegal entry, temporary visas could be issued for agricultural workers, employers should be compelled to use a system — already in place — to verify the status of job applicants, etc., etc.

The problem is difficult, but not impossible to solve if the legislators negotiate in good faith. It could even be said that this is a humanitarian issue. We are where we are now because nothing was done many years ago. The president must take the initiative in this new effort, just as he has promised to do.

#### Key to Latin American relations

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation. The inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United States and nearly every other country in the Americas. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

#### Relations are key to solve a laundry list of existential threats---the brink is now

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties. Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a vital market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology for Latin America, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, Latin America’s rising economies will inevitably become more and more crucial to the United States’ economic future. The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such global matters as climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and democracy and human rights.With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

### 1nc

#### Next is the community relations disad

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

Parthemore and Rogers, 10

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

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

#### Plan causes local community backlash - Even aff advocates admit the link is true and highly likely

Andres and Breetz 11

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

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

#### Impact --- Military community relations key to prevent base closures and ensure readiness

\*\*\*only read purple if there is econ adv in 1ac

OPR 09 (Governor’s Office of Planning & Research – State of California, December, Community and Military Compatibility Planning, <http://opr.ca.gov/docs/Military_GPG_Supplement.pdf>, jj)

The Department of Defense (DoD) has a significant presence in the State of California. The military has made many economic and technological investments including large investments in land and military installations. The State has a strategic location, unique landscape and valuable resources that help further military readiness for actions around the globe. The state’s unique resources and the military’s investments have fostered a strong partnership between the two parties. This partnership and collaboration is vital for economic, resource management, and military readiness reasons. The economies of local communities, as well as the state, are impacted by the militaries presence and California plays an integral role in national security. The burden of maintaining this partnership often falls on the shoulders of cities and counties. In addition to juggling the competing demands of expanding development, promoting economic development and upholding environmental quality standards, local governments must also consider the needs of local military installations in their land use planning. Traditionally military installations were strategically located in underdeveloped areas so as to avoid land use conflicts. As the population of the state continues to grow and the land use needs of communities continue to expand outward, the need for stronger relationships and communication between local governments and the military is needed. Without adequate communication and coordinated land-use efforts, military missions, quality of life and public safety are increasingly jeopardized.

III. Base Closure and Realignment

Growth encroaching a military installation so as to hinder its mission can contribute to the installation’s closure. Under the Defense Base Closure and Alignment Act of 1990 (PL 101-510), as amended through FY 2005 Authorization Act, the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission authorized base closures throughout the country between the years of 1988-2005. Some locations that were identified for closure had been significantly impacted by surrounding development, and as a result, the military mission could no longer be carried out in full. Base closures can bring severe economic impacts, through direct and indirect job loss. The DoD offers financial and technical assistance for reuse planning efforts, but recovery from the economic loss can be slow and have long lasting effects. These effects are not exclusively economic. Local installations often act as community centers and social hubs, the loss owhich can also bring negative effects. Preventing base closure is possible if both the community and the installation work together.

**Solvency**

***DoD SMRs not viable till 2020 at the earliest --- too many hurdles***

**King 11** (Marcus King, Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team at Center for Naval Analyses, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>)

**Finding specific sites for nuclear power plants on or near military installations will be challenging.** **There are many considerations that affect whether a site is appropriate. Some of the considerations relate to safety and others to limiting risks of attack or sabotage, and still others to public opinion**. **Being located on a military installation** provides some advantages, but it also **imposes some constraints on how portions of the installation near the nuclear power plant can be used. Trade-offs will be required.**

**Designs for small reactors are at various levels of technological readiness and some are about to begin the NRC licensing process, but none have been licensed or constructed yet.** Consequently, **there are a number of unresolved certification, licensing, and regulatory issues**. **The size of the emergency planning zone that should surround the reactor is an example of such an issue. Resolving these issues will take time and resources**. NRC representatives have indicated that **they expect these issues could be resolved by the middle of the decade and that a plant could be built and operating by about 2020.**

**Afghanistan**

***( ) SMRs hurt readiness --- putting a nuclear power plant on a military installation hampers land and airspace use nearby***

**King 11** (Marcus King, Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team at Center for Naval Analyses, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>)

**There are liabilities to having a nuclear power plant located on a military installation**. First, **the military installation must find and give up all other use of a small area where the site is to be built.** **The site would need to be “not too near” to certain types of facilities. For example, not too near a hospital and not too near a facility that stores and handles explosives. Finding a specific site on an installation that is appropriate and suitable may be difficult**. In addition, **having a nuclear power plant on a military installation would almost certainly impose some restrictions on how land and airspace in the immediate vicinity of the nuclear plant could be used thereafter.**

**A small nuclear plant providing power to a DoD installation could be located on non-military government controlled land or on private land near the military installation. This may make site security more complicated and would probably make the approval process more challenging**. This doesn't mean that siting on non-military government controlled land or private land shouldn't be considered; it means that such siting would need to be supported by clear and persuasive reasons.

***( ) DOD SMR procurement sends a global signal of impending U.S. military aggression—causes resentment against U.S. unilateralism***

Terrence P. **Smith 11**, program coordinator and research assistant with the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy at the CSIS, February 16, 2011, "An Idea I Can Do Without: "Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations,"" <http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations>

**The report repeatedly emphasizes the point that “DOD’s “’first mover’ pursuit of small reactors could have a profound influence on the development of the industry**,” **and cautions that “if DOD does not support the U.S. small reactor industry, the industry could be dominated by foreign companies.” The U.S. nonproliferation agenda, if there is one, stands in opposition to this line of thinking**. **Pursuing a nuclear technology out of the fear that others will get it (or have it), is what fueled the Cold War and much of the proliferation we have seen and are seeing today. It is a mentality I think we should avoid.** I do not mean to say this report ignores the risks. In fact they explicitly say, “We acknowledge that there are many uncertainties and risks associated with these reactors.” For example it says, **Some key issues that require consideration include securing sealed modules, determining how terrorists might use captured nuclear materials, carefully considering the social and environmental consequences of dispersing reactors.** The report also points out that “from a financial perspective, small reactors represent substantial losses in economies of scale.” These issues, which were briefly mentioned, hardly seem like small potatoes. The reports answer to the issues raised: “making reliable projections about these reactors’ economic and technical performance while they are still on paper is a significant challenge,” and “Nevertheless, no issue involving nuclear energy is simple.” On the other hand, the report argues, “failing to pursue these technologies raises its own set of risks for DOD.” “First, small reactors may fail to be commercialized in the United States; second, the designs that get locked in by the private market may not be optimal for DOD’s needs; and third, expertise on small reactors may become concentrated in foreign countries.” Yes these are important issue for a business stand, but I don’t find them to be the primary concern. **The reactors are purely for energy purposes, but in a world that seems to be growing tired of U.S. military intervention, the idea of ensuring our ability to do so through the proliferation of mobile nuclear reactors will hardly quell any hostile sentiment**. In addition, **it can only add fire to the “nuclear = good” flame**. **So, while even under best case scenario, the reactors are completely proliferation proof and pose no direct threat to the nonproliferation cause (ignoring the spreading of nuclear tech and knowledge in general), I have a tough time seeing how it helps.** The report concludes that the DoD “should seriously consider taking a leadership role on small reactors.” Since the 1970s, the report says, “in the United States, only the military has overcome the considerable barriers to building nuclear reactors. This will probably be the case with small reactors as well.” For now, the plans for small nuclear reactors are “unfortunately,” for the most part, “caught between the drawing board and production.” **My point is, maybe that is where they should stay.**

***( ) Forward deployed SMRs invite attacks and theft --- turns case***

**Andres and Breetz 11**

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

**Using the emerging technology at expeditionary locations carries far greater risks**. Besides the concerns outlined above, **forward located reactors could be subject to attack**. **Today, forward operating bases in Iraq and Afghanistan are regularly subjected to mortar attacks**, suggesting that **reactors at such locations could make these bases *prime targets* for attack. Since** **forward bases are** also **subject to capture, any design proposal that envisions deployment at forward operating bases must incorporate contingency plans in the event that reactors fall into enemy hands.**

***( ) Grid is resilient and sustainable***

**Clark 12**, MA candidate – Intelligence Studies @ American Military University, senior analyst – Chenega Federal Systems, 4/28/’12

(Paul, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University)

**In 2003, a simple physical breakdown occurred** – trees shorted a power line and caused a

fault – **that had a cascading effect** and caused a power blackout across the Northeast (Lewis

2010). **This** singular occurrence **has been used as evidence that the electrical grid is fragile and**

**subject to severe disruption** through cyber-attack, a disruption that could cost billions of dollars,

brings business to a halt, and could even endanger lives – if compounded by other catastrophic

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

***( ) Their ev is terrible --- no reason Russia or China would go nuts and nuke us if our grid went out. They’re not irrational.***

***( ) Squo solves—all bases have backups***

**Kwartin et. al 12** (Vice president of ICF International, consulting firm that partners with government and commercial clients to deliver professional services and technology solutions in the energy, environment, and infrastructure; health, social programs, and consumer/financial; and public safety and defense markets, Robert Kwartin, Sarah Alexander, Martin Anderson, Donald Clark, John Collins, Chris Lamson, Garrett Martin, Ryan Mayfield, Lindsay McAlpine, Daniel Moreno, Jeffrey Patterson, Craig Schultz, and Emily Stiever, "Solar Energy Development on Department of Defense Installations in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts", January, Pdf)

**The potential sources of on-site power generation are: 1) diesel generators tied to the existing microgrid** in the cantonment area, **2) remote third party owned solar not tied to microgrid, and 3) cantonment third party solar that is tied to the existing microgrid**. ***Most DoD facilities already have some level of emergency backup power that is supplied by diesel generators***. **Many of the installations also currently host third-party owned solar projects, either adjacent to the cantonment or in other areas, or have the technical and economic capability to do so**, as discussed in the Solar Potential Assessment chapter.

***( ) No fuel convoys internal link***

**Hargreaves 11** (Steve, CNN Money, "For the military clean energy saves lives", 8/17, <http://money.cnn.com/2011/08/17/technology/military_energy/index.htm>)

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- **One out of eight U.S. Army casualties in Iraq was the result of protecting fuel convoys**. **This statistic**, derived from an Army study looking at fuel convoys in Iraq from 2003 to 2007, **is a powerful incentive for the military to move away from oil and toward renewable energy, and *that's exactly what it's doing***. **From experimental solar-powered desert bases for the Marines to Navy robots that run on wave energy, the military is quickly becoming a leading buyer of cutting-edge renewable energy technology**. For the armed services, the benefits extend beyond reducing fuel convoy casualties. A fighting force that isn't restricted by the reach of a tanker truck or weighted down by heavy batteries is more nimble and, as a result, more lethal. **For renewable energy companies, the military is proving to be a vital customer, buying the latest in clean energy gadgets and encouraging private investment**. **The hope is the armed services can shepherd this technology to the point where it becomes commercially viable, much like it did a generation ago for GPS systems or the Internet.**

***( ) No cyberterror***

**Knake ’10** (Robert K, international affairs fellow in residence at the Council on Foreign Relations studying cyber war, 2-16, CFR, “Cyberterrorism Hype v. Fact” <http://www.cfr.org/terrorism-and-technology/cyberterrorism-hype-v-fact/p21434>, jj)

While the United States' critical infrastructure, from the electric grid to the financial sector, is vulnerable to attack through cyberspace, **al-Qaeda lacks the capability and motivation to exploit these vulnerabilities**. **To penetrate, map, and damage the networks that control the industrial base requires a large team of experienced hackers, a lot of time, and advanced infrastructure. Only a handful of groups, mostly nation state actors, possess this level of capability, and al-Qaeda is not one of them**. **In the last ten years**, according to the National Counterterrorism Center's Worldwide Incidents Tracking Database, **there have been 63,192 incidents of terrorism. Not one was an incident of cyberterrorism.** As [Irving Lachow](http://www.ndu.edu/IRMC/ia/lachow.html) at NDU has pointed out, **the jihadist community heavily relied on one London-based hacker known by the moniker Irhabi 007, who at best had moderate ability. Since his arrest in 2005, indications are that al-Qaeda's cybercapabilities have only eroded**. While continuing to rely on petty crime to fund many plots, **al-Qaeda has been unable to capitalize on the explosion of cybercrime, lacking the technical capability to do so.** **For al-Qaeda to do any real damage with cyberattacks, it would need to make a multi-year investment in developing offensive cybercapabilities and would need a secure facility and advance test bed from which to do it. Understanding the control software for an electric grid is not a widely available skill. It is one thing to find a way to hack into a network and quite another to know what to do once you're inside.**

***( ) States won’t do it either***

**CSIS ’10** (Center for Strategic and International Studies ,“The Cyber War Has Not Begun,”March)

Weak attribution could allow an opponent to attack covertly, but this would require accepting the risk that the Americans would not eventually determine the source of the attack. **Uncertainty about how much the Americans know and how good they are at attribution makes attackers cautious. Fear of retaliation, including kinetic retaliation, for attacking the American homeland is a threshold that no nation has been willing to cross**. ***Call this deterrence if you like*. Even in a conflict –** with China over Taiwan or Russia over Georgia **– our opponents would be constrained in launching some kinds of cyber attack. Attacks on civilian targets in the continental United States could trigger a much stronger reaction than attacks on military targets and deployed forces**. Moving from deployed forces in theater to civilian targets in the homeland risks unmanageable escalation. **These risks and uncertainties create implicit thresholds in cyber conflict that nations have so far observed.** Just as with missiles and aircraft, our nation-state opponents have the ability to strike the United States using cyber attacks, but **they have chosen not to do so because of the risk of retaliation. While there are parallels to other weapons systems, cyber attack is unlikely to be decisive against a determined opponent**.

***Forward deployment not key to heg***

**Sapolsky et al. 09** (Harvey M. Sapolsky is a professor of public policy and organization at MIT. Benjamin H.

Friedman is a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute.

Eugene Gholz is an associate professor of public affairs at the University of Texas at

Austin. Daryl G. Press is an associate professor of government at Dartmouth College.

Restraining Order: For Strategic Modesty, WORLD AFF. J., Fall 2009, at 84, 89-90, online, jj)

**The United States would be better off pursuing a different grand strategy, one that would regain the advantages of our geography and accustom our friends once again to carrying the responsibility for their own security**. Though we are the globe’s strongest nation—with a very powerful military, the world’s largest economy, and an enticing culture—we have neither the need nor the resources to manage everyone else’s security. We can meet the challenges of globalization and terrorism without being the self-appointed and self-financed global police force.

**Restraint would offer the opportunity to reinvigorate the foundations of America’s strength**. Foreign distractions, among other causes, have led the United States to neglect its transportation infrastructure, its educational system, its finances, and its technology base. **If we were to restrain** the **global interventionism** that has become our second nature since the end of World War II, **we could ensure our safety while preserving our power to deal more precisely with threats that may materialize in an uncertain future.**

**The first virtue of a restraint strategy is that it husbands American power**. It acknowledges both **America’s great strengths**—a combination of human and physical resources unmatched in the world—and the limitations of our power, which **is easily dissipated in wasteful attempts to manage global security.**

**No nation or ideology now menaces American security in the same ways or to the same degree that the Soviet Union and Communism did during the Cold War.** **Instead, a variety of ethnic, religious, and nationalistic conflicts oceans away from us now obsess our policymakers, even though those conflicts have little to no prospect of spreading our way**. To be sure, **radical Islamists** have attacked Americans at home and abroad, and while these attackers should be hunted down, they **do not pose an existential threat**, only a difficult and distracting one. Killing or capturing the criminals who attack Americans makes sense; trying to fix the failed states they call home is hopeless and unnecessary. **The United States is safer than ever**. The challenge now is staying safe.

**The U.S. military is supposed to stand between America and hostile nations, but its forward deployment actually puts our forces between others and their own enemies**. **Alliances** once meant to hold a coalition together against a common foe **now protect foreign nations from adversaries that in most cases have no direct dispute with the United States**. **Although our allies are capable of fending for themselves, the fact that they can take shelter under an American umbrella allows them to defer taking responsibility for their own security**. **The United States should now use tough love to get our allies off our security dole. We need to do less so others will do more.**

Restraint should not be confused with pacifism. Calling for America to come home is different today than it was during the Cold War, when there was a world to lose. Today it is not a call for capitulation or disarmament, though it does provide an opportunity for force reductions. The restraint strategy requires a powerful, full-spectrum, and deployable military that invests heavily in technology and uses realistic training to improve capabilities and deter challenges. **Restraint demands a military with a global reach that is sparingly used.**

Similarly, **restraint is not isolationism**. Isolation avoids economic and diplomatic engagement and eschews potential profits from the global economy and the enrichment that sharing ideas and cultures can offer. The United States would be foolish to decline these opportunities. Restraint does not mean retreating from history, but merely ending U.S. efforts to try to manage it. **Restraint would rebalance global responsibilities among America and its allies, match our foreign objectives to our abilities, and put domestic needs first.**

A strategy of restraint would treat alliances as a means, not an end. Alliances are a way of sharing the price of working toward strategic goals. Three conditions should be met for the United States to enter—or retain—an alliance.

• Does the potential partner need American help? If it has not tried to manage a given situation with its own resources or regional partners, then the United States should demur.

• Secondly, is it in America’s immediate interest to help, or alternatively, does the partner especially deserve American help? The United States should continue to work closely with countries with whom it has a special relationship or to whom it owes a special debt, in addition to those countries with which the United States shares a pressing strategic dilemma or opportunity.

• Finally, can the United States constructively engage or intervene? U.S. assistance only makes sense when practical actions are likely to improve the situation. Because preserving alliances is not itself an important goal of the restraint strategy, no alliance should be permanent.

As global threats and opportunities evolve, American alliances should also evolve. More broadly, the United States should recognize a variety of positive relationships with other countries beyond the special category of ally. A policy of restraint means cooperating with other countries at a less intense level through ad hoc coalitions, friendly diplomatic engagement, trade agreements, cultural exchanges, and other means.

Policymakers should consider both the opportunities and the costs of alliances. Alliances are like off-balance-sheet liabilities whose risks only show up as costs on the rare occasions when the alliances get involved in high-profile crises and conflicts. Under the current dispensation, we often extend guarantees to our allies without considering the huge payouts.

Alliances are costly for another reason. **They cause us to spread our military assets around the world, giving potential enemies U.S. targets in their own backyards rather than forcing them to pay the price of attacking the United States by crossing the oceans that separate us from them.**

Moreover, policymakers generally ignore the investments alliances require in a larger U.S. force structure. In the past, politicians have often explained that America’s partners help pay the cost of basing the American military—a proposition that was always questionable but is certainly not true today as American forces shift to Eastern European, Middle Eastern, and Central Asian bases. American taxpayers often pay for basing rights rather than being paid for the military shield they provide our allies. (Even when Japan and Germany shared the burden of paying for Cold War bases, the United States paid full cost to train, equip, and develop the power-projection forces suited to America’s established, long-term alliance commitments.)

Under a strategy of restraint, the United States would stop giving away American support. During the Cold War, interventionists could credibly argue that the vulnerability of allies was a direct threat to the United States, so we could not, for instance, afford to gamble that West Germany would resist Soviet blandishments if America’s military shield was diminished or withdrawn altogether. Because everyone knew that we would ultimately come to the defense of a crucial ally, no matter how disloyal its diplomatic behavior or how small its defense investment, the United States was often hogtied in its alliances. **Today, our own security is not so inseparably linked to that of our allies; the threats they face are less severe than in the Cold War, and they can afford to defend themselves.**

***Data disproves hegemony impacts***

**Fettweis, 11**

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that **there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between** the relative level of **U.S. activism and international stability**. In fact, **the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true**. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially**. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990**.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, **if** the pacific **trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but** **a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence.**

The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: **The world grew more peaceful while the U**nited **S**tates **cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable U**nited **S**tates **military**, or at least **none took any action that would suggest** **such a belief**. **No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished**. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated.

Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered.

However, **even if it is true that either U.S. commitments** or relative spending **account for global** pacific **trends**, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that **there is in fact a level of engagement below which the U**nited **S**tates **cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined**. **Grand strategic decisions are never final**; continual **adjustments can** and must **be made** as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation.

It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled**. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should** at least **pose a problem**. As it stands, **the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending**. Evidently **the rest of the world can operate** quite **effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.**

#### Regional cooperation will prevent escalation

Innocent and Carpenter, 9- \*foreign policy analyst at Cato who focuses on Afghanistan and Pakistan AND \*\*vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at Cato (Malou and Ted, “Escaping the Graveyard of Empires: A Strategy to Exit Afghanistan,” http://www.cato.org/pubs/wtpapers/escaping-graveyard-empires-strategy-exit-afghanistan.pdf)

Additionally, **regional stakeholders, especially Russia and Iran, have an interest in a stable Afghanistan**. **Both countries possess the capacity to facilitate development in the country and may even be willing to assist Western forces**. In July, leaders in Moscow allowed the United States to use Russian airspace to transport troops and lethal military equipment into Afghanistan. **Yet another relevant regional player is the** **C**ollective **S**ecurity **T**reaty **O**rganization, made up of Russia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Armenia, and Belarus. At the moment, CSTO appears amenable to forging a security partnership with NATO. CSTO secretary general Nikolai Bordyuzha told journalists in March 2009 of his bloc’s intention to cooperate. “**The united position of the CSTO is that we should give every kind of aid to the anti-terror coalition operating in Afghanistan. . . . The interests of NATO and the CSTO countries regarding Afghanistan conform unequivocally**.”83 **Mutual interests between Western forces and Afghanistan’s surrounding neighbors can converge on issues of transnational terrorism, the Caspian and Central Asia region’s abundant energy resources, cross-border organized crime, and weapons smuggling**. Enhanced cooperation alone will not stabilize Afghanistan, but **engaging stakeholders may lead to tighter regional security**.

#### \*\*4. No risk of Afghanistan spillover

Silverman ‘9(Sturdy Dominos Jerry Mark Silverman has a PhD in international relations-government and, as a Ford Foundation Project Specialist was involuntarily transferred from Saigon to Bangkok just days before the arrival of North Vietnamese forces in April 1975. He is also author of the 1975 article "The Domino Theory: Alternatives to a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy" published that same year in Asian Survey. His most recent publication in TNI Online was "A False Awakening." [Jerry Mark Silverman](http://nationalinterest.org/profile/jerry-mark-silverman) | November 19, 2009

**With the benefit of hindsight, we know that the earlier domino theory falsely represented interstate and domestic political realities throughout most of Southeast Asia** in 1975. Although it is true that American influence throughout much of Southeast Asia suffered for a few years following Communist victories in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam, we now know that while we viewed the Vietnam War as part of a larger conflict, our opponent’s focus was limited to the unification of their own country. Although border disputes erupted between Vietnam and Cambodia, China and the Philippines, actual military conflicts occurred only between the supposedly fraternal Communist governments of Vietnam, China and Cambodia. Neither of the two competing Communist regimes in Cambodia survived. Further, no serious threats to install Communist regimes were initiated outside of Indochina, and, most importantly, the current political situation in Southeast Asia now conforms closely to what Washington had hoped to achieve in the first place. It is, of course, unfortunate that the transition from military conflict in Vietnam to the welcome situation in Southeast Asia today was initially violent, messy, bloody, and fraught with revenge and violations of human rights. But as the perpetrators, magnitude, and victims of violence changed, the level of violence eventually declined. **This time around, there are at least two questionable assumptions underlying the resurrection of the domino theory. First, the Taliban is no longer the unified group that emerged during 1994.** Instead, **the term “Taliban” is applied to several groups engaged in the current insurgency** against the Karzai government and NATO forces. Those groups collaborate through a complex set of shifting alliances that extend across the disputed Afghanistan/Pakistan border. **Second**, given that local Taliban have demonstrated their capacity to effectively engage NATO forces without the equivalent of NATO military and civilian trainers or logistical support, other **indigenous groups opposed to the Taliban and/or al-Qaeda are also likely to be stronger than domino theorists assume and are likely to proactively defend themselves against radical Islamists** once we are no longer there to do it for them. A retrospective view of America’s involvement in Vietnam and its ultimate consequences for U.S. interests reinforces the aphorism that all politics are local. That truism seems lost on American foreign-policy decision makers who tend to see international threats in global rather than local terms. Further, the danger remains that the metaphor of falling dominos might resonate with governments in the region that face their own increasingly radical domestic opposition. Our fears of regional collapse might also speak to Russian and Chinese policy makers fearful of potentially greater instability along their borders. But such regional threats, even if they do arise, do not threaten the core national interests of the United States—the substantially exaggerated fears of terrorist “safe-havens” notwithstanding. Those worries simply do not justify the overwhelmingly disproportionate and financially ruinous military response that has characterized our involvement there.  **The “fall of dominos” is no more inevitable in South and central Asia now than it was in Southeast Asia more than a half century ago.** True, the earlier circumstances in Vietnam and Southeast Asia are not, in most respects, similar to the current situation in Afghanistan, Pakistan, or the remainder of South and central Asia. Nonetheless, **the emphasis in both cases on external interstate threats—rather than on autonomous non-state actors—has been a mistake because it does not reflect the actual source of most violent conflicts since the 1960s. In an exponentially complex world characterized by multiple actors, the domino theory does not help predict the future course of political relations in the region—**nor would any other simplistic metaphor. Despite the view that the alliance between various Taliban and al-Qaeda factions is both strategic and long-term, a consensus is forming that most Taliban groups are either nationalists who want to seize formal authority within recognized sovereign-states, or more localized groups that merely want to be left alone by any pretenders to centralized state-authority. Perversely, **the desire of nationalist Taliban to seize sovereign-state power represents an acceptance of a largely secular European system of interstate relations. In that conversion will likely be found the seeds of their eventual undoing—as local community-based groups continue to oppose any attempts, whether sponsored by Americans or Islamic radicals, to establish centralized state authority there.**

#### 1. No Pakistan collapse

AP ‘10 (Pakistan's stability, leadership under spotlight after floods and double dealing accusations, 6 August 2010, http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/08/06/pakistans-stability-leadership-spotlight-floods-double-dealing-accusations)

Not for the first time, Pakistan appears to be teetering on the edge with a government unable to cope. Floods are ravaging a country at war with al-Qaida and the Taliban. Riots, slayings and arson are gripping the largest city. Suggestions are flying that the intelligence agency is aiding Afghan insurgents. The crises raise questions about a nation crucial to U.S. hopes of success in Afghanistan and to the global campaign against Islamist militancy. Despite the recent headlines, few here see Pakistan in danger of collapse or being overrun by militants — a fear that had been expressed before the army fought back against insurgents advancing from their base in the Swat Valley early last year. From its birth in 1947, Pakistan has been dogged by military coups, corrupt and inefficient leaders, natural disasters, assassinations and civil unrest. Through it all, Pakistan has not prospered — but it survives. “There is plenty to be worried about, but also indications that when push comes to shove the state is able to respond," said Mosharraf Zaidi, an analyst and writer who has advised foreign governments on aid missions to Pakistan. "The military has many weaknesses, but it has done a reasonable job in relief efforts. There have been gaps in the response. But this is a developing a country, right?" The recent flooding came at a sensitive time for Pakistan, with Western doubts over its loyalty heightened by the leaking of U.S. military documents that strengthened suspicions the security establishment was supporting Afghan insurgents while receiving billions in Western aid. With few easy choices, the United States has made it clear it intends to stick with Pakistan. Indeed, it has used the floods to demonstrate its commitment to the country, rushing emergency assistance and dispatching helicopters to ferry the goods. The Pakistani government's response to the floods has been sharply criticized at home, especially since President Asif Ali Zardari departed for a European tour. With so many Pakistanis suffering, the trip has left the already weak and unpopular leader even more vulnerable politically. The flooding was triggered by what meteorologists said were "once-in-a-century" rains. The worst affected area is the northwest, a stronghold for Islamist militants. Parts of the northwest have seen army offensives over the last two years. Unless the people are helped quickly and the region is rebuilt, anger at the government could translate into support for the militants. At least one charity with suspected links to a militant outfit has established relief camps there. The extremism threat was highlighted by a suicide bombing in the main northwestern town of Peshawar on Wednesday. The bomber killed the head of the Frontier Constabulary, a paramilitary force in the northwest at the forefront of the terror fight. With authorities concentrating on flood relief, some officials have expressed concern that militants could regroup. The city of Karachi has seen militant violence and is rumored to be a hiding place for top Taliban and al-Qaida fighters. It has also been plagued by regular bouts of political and ethnic bloodletting since the 1980s, though it has been calmer in recent years. The latest violence erupted after the assassination of a leading member of the city's ruling party. More than 70 people have been killed in revenge attacks since then, paralyzing parts of the city of 16 million people. While serious, the unrest does not yet pose an immediate threat to the stability of the country. Although the U.S. is unpopular, there is little public support for the hardline Islamist rule espoused by the Taliban and their allies. Their small movement has been unable to control any Pakistani territory beyond the northwest, home to only about 20 million of the country's 175 million people.

### Russia

***No SMRs being built internationally now***

**Biello 10** (David Biello | March 5, 2010, Scientific American, A need for new nukes? “Modular reactors” for energy attract interest <http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/2010/03/05/a-need-for-new-nukes-modular-reactors-for-energy-attract-interest/>, jj)

Regardless, **of the 52 nuclear reactors being built or planned around the world, exactly none employ these alternative designs**. In fact, **the only thing small about nuclear may be the amount of energy it ultimately contributes to the world at present rates of construction**. "**Nuclear will still be a small portion based on what’s seen today,**" said General Electric CEO Jeff Immelt at the ARPA-E summit, one of the would-be manufacturers of new nuclear power plants who notes that either new nuclear, coal with carbon capture and storage or both will be absolutely necessary going forward for reliable electricity with low greenhouse gas emissions. "Someday there’s going to be some CEO of GE that makes money on nuclear. I can tell you honestly the last two have not."

***Countries seeking nuclear only want big reactors***

**O’Connor 11** Dan O’Connor is a Policy Fellow in AEL’s New Energy Leaders Project, 1-4-2011 <http://leadenergy.org/2011/01/small-modular-reactors-miracle-mirage-or-medium/>

From an international leadership perspective, the SMR may be one of the few remaining technologies which **the US stands to commercialize more successfully and rapidly than its competitors.** **Interest among nations like China and India in SMR technology development is weaker than in the US, principally because their** rapidly growing energy demand and **comparably quick nuclear implementation policies are conducive to constructing large reactors.**

#### Fukushima weakens Russian nuclear expansion

**Brooke ‘11**

James Brooke, 3-23-11, Voice of America, Russian Support for Nuclear Power Weakens as Chernobyl Anniversary Nears <http://www.voanews.com/content/russian-support-for-nuclear-power-weakens-as-chernobyl-anniversary-nears-118605639/137018.html>, jj

**Japan’s nuclear accident comes as Russia prepares for the 25th anniversary of** the **Chernobyl** nuclear explosion. **This combination may weaken support for nuclear energy in Russia, long a major nuclear advocate. A Soviet official hysterically bellowing that there is no accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant is not the face the Russia nuclear power industry would like to project to the world at this time of Japan’s nuclear leak in Fukushima.** But the scene is featured in Innocent Saturday, a docudrama about the Chernobyl nuclear disaster that opened in movie theaters across Russia one month before the 25th anniversary of the explosion and fire at the Soviet power plant. The movie is banned in Belarus, the country that most suffered from the Chernobyl disaster. Last week, Belarus authorities signed a $9.4 billion deal with neighboring Russia to build two nuclear reactors. The export deal is part of a drive to make Rosatom, Russia’s state-owned nuclear-power company, the leading builder of nuclear reactors around the world. Building plants in Turkey, Bulgaria, India, China and Iran, Rosatom says it is building one quarter of the 60 nuclear power plants under construction worldwide. To help this sales effort, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev posted an eight-minute video on his website saying Russian designs offered "maximum safety barriers." He called for restrictions on construction of power plants in earthquake zones. But Russian environmentalists say that nuclear reactors are already in use in earthquake prone areas of the former Soviet Union, in Armenia, and in Rostov in Southern Russia. Domestically, Russia plans to build another 11 reactors during the next decade, raising the nuclear portion of the nation’s electricity from 16 to 25 percent. Overseas, Rosatom wants triple sales, to $50 billion by 2030. The head of Russian environmental group Eco-Defense, Vladimir Slivyak, led an anti-nuclear protest Wednesday outside the headquarters of Rosatom in central Moscow. He says of the company’s sales forecasts: "That is government propaganda. I do not believe they are able to sell that amount of reactors per year or even per decade," he said. "The Russian government now needs to spread as much propaganda as possible to make Russian people believe that Russian nuclear industry is great, and much better than Western nuclear industry." Slivyak says that 11 of the 32 nuclear reactors working in Russia are of the Chernobyl era, built with designs from the 1970s. One outside St. Petersburg, just had its working life extended for 15 years. Last week, in light of the nuclear accident in Japan, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin ordered an across the board review of nuclear safety in Russia. But with electricity prices slated to rise by 15 percent this year, an election year, the government does not want to retire old reactors. Aging reactors are part of a wider problem. Modern day Russia is coasting on infrastructure investments made during the final decades of the Soviet Union. A wakeup call came two summer ago, when turbine bolts broke at Sayano Shushenskaya Dam, the largest hydroelectric plant in Russia. The ensuing water hammer pushed a 1,000-ton turbine into the air like a toy. The accident took 75 lives and caused damage that will take four years to repair. The accident was blamed on sloppy maintenance and metal fatigue in a plant installed 40 years ago. In Germany, Chancellor Merkel is suspending operation of seven aging nuclear plants pending the outcome of "stress tests." The German leader made the move to head off a brewing anti-nuclear campaign. But Germany is far more densely populated in Russia. Here, in the world’s largest nation, the attitude toward nuclear power is often: out of sight, out of mind. Greenpeace Russia Campaign Director Ivan Blokov says local opposition is often strong. "Something like 75 percent to 92 percent of the population is totally against. But when people do not see a nuclear power station in their backyard, they simply do not care," he said. But **with the Chernobyl anniversary coinciding with balmy spring weather, bigger anti-nuclear protests may be in store for Russia.** "On April 26th, when the 25th anniversary of Chernobyl will happen, we are planning to organize bigger protests and probably more radical," says Vladimir Slivyak of Eco-Defense. **The mix of radiation leaking from Japan’s damaged reactor compounded by the Chernobyl anniversary may shift public attitudes in Russia, currently one of the world’s strongest advocates of nuclear power.**

***Nuclear energy low globally***

**Tickell ‘12**

Oliver Tickell [of Tickell ’08 warming impact fame] for Resurgence & the Ecologist, part of the Guardian Environment Network, 8-20-12, the Guardian, Does the world need nuclear power to solve the climate crisis? <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/20/world-need-nuclear-power-climate-crisis?newsfeed=true>, jj

**Given that nuclear power generation has flatlined over the last decade, and has sharply declined in the last few years, that looks like a tall order**. **There are currently plans for about 200 new nuclear reactors around the world, mainly in China, the Middle East and the USA. But few observers expect** all of **these to be built, since the economics of nuclear power are unattractive to private investors, owing to high construction cost, long lead time, electricity price uncertainty, political hazard and long-term liabilities**. **Realistically the world might build 100 or so new reactors over the coming decade** or so – perhaps one every 35–50 days. **Over this same period a similar number of existing reactors will reach the end of their lives and close, leading to a net growth rate *close to zero*.** That does not mean it's impossible to build 11,000 reactors in 35 years if the world dedicates sufficient resources to the task. **At a construction cost of about US$10 billion per reactor, we would need to dedicate US$110 trillion, or about two years' gross world product, while also providing for long-term liabilities**. But before we seriously consider doing so, we should ask what an 11,000-reactor world would be like.

***Korea is the SMR leader now --- plan trades off and destroys their economy***

Christofer M. **Mowry**, President, Babcock & Wilcox Nuclear Energy, Inc., July 14, 20**11** Testimony Before the Energy & Water Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee United States Senate July 14, 2011, KEL

**Failing to move forward** with this program **will not stall the deployment of SMRs in the United States or world-wide, but will simply stymie the U.S. industry’s current early mover advantage in SMR technology and manufacturing leadership.** **Failure to fund an SMR cost-share program will ensure that foreign SMRs (like the South Korean SMART reactor) receive the manufacturing jobs and exporting benefits by selling to U.S. utility customers**. **At a time when we need to ensure** that public **policy promotes U.S. competitiveness in technology innovation and leadership**, **the SMR cost-share program is the conduit to maintain U.S. leadership and create the manufacturing base here instead of overseas**. Conversely, the sharing of risks and costs through public-private partnership will ultimately result in a return on investment to government by supporting nuclear technology which can compete in the market without government support or subsidy, while creating U.S. design, supply chain, construction, and operations jobs.

***Korean economic collapse ensures nuclear war***

**Green & Schrage 09** (Michael J. Green is senior advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and associate professor at Georgetown University. Steven P. Schrage is the CSIS Scholl Chair in International Business and a former senior official with the U.S. Trade Representative's Office, State Department and Ways & Means Committee. THE KOREA HERALD, March 27, 2009, Asia's strategic dangers from financial crisis, Lexis, jj)

Dangerous states: It is noteworthy that **North Korea**, Burma, and Iran **have** all **intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis**, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority, and sown potential discord. **With** Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and **leaders in** Japan and **South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, Pyongyang has grown increasingly boisterous about its claims to great power status as a** nuclear weapons **state**. The junta in Burma has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of ASEAN. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the P-3 (the United States, United Kingdom and France) and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a policy tool. It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Burma), but that may depend on how much authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people and face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either. A lot of evidence suggests these **dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their** asymmetrical advantages over the international system.

#### All terrorists are weaker than ever --- no risk of attack

John Mueller and Mark G. Stewart 12, Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute AND Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle, "The Terrorism Delusion," Summer, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1, politicalscience.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller//absisfin.pdf, jj

In fact, it is unclear whether al-Qaida central, now holed up in Pakistan and under sustained attack, has done much of anything since September 11 except issue videos filled with empty, self-infatuated, and essentially delusional threats. For example, it was in October 2002 that Osama bin Laden proclaimed,

“Understand the lesson of New York and Washington raids, which came in response to some of your previous crimes. . . . God is my witness, the youth of Islam are preparing things that will fill your hearts with fear. They will target key sectors of your economy until you stop your injustice and aggression or until the more short-lived of us die.” And in January 2006, he insisted that the “delay” in carrying out operations in the United States “was not due to failure to breach your security measures,” and that “operations are under preparation, and you will see them on your own ground once they are finished, God willing.” 18

Bin Laden’s tiny group of 100 or so followers does appear to have served as something of an inspiration to some Muslim extremists, may have done some training, has contributed a bit to the Taliban’s far larger insurgency in Afghanistan, and may have participated in a few terrorist acts in Pakistan. 19

In his examination of the major terrorist plots against the West since September 11, Mitchell Silber finds only two (cases 1 and 20) that could be said to be under the “command and control” of al-Qaida central (as opposed to ones suggested, endorsed, or inspired by the organization), and there are questions about how full its control was even in these two instances. 20

This highly limited record suggests that Carle was right in 2008 when he warned, “We must not take fright at the specter our leaders have exaggerated. In fact, we must see jihadists for the small, lethal, disjointed and miserable opponents that they are.” Al-Qaida “has only a handful of individuals capable of planning, organizing and leading a terrorist organization,” and although it has threatened attacks, “its capabilities are far inferior to its desires.” 21

Impressively, bin Laden appears to have remained in a state of self-delusion even to his brutal and abrupt end. He continued to cling to the belief that another attack such as September 11 might force the United States out of the Middle East, and he was unfazed that the first such effort had proven to be spectacularly counterproductive in this respect by triggering a deadly invasion of his base in Afghanistan and an equally deadly pursuit of his operatives.22

Other terrorist groups around the world affiliated or aligned or otherwise connected to al-Qaida may be able to do intermittent damage to people and infrastructure, but nothing that is very sustained or focused. In all, extremist Islamist terrorism—whether associated with al-Qaida or not—has claimed 200 to 400 lives yearly worldwide outside war zones. That is 200 to 400 too many, of course, but it is about the same number as bathtub drownings every year in the United States. 23

In addition to its delusional tendencies, al-Qaida has, as Patrick Porter notes, a “talent at self-destruction.”24

With the September 11 attacks and subsequent activity, bin Laden and his followers mainly succeeded in uniting the world, including its huge Muslim population, against their violent global jihad. 25These activities also turned many radical Islamists against them, including some of the most prominent and respected.26

#### Their trade argument is beyond dumb --- a terrorist attack might temporarily take trade offline but it wouldn’t cause protectionism --- countries would still be interdependent

#### protectionism won’t lead to wars

**Matthews ’10** (Jessica Tuchman, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace + former employee in the executive and legislation branches of the USFG, 12-29, Carnegie, “The World in 2011” <http://carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=42207#china>, jj)

Will it be a tough year for the global economy? **Is there a danger that a currency or trade war could break out? People felt that the threat in 2010 was enormous and that we would see tit for tat trade sanctions and barriers—but we didn’t. This is** **partially because the world remembers how devastating that was during the period between the two world wars.**

***A) Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace***

**MARTIN, MAYER, AND THOENIG 2008 (**Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

***B) Doha proves even sudden collapse of free trade will not cause war***

**THE SEATTLE TIMES 7-31-2008**

Economists disagree on the Doha round's potential benefits; estimates of economic gain that could have been reaped through additional trade range from $4 billion to $100 billion. Set against the rapid expansion of global trade to $13.6 trillion last year from $7.6 trillion five years ago, however, the bottom-line loss from Doha's failure is "not a market issue," said Julian Callow, an economist at Barclays Capital in London. Nor is the world on the edge of the kind of protectionist wave that ended the last period of globalization in the early 20th century and contributed to two world wars, analysts say. Countries are likely to go on negotiating bilateral trade deals with each other, such as the U.S.-South Korea free-trade deal earlier this year.

#### \*\*2. Great powers won’t get involved

Chipman ’09 (Dr John, 3-5, International Institute for Strategic Studies, “Strategic Challenges in Latin America” <http://www.iiss.org/conferences/strategic-perspectives-on-latin-america/speeches/strategic-challenges-in-latin-america-dr-john-chipman/>, jj)

Overall, the broad assessment must be that the diplomatic, economic and military interests of outside powers in Latin America do not pose the sort of geopolitical challenge that could have a major security impact. While natural resources and the economic realities of globalisation have drawn more countries to Latin America, perhaps reducing the relative isolation of Latin America from the rest of the world, it is fanciful to read into this a prospective ‘great game’ for influence and control. The need for the region to defend against an external threat is not there in a way that should seriously affect defence policy or the sizing of armed forces.

#### \*\*3. Doesn’t escalate

Dominguez et al ’03 (Jorge I., Clarence Dillon Professor of International Relations and director of the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University, David Mares, Manuel Orozco, David Scott Palmer, Francisco Rojas Aravena, Andres Serbin, United States Institute of Peace, August, Peaceworks No. 50, <http://www.usip.org/publications/boundary-disputes-latin-america>, jj)

**S**ince the start of 2000, five Latin American boundary disputes between neighboring states have resulted in the use of force, and two others in its deployment. These incidents involved ten of the nineteen independent countries of South and Central America. In 1995, Ecuador and Peru went to war, resulting in more than a thousand deaths and injuries and significant economic loss. And yet, by international standards the Americas were comparatively free from interstate war during the twentieth century. Latin Americans for the most part do not fear aggression from their neighbors. They do not expect their countries to go to war with one another. The puzzle that this paper seeks to solve is how to explain the following unusual cluster of traits in the hemisphere: ◗ Territorial, boundary, and other disputes endure. ◗ Interstate conflict over boundaries is relatively frequent. ◗ Disputes sometimes escalate to military conflict because states recurrently employ low levels of force to shape aspects of bilateral relations. ◗ Such escalation rarely reaches full-scale war. ◗ Interstate war is infrequent indeed. Solving this puzzle may help point the way toward more effective prevention and resolution of conflicts about borders and territory. It is encouraging to note that some of the longest-lasting and most serious boundary disputes in South America have been settled since 1990—Argentina and Chile, Ecuador and Peru, Chile and Peru, Brazil and all its neighbors. At the same time, however, similar border disputes have been exacerbated in the cases of Guyana, Venezuela, and Colombia and in Central America. Each of this second set of countries has been involved in at least one militarized interstate dispute since 1990. Nicaragua tops the list, having had militarized disputes with four states. Venezuela and Honduras have each had militarized disputes with three neighboring states. El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, and Colombia have each had militarized disputes with two neighbors. Since 1990 militarized interstate disputes have been frequent, therefore, yet only the dispute between Ecuador and Peru in 1995 escalated to war.

#### \*\*1. Russia isn’t imperialist

de Waal ‘11 (Thomas, senior associate in the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, Winter, Vol. 35, Iss. 1; pg. 17, “Moving Beyond Mirages: THOMAS DE WAAL DISCUSSES A NEW PARADIGM FOR FOREIGN INTERVENTION IN THE SOUTH CAUCASUS” proquest, jj)

DE WAAL: I suppose the issue that I would like to raise again is Russia. I think Russia is clearly a very difficult neighbor, with a long colonial interest in the region, but I think it's a mistake to see Russia as being a hegemon that wants to dominate this region. I think Russia has moved into a postimperialist phase, in which it does not want to dominate this region and actually does not have the capacity to do so. Clearly, there are constituencies in Russia, such as the military, who still have an interest in this. And, of course, Russia is still in charge of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. However, I think that in looking at the broader region- Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan-Russia is slowly adjusting to the new reality, where it realizes that it is one actor among many in the Caucasus. Therefore, framing policy to keep Russia out of the region is a waste of time and is counterproductive. I think it should be possible to look at ways of working with Russia in the region. And that applies also to Turkey and Iran. Basically, it's a matter of accepting that there should be some kind of Great Power truce in the Caucasus in which everyone's interest is acceptable as long as it is benign.

#### \*\*2. No impact---Russia isn’t a threat

Bandow ’10 (Doug, senior fellow & former special assistant to Reagan, 3-15, CATO, “Give Peace A Chance” <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=11573>, jj)

First, Moscow poses no threat to America. No doubt, Vladimir Putin's Russia has taken a nasty authoritarian turn. But it is a declining power with a weakened military and shrinking population. Washington once feared the well-provisioned Soviet military. Today Moscow is buying ships from France. Russia is not even to blame for the Georgian war. The Putin government may have provoked conflict with Georgia, but it did not force the Saakashvili government to fire the first shot. The war looks similar to President George H. W. Bush's invasion of Panama: a dubious venture, but one foolishly invited by an irresponsible local ruler. Even assuming blatant aggression, Georgia, a border state that was once part of Imperial Russia as well as the Soviet Union, is a matter of peculiar geopolitical interest in Moscow. The Baltic States are not such obvious targets of Russia's coercive attention. Moreover, the Russia-Georgia war basically exhausted Russian offensive capabilities. Moscow retains a superpower's nuclear arsenal, but little else. Today the Kremlin can barely rough up Tbilisi. Even Ukraine would not be easy for Moscow to swallow. The European Union has three times the population and ten times the GDP of Russia. The United States has an even greater advantage. Moscow isn't going to choose war with America. Why should Washington choose war with Russia? Second, a mere threat to go to war by the Bush administration would not likely have deterred Russia from acting. Some war advocates contended that offering Tbilisi a Membership Action Plan at the April 2008 NATO summit would have convinced Moscow not to attack Georgia. In fact, the Kremlin likely would not have taken the threat seriously, since Russia understands how difficult it would be for the allies (even if willing) to protect Georgia. And the nations most interested in defending Georgia, in Eastern Europe, are the least able to do anything for Georgia.

#### \*\*4. Their arguments are just demonization—Russia is the least war prone of the great powers

MANDELBAUM 1999(Michael, Professor of American Foreign Policy, Johns Hopkins University; Director, Project on East-West Relations, Council on Foreign Relations, “Transcript: is Major War Obsolete?” Transcript of debate with John Mearsheimer, CFR,

Feb 25, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/)

Prof. Mandelbaum: Can I make two quick comments? First on the subject of Russia, it’s been my observation that almost anything can now be said or believed about Russia, not by somebody like [previous questioner] who knows it well, but somehow we are willing to impute things to Russia that we wouldn’t impute to any other country. It’s a country with troubles, but it’s not on another planet. And furthermore, at this point, no country is less bellicose; anti-war sentiment is nowhere as strong as it is in Russia. I count it as a question mark only because I think the political arrangements and the political culture of Russia are unsettled, but the Russians are not champing at the bit, waiting to jump to wash their boots in the Caspian Sea.

## Block

### Overview

#### Key to Latin American relations

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation. The inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United States and nearly every other country in the Americas. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

#### Relations are key to solve a laundry list of existential threats---the brink is now

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties. Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a vital market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology for Latin America, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, Latin America’s rising economies will inevitably become more and more crucial to the United States’ economic future. The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such global matters as climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and democracy and human rights.With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

***CIR solves Latin American relations and prevents massive instability***

Robert **Gittelson** (Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics, & Public Policy) 20**09** “The Centrists Against the Ideologues: What Are the Falsehoods That Divide Americans on the Issue of Comprehensive Immigration Reform?” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1400764>

However, the above list of security enhancements is only a part of the overall security ramifications of CIR. For example, as everyone—including our enemies all over the world—knows, our military **manpower** is strained **to the limit. Our troops are on a seemingly endless loop of deployment**s, with no imminent relief in sight. Our **military recruiting officers are struggling to meet the vital new quotas for fresh servicemen and women**, and scandals have started to come to light of instances where we have waived or lowered our induction standards.28 We are also offering record high bonus inducements to lure potential recruits to join the armed forces.29 CIR can really help us **in this regard,** with the **potential** addition of millions of military age**, able-bodied** men and women**, should CIR allow them to legalize their status.** This would not only increase the **potential** pool of **new** recruits; it would allow the military to **once again** raise standards, and— because of the laws of supply and demand—**they could save much-needed revenue** by lowering the bonuses that they are currently offering due to the short supply of potential seamen, soldiers, and airmen. The long-term benefit to our country through the addition of these potential recruits is that these young men and women would receive valuable training for advancement in life in whatever career path they should choose. They would be able to take advantage of the laws governing accelerated citizenship for immigrants who serve in the military, and, of course, our country—and by extension **the entire world**—**would be safer because of this** provision of **CIR**. In the alternative, should we fail to pass CIR**,** and instead opt to deport or force attrition on these millions of economic refugees through an enforcement-only approach to our current undocumented immigrant difficulties, what would be the net result? Forgetting for now the devastating effect on our own economy, **and the worldwide reproach and loss of moral authority** that we would frankly deserve should we act so callously and thoughtlessly, there is another important political imperative to our **passing** CIR that affects our national security, and the security and political stability of our neighbors in our hemisphere. That is the very real threat of communism and/or socialism. First of all, the primary reason why millions of undocumented economic refugees migrated to the United States is because the economies of their home countries were unable to support them. They escaped extreme poverty and oppression, and risked literally everything they had, including their lives and their freedom, to come to this country to try to work hard and support themselves and their families. Deporting our illegal immigrant population back to **primarily** Latin America would boost the communist **and socialist** movements in that **part of our** hemisphere, and if the anti-immigrationists only understood that fact, they might re-think their “line in the sand” position on what they insist on calling “amnesty.” Communism thrives where hope is lost. **The economies of Latin American nations are struggling to barely reach a level of meager subsistence for the population that has remained at home;** Mexico, for example, has already lost 14% of their able-bodied workers to U.S. migration.30 Without the billions of dollars in remissions **from these nations’ expatriates working in the United States that go back to help support their remaining family members**, the economies of many of these countries**, most of whom are in fact our allies,** would **certainly** collapse, or at least deteriorate to dangerously unstable levels. The addition of millions of unemployed and frustrated deported people who would go to the end of the theoretical unemployment lines of these already devastated economies would **surely** cause massive unrest and anti-American sentiment. The issue of comprehensive immigration reform is not simply a domestic issue. In our modern global economy, everything that we do, as the leaders of that global economy, affects the entire world, and most especially our region of the world. If we were to naively initiate actions that would lead to the destabilization of **the** Mexican and **many Central and** South American governments, while at the same time **causing serious harm to our own economy** (but I digress . . .), it would most assuredly lead to disastrous economic and political consequences. By the way, I’m not simply theorizing here. In point of fact, over the past few years, eight countries in Latin America have elected leftist leaders. Just last year, Guatemala swore in their first leftist president in more than fifty years, Alvaro Colom.31 He joins a growing list. Additional countries besides Guatemala, Venezuela,32 and Nicaragua33 that have sworn in extreme left wing leaders in Latin America recently include Brazil,34 Argentina,35 Bolivia,36 Ecuador,37 and Uruguay.38 This phenomenon is not simply a coincidence; it is a trend. **The political infrastructure of Mexico is under extreme pressure** from the left.39 Do we really want a leftist movement on our southern border? If our political enemies such as the communists Chavez in Venezuela and Ortega in Nicaragua **are** call**ing** the shots in Latin America, what kind of cooperation can we expect **in our battle to secure our southern border**?

#### Immigration liberalization key to nuclear renaissance

Hoskin Davis 08 Management Consulting Firm, provides strategic workforce planning, change management and executive search services, “Staffing the Nuclear Renaissance” online, jj

It is generally believed that over the next twenty years demographic trends will produce a serious personnel supply-demand gap in the developed world, particularly in the United States. We have been studying the situation in the nuclear power industry, which is poised for a renaissance. This industry provides an interesting case study of what other industries may face and what kinds of solutions they should embrace.

The nuclear power talent supply constraints are caused by several factors. First and foremost is the aging workforce as the baby boom generation nears retirement. Birth rates in developed countries have been historically low. There has been a softening in our educational system’s emphasis on math and science education and lower enrollments in these majors relative to, say, the days of the space race.

In addition, cultural trends have emphasized the virtues of a four-year college degree and de-emphasized the importance of technical and craft careers. Plumbers, mechanics, welders, pipe-fitters, electricians, construction workers, and the like are not viewed as great occupations, even though the pay rates are very substantial. Finally, in spite of the forces propelling immigration, security concerns since 9/11 have created real restrictions on the international movement of labor, particularly for high-security endeavors such as nuclear plant construction.

#### CIR key to soft power

Bush et al 09 Jeb Bush and Thomas F. McLarty III, Chairs, Edward Alden, Project Director, Council on Foreign Relations, Independent Task Force Report No. 63, U.S. Immigration Policy, online, jj

America’s image in the world has taken a beating in the past decade. The Pew Global Attitudes Project, the most comprehensive survey of its type, showed a precipitous drop in favorable opinions toward the United States from across the world between 1999 and 2008, with only a handful of exceptions.44 The reasons for this decline are many, but the evidence is strong that immigration and cross-border exchanges of all types are among the best tools the U.S. government has for trying to reverse this decline. Certainly, mistreatment at the hands of U.S. border and immigration officials is one of the surest ways to denigrate America’s standing in the eyes of many in the world.

Allowing people to come to the United States helps America’s image by exposing foreigners directly or indirectly to the realities of life in this country. Polls of foreign attitudes toward the United States indicate strongly that those who have spent time here, or have friends or families who have spent time here, have more positive views of the United States than those who have not. In its polling of Arab countries, for instance, Zogby International found that Arabs who knew even a single American were roughly 10 percent more favorable in their opinion of the United States than those who did not. Among those who had traveled to the United States, wanted to travel here, or had a relative living here, the favorability was 25 to 30 percentage points higher. 45 The Task Force finds that one of the most successful forms of public diplomacy has been to allow non-Americans to see what the United States has achieved at home. Encouraging travel to the United States has more positive influence than the best efforts that the government can muster to use the media and other channels to present a positive image abroad.

#### Soft power is key to survival

**Nye and Armitage, ’07** [Joseph S. Nye, Sultan of Oman Sultan of Oman Professor of International Relations and former Dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and Richard, deputy secretary of state from 2001 to 2005, both are co-chairs of the CSIS Commission on Smart Power, 2007, “CSIS Reports – A Smarter, More Secure America”, http://www.csis.org/component/option,com\_csis\_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/, 11/6]

The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of widespread physical harm to the planet posed by nuclear catastrophe has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases. The potential security challenges posed by climate change raise the possibility of an entirely new set of threats for the United States to consider. The next administration will need a strategy that speaks to each of these challenges. Whatever specific approach it decides to take, two principles will be certain: First, an extra dollar spent on hard power will not necessarily bring an extra dollar’s worth of security. It is difficult to know how to invest wisely when there is not a budget based on a strategy that specifies trade-offs among instruments. Moreover, hard power capabilities are a necessary but insufficient guarantee of security in today’s context. Second, success and failure will turn on the ability to win new allies and strengthen old ones both in government and civil society. The key is not how many enemies the United States kills, but how many allies it grows. States and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk. China has invested in its soft power to ensure access to resources and to ensure against efforts to undermine its military modernization. Terrorists depend on their ability to attract support from the crowd at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy’s will to fight.

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- key to India relations

Los Angeles Times, 11/9/2012 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html>)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US-Indian relations key to solve all global problems

Asia Society Task Force ‘09  
[Delivering on the Promise: Advancing US Relations With India, January, <http://www.asiasociety.org/policy-politics/task-forces/delivering-promise-advancing-us-relations-india>, Acccessed, 9-19-09, p. 7-8]

India matters to virtually every major foreign policy issue that will confront the United States in the years ahead. A broad-based, close relationship with India will thus be necessary to solve complex global challenges, achieve security in the critical South Asian region, reestablish stability in the global economy, and overcome the threat of violent Islamic radicalism which has taken root across the region and in India. The members of this task force believe that the US relationship with India will be among our most important in the future, and will at long last reach its potential for global impact—provided that strong leadership on both sides steers the way. The new relationship rests on a convergence of US and Indian national interests, and never in our history have they been so closely aligned. With India, we can harness our principles and power together to focus on the urgent interconnected challenges of our shared future: economic stability, expanded trade, the environment and climate change, innovation, nonproliferation, public health, sustainability, and terrorism. Together our two countries will be able to take on some of the most vexing problems facing the world today, and improve the lives and security of our citizens in doing so. But to get there, we must set broad yet realistic goals to be shared by both countries.

### Uq

#### Not pushed by Obama

Aiken Standard 1-5 http://www.aikenstandard.com/article/20130105/AIK0101/130109807/1004/nuclear-agency-county-clash-over-waste-funds

Judges in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit are hearing the lawsuit that states the NRC illegally halted its consideration of a license for the proposed Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository in 2010.

The lawsuit, of which Aiken County is the named plaintiff, is seeking a court order for the agency to complete its studies of the site. The NRC has argued it halted work on the project after the Obama administration announced it was terminating the project and began zeroing out funding for it.

Aiken County wants the Court of Appeals to order the Department of Energy to continue the licensing proceedings. The NRC said it sees no point in this as the American electorate “returned to office an Executive Branch administration that has stated that it does not intend to seek a license for Yucca Mountain.”

### 2nc Wall

#### Prefer the direction of the link --- PC creates momentum as long as Obama stays focused on immigration --- that’s St. Augustine --- more evidence

This card also feeds our link arguments --- he has to stay focused and make it clear immigration is a high priority or congress will get distracted --- Obama’s capital will create momentum for CIR now, but the plan muddles his message and distracts Congress.

Hesson 1-2 Ted Hesson is the immigration editor for Univision News. Before joining the team in 2012, he served as online editor for Long Island Wins, a non-profit organization focusing on local and national immigration issues. Ted has written for a variety of magazines, newspapers, and online publications, including The Huffington Post, Time Out New York, and the Philadelphia City Paper. He earned his master’s degree at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and his bachelor’s degree at Boston College. Born and raised in Philadelphia, Ted has lived in New York City since 2003. Jan. 2, 2013, ABC News, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOTU-OSx-Sp>, jj

1. Be a Leader

During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.

#### Big push coming this month --- passage likely

Expect him to spotlight it in his State of the Union --- this will create momentum and give passage a good shot

Sarlin 1-3 Benjy Sarlin is a reporter for Talking Points Memo and co-writes the campaign blog, TPM2012. He previously reported for The Daily Beast/Newsweek as their Washington Correspondent and covered local politics for the New York Sun. JANUARY 3, 2013, Talking Points Memo, Debt Fight Threatens To Overshadow Obama’s Immigration Push, <http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2013/01/debt-fight-threatens-to-overshadow-obamas-immigration-push.php>, jj

Immigration advocates are still expecting big movement this month from the White House on comprehensive reform, especially in the president’s State of the Union address. With Republican leaders publicly calling for a debate on the issue before the 2014 elections in the hopes of winning over Latino voters, Obama still has his best shot yet at moving a bill through Congress.

#### Fiscal cliff deal creates momentum

Fiscal cliff provides momentum --- shows congress can make deals, Congress views immigration as a rare opportunity for compromise

Has unique momentum that can’t be slowed down by deficit battles --- it won’t get bogged down by partisan gridlock now

Boehner provides momentum --- he broke the “Hastert Rule” and brought fiscal cliff to vote even though Tea Party didn’t like the deal --- proves he is willing to stand up to the right wing, makes immigration passage likely

Foley & Stein 1-2 Elise Foley is a reporter for the Huffington Post in Washington, D.C. She previously worked at The Washington Independent. Sam Stein is a Political Reporter at the Huffington Post, based in Washington, D.C. Previously he has worked for Newsweek magazine, the New York Daily News and the investigative journalism group Center for Public Integrity. He has a masters from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and is a graduate of Dartmouth College. Sam can be reached at [stein@huffingtonpost.com](mailto:stein@huffingtonpost.com). 1-2-13, Huffington Post, Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>, jj

WASHINGTON -- Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda.

An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well.

The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit.

With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished.

"The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill."

It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push.

Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

Advocates have vowed to keep pushing for reform. As part of their efforts, they plan to remind Republican members of Congress about their presidential nominee's defeat among Latino and Asian voters, a majority of whom support a fix to the immigration system.

"They can procrastinate as long as they want, but they're going to have a serious day of reckoning next election cycle," said Angela Kelley, vice president for immigration policy and advocacy at the Center for American Progress. "We're going to have a lot of near-death experiences with this issue, but I'm pretty confident it's never going to go completely to a flatline."

Good news for immigration advocates may have come Tuesday night, when Boehner broke the so-called "Hastert Rule" and allowed the fiscal cliff bill to come for a vote without support from a majority of his Republican conference. Given opposition to immigration reform by many Tea Party Republicans, the proof that Boehner is willing to bypass them on major legislation is a good sign, the Democratic aide said.

"If something is of such importance that the GOP establishment [is] telling Boehner, 'You must do this. You need to get this off the table soon,'" the Democratic aide said, the speaker could break the Hastert Rule again.

"He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority," the aide continued.

Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-immigration reform group America's Voice, also said he thinks the House could pass an immigration bill in the same way it did last night, relying on support from both parties. He's hopeful that the fiscal cliff fight could even make them happy to work out legislation in a more standard way.

"I never thought I'd say this, but after bruising battles over the future of the American and world economy, the chance to legislate through regular order on immigration reform might have leaders in both parties working together and singing 'Kumbaya,'" Sharry said.

#### Immigration reform will pass --- unique area for compromise

Passage very likely --- Republicans know they need to soften --- Obama’s PC ensures the deal includes citizenship measures --- immigration is seriously the most likely area for cooperation all year

Malone 12/31 JIM MALONE, After a stint in the Peace Corps in Swaziland, Jim joined VOA in 1983 as a reporter and anchor on English broadcasts to Africa. He served as East Africa correspondent, then covered Congress in the early 1990′s. Since 1995, Jim has served as VOA national correspondent responsible for coverage of U.S. politics, elections, the Supreme Court and Justice Department. Jim has been involved in VOA’s election coverage since the 1984 presidential campaign and has co-anchored live VOA broadcasts of numerous national political conventions, candidate debates and election night coverage. 12/31/12, Voice of America News, Political Battle Lines for 2013, <http://blogs.voanews.com/usa-politics/2012/12/31/political-battle-lines-for-2013/>, jj

Prospects for Immigration Reform

This is an area that holds perhaps the greatest promise of cooperation between the two parties in the year ahead. Democrats will make a bigger push for comprehensive immigration reform in 2013 because they benefited so much from Hispanic support in the November election. At the same time a number of Republicans will be clamoring for a different approach on immigration given how poorly they did with Hispanic voters in 2012 and the prospects for even more defeats in the years to come without trimming the Democrat’s huge advantage with minority voters.

The two sides diverge somewhat on whether the path to legalization should result in citizenship, as many Hispanic activists would like, or simply legalization of their status inside the U.S., a path many Republicans prefer. Either way, the Republicans are much more likely to engage in a debate about immigration reform in the wake of the election. One of the things that hurt Mitt Romney badly last year was the tone of the Republican primary debates on immigration that made several of the Republican presidential contenders sound extreme on immigration, something voters remembered when it came time to cast their ballots in November. In fact, of all the issues that will come up this year this one might have the best chance of actually bringing the two parties together.

#### Will pass but it will be a fight --- PC key

2013 is the year of immigration --- political winds have shifted --- a bill will sneak through the house now

Kiplinger 12/18 The Kiplinger Washington Editors, 12-18-12, Why Immigration Reform Is Likely in 2013, <http://www.kiplinger.com/columns/washington/archives/immigration-reform-likely-in-2013.html#lObtuiMB6R9j3TdG.99>, jj

Is 2013 the year for immigration reform? It sure seems that way. Even as Congress remains divided on many other issues, the prospects for a major overhaul are the best they’ve been in years.

The Senate, for sure, will pass a broad immigration package, backed by Democrats and some moderate Republicans. The fight will be more difficult in the GOP-controlled House, where hard-line conservatives will try to resist the push by more-mainstream Republicans to make big changes.

But, in the end, don’t be surprised if a bill sneaks through and is signed by President Obama this fall, with House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) at his side.

The reason? The political winds have shifted since 2007, when a coalition of strange bedfellows -- conservatives and some in organized labor -- lined up to doom President George W. Bush’s initiatives to allow many illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. and work.

This time, organized labor stands united. It’s the Republican Party that’s divided. One on side are conservatives , fighting to derail any immigration reform. On the other, party members who want to mend fences with Hispanics and other minority voters before 2016, when the next president will be chosen. GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney won just 27% of the Hispanic vote this year, down from 44% for Bush in 2004. If the downward trend continues, some in the party worry that even Republican strongholds such as Texas and Arizona will tilt toward the Democrats, as Colorado, Florida, New Mexico and Nevada did this time around.

### Top of Docket – A2: General Thumpers

#### Their thumpers aren’t stopping Obama’s push now

Matt Cantor, Newser Staff, 1-3-13, Next for Obama: Immigration Reform, <http://www.newser.com/story/160309/next-for-obama-immigration-reform.html>, jj

(NEWSER) – Despite continued hand-wringing over fiscal policy, President Obama remains on schedule to push for immigration reform this month, an insider tells the Huffington Post. The effort will likely be led by Democratic Rep. Zoe Lofgren, who warns that "in the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker Boehner wants to do it." Still, the fiscal cliff negotiations suggest the House Republican leadership could be open to compromise, say immigration reform advocates.

#### Higher priority than fiscal issues

Weber 1-1 Joseph Weber, January 01, 2013, Fox News, Guns, immigration, fiscal issues emerge as top priorities for Obama, new Congress, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/01/gun-control-immigration-reform-fiscal-issues-emerge-as-top-issues-for-new/>, jj

After an election year in which legislative business practically ground to a halt, Congress is poised to make up for lost time in 2013.

The new Congress will begin its next session with an agenda expected to focus largely on issues that re-emerged over the past several weeks and months, with gun legislation and immigration reform near the top.

Though fiscal issues will remain a priority, how much work lawmakers put into them depends on whether, or to what extent, President Obama and congressional Republicans resolve the fiscal crisis in the closing days of this session.

A basic deal to prevent some of the $600 billion mix of tax increases and automatic spending cuts from kicking in Jan. 1 would still leave the 113th Congress to address debt ceiling and tax code issues.

But in the near term, immigration legislation appears to be high on the docket in the next Congress and second Obama administration term.

Washington has tried for years to change the country's immigration policy -- to strengthen border security and stem the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S.; to reform the visa system for the benefit of those legal immigrants following the rules; and figure out how to address the millions of illegal immigrants already here.

Legislative efforts by Democrats and Republicans on comprehensive immigration reform had reached a standstill -- until the issue re-emerged during this election cycle when Obama suspended deportation for many young immigrants brought to the U.S. illegally by their parents.

Republicans have since signaled their intentions to be the first to introduce and pass more comprehensive legislation to deal with the roughly 11 million illegal immigrants in the United States, especially after Obama won re-election with roughly 71 percent of the Hispanic vote.

However, Obama appeared to re-stake his turf Sunday, saying he would introduce legislation next year to fix “our broken immigration system.”

#### CIR is top of the docket and will pass

CIR with a path to citizenship will pass --- extend Grant --- Obama re-election has fundamentally altered the terms of debate and made compromise likely --- it’s the top of the agenda and negotiations are already happening.

Grant 12/29 David Grant | The Christian Science Monitor | Dec 29, 2012, Alaska Dispatch, US immigration reform: Is 'amnesty' a possibility for illegal immigrants now?, <http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/us-immigration-reform-amnesty-possibility-illegal-immigrants-now>, jj

The momentum of President Obama's resounding victory in November's election – with a big push from Latinos and other minority groups – has catapulted immigration policy to the top of Washington's 2013 agenda, making reform not only possible but also likely.

The shift in the political conversation has been so dramatic that even a pathway to citizenship for some of the estimated 12 million undocumented immigrants in the United States – long rejected out of hand by most Republicans and some Democrats – could be part of the deal.

The task is momentous. It involves weighing the wishes of industries from agriculture to high-tech, as well as the sensitivities of opening the door to immigrant workers at a time when unemployment remains high.

The past only reinforces the potential difficulties ahead. In 1986, Republicans felt betrayed when Democrats stripped the enforcement provisions from a bill that offered citizenship to some 3 million illegal immigrants. By 2005, the issue had become so politically toxic to conservatives that they blocked President George W. Bush's push for a new round of immigration reform.

Yet with Election 2012 highlighting the electoral consequences of America's changing demographics, the next year appears to be ripe for compromise. How reforms might take shape could be a major point of contention between the parties, but lawmakers on both sides suddenly see an opportunity for what could be their most expansive achievement of 2013.

"It has to be in 2013," says Rep. Raúl Labrador (R) of Idaho, an immigration lawyer who thundered into Congress in the tea party wave of 2010. "If we wait until 2014, it's going to be election time. And you know how efficient we are here during election time."

Recent weeks have seen a flurry of activity on Capitol Hill. In the Senate, a "Gang of Eight" – led by longtime immigration reformers Sen. Chuck Schumer (D) of New York and Republican Sens. John McCain of Arizona and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina – has added freshman Sens. Michael Bennett (D) of Colorado and Mike Lee (R) of Utah, while potential 2016 presidential aspirant Sen. Marco Rubio (R) of Florida leads his own initiative.

Members of the House have seen movement, too. "One thing clearly has changed," says Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D) of Illinois, the lawmaker who co-wrote a 2005 comprehensive immigration reform measure with now Sen.-elect Jeff Flake (R) of Arizona. "Nobody is talking about self-deportation. Nobody is talking about how [Arizona's controversial immigration law] should be the standard applied across the land. Nobody is talking about vetoing the DREAM Act," which offers a path to citizenship for some young undocumented immigrants.

"We are having wonderful conversations," Representative Gutierrez says.

That more moderate tone from the GOP is what the November election has wrought.

#### Their thumpers are backwards --- immigration is drawing attention from other issues

Burritt 1/2

Chris. CEOs Give U.S. Politicians Incomplete Grade on Fiscal Cliff Work. 1/2/13. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-03/ceos-give-u-s-politicians-incomplete-grade-on-fiscal-cliff-work.html. Citing Matthew Shay, CEO of the National Retail Federation in Washington.

Even so, passage of a limited deal offers no guarantee that Congress will tackle broader fiscal reform later because gun control, immigration reform and other issues are going to draw attention from fiscal matters, Shay said.

“We should be more realistic about prospects for whether or not we’re going to get the so-called big deal, because once we get over the cliff and we get resolution to some of the basic elements, then obviously all of the pressure is off and you lose that opportunity to do the big deal,” he said. “It’s going to be much more difficult to get the big deal because people are going to lose their enthusiasm.”

### A2: Hagel Appointment Thumper

#### Hagel won’t be a fight---DC press analysis doesn’t reflect reality

Josh Marshall 1-6, editor of Talking Points Memo, 1/6/13, “Crack Pipe,” http://talkingpointsmemo.com/archives/2013/01/crack\_pipe\_1.php

I’m watching a lot of neoconservative policy activists and a lot of people in the press telling me that it’s a very up in the air thing whether Chuck Hagel gets confirmed as Secretary of Defense. These folks should stop smoking crack. Because crack isn’t good for you.

Maybe I’m just out of the loop because I’m not reporting aggressively myself. Or maybe — I think much more likely — I’m not in the same crack den with the rest of these good people so the air I’m breathing is clear and I know what is happening in the real world.

Will Republicans uniformly oppose a former member of their own caucus when the issues at stake are complaints that look comical when held up to the light of day? One who was one of the top foreign policy Republicans in the Senate? I doubt it.

Will Democratic senators deny a reelected President Obama his choice for one of the top four cabinet positions when he is quite popular and the expansion of their caucus is due in significant measure to his popularity? Please. Chuck Schumer will oppose the President? Not likely.

So I look forward to Republican crocodile tears on gay rights — seemingly in large part over something Hagel said in the 90s in support of the Senate Republican caucus’s efforts to pillory an openly gay nominee. And yes, perhaps it really will pave the way for a LGBT upsurge of support for Richard Grinnell for President in 2016. But I doubt it.

Otherwise, assuming President Obama nominates him tomorrow, get ready for a Hagel Pentagon.

#### Appointments don’t drain PC---empirics

Hutchinson 12/2 Earl Ofari, "Rice Nomination Fight Won't Drain President Obama's Political Capital, 2012, www.eurweb.com/2012/12/rice-nomination-fight-wont-drain-president-obamas-political-capital/

It won’t hurt him. All presidents from time to time face some backlash from real or manufactured controversies by opponents over a potential nominee to the Supreme Court, a cabinet or diplomatic post. In 2008, Obama faced backlash when he nominated Eric Holder as Attorney General. A pack of GOP senators huffed and puffed at Holder for alleged transgressions involving presidential pardons he signed off on as Clinton’s Deputy Attorney General. In the end he was confirmed. The mild tiff over Holder didn’t dampen, diminish, or tarnish Obama in his hard pursuit of his major first term initiative, namely health care reform.¶ This was true three years earlier when then President Bush nominated Condoleezza Rice for Secretary of State. Rice was slammed hard by some Democratic senators for being up to her eyeballs in selling the phony, conniving Bush falsehood on Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction. The threat to delay Rice’s confirmation in the Senate quickly fizzled out, and she was confirmed. This did not distract or dampen Bush in his pursuit of his key initiatives. There was not the slightest inference that in nominating Rice, and standing behind her in the face of Democrats grumbles about her would threaten his push of his administration’s larger agenda items.¶ Susan Rice will continue to be a handy and cynical whipping person for the GOP to hector Obama. But the political reality is that the legislative business that Congress and the White House must do never has been shut down by any political squabble over a presidential appointee. The fiscal cliff is an issue that’s too critical to the fiscal and economic well-being of too many interest groups to think that Rice’s possible nomination will be any kind of impediment to an eventual deal brokered by the GOP and the White House.¶ The Rice flap won’t interfere in any way with other White House pursuits for another reason. By holding Rice hostage to a resolution of the fiscal cliff peril and other crucial legislative issues, the GOP would badly shoot itself in the foot. It would open the gate wide to the blatant politicizing of presidential appointments by subjecting every presidential appointment to a litmus test, not on the fitness of the nominee for the job, but on whether the appointee could be a bargaining chip to oppose a vital piece of legislation or a major White House initiative. This would hopelessly blur the legislative process and ultimately could be turned against a future GOP president. This is a slippery slope that Democrats and the GOP dare not risk going down.¶ Rice will not be Obama’s only appointment at the start of his second term. He will as all presidents see a small revolving door of some cabinet members and agency heads that will leave, and must be replaced. There almost certainly will be another Obama pick that will raise some eyebrows and draw inevitable fire from either the GOP or some interests groups. Just as other presidents, Obama will have to weigh carefully the political fall-out if any from his pick. But as is usually the case the likelihood of any lasting harm to the administration will be minimal to nonexistent.

#### History proves

Sullivan 1-7 Sean Sullivan on January 7, 2013, Washington Post, Chuck Hagel’s chances — in 3 charts, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/01/07/the-good-and-bad-news-for-chuck-hagel-in-three-charts/>, jj

We encourage you to read the entire report, from which we’ve plucked out some charts illustrating three truths about the Cabinet confirmation process – two of which The Fix’s Aaron Blake also noted in a recent post — that reveal both good and bad news for Hagel’s odds:

1) The vast majority of individuals whom presidents nominate to their Cabinets are confirmed by the Senate.

2) The defense secretary post has tended to be a source of very little controversy.

3) Public policy issues account for much of the opposition in the confirmation process.

Let’s take a look at each point.

1. When presidents nominate individuals to serve in the Cabinet, they are almost always confirmed, which is good news for Hagel. Just 21 Cabinet nominees in history have been defeated or have withdrawn. And as the following chart from King’s paper shows, just nine failed to survive the process between 1969 and 2008. Eight of them were withdrawn as nominees, and one (John Tower in 1989) was rejected in a vote.

(The chart only runs through 2008, so it’s worth noting that in 2009, Obama’s nomination of former Senate majority leader Tom Daschle to be secretary of health and human services was withdrawn.)

2. Compared to other departments, Defense nominees haven’t tended to run into as much opposition. As the following chart shows, more than 9 in 10 have been confirmed with little or no challenge. Nominees to the Justice and Interior departments, by comparison, have faced more pushback, while nominees to head the CIA, Homeland Security Department, and Veterans Affairs have suffered more rejection.

### A2: Debt Ceiling Thumper

#### A deal is inevitable --- the GOP isn’t serious about fighting on the debt ceiling

Chaddock 1-2 Gail Russell Chaddock, Staff writer / January 2, 2013, Christian Science Monitor, 'Fiscal cliff' deal: After rush of relief, debt ceiling clash already looms, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2013/0102/Fiscal-cliff-deal-After-rush-of-relief-debt-ceiling-clash-already-looms/(page)/2>, jj

Republicans are divided over how aggressively to push the debt-ceiling negotiations in a new round with the White House. Last month, Mr. Boehner, who is up for relection as speaker on Jan. 4, offered to defer a fight over raising the debt limit for a year, as part of negotiations with Obama over a “grand bargain.” But he has taken a battering from some conservative activist groups and members of his own caucus for those failed negotiations.

Conservative groups see the debt ceiling as a point of maximum leverage on spending and are urging Boehner to again insist on "the Boehner rule" and use it as a point of maximum leverage.

“The mass majority of Americans know the danger we’re putting ourselves in and want less debt,” says Chris Chocola, president of the Club for Growth, best known for funding primary campaigns against GOP incumbents viewed as not conservative enough.

“It’s up to Republicans to tell this story, and they have more leverage [in debt-ceiling negotiations] than they did in the fiscal cliff debate,” he adds. “If they’re not willing to go there, they have nothing.”

But after tough 2012 elections, some House Republicans are wary of confronting the White House on an issue so potentially damaging to the economy.

"A lot of people talk about the debt ceiling, but I don’t want to be messing around with the obligations of the federal government,” says Rep. Jim Renacci (R) of Ohio, a veteran of the 2010 tea party class. “We can use that for some leverage, but we should be using every opportunity to cut debt.”

“After two tough races, I did not come here to continue the status quo,” he adds.

#### Obama won’t spend PC

Zeke Miller, BuzzFeed Staff, 1-1-13, Obama: I Won't Negotiate Over The Debt Ceiling, <http://www.buzzfeed.com/zekejmiller/obama-i-wont-negotiate-over-the-debt-ceiling>, jj

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama reiterated his pledge not to negotiate over the nation's borrowing limit Tuesday night, as he marked the passage of a bill to avert the fiscal cliff.

Speaking from the White House briefing room 20 minutes after the House of Representatives passed the bill — and minutes before his own return to a vacation in his native Hawaii — Obama offered Republicans brief, tough talk.

"While I will negotiate over many things, I will not have another debate with this Congress over whether they should pay the bills for what they've racked up," Obama said. "We can't not pay bills that we've already incurred."

**A2: Winners Win**

***Controversial wins bleed momentum not build it.***

**Politico**, 1/20/20**10** (Obama's first year: What went wrong, p. http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9)

**Obama believed that** early **success would be self-reinforcing, building** a powerful **momentum for bold** government **action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a** big **stimulus** package **would lead to success in** passing **health care, which** in turn **would clear the way for** major **cap-and-trade** environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. **This proved to be a radical misreading of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of** the **stimulus** package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — **meant that Obama spent the year bleeding momentum** **rather than steadily increasing public confidence** in his larger governing vision. **That vision was further obscured** for many Americans **by the** smoke from the bitter and **seemingly endless legislative battle on** Capitol Hill over **health care**.

***Wins don’t spill over. Climate proves.***

**Hertzberg**, 2/7/20**11** (Hendrik – senior editor and political essayist at the New Yorker, The New Yorker, p. http://www.newyorker.com/talk/comment/2011/02/07/110207taco\_talk\_hertzberg?printable=true)

Strong words. But now they are not even whispered. **The climate bill**, like hundreds of others less consequential, **met its fate on the legislative terminal ward** that is the United States Senate, **where bleeding is still the treatment of choice**. The bill died of complete organ failure, you might say. **The contributing causes included** the economic crisis, which made it easy to stoke fear; the power, money, and regional clout of sectors that benefit from the greenhouse-gas-producing status quo, especially the coal and oil industries; **the Republican** congressional **leadership’s determination** to forgo compromise in favor of a disciplined drive **to block anything that might resemble a victory for Obama**; the rise of the Tea Party right and the baleful influence of talk radio and Fox News; and, as always, the filibuster. But **Obama** and the White House **cannot escape blame. They botched** delicate **negotiations in the Senate**, were neglectful at key moments, **and expende**

**d little** of the courage, imagination, and **resources they brought to health-care reform. Perhaps they calculated that winning health care would strengthen them for climate change**, like Popeye after a helping of spinach. But **the political effect**, at least in its immediate manifestations, **was more like Kryptonite.**

***( ) Link outweighs the “winner’s win” link turn on timeframe***

**Silber ‘7**

(PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

Important to the discussion of political capital is whether or not it can be replenished over a term. If a President expends **p**olitical **c**apital on his agenda, can it be replaced? Light suggests that “capital declines over time – public approval consistently falls: midterm losses occur” (31). Capital can be rebuilt, but **only to a limited extent**. The decline of capital makes it difficult to access information, recruit more expertise and maintain energy. If a lame duck President can be defined by a loss of political capital, this paper helps determine if such capital can be replenished or if a lame duck can accomplish little. Before determining this, a definition of a lame duck President must be developed.

**2nc – Nuclear**

***Nuclear power proposals are controversial—sap political capital***

**Financial Times 1/26/05** (lexis)

The **less monumental items** on Mr Bush's agenda **are nevertheless controversial, potentially sapping** the **political capital** he **earned** in the election.  
**These include**: immigration reform; **an energy bill that will ease the way for building more nuclear power capacity** as well as drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; medical liability reform; changes to legal awards for punitive damages; as well as tax cuts and the simplification of the tax code.

***Nuclear’s unpopular --- Fukushima and natural gas***

**Ornstein 12** (Norman Ornstein is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. June 27, 2012, American Enterprise Institute, An expanded natural gas focus is no-brainer <http://www.aei.org/article/politics-and-public-opinion/an-expanded-natural-gas-focus-is-no-brainer/>, jj)

While he discusses in some detail why such a program makes sense and why it beats alternatives such as waiting for the industry to do it on its own, I don’t have much interest in pursuing that argument. Instead, the Norris column provoked me to reflect on why whatever one thinks about the role and power of **the federal government**, it **has a clear role in crafting and pursuing a national energy strategy and converting it into policy. What we get instead is the dysfunctional debate, or what passes for debate, in this Congress about natural gas and no debate or action to pursue alternative energy sources.**

Of course, the fireworks have all been about the Keystone XL **oil** pipeline, pitting environmentalists and a majority of Democrats against virtually all Republicans, with much of organized labor joining on the pro-pipeline side. The pipeline **has become a political football**, injected into the campaign but **with little real opportunity for Congress to do anything** about it except a series of efforts by House Republicans to try to leverage the issue to force the White House to give in on the pipeline.

**Faced with staunch environmental opposition** that grew more strident after the administration issued its ozone rule, President Barack **Obama decided to** use his authority to **punt** until after the election, and the issue will stay there for now, although the pipeline in some form will almost surely go forward next year.

**The bigger issue is how we can devise an energy policy that understands we will be dependent for a long time on fossil fuels, especially oil, that finding ways to reduce that dependence and reduce carbon emissions is a high priority and that the solution has to involve a panoply of energy sources, including wind and solar and also natural gas**. Coal and **nuclear** power **are** also **necessary parts of the solution, but as they have emerged once again in controversy, with nuclear power in retreat after the Japanese earthquake/tsunami, gas looks even more essential.**

***SMRs are politically “nuclear”***

**Fairley 10** Peter, IEEE Spectrum, May, "Downsizing Nuclear Power Plants,” [spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/downsizing-nuclear-power-plants/0](http://spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/downsizing-nuclear-power-plants/0)

However, **there are political objections to SMRs**. Precisely **because they are more affordable, they** may well **increase the risk of proliferation by bringing the cost and** power **output of nuclear reactors within the reach of poorer countries**.¶ **Russia’s first SMR**, which the nuclear engineering group Rosatom expects to complete next year, **is of particular concern**. The Akademik Lomonosov is a floating nuclear power plant sporting two 35-MW reactors, which Rosatom expects to have tethered to an Arctic oil and gas operation by 2012. **The reactor’s portability prompted Greenpeace Russia to call this** floating plant the world’s most dangerous nuclear project in a decade**.¶**SMRs may be smaller than today’s reactors. **But, politically at least, they’re just as nuclear.**

***Military clean energy costs PC***

**Snider 12**

Annie Snider, E&E reporter February 23, 2012 Military's alt energy programs draw Republicans' ire <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/02/23/2?page_type=print>

**Suspicion is growing among Republican lawmakers that the Defense Department's efforts to move to renewable energy are more about politics than they are about saving lives and boosting security**, as officials claim. The Pentagon's green push -- including outfitting Marines and soldiers with solar gear, testing aircraft and ships on biofuels and building renewable power plants at bases -- won supporters from both sides of the aisle over the past year as leaders drew a clear line between the technologies and military might. Stories about how solar equipment allowed units in Afghanistan to carry fewer batteries and more ammunition helped prompt eight Republicans and 15 Democrats -- many of whom hold vastly opposing views on national energy policy -- to last summer form the Defense Energy Security Caucus, which aims to educate Congress on military energy issues, including "the strategic value of utilizing sustainable energy" (E&E Daily, July 8, 2011). And at a subcommittee hearing with the Pentagon's top energy and environment officials last spring, lawmakers were more concerned about where the solar panels being installed at military installations were made than with the policy behind the projects in the first place (E&E Daily, April 14, 2011). But **as election-year politics ramp up and Republicans target the Obama administration for its clean energy programs, especially its investment in failed solar panel manufacturer Solyndra, the military's attempts to move to alternative energy are coming under new scrutiny.** "**Obama is hiding new renewable energy bets at the Pentagon, charging our Defense Department with major investments in 'low-emissions economic development' while cutting their budget by $5.1 billion**," Catrina Rorke, director of energy policy at the center-right American Action Forum, wrote in a blog post following the Obama administration's budget release last week. "New energy spending is new energy spending, no matter where it happens." **The idea that the administration is using DOD as a more politically palatable vehicle for renewable energy investments is now reverberating across Capitol Hill**, even as Pentagon officials flatly deny the allegations. At a budget hearing last week, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, the department's most high-profile alternative energy advocate, took volley after volley from Republicans on the House Armed Services Committee. **They said that his priorities were misplaced, argued that spending on clean energy was taking money out of more important missions and hinted at a link between the Pentagon's green efforts and the prominence of former Silicon Valley clean-tech investors within the Obama administration**. "You're not the secretary of the energy, you're the secretary of the Navy," said Rep. Randy Forbes (R-Va.), who leads the subcommittee with jurisdiction over military energy and environment issues. **Prime among the lawmakers' complaints was that the military is paying a higher price for some forms of alternative energy at a time when DOD proposes cutting weapons programs and reducing forces in order to meet budget mandates**. "**You've bought fuel**, blended [bio]fuel for the jets to fly **at almost four times the cost of traditional energy**," Rep. Mike Conaway (R-Texas) said to Mabus, referring to the $12 million the Navy is paying for 450,000 gallons of advanced biofuel to power a carrier strike group during exercises off the coast of Hawaii this summer (Greenwire, Dec. 5, 2011). "So in order to make up for that difference, will those planes fly a quarter of the time they would have otherwise flown as part of this exercise?"

**Nuclear Lobby Link Turn**

***No link turns – nuclear has no political clout – there’s not enough of a constituency***

**Tucker, 12** – veteran journalist whose work has appeared in Harper’s, the Atlantic Monthly, the American Spectator, the Weekly Standard, National Review, Reason, the New Republic, Reader’s Digest, the Wall Street Journal, and many other publications; author of Terrestrial Energy: How a Nuclear-Solar Alliance Can Rescue the Planet (William, 8/16. “Nuclear’s Problem — Too Much Energy, Not Enough Jobs.” Nuclear Townhall. http://www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-nuclear%E2%80%99s-problem-%E2%80%94-too-much-energy-not-enough-jobs/)

So there you have it. America’s energy future is a contest between coal and wind. Which can create more jobs? If you think there’s a better option, you don’t have a place at the table. And that’s where nuclear stands today. Sure, there may be questions about potential accidents and the effects of radiation, but the real problem is this: Nuclear is so energy intensive that it doesn’t produce enough jobs to create a political constituency. Why does coal still have such enormous political clout? The answer is simple. It requires so much mining and transportation of raw material that hundreds of thousands of workers – whole states, in fact – become involved in the task. There are now 1300 coal mines in 27 states employing 88,000 workers. More than half a dozen of these states identify themselves as “coal states” – West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Colorado and Wyoming just fir a start. The state with the biggest coal reserves – Montana – hasn’t really started developing them yet. Next to farming, coal mining is most widely entrenched resource-based industry in the country. There is good reason for all this job creation. A1000-MW coal plant must be resupplied by a 110-car unit train arriving every 30 hours. Almost half the railroad freight in the U.S. is coal. Economists say there’s a real question of whether the railroads actually own the coal companies or the coal companies own the railroads. In any case, all this produces huge work forces with powerful labor union backing. Wind energy works the same way. Because each giant 45-story windmills produces only about 2 MW, thousands upon thousands will be required to produce electricity in commercial quantities. This creates a huge work force. The American Wind Energy Association claims 90,000 employees in the wind industry with more than 4,000 in California, Texas, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania and North Dakota. Building out the transmission lines to carry this electricity to population centers will eventually employ thousands more. Wind is nothing if not labor intensive.So how does nuclear do by comparison? According to the Uranium Producers of America, there are 13 uranium mines in the U.S. employing 1635 people. Their annual output was 16, 000 tons of uranium oxide – the equivalent of two coal trains leaving the Powder River Basin (where one now departs every eight minutes). Our domestic production of uranium has actually been suppressed over the last two decades because we have been using former Soviet weapons material for half our fuel in the Megatons to Megawatts program, although the pace may pick up when the treaty expires next year. Worldwide there are only 46 uranium mines – as opposed to 450 coal mines in Kentucky alone. Recently the Russians have proposed supplying the entire world out of one uranium mine in Siberia. Nuclear’s great energy density has one glaring weakness – there is no possibility of building a huge mining and transport constituencies that can support the technology. Uranium does require reprocessing and there are major facilities in Kentucky and Ohio. But even those hardly constitute more than a ripple in the two states’ economies. Traditionally, the only places where nuclear has gained a political foothold is those states that have national laboratories. New Mexico’s Democratic Senator Pete Domenici was long a leading supporter because of the Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories. Senator Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, which hosts Oak Ridge and the Tennessee Valley Authority, has now picked up the mantle. But Tennessee is much more involved in the auto industry and there is no “nuclear state” to match the half-dozen coal states. Well then, what about the 104 reactors that operate around the country? Don’t they generate some political support? The average reactor employs about 650 people and is extremely popular in its home territory. Bisconti Research has found that support for nuclear increases to around 85 percent in communities that host reactors. But this support tends to be highly localized and reactors create little ancillary employment. Replacing the fuel rods, for instance, requires only six tractor trailers arriving once every 18 months. Illinois gets almost half its electricity from nuclear and even Barack Obama was known to say a few nice things about it while he was Senator from Illinois. But most states with large nuclear complexes are equally committed to coal. Even in a state that is highly dependent on nuclear, the work force is so small as to be inconsequential. Vermont gets 60 percent of its electricity form Vermont Yankee, yet its efforts to close down the reactor have generated very little pushback. Vernon, the tiny town of 2,000 that supplies all this energy, is 100 percent in favor of keeping the reactor. But its interests are completed swamped by 623,000 other Vermonters who only get clean, cheap energy from nuclear and think they can do the same by covering the green mountains with 45-story windmills. The only place where nuclear has built a true constituency is in the South. This is partly because of the many military veterans in the region, since a large portion of the nuclear workforce has come up through the Nuclear Navy. South Carolina is probably the most pro-nuclear state in the country with Georgia and Tennessee also strongly in favor. It is no accident that the four new reactors licensed for construction will be built in Georgia and South Carolina. Areva is also completing its plutonium recycling plant at the Savannah River Site. But all these states are pretty much locked up for Republicans and have very little impact at the national level. So nuclear’s weakness is plain to see. It does very poorly at creating the kind of widespread employment that builds political constituencies. It is only good at producing energy.

### \*Ext – SMRs Hurt Readiness

***SMR’s kill readiness:***

***A) Training exercises***

**King 11** (Marcus King, Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team at Center for Naval Analyses, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>)

**The key factor that DoD must consider in the siting of nuclear reactors is the potential impact on training and readiness**. **All reactors regulated by the NRC have designated exclusion areas. The exclusion area is the area surrounding the reactor, in which the reactor licensee has the authority to determine all activities, including exclusion or removal of personnel and property from the area**. The existence of an exclusion area would not necessarily prohibit military training. According to the NRC definition, This area may be traversed by a highway, railroad, or waterway, provided these are not so close to the facility as to interfere with normal operations of the facility and provided appropriate and effective arrangements are made to control traffic on the highway, railroad, or waterway, in case of emergency, to protect the public health and safety [48].

***Effective training key to readiness and heg***

**ICMA 06** (ICMA International City/County Management Association, NACo National Association of Counties, Working With Local Governments: A Practical Guide for Installations, <http://www.fedcenter.gov/_kd/Items/actions.cfm?action=Show&item_id=6203&destination=ShowItem>, jj)

**The U.S. military is responsible for protecting the American people and U.S. interests around the world. To maintain the country’s premier military edge, troops must have the best and most realistic training and preparation for the challenges of combat before they go to war**. **Restrictions** caused by increased growth and development **can have a detrimental impact on the military’s ability to “train as we fight**.” **If trainees receive restricted or inadequate training, they are more likely to misunderstand combat strategies and tactics, leading to poor skills and unsafe practices on the battlefield.**

***B) Accidents --- they make bases unusable***

**King 11** (Marcus King, Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team at Center for Naval Analyses, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>)

Another factor to consider is that the exclusion area for SMRs are likely to be smaller than those established for large reactors. **DoD must also consider the potential effect of military training on reactor operations**. **Reactors must be designed to the criteria that no accidents at nearby military facilities may threaten nuclear plant safety** [48]. NRC regulations note that **accidents at nearby military facilities such as munitions storage areas and ordinance test ranges may threaten safety**. **Flight training is another area of concern. The NRC stipulates that nuclear plant developers should identify airports within 16 km, and the risks of potential incidents must be taken into consideration** [48]. **Hybrid concepts that include industrial facilities associated with nuclear reactors raise additional safety concerns. Another factor is whether a nuclear accident would affect critical DoD missions.** **It is important that DoD consider only those sites that support missions that are not so critical to national security so that if an interruption caused by a nuclear incident, or an evacuation order, would create lasting damage to national security.**

### \*Ext – Unilat Turn

***Nuclear tech has unique stigma --- causes host nation backlash --- also proves the links to our community relations disads***

**Causbie 12** (CADET HANSON CAUSBIE ’12, CO F3, WEST POINT, NEW YORK, 13 MARCH 2012, US Military Academy, DEPLOYABLE NUKES: THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN THE DEPLOYED ENVIRONMENT, online, jj)

**These challenges do not exist with the current power infrastructure**. Personnel are already trained to maintain generators with minimum security and safety requirements. Generators also do not require special transport as they are not considered as volatile and dangerous as their nuclear counterparts. Additionally, **the *stigma* associated with nuclear power does not exist with diesel power production**. **Education of the military population regarding the safety of nuclear power as well as our coalition partners is essential to successful use of this technology**. **While a host nation may not have an issue with diesel generators they may have concerns with the installation of a nuclear power facility on their own soil.**

***DoD SMRs don’t happen in a vacuum --- plan has key diplomatic implications --- it’s perceived internationally and freaks out allies and local populations***

**Xie 11** (Yanmei Xie, Platts Nucleonics Week, 6-30-11, Small reactors a hard sell for military, Lexis, jj)

**The cost-benefit calculation for energy supply changes dramatically at military bases in combat zones.** For example, to maintain bases in Afghanistan, the US military ships fuel from places like Russia and Turkey, said Roege. Not only is it expensive to transport the fuel, he said, "people are killed; forces are diverted from other tasks." Therefore, a high-density energy source that could replace batteries and diesel shipped from afar "would certainly have a clear benefit, in terms of the logistics to deliver the energy," Roege said. Given conditions at such forward operation bases, small nuclear reactors are the "best option" to meet the military's energy needs, said Farrell of Radix. That is the conclusion he reached after leading a study that began seven years ago under a contract by the US Army Research Laboratory. The study was conducted by BrookhavenTechnology Group, of which Farrell is president. Based on that conclusion, Brookhaven began to design a reactor that could be transported with the fuel sealed in the core so that the entire reactor could be removed "without changing fuel onsite," Farrell said. The reactor was named DEER, for deployable electric energy reactor. But **when the company presented its findings to the Army three years ago, it received mixed responses**. "**There were some who thought** it was a very good idea and could be handled and others who thought **it was just not appropriate for the Army to be thinking about nuclear at all**," Farrell said. Although "there continues to be strong interest" in nuclear power from the Army, he said, financial support for the project dried up three years ago. That was when Radix was formed to commercialize the DEER reactor concept and seek civilian investors and customers, Farrell said. Portable nuclear reactors make "a compelling case" for forward bases and the military would buy reactors under those conditions, said Roege, but "**there's a whole host of downstream cost-and-benefits that would need to considered." These include the expense of operating and securing the reactor and the consequences of an accident or it being captured by the enemy**, he said. In addition, **"somebody would look at the *diplomatic implications*" of running nuclear reactors in foreign, sometimes "hostile" countries**, Roege said.

### \*Ext – Attacks/Terror DA

***1) Meltdowns --- SMRs will be subject to numerous mortar attacks --- raises huge safety issues that obviously turn readiness --- independently causes extinction***

**Mcpherson 11**—Prof. of natural resources @ the University of Arizona (w/ 10 books & over 100 papers & articles) (Guy, above, 11/9/11, “Three paths to near-term human extinction,” http://transitionvoice.com/2011/11/three-paths-to-near-term-human-extinction/, alp)

Safely shuttering a nuclear power plant requires a decade or two of careful planning. Far sooner, we’ll complete the ongoing collapse of the industrial economy. This is a source of my nuclear nightmares. **When** the world’s 443 **nuclear power plants melt down** catastrophically, ***we’ve entered an extinction event***. Think clusterfukushima, times 400 or so. **Ionizing radiation** could, and probably **will, destroy every terrestrial** organism and, therefore, every **marine and freshwater organism. That**, by the way, **includes the most unique, special, intelligent animal on Earth**. You’ve been warned repeatedly in this space, and the Guardian finally joins the party: The industrial economic system is about to blow. This burst of hope, our remaining chance at salvation, will undoubtedly be greeted with the usual assortment of protests, ridicule, and hate mail I’ve come to expect from planetary consumers who want to keep consuming the planet.

***SMRs not meltdown proof --- ignore aff ev***

**Lyman 11** Dr. Edwin Lyman, SENIOR SCIENTIST, GLOBAL SECURITY, UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS, HEARING before a SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ SPECIAL HEARING JULY 14, 2011--WASHINGTON DC <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112shrg72251/html/CHRG-112shrg72251.htm>, jj

**Proponents of** small modular reactors (**SMRs) claim that their designs have inherent safety features compared to large reactors, and some even argue that their reactors would have been able to withstand an event as severe as Fukushima. We find these claims to be unpersuasive**. **For any plant**--large or small--**the key factor is the most severe event that the plant is designed to withstand**--the so-called maximum ``design-basis'' event. **Unless nuclear safety requirements for new reactors are significantly strengthened, one cannot expect that either small or large reactors will be able to survive a beyond-design- basis event like Fukushima**. Although some light-water SMR concepts may have desirable safety characteristics, **unless they are carefully designed, licensed, deployed and inspected, SMRs could pose comparable or even greater safety, security and proliferation risks than large reactors.**

**Some SMR vendors argue that their reactors will be safer because they can be built underground.** While **underground siting** could enhance protection against certain events, such as aircraft attacks and earthquakes, it **could** also **have disadvantages** as well. For instance, **emergency diesel generators and electrical switchgear at Fukushima Daiichi were installed below grade to reduce their vulnerability to seismic events, but this increased their susceptibility to flooding**. **And in the event of a serious accident, emergency crews could have greater difficulty accessing underground reactors.**

**Some SMR vendors emphasize that their designs are ``passively safe''**. However, **no credible reactor design is completely passive and can shut itself down and cool itself in every circumstance without need for intervention**. Some reactor designs--large or small--have certain passive safety features that allow the reactor to depend less on operator action for a limited period of time following design-basis accidents. Small reactors may have an advantage because the lower the power of a reactor, the easier it is to cool through passive means such as natural convection cooling with water or even with air. However, **accidents affecting multiple small units may cause complications that could outweigh the advantages of having lower heat removal requirements per unit**. Moreover, **passively safe reactors generally require some equipment, such as valves, that are designed to operate automatically, but are not 100 percent reliable.**

**Operators will always be needed to monitor systems to ensure they are functioning as designed, and to intervene if they fail to do so. Both passive systems and operator actions would require functioning instrumentation and control systems, which were unreliable during the severe accidents at Three Mile Island and Fukushima**. **Passive systems may not work as intended in the event of beyond-design-basis accidents, and as result passive designs should also be equipped with highly reliable active backup systems and associated instrumentation and control systems**.

**But more backup systems generally mean higher costs. This poses a particular problem for SMRs, which begin with a large economic disadvantage compared to large reactors.**

According to the standard formula for economies-of-scale, the overnight capital cost per kilowatt of a 125 megawatt reactor would be roughly 2.5 times greater than that of a 1,250 megawatt unit, all other factors being equal. Advocates argue that SMRs offer advantages that can offset this economic penalty, such as a better match of supply and demand, reduced upfront financing costs, reduced construction times, and an accelerated benefit from learning from the construction of multiple units. However, **a 2007 paper** by Westinghouse scientists and their collaborators **that quantified the cost savings associated with some of these factors found that they could not overcome the size penalty:** the paper found that at best, **the capital cost of four 335 megawatt reactors was slightly greater than that of one 1,340 megawatt reactor.**\1\

Given that **there is no apparent capital cost benefit for SMRs**, it is not surprising that the SMR industry is seeking to reduce operating and maintenance (O&M) costs by pressuring the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to weaken certain regulatory requirements for SMRs. Deputy Assistant Energy Secretary John Kelly told the NRC in March that the NRC's regulatory requirements for SMRs will ``directly influence the operating cost, which will be a large determinant into the economic feasibility of these plants.''

For example, the industry argues that regulatory requirements for SMRs in areas such as emergency planning, control room staffing, and security staffing can be weakened because SMRs contain smaller quantities of radioactive substances than large reactors and therefore pose lower risks to the public. The NRC is currently considering the technical merits of these arguments.

However, **small reactors will not necessarily be safer than large reactors on a per-megawatt basis**. **Simply put, the risk to the public posed by one 1,200-megawatt reactor will be comparable to that posed by six 200-megawatt reactors** (assuming that all units are independent), **unless the likelihood of a serious accident is significantly lower for each small reactor. But such an outcome will not be assured under the current regulatory regime**. **The NRC has a long-standing policy that new nuclear reactors--large or small--are not required to be safer than operating reactors.** **One consequence of this policy is that new reactor designs that have inherent safety features not present in current reactors may not actually end up being safer in the final analysis if designers compensate by narrowing safety margins in other areas, such as by reducing containment strength or the diversity and redundancy of safety systems. Any safety advantages will be eroded further if the NRC allows SMR owners to reduce emergency planning zones and the numbers of required operators and security officers.**

**One of the early lessons from Fukushima is that prevention of serious nuclear accidents requires significant margins of safety to protect against extreme events**. Earlier this week, UCS and the NRC's Fukushima Near-Term Task Force each issued recommendations for strengthening nuclear safety requirements. Consider the following examples:

--Emergency planning zones around U.S. nuclear plants extend to a radius of 10 miles. Yet significant radiological contamination from the Fukushima accident has been detected well beyond a distance of 10 miles from the plant. In fact, radiation levels high enough to trigger resettlement if they occurred in the United States have been detected more than 30 miles away from the Fukushima site. **The discussion we should be having today is whether current emergency planning zones need to be increased, not whether we can shrink them for SMRs.**

--**As we have seen at Fukushima, nuclear plants with multiple reactors that experience severe accidents present extreme challenges**. In its June 2011 report to the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency of Japan (NISA) stated that:

``**The accident occurred at more than one reactor at the same time, and the resources needed for accident response had to be dispersed**. Moreover, as two reactors shared the facilities, the physical distance between the reactors was small . . . The development of an accident occurring at one reactor affected the emergency responses at nearby reactors.

``Reflecting on the above issues, Japan will take measures to ensure that emergency operations at a reactor where an accident occurs can be conducted independently from operation at other reactors if one power station has more than one reactor. Also, Japan will assure the engineering independence of each reactor to prevent an accident at one reactor from affecting nearby reactors. In addition, Japan will promote the development of a structure that enables each unit to carry out accident responses independently, by choosing a responsible person for ensuring the nuclear safety of each unit.''

**The NRC will need to consider these issues in developing its licensing approach for small modular reactor sites, which may host two to four times the number of units present at the largest U.S. nuclear plant site today**. **The NRC has acknowledged that some of its current regulations and procedures do not account for events affecting multiple units on a site**. For instance, according to the NRC, emergency planning regulations focus on single-unit events with regard to requirements for emergency operations staffing, facilities, and dose projection capability. Also, the NRC's guidance for probabilistic risk assessment, an analysis tool which is used in many regulatory applications, does not require the consideration of multiple- unit events. The NRC Fukushima Near-Term Task Force is recommending that emergency preparedness requirements be revised to address multi-unit events, which could have a significant impact on SMR licensing.

--**Fukushima also demonstrated how rapidly a nuclear reactor accident can progress to a core meltdown if multiple safety systems are disabled**. **A well-planned and executed terrorist attack could cause damage comparable to or worse than the earthquake and tsunami that initiated the Fukushima crisis, potentially in even less time**. And although Osama bin Laden is gone, **the terrorist threat to domestic infrastructure may actually increase over time if al Qaeda seeks to retaliate**. **This is the wrong time to consider reducing security requirements for nuclear powerplants, regardless of their size**. However, **SMR vendors have emphasized that reducing security staffing is critical for the economic viability of their projects**. Christofer Mowry of B&W told the NRC in March that ``whether **SMRs get deployed in large numbers or not is going to come down to operations and maintenance** (O&M). **And the biggest variable that we can attack directly . . . is the security issue.''** A Nuclear Energy Institute representative said in a presentation in June that ``**optimal security staffing levels (for SMRs) may appreciably differ from current levels.''**

UCS is also concerned that **reducing safety and security requirements for SMRs could facilitate their sale to utilities or other entities in the United States and abroad that do not have prior experience with nuclear power.** **Some SMR vendors argue that their technology is so safe that it can be deployed to remote areas, military bases, and countries in the developing world that have relatively low electric demand and no nuclear experience or emergency planning infrastructure. However, SMRs deployed in this manner could raise additional safety and security concerns compared to their deployment by established and experienced nuclear utilities.**

### \*\*\*\*\*\*Ext – Grid = Resilient

***Grid is resilent – Katrina proves***

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

This conclusion is different from the strategic consequences on a cyber attack on the power grid. **The United States routinely suffers blackouts. The nation does not collapse. In the short term, military power and economic strength are not noticeably affected - a good example for opponents to consider is Hurricane Katrina, which caused massive damage but did not degrade U.S. military power in or even long-term economic performance**. **Is there any cyber attack that could match the hurricane?**

**The United States is a very large collection of targets with many different pieces making up its electrical infrastructure. While a single attack could interrupt service, the large size and complexity of the American economy make it more resilient. Even without a Federal response plan, the ability of electrical companies to work quickly together to restore service is impressive and we should not underestimate the ingenuity of targets to recover much more rapidly than expected. This is a routine occurrence in aerial bombing:** impressive damage is quickly rectified by a determined opponent.

***Prefer our evidence—grid is actively improving***

**Koerth-Baker**, science editor – Boing Boing, columnist – NYT Magazine, electric grid expert, 8/3/**’12**

(Maggie, “Blackout: What's wrong with the American grid,” <http://boingboing.net/2012/08/03/blackout-whats-wrong-with-t.html>)

But this is about more than mere bad luck. **The real causes of the 2003 blackout were fixable problems**, ***and*** the good news is that, since then, ***we’ve made great strides in fixing them.*** The bad news, say some grid experts, is that we’re still not doing a great job of preparing our electric infrastructure for the future.¶ Let’s get one thing out of the way right up front: **The North American electric grid is not one bad day away fro**m the kind of **catastrophic failures** we saw in India this week. I’ve heard a lot of people speculating on this, but the **folks who know the grid say that, while such a huge blackout is theoretically possible, it is** also ***extremely unlikely.*** As Clark **Gellings, a fellow at the Electric Power Research Institute put it, “An engineer will never say never,” but *you should definitely not*** ***assume*** anything resembling ***an imminent threat*** at that scale. Remember, the blackouts this week cut power to half of all Indian electricity customers. Even **the 2003 blackout**—the largest blackout in North America ever—**only affected about 15% of Americans.**¶ We don’t know yet what, exactly, caused the Indian blackouts, but there are several key differences between their grid and our grid. **India’s electricity is only weakly tied to the people who use it**, Gellings told me. Most of the power plants are in the far north. Most of the population is in the far south. **The power lines** linking the two **are neither robust nor numerous. That’s not a problem we have in North America.**¶ Likewise, **India has considerably more demand for electricity** than it has supply. **Even on a good day, there’s not enough electricity for all the people who want it**, said Jeff Dagle, an engineer with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory’s Advanced Power and Energy Systems research group. “**They’re pushing their system** much harder, **to its limits**,” he said. “**If they have a problem, there’s less cushion to absorb it**. **Our system has rules that prevent us from dipping into our electric reserves** on a day-to-day basis. So ***we have reserve power for emergencies***.”

***Their ev is hype***

**Sorebo**, chief cybersecurity technologist and vice president – SAIC, consultant for the government and industry in cybersecurity and smart grid technology, MA – GW University, JD – Catholic U, 2/8/**’10**

(Gib, “The Many Shades of Project Grey Goose,” RSA Conference)

As I noted in my previous post about a recent 60 Minutes segment, we often rely on rumor and innuendo as the basis for **journalism in critical infrastructure**. If a current or former high-ranking public official says he heard something, then it must be true. Unfortunately, Project Grey Goose, whose stated objective was “to answer the question of whether there has been any successful hacker attacks against the power grid, both domestically and internationally,” **falls victim to** much of the same **fear, uncertainty, and doubt.** As in all media **reports**, there are factual bases for findings that ***exaggerated the true state of the electric grid.*** For example, **the**ir **statement that “90% of the** U.S. Department of Defense's (**DOD**) **most critical assets are entirely dependent on the bulk power grid” is presumably taken from a** Government Accountability Office (**GAO**) **report noting that 85 percent of critical DoD assets rely on commercial electric power.** However, **the “entirely dependent” statement *ignores the wide variety of backup generators that support these assets***, and while not adequate, are nonetheless ***a significant contribution to the reliability of critical DoD assets.*** So rather than sounding the alarm that military bases, for the most part, do not have their own power plants, a better response would have been to suggest that the military expand the use of backup generators and micro-grid technology to augment commercial power as **the GAO report** does. Of course, that **would not grab as many headlines.**

Similarly, the Grey Goose Report note that “[m]ost Grid asset owners and operators have been historically resistant to report cyber attacks against their networks as well as make the necessary investments to upgrade and secure their networks.” **While it may be true that incidents are underreported, the implication** that the electricity industry is deficient compared to other industrial sectors **is misleading or even wrong**. Most companies do not report security incidents unless legally required to or to mitigate the harm to their customers, and even then the evidence of an intrusion and theft of data had better be definitive. Lost laptops and backup tapes are one thing. You cannot say they are within your control if they go missing. However, **organizations in general have a horrible record of even detecting when a successful attack has occurred let alone what was taken.** Like many industries, **the electricity industry has struggled to pinpoint the source of many disruptions associated with their network infrastructure.** **More often than not, the problems were inadvertent and not malicious.** We can certainly do better, and with technologies like Smart Grid, we have to. However, calling out the electricity industry for failures that we’ve all been subjected to is not very productive.

The other statements made about the vulnerabilities in the electricity sector are misleading. While North American Electric Reliability Corporation Critical Infrastructure Protection (NERC CIP) still does not apply to many aspects of the electrical grid for a variety of jurisdictional reasons, where it does apply, it is not voluntary, as the many utilities subjected to rigorous and painful audits can attest. The process may not be perfect, but **utilities are being subjected to scrutiny.** Moreover, **anyone receiving stimulus grants** under the Department of Energy’s Smart Grid grant program **has to demonstrate a very rigorous approach to cyber security** through the entire implementation life cycle.

Finally, **the report cites a litany of vulnerabilities** discovered **in various Smart Grid devices** such as meters and perpetuates speculation about the potential impact on the grid without considering compensating security controls. **Nowhere does the report cite names of vulnerable vendors** **nor does it provide any information about whether these vulnerable products have actually been implemented. It’s like saying that tests on personal computers showed that they were vulnerable to attack without identifying the operating system or** the **applications** running on the device.

# Round 6 – Neg V UMich AP

## 1NC

### T

#### Interpretation and violation --- production is the extraction of hydrocarbons --- the plan lifts a restriction on leasing which falls under the exploration phase

GDF SUEZ, no date global gas and lng division (GDS SUEZ, Global Gas %26 LNG Division, "Exploration and production of natural gas," <http://www.gdfsuez.com/en/businesses/gas/natural-gas-prospection-production/-http://www.gdfsuez.com/en/businesses/gas/natural-gas-prospection-production/>)

Exploration is the first stage of the gas chain. At the core of this essential activity, GDF SUEZ specialists (geologists, geophysicists, engineers, etc.) analyze the structure of the soil to detect areas liable to contain hydrocarbons. They carry out specific tests, such as seismic analyses, to confirm their initial studies. When there is a high probability of discovering gas (or oil), wells are drilled. If those wells prove successful, production (extraction and processing of the natural gas or oil) can start. Exploration-production activities also include the acquisition of licenses (the right to explore then exploit a field) from the authorities of the countries in which those fields are located.

#### Voting issue –

#### A. Limits – allows any minute combination of leasing restriction modification --- crushes predictability and preparation

#### B. Ground – their interp allows the aff to change leasing requirements without having to defend production is increased --- moots all core DA’s like oil prices and trade off

**DA**

***Comprehensive immigration reform will pass now --- gun control and fiscal issues don’t crowd it out***

**Gonzalez & Nowicki 1-4** Daniel González and Dan Nowicki, The Republic | azcentral.com, ‘Cliff’ fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight, Jan 4, 2013, <http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130103immigration-reform-at-crossroads.html>, jj

Republican and Democratic members of Arizona’s congressional delegation who support **immigration reform** agree it **faces an uphill battle**. **But they remain optimistic that Congress can come to a deal over immigration reform despite competition from the looming fight over spending cuts, gun control** and any other issues that may emerge.

“I think we can walk and chew gum at the same time,” said Rep. Raúl Grijalva, D-Ariz.

Grijalva said immigration reform has been put off long enough.

“That’s what happened to immigration the last time. We kept putting it on the back burner because something else had come up,” he said. “**Having learned that lesson, we on the Democratic side are very much committed not to allow this one to slide to the back burner.”**

However, Rep. Ed Pastor, D-Ariz., warned that the coming “economic tsunami” could swamp efforts to enact immigration reform.

Pastor said upcoming battles in the next few months will be over the federal debt ceiling, spending cuts and the continuing resolution to keep the government funded. Partisan tensions already are high, and the continued bitter fighting over fiscal issues could bruise more feelings and egos on Capitol Hill, which would make bipartisan cooperation less likely on other big issues, he said.

“What we saw New Year’s Day ... is probably a mild storm compared to what is going to happen in Phase 2, Phase 3 and Phase 4,” Pastor said.

But he said **the outlook in the House “looks better for immigration reform” than for gun control**.

Sen. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., who took office Thursday, said he believes the **bipartisan urgency to pass immigration reform that emerged after the election is still there**.

“I think **everyone recognizes that it has to be done this year,” said Flake, who is part of a bipartisan group of senators who have already started laying the groundwork for an immigration bill.**

“**You can’t wait on an issue like this until an election year, and it really has to be done, or started, in the first part of the year**,” he said**. “I do sense that on both sides of the aisle there is a willingness, for different reasons, to get it done and get it behind us.”**

***Natural gas causes massive debates that drain PC --- too many trade offs***

**Ornstein 12** (Norman Ornstein is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. June 27, 2012, American Enterprise Institute, An expanded natural gas focus is no-brainer <http://www.aei.org/article/politics-and-public-opinion/an-expanded-natural-gas-focus-is-no-brainer/>, jj)

While he discusses in some detail why such a program makes sense and why it beats alternatives such as waiting for the industry to do it on its own, I don’t have much interest in pursuing that argument. Instead, the Norris column provoked me to reflect on why whatever one thinks about the role and power of **the federal government**, it **has a clear role in crafting and pursuing a national energy strategy and converting it into policy. What we get instead is the dysfunctional debate, or what passes for debate, in this Congress about natural gas and no debate or action to pursue alternative energy sources.**

Of course, the fireworks have all been about the Keystone XL **oil** pipeline, pitting environmentalists and a majority of Democrats against virtually all Republicans, with much of organized labor joining on the pro-pipeline side. The pipeline **has become a political football**, injected into the campaign but **with little real opportunity for Congress to do anything** about it except a series of efforts by House Republicans to try to leverage the issue to force the White House to give in on the pipeline.

**Faced with staunch environmental opposition** that grew more strident after the administration issued its ozone rule, President Barack **Obama decided to** use his authority to **punt** until after the election, and the issue will stay there for now, although the pipeline in some form will almost surely go forward next year.

**The bigger issue is how we can devise an energy policy that understands we will be dependent for a long time on fossil fuels, especially oil, that finding ways to reduce that dependence and reduce carbon emissions is a high priority and that the solution has to involve a panoply of energy sources, including wind and solar and also natural gas**. Coal and nuclear power are also necessary parts of the solution, but as they have emerged once again in controversy, with nuclear power in retreat after the Japanese earthquake/tsunami, gas looks even more essential.

At one level, **the expanded focus on natural gas ought to be a no-brainer**. We have massive amounts of a fuel that is more efficient and less environmentally damaging than oil or coal, enough to handle our own needs and to make us one of the largest net energy exporters, good for our economy and our foreign policy. The discovery of massive additional amounts of natural gas have reduced prices to a fraction of equivalent amounts of oil.

**But it is also true that** the process of extracting the gas from shale — a method called hydraulic fracturing, or **fracking**, involves the use of sand, water and chemicals at high pressure injected underground — **could have serious environmental and health concerns**.

The word alone sounds awful. We clearly need to explore further how to balance environmental safety while exploiting this resource. **But as with so many other issues, the lines have been drawn between environmentalists and drill-**

**baby-drill proponents, and at hearings that Congress has held on fracking** (all of three this Congress), **lawmakers have basically talked past each other.**

The Keystone XL pipeline aside, there is plenty of action out there in the country. Some Western states, especially, have moved ahead rapidly to expand drilling, while in the East, where the Marcellus Shale has massive quantities of gas to tap, there has been more extensive discussion about dealing with dangers to the underground aquifers and from methane gas released as part of the process.

Democratic New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo has unveiled a policy to limit the drilling to economically struggling parts of the state that border Pennsylvania while leaving it up to each community to decide whether it wants to go forward. That position has left neither energy developers nor environmentalists happy.

And while making sure local communities feel comfortable taking on health risks in return for development and jobs is commendable, having these decisions made at the local level does not substitute for a national energy strategy — or for an accelerated approach to expanding R&D to make the extraction process less messy and dangerous to health and safety.

**There is no easy way to make the necessary trade-offs palatable to all sides**. **Even in the best of times, when Congress was more functional, we had little serious effort to establish a broader energy strategy**. So our dysfunction alone does not explain the failure here. It just adds to my frustration that, **at a time when we have opportunities to expand jobs — including renewable energy jobs — and at the same time help to reduce carbon while expanding our energy capacity, we are floundering.**

***Obama’s PC key to reform that includes a path to citizenship***

**St. Augustine 12/6**/12 Perspective: Obama must push for immigration reform <http://staugustine.com/opinions/2012-12-05/perspective-obama-must-push-immigration-reform#.UNUW5uSx-So>, jj

**Immigration reform is not easy because there are many in Congress who oppose amnesty** for the estimated eleven million undocumented immigrants who live here. During the **Bush** administration he **tried several times** in 2007 **to have a reform passed**. Senators Edward Kennedy and John McCain prepared a good bill that was never passed, **the resistance of many members of the Republican Party prevailed and nothing was done.**

**Everyone agrees** that the issue of a **c**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform **can no longer be postponed**. **It is a question of beginning to work on it immediately**, as soon as the next Congress is in session, perhaps building on prior efforts, **to try to reach a solution that is satisfactory to all**. The **legal status** of eleven million individuals **has to be defined** in some way. A considerable number of them are decent persons useful to society. **Borders must be secured** to prevent illegal entry, **temporary visas could be issued for agricultural workers**, **employers should be compelled** to use a system — already in place — **to verify the status of job applicants**, etc., etc.

**The problem is difficult**, **but not impossible** **to solve** if the legislators negotiate in good faith. It could even be said that this is a humanitarian issue. We are where we are now because nothing was done many years ago. **The president must take the initiative in this new effort, just as he has promised to do.**

***CIR solves Latin American relations and prevents massive instability***

Robert **Gittelson** (Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics, & Public Policy) 20**09** “The Centrists Against the Ideologues: What Are the Falsehoods That Divide Americans on the Issue of Comprehensive Immigration Reform?” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1400764>

However, the above list of security enhancements is only a part of the overall security ramifications of CIR. For example, as **everyone**—including our enemies all over the world—**knows, our military manpower is strained to the limit. Our troops are on a seemingly endless loop of deployment**s, with no imminent relief in sight. Our **military recruiting officers are struggling to meet the vital new quotas for fresh servicemen and women**, and scandals have started to come to light of instances where we have waived or lowered our induction standards.28 We are also offering record high bonus inducements to lure potential recruits to join the armed forces.29 **CIR can really help us in this regard, with the potential addition of millions of military age, able-bodied men and women, should CIR allow them to legalize their status. This would not only increase the potential pool of new recruits; it would allow the military to once again raise standards**, and— because of the laws of supply and demand—**they could save much-needed revenue** by lowering the bonuses that they are currently offering due to the short supply of potential seamen, soldiers, and airmen. The long-term benefit to our country through the addition of these potential recruits is that these young men and women would receive valuable training for advancement in life in whatever career path they should choose. They would be able to take advantage of the laws governing accelerated citizenship for immigrants who serve in the military, and, of course, our country—and by extension **the entire world**—**would be safer because of this** provision of **CIR**. In the alternative, **should we fail to pass CIR,** and instead opt to deport or force attrition on these millions of economic refugees through an enforcement-only approach to our current undocumented immigrant difficulties, what would be the net result? Forgetting for now **the devastating effect on our own economy, and the worldwide reproach and loss of moral authority** that we would frankly deserve should we act so callously and thoughtlessly, there **is** another **important** political imperative to our **passing CIR** that **affects** our national security, and **the** security and **political stability of our neighbors in our hemisphere**. That is the very real threat of communism and/or socialism. First of all, the primary reason why millions of undocumented economic refugees migrated to the United States is because the economies of their home countries were unable to support them. They escaped extreme poverty and oppression, and risked literally everything they had, including their lives and their freedom, to come to this country to try to work hard and support themselves and their families. **Deporting our illegal immigrant population back to primarily Latin America would boost the communist and socialist movements in that part of our hemisphere**, and if the anti-immigrationists only understood that fact, they might re-think their “line in the sand” position on what they insist on calling “amnesty.” Communism thrives where hope is lost. **The economies of Latin American nations are struggling to barely reach a level of meager subsistence for the population that has remained at home;** Mexico, for example, has already lost 14% of their able-bodied workers to U.S. migration.30 **Without the billions of dollars in remissions from these nations’ expatriates working in the United States that go back to help support their remaining family members, the economies of many of these countries, most of whom are in fact our allies, would certainly collapse**, or at least deteriorate **to dangerously unstable levels. The addition of millions of unemployed and frustrated deported people** who would go to the end of the theoretical unemployment lines of these already devastated economies **would surely cause massive unrest and anti-American sentiment**. The issue of comprehensive immigration reform is not simply a domestic issue. In our modern global economy, everything that we do, as the leaders of that global economy, affects the entire world, **and** most especially our region of the world. If we were to naively initiate actions that **would lead to the destabilization of the Mexican and many Central and South American governments,** while at the same time **causing serious harm to our own economy** (but I digress . . .), it would most assuredly lead to disastrous economic and political consequences. By the way, I’m not simply theorizing here. In point of fact, over the past few years, eight countries in Latin America have elected leftist leaders. Just last year, Guatemala swore in their first leftist president in more than fifty years, Alvaro Colom.31 He joins a growing list. Additional countries besides Guatemala, Venezuela,32 and Nicaragua33 that have sworn in extreme left wing leaders in Latin America recently include Brazil,34 Argentina,35 Bolivia,36 Ecuador,37 and Uruguay.38 This phenomenon is not simply a coincidence; it is a trend. **The political infrastructure of Mexico is under extreme pressure** from the left.39 Do we really want a leftist movement on our southern border? If our political enemies such as the communists **Chavez** in Venezuela **and Ortega** in Nicaragua **are calling the shots in Latin America, what kind of cooperation can we expect in our battle to secure our southern border**?

***The impact is global great power wars***

**Rochin ‘94**  
Rochin, Professor of Political Science, ‘94 James, Professor of Political Science at Okanagan University College, Discovering the Americas: the evolution of Canadian foreign policy towards Latin America, pp. 130-131

While there were economic motivations for Canadian policy in Central America, security considerations were perhaps more important. Canada possessed an interest in promoting stability in the face of a potential decline of U.S. hegemony in the Americas. **Perceptions of declining U.S. influence in the region** – which had some credibility in 1979-1984 due to the wildly inequitable divisions of wealth in some U.S. client states in Latin America, in addition to political repression, under-development, mounting external debt, anti-American sentiment produced by decades of subjugation to U.S. strategic and economic interests, and so on – **were linked to the prospect of explosive events occurring in the hemisphere**. Hence, **the Central American imbroglio was viewed as a fuse which could ignite a cataclysmic process throughout the region.** Analysts at the time worried that in a worst-case scenario, **instability created by a regional war, beginning in Central America and spreading elsewhere in Latin America, might preoccupy Washington to the extent that the United States would be unable to perform adequately its important hegemonic role in the international arena** – a concern expressed by the director of research for Canada’s Standing Committee Report on Central America. It was feared that **such a predicament could generate increased global instability and perhaps even a hegemonic war**. This is one of the motivations which led Canada to become involved in efforts at regional conflict resolution, such as Contadora, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

### CP

#### The United States federal government should repeal the Environmental Protection Agency’s New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews for natural gas production. The United States federal government should issue a moratorium on further federal restrictions on hydraulic fracturing for natural gas production in the United States.

#### The USFG should issue a moratorium on offshore oil and natural gas production.

***Federal restrictions are the only thing holding back a shale gas revolution – it solves the aff***

Russell ‘12

Barry Russell, President, Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA), National Journal, 1-17-12, What's Ahead for Natural Gas? http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/whats-ahead-for-natural-gas.php?mrefid=site\_search, jj

Furthermore, as President Obama touts the benefits of natural gas, his administration has embarked upon a double-flanked assault on the oil and natural gas industry, led by the ***E***nvironmental ***P***rotection ***A***gency and the Interior Department. These federal agencies have sought to regulate hydraulic fracturing and instill unfounded fear about its side-effects and management at every turn. The states are well-equipped to handle the environmental issues surrounding development. After all, they have been regulating hydraulic fracturing for decades. More and more states have been utilizing FracFocus, the chemical registry website on which companies voluntarily disclose their hydraulic fracturing fluids to the public. The state regulatory systems can deal with each state’s different geological and environmental complexities. ***Attempting to operate a federal regulatory regime out of Washington, with limited funds and regulators, would cause confusion and cost many jobs.***America’s natural gas industry has quite a future – as long as it’s not impeded by politically motivated forces. ***The administration must*** make its campaign rhetoric a reality and ***call off its massive federal overreach***. If states remain empowered to continue their responsible regulation of hydraulic fracturing, natural gas will certainly power America’s future.

#### Offshore drilling causes massive accidents that wreck ecosystems

Schlickeisen ‘10

Rodger Schlickeisen, President and CEO, Defenders of Wildlife, National Journal, July 12, 2010, Should Congress Expand Offshore Drilling? <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/07/should-congress-expand-offshor.php>, jj

Each day that oil continues to gush into the Gulf of Mexico should serve as one more nail in the coffin of dirty fossil fuels. Each wave that brings thick crude upon formerly pristine beaches, each pelican that struggles to spread its oil-coated wings, each fisherman who wonders how he’ll feed his family now that his livelihood has been compromised. So the answer to the question posed by Senator Graham is NO. America’s dependence on foreign oil and dirty fossil fuels has already reached critical mass – and in light of the Gulf oil disaster and everything that is at risk from oil and gas exploration, it’s time for the country to make a serious push for the development of clean, renewable sources of energy. Offshore oil and gas drilling is a risky, dangerous operation that threatens American lives, jobs, environment and natural resources. By expanding offshore drilling, Congress would open the Gulf region, Arctic and Atlantic coast to more disasters such as the Deepwater Horizon spill. We now know that oil companies cannot promise that their drilling procedures are safe, either in the Gulf or in the Arctic, where it will be even more difficult to control a spill. Without a moratorium on new offshore drilling, we can anticipate even more costly spills in the future, destroying coastal communities and wildlife habitats.

#### Ecosystem collapse causes extinction

Coyne and Hoekstra ‘7 (Jerry professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago \*\*AND Hopi Associate Professor in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University, The New Republic, “The Greatest Dying,” 9/24, <http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatest-dying>)

But it isn't just the destruction of the rainforests that should trouble us. Healthy ecosystems the world over provide hidden services like waste disposal, nutrient cycling, soil formation, water purification, and oxygen production. Such services are best rendered by ecosystems that are diverse. Yet, through both intention and accident, humans have introduced exotic species that turn biodiversity into monoculture. Fast-growing zebra mussels, for example, have outcompeted more than 15 species of native mussels in North America's Great Lakes and have damaged harbors and water-treatment plants. Native prairies are becoming dominated by single species (often genetically homogenous) of corn or wheat. Thanks to these developments, soils will erode and become unproductive - which, along with temperature change, will diminish agricultural yields. Meanwhile,with increased pollution and runoff, as well as reduced forest cover, ecosystems will no longer be able to purify water; and a shortage of clean water spells disaster.     In many ways, oceans are the most vulnerable areas of all. As overfishing eliminates major predators, while polluted and warming waters kill off phytoplankton, the intricate aquatic food web could collapse from both sides. Fish, on which so many humans depend, will be a fond memory. As phytoplankton vanish, so does the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. (Half of the oxygen we breathe is made by phytoplankton, with the rest coming from land plants.) Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion.     In fact, the global value of "hidden" services provided by ecosystems - those services, like waste disposal, that aren't bought and sold in the marketplace - has been estimated to be as much as $50 trillion per year, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of all countries combined. And that doesn't include tangible goods like fish and timber. Life as we know it would be impossible if ecosystems collapsed. Yet that is where we're heading if species extinction continues at its current pace.     Extinction also has a huge impact on medicine. Who really cares if, say, a worm in the remote swamps of French Guiana goes extinct? Well, those who suffer from cardiovascular disease. The recent discovery of a rare South American leech has led to the isolation of a powerful enzyme that, unlike other anticoagulants, not only prevents blood from clotting but also dissolves existing clots. And it's not just this one species of worm: Its wriggly relatives have evolved other biomedically valuable proteins, including antistatin (a potential anticancer agent), decorsin and ornatin (platelet aggregation inhibitors), and hirudin (another anticoagulant).     Plants, too, are pharmaceutical gold mines. The bark of trees, for example, has given us quinine (the first cure for malaria), taxol (a drug highly effective against ovarian and breast cancer), and aspirin. More than a quarter of the medicines on our pharmacy shelves were originally derived from plants. The sap of the Madagascar periwinkle contains more than 70 useful alkaloids, including vincristine, a powerful anticancer drug that saved the life of one of our friends.     Of the roughly 250,000 plant species on Earth, fewer than 5 percent have been screened for pharmaceutical properties. Who knows what life-saving drugs remain to be discovered? Given current extinction rates, it's estimated that we're losing one valuable drug every two years.     Our arguments so far have tacitly assumed that species are worth saving only in proportion to their economic value and their effects on our quality of life, an attitude that is strongly ingrained, especially in Americans. That is why conservationists always base their case on an economic calculus. But we biologists know in our hearts that there are deeper and equally compelling reasons to worry about the loss of biodiversity: namely, simple morality and intellectual values that transcend pecuniary interests. What, for example, gives us the right to destroy other creatures? And what could be more thrilling than looking around us, seeing that we are surrounded by our evolutionary cousins, and realizing that we all got here by the same simple process of natural selection? To biologists, and potentially everyone else, apprehending the genetic kinship and common origin of all species is a spiritual experience - not necessarily religious, but spiritual nonetheless, for it stirs the soul.     But, whether or not one is moved by such concerns, it is certain that our future is bleak if we do nothing to stem this sixth extinction. We are creating a world in which exotic diseases flourish but natural medicinal cures are lost; a world in which carbon waste accumulates while food sources dwindle; a world of sweltering heat, failing crops, and impure water. In the end, we must accept the possibility that we ourselves are not immune to extinction

### K

#### Energy Policy is a product of capitalism’s attempt to increase productivity and profit. This allows for exploitative working conditions and leads to extinction.

ICC ’11 (Nuclear Energy, Capitalism and Communism, August 16, 2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear)

The revolution in the form and quantity of energy available to humanity underpinned the industrial revolution and opened the door from the realm of want to that of plenty. But this revolution was driven by the development of capitalism whose purpose is not the satisfaction of human needs but the increase of capital based on the appropriation of surplus value produced by an exploited working class. Energy is used to drive the development of productivity but it is also a cost of production. It is part of the constant capital alongside raw materials, machines and factories and, as such, tends to increase in relation to the variable capital that is the source of capitalism’s profits. It is this that dictates capitalism’s attitude to energy.

Capitalism has no regard for the use of energy, for the destruction of finite resources, other than as a cost of production. Increased productivity tends to require increased energy, so the capitalists (other than those in the oil industry) are driven to try and reduce the cost of this energy. On the one hand this results in the profligate use of energy for irrational ends, such as transporting similar commodities back and forth across the world and the ceaseless multiplication of commodities that meet no real human need but serve only as a means to extract and realise surplus value. On the other, it leads to the denial of access to energy and to the products of energy for millions of humans who lack the money to be of interest to the capitalists. This is illustrated in Nigeria where Shell pumps out billions of dollars worth of oil while the local people go without or risk their lives by trying to illegally tap the oil from the pipeline. The price is also paid by those working in the energy industries in lives lost and bodies maimed or poisoned and by the environment and all that lives in it, from the polluted, toxic waters of the Thames that characterised 19th century London to the warming of the globe that threatens the future of humanity today.

#### Vote neg on ethics - resisting this reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility

Zizek and Daly 2004

(Slavoj, professor of philosophy at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana, and Glyn, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, Conversations with Zizek, page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

#### The alternative is to withdraw from the ideology of capital. Capitalism only survives because we believe it is a truth claim.

Johnston ’04 (Adrian, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory, The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Žižek’s recent writings isn’t a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Žižek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance ( Žižek, 2001d, pp 22–23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Žižek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of ‘‘magic,’’ that is, the belief in money’s social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance’s powers. The ‘‘external’’ obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, ‘‘internally’’ believe in it – capitalism’s life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others’ belief in the socio-performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism’s frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic’s fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism, makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Žižek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing). Or, the more disquieting possibility to entertain is that some people today, even if one succeeds in exposing them to the underlying logic of their position, might respond in a manner resembling that of the Judas-like character Cypher in the film The Matrix (Cypher opts to embrace enslavement by illusion rather than cope with the discomfort of dwelling in the ‘‘desert of the real’’): faced with the choice between living the capitalist lie or wrestling with certain unpleasant truths, many individuals might very well deliberately decide to accept what they know full well to be a false pseudo-reality, a deceptively comforting fiction (‘‘Capitalist commodity fetishism or the truth? I choose fetishism’’).

**Solvency FL**

***Solvency is super long term***

Kahn ‘10

Chris Kahn, associated press, 3-31-10, MSNBC, The impact of more offshore drilling, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/36121239/ns/business-oil_and_energy/t/impact-more-offshore-drilling/>, jj

The offshore areas are located along relatively pristine parts of the U.S. ***O***uter ***C***ontinental ***S***helf, a new frontier for oil companies. It could take years before drillers will know how much oil can be pumped from these areas, and when. A report by the federal Minerals Management Service noted that most of the seismic data used to evaluate oil and natural gas resources there are more than 25 years old. So the information "may not be adequate" to build maps or develop leases for drilling operations.

***Best case scenario is at least 8 years***

Kahn ‘10

Chris Kahn, associated press, 3-31-10, MSNBC, The impact of more offshore drilling, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/36121239/ns/business-oil_and_energy/t/impact-more-offshore-drilling/>, jj

It will take years for oil companies to find the right pockets of oil and gas, build deepwater platforms and begin pumping crude to onshore refineries. Which companies will be most interested in the new areas? Offshore drilling is expensive, and analysts expect the new leases to be filled by oil giants such as Exxon Mobil, BP and Shell. BP, which already has numerous drilling projects in the Gulf of Mexico, welcomed Obama's announcement on Wednesday. But a company spokesman wouldn't say whether the company planned to bid for any of the new leases. Will this affect gasoline prices? Don't hold your breath. Even if oil exploration in these areas goes exactly as planned, "you're looking at seven or eight years down the road" before that oil can be pumped in large quantities for U.S. refiners, said Mark Gilman, an oil and gas analyst for The Benchmark Company.

#### Onshore gas is sufficient to solve their harms --- but increased reliance on offshore gas means hurricane-induced price spikes are inevitable, flips the aff

AGA ‘12

American Gas Association, 9-6, Abundant Onshore Natural Gas Supply Keeps Prices Stable During Natural Disasters <http://www.truebluenaturalgas.org/abundant-onshore-natural-gas-supply-prices-stable-natural-disasters/>, jj

Hurricane Isaac has made its way across the Gulf Coast and points north. Local residents and businesses in its wake are struggling with the impact of the storms. This region has seen more than its share of natural disasters and is still recovering from previous incidents. Unlike previous hurricanes that have impacted the gulf, Isaac’s effect on natural gas prices was unnoticeable, pointing to a new era in market stability. Whereas hurricanes and other severe coastal weather in the Gulf used to signal shortages and price spikes due to interrupted offshore natural gas production, the now abundant supply of onshore natural gas has led to a new reality for the natural gas market. While natural gas prices rose nearly 14 percent as a result of Hurricane Katrina in 2005, they remained far more stable during Isaac, rising just two percent. This means the natural gas supply in the United States remained steady, even as operations responsible for about 72.5 percent of daily natural gas production in the Gulf of Mexico were shut down. AGA sees several factors contributing to this new stability, the key being that we now have an abundant supply of onshore natural gas in the United States. Gas sourced from onshore shale plays now accounts for about 40 percent of domestic production, while offshore production in the Gulf provides less than 10 percent. Paired with this increased onshore supply, that makes industry less reliant on offshore production, which can be vulnerable to hurricanes and coastal weather systems. Improvements to infrastructure and protection of processing plants have also increased the stability of domestic natural gas supplies. The grid-like structure of the Gulf Coast’s collection and transportation system also allows for gas to be rerouted and for other creative connection solutions, keeping the fuel source flowing. In the past, influences to offshore facilities were not always long-lasting, but the impact of production interruption could last onshore if key facilities were damaged. “Now, given the current national picture for all supply sources,” says AGA Vice President of Policy and Analysis Chris McGill, “we do not believe there will be serious lingering impacts regarding the ability to serve coming winter heating season markets.”

**Manufacturing Adv FL**

***Status quo solves manufacturing, regardless of energy prices***

McKendrick 12/5/12 Joe McKendrick is an independent analyst who tracks the impact of information technology on management and markets. He is the author of the SOA Manifesto and has written for Forbes, ZDNet and Database Trends & Applications. He holds a degree from Temple University. He is based in Pennsylvania. 12/5/12, Smart Planet, 6 reasons manufacturing is returning to North America, <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/bulletin/6-reasons-manufacturing-is-returning-to-north-america/7422>, jj

Lower transportation costs, competitive wages, technology and employee productivity have made North America a manufacturing destination. In a sign of this manufacturing renaissance, GE, one of the world’s largest appliance manufacturers, gearing up its almost-dormant Louisville facilities for new product development and production.

In a new report in The Atlantic, Charles Fishman describes how the “insourcing” boom is bringing back manufacturing to North American shores.

He cites a number of reasons why manufacturing is suddenly so attractive again:

High transportation costs: “Oil prices are three times what they were in 2000, making cargo-ship fuel much more expensive now than it was then.”

Lower domestic energy costs: “The natural-gas boom in the U.S. has dramatically lowered the cost for running something as energy-intensive as a factory here at home,” Fishman relates, adding that “natural gas now costs four times as much in Asia as it does in the U.S.”

Offshore wages are rising: “In dollars, wages in China are some five times what they were in 2000—and they are expected to keep rising 18% a year.”

Labor relations are more cooperative: “Appliance Park’s union was so fractious in the ’70s and ’80s that the place was known as ‘Strike City,’” says Fishman.

Employee productivity is rising: “Labor costs have become a smaller and smaller proportion of the total cost of finished goods. You simply can’t save much money chasing wages anymore.”

Offshore factories can’t keep up with design and technology changes: “As products change, as technologies evolve, as years pass, as you change factories to chase lower labor costs, the gap between the people imagining the products and the people making them becomes as wide as the Pacific. Factories take a while to settle into a new product, a new design. They face a learning curve. But models that have a run of only a couple years become outdated just as the assembly line starts to hum. That makes using faraway factories challenging, even if they are cheap.”

Fishman cites GE’s Appliance Park, a mega-site of buildings that was established outside of Louisville, Kentucky in the early 1950s, with employment at the site peaking at 23,000 in 1973. The move to offshore manufacturing eventually dwindled the Appliance Park workforce to 1,863 in 2011. Over the past year, however, two assembly lines have been launched at the facility — one for energy-efficient water heaters and the other for a high-tech refrigerator. Plans are to launch a third assembly line for stainless steel dishwashers in early 2013.

Jason Hiner of TechRepublic (a SmartPlanet sister site) describes the role of information technology in restarting the engines of Appliance Park.

The ability to keep production close to engineering and design is an important aspect of innovation, Fishman adds:

“Bringing jobs back to Appliance Park solves a problem. It is sparking a wave of fresh innovation in GE’s appliances—every major appliance line has been redesigned or will be in the next two years—and the experience of ‘big room’ redesign, involving a whole team, is itself inspiring further, faster advances. In fact, insourcing solves a whole bundle of problems—it simplifies transportation; it gives people confidence in the competitive security of their ideas; it lets companies manage costs with real transparency and close to home; it means a company can be as nimble as it wants to be, because the Pacific Ocean isn’t standing in the way of getting the right product to the right customer.”

The gains to made from the increased innovation possible with in-sourcing back to North American shores more than offsets any gains made by using cheap labor, Fishman points out.

Another force that may bring manufacturing back to North American shores — but not addressed by Fishman in this article — is the rise of 3D printing (or “additive manufacturing” as it’s called in industrial circles). The ability to mass-produce highly customized products with low-priced 3D printers will dramatically lower production costs, and there is no reason why it needs to happen apart from the design source.

***Manufacturing overwhelmingly high***

Worstall ‘11

Tim Worstall, Contributor, Forbes, 6-17-11, What Decline of American Manufacturing? <http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2011/06/17/what-decline-of-american-manufacturing/>, jj

We’re consistently told that US or American manufacturing is in decline. Further, that we really ought to do something about this. However, what’s not commonly realised is that while US manufacturing employment is in decline, American manufacturing is not. In fact, the US is still by a long, long, way the largest manufacturer in the world. As Mark Perry goes on to point out: “ The U.S. ranked #1 in the world for manufacturing, and produced 14% more output than second-ranked China ($2.04 trillion) and twice as much output as third-ranked Japan ($1.15 trillion). What’s most impressive is that the U.S. produced almost as much manufacturing output as the manufacturing sectors of Germany (#4), Italy (#5), France (#6), Russia (#7), U.K. (#8), Brazil (#9) and Canada (#10) combined ($2.44 trillion). If American manufacturing isn’t in decline then what are we supposed to be doing about this thing that isn’t happening?

***Energy costs don’t affect manufacturing costs***

Alden ‘12

Edward Alden, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, 6-1-12, Council on Foreign Relations, Policy Initiative Spotlight: Does Fracking Increase U.S. Competitiveness? <http://blogs.cfr.org/renewing-america/2012/06/01/policy-initiative-spotlight-does-fracking-increase-u-s-competitiveness/>, jj

The size of this advantage—particularly for manufacturing—was the subject of a recent blog post by CFR’s Michael A. Levi. Levi cited reports that indicated only one tenth of U.S. manufacturing industries had energy as more than 5 percent of the cost component. Petrochemical manufacturing is one industry that could experience high growth, because natural gas could be used as a feedstock for many products. But this industry is relatively small and employs around 24,000 in the United States, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is a relatively high wage occupation, however, with an average annual pay of $103,000. Increased domestic production can also reduce the trade deficit by displacing imports. Over the past three years, the value of net natural gas imports fell from $10.3 billion to $7.2 billion, according to the EIA. Rising prices have caused the value of net oil imports to rise, even though the United States imports almost 12 percent fewer barrels of crude oil than it did in 2009, a $41 billion dollar savings at current prices. Greater domestic production could also spur job creation in supporting industries. Levi’s recent post pointed to an IHS-CERA report that argued that in 2010, shale gas supported a total of 71,000 ancillary jobs, and projected that would rise to 124,000 by 2020. Simply put, the expansion of domestic oil and gas production is not—itself—likely to lead to a manufacturing boom in the United States. While firms will enjoy lower electricity and heating bills from lower natural gas prices, few industries will see a substantial decrease in production prices because energy is usually a small portion of total costs. However, shifting from foreign to domestic fuel sources trims the trade deficit, and boosts related industries at home.

***Plan doesn’t solve economy***

Hulbert 11/7—[Matthew Hulbert](http://blogs.forbes.com/matthewhulbert/), Contributor, Forbes, 11/7/12, Obama Ground Zero: Why Cheap American Energy Is The Death Of American Power, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/11/07/obama-ground-zero-why-cheap-american-energy-is-the-death-of-american-power/>, jj

Structural Own Goal: Gas Lessons

And that’s America’s structural flaw here: In comparative terms, cheap energy doesn’t mean much to the American economy, but it means everything to China. Look at the numbers. America’s GDP was around $15trn last year, with the oil and gas sector accounting for little more than 1% of national GDP. America can pump all it likes – it’s never going to shift the needle for a post-industrial economy towards an energy based future. For all the talk of cheap gas giving America a competitive edge, manufacturing only employs 9% of the non-farm workforce in the U.S., and the chemicals sector a mere 0.6%. That’s pretty small beer when you consider America has a total labour force of 155m people. Even when you look at the trade deficit, most analysts think the U.S. will do well to clip it by $150bn towards 2020. Important, but not a ‘game changer’.

***1. Global economy resilient***

**Zakaria ‘9 -** PhD Poli Sci @ Harvard, Zakaria, Editor of Newsweek, 12/12/’9 (Fareed, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425>)

**A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets.** So consider this: **the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year**. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but **it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled**. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "**We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual**?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, **governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s,** when governments played a tiny role in national economies**. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles:** the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. **Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force.** When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.**

***2. Economic collapse doesn’t cause war***

Fareed **Zakaria** was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 20**09**, “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html>

**Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries.** At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. **One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks** (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). **Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran.** Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But **overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**.

***3. US isn’t key to the world economy***

John **Curran, 9-2-2010,** “Can World Economy Keep Growing If U.S. Doesn’t?” Time,<http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/can-world-economy-keep-growing-if-u-s-doesnt/?xid=rsstopstories&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed:+time/topstories+%28TIME:+Top+Stories%29>

A worrying economic question these days is the possibility of a return to negative GDP growth in the U.S, the dreaded double dip. If it happened it could pull much of the world back into recession, possibly triggering another round of financial crisis. Though all but a few consider this a low possibility, it's not so low as to be off the radar. Economists I follow generally put the risk of a U.S. double dip at somewhere between 20% and 35%. There's ample evidence that the U.S. economy is not out of the woods yet. U.S. consumers picked up spending slightly last month, but they are still tentative and their debt levels remain high. Businesses are watching consumers closely because managers are reluctant to commit to new hiring and investment while so many people are out of work. Consumer spending picked up slightly in July, but confidence is weak and retailers are hurting. The latest signs of this come from back-to-school shopping, where price cutting ruled, and tumbling U.S. auto sales (down 21% in August). There is talk of a second federal stimulus but nobody can count those chickens until they hatch. The chicken you can count on, though, is the economic energy coming from developing markets, specifically the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China). Though the BRICs will advance in fits and starts—for more on this, see Michael Schuman's insightful [post](http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/is-red-hot-india-too-hot/) on India and China—the fact of their increasing consumption power now feeds into the global growth calculation in a meaningful way. **The good news is that BRIC growth increasingly makes U.S. growth shortfalls in the years ahead less of a threat for the world economy**. According to work by Jim O'Neill, who heads Goldman Sachs' global economics team, the current value of consumption in the BRIC countries is roughly $4 trillion, still less than half of the $10.5 trillion that U.S. consumers spend. But **O'Neill sees a powerful lift from these countries in the years just ahead. With BRIC consumption growing by roughly 15% per year, he estimates, it should rival that of U.S. consumption by the end of the decade. The world will feel the beneficial effects sooner.**  BRIC consumption is already growing by roughly $600 billion a year and should rise to $1 trillion a year by the middle of the decade, says O'Neill. **Such demand does not all land at the U.S. doorstep but it does flow to the world, providing a nice offset to what is likely to be long-term weakness in U.S. consumption. That's good news for all.**

### Internationalism

#### Still need to import oil

**Spence ‘12**

David B. Spence, Prof. of Law, Politics & Regulation, University of Texas at Austin, Northwestern Law School's Searle Center Conference, Federalism, Regulatory Lags, and Energy Production,

<http://www.law.northwestern.edu/searlecenter/papers/Spence_Federalism_Energy_3-4.pdf>, jj

However, the nature of the energy security gains provided by this source of domestic supply depends upon a number of factors. Currently, Americans use natural gas primarily for domestic heating and cooking, and electricity generation. A reliable supply of inexpensive natural gas could alter the profile of natural gas in the American electric generation mix. Natural gas-fired generation currently comprises a little more than 20 percent of the American electric generation mix,284 and has been the fastest-growing electric generation fuel (by generating capacity) over the last decade.285 **Increasing our natural gas-fired electric generating capacity does little or nothing to increase energy security, since the fuels natural gas would displace are domestically produced. Coal-fired power generation (a little less than 50 percent of the current generation mix), nuclear power (about 20 percent), and renewable power (about 10 percent) all rely on domestically available sources**.286 However, **if the United States were to expand its uses of natural gas to include transportation fuels, domestic natural gas might displace some petroleum imports**, further enhancing the country's energy security. An examination of the conversion of the United States vehicle fleet from gasoline to natural gas is beyond the scope of this article, but it is clear that such a conversion is technically feasible. Many government and corporate vehicle fleets currently run on natural gas,287 and there is at least one commercially available consumer automobile model that runs on natural gas.288 On the other hand, **a larger scale conversion would require a very large investment in infrastructure for refueling a natural gas powered vehicle fleet, an investment that seems unlikely given the dearth of proposals in Congress or the federal energy bureaucracy promoting any such investment.289 Absent a national commitment to such a conversion, the energy security argument for a national licensing regime to ensure natural gas production remains an unpersuasive one.**

#### Mead ev goes neg --- says the status quo solves and plan not key

Mead, 12 [7/15/12, Walter Russell, Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College, Editor at the American Interest, “Energy Revolution 2: A Post Post-American Post,” American Interest, http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/07/15/energy-revolution-2-a-post-post-american-post/]

By some estimates, the United States has more oil than Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran combined, and Canada may have even more than the United States. A GAO report released last May (pdf link can be found [here](http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-740T)) estimates that up to the equivalent of 3 trillion barrels of shale oil may lie in just one of the major potential US energy production sites. If half of this oil is recoverable, US reserves in this one deposit are roughly equal to the [known reserves of the rest of the world combined](http://thecoloradoobserver.com/2012/05/trillions-of-barrels-of-recoverable-oil-in-colorado-utah-gao-estimates/).

Edward Luce, an FT writer usually [more given to tracing America’s decline](http://www.amazon.com/Time-Start-Thinking-America-ebook/dp/B007P5WEK2/ref=sr_1_1_title_1_kin?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1342383469&sr=1-1&keywords=edward+luce+time+to+start+thinking) than to promoting its prospects, cites estimates that as early as 2020 [the US may be producing more oil than Saudi Arabia](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/3f86b2fc-cce4-11e1-9960-00144feabdc0.html#axzz20ihzwGAF).

So dramatic are America’s finds, analysts talk of the US turning into the world’s new Saudi Arabia by 2020, with up to 15m barrels a day of liquid energy production (against the desert kingdom’s 11m b/d this year). Most of the credit goes to private sector innovators, who took their cue from the high oil prices in the last decade to devise ways of tapping previously uneconomic underground reserves of “tight oil” and shale gas. And some of it is down to plain luck. Far from reaching its final frontier, America has discovered new ones under the ground.

Additionally, our natural gas reserves are so large that the US is likely to become a major exporter, and US domestic supplies for hydrocarbon fuels of all types appear to be safe and secure for the foreseeable future. North America as a whole has the potential to be a major exporter of fossil fuels for decades and even generations to come.

Since the 1970s, pessimism about America’s energy future has been one of the cornerstones on which the decline theorists erected their castles of doom; we are now entering a time when energy abundance will be an argument for continued American dynamism.

The energy revolution isn’t a magic wand that can make all America’s wishes come true, but it is a powerful wind in the sails of both America’s domestic economy and of its international goals. The United States isn’t the only big winner of the energy revolution — Canada, Israel and China among others will also make gains — but the likely consequences of the energy revolution for America’s global agenda are so large, that the chief effect of the revolution is likely to be its role in shoring up the foundations of the American-led world order.

I will look at the global consequences for geopolitics and the environment in some upcoming posts, but first things come first and I’d like to look at the domestic consequences of the boom before moving on to its impact on the world.

Domestically, the energy bonanza changes the American outlook far more dramatically than most people yet realize. This is a Big One, a game changer, and it will likely be a major factor in propelling the United States to the next (and still unknown) stage of development — towards the next incarnation of the American Dream.

The energy revolution is first and foremost a revolution that affects jobs. We are in the very early stages, but since the financial crisis of 2008, fracking alone has created something like 600,000 new jobs in the United States, [says the FT](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/3f86b2fc-cce4-11e1-9960-00144feabdc0.html#axzz20ihzwGAF). Throw in more jobs in both extracting and refining the new energy wealth, and add the manufacturing and processing industries that will return to US shores to benefit from cheap, secure and abundant energy and feedstock, and it is clear that the energy revolution will be a jobs revolution. These jobs pay well; for the first time in a generation we are looking at substantial growth of high-income jobs for skilled blue collar workers. Some of these jobs, especially with overtime, will pay in the six figures; most offer wages well above the national blue collar average. The boom has the potential to change the debate over immigration. The best blue collar jobs in the new oil and gas patches will demand workers with good English language skills and some technical background — good junior colleges and strong vocational high schools will prepare workers for these new jobs. Low skilled, non-English speaking workers will have a hard time competing for these jobs but will work instead in less well paid jobs servicing the energy sector and its workers. They will build houses for the oil workers to live in and staff the restaurants where they eat. As more blue collar native-born Americans see their living standards rise, it is likely that (legal) immigration will lose some of its political salience. Towards A New Geography of Power? There’s another advantage: these jobs will mostly be located away from the coasts. The hollowing out of Middle America has been one of the tragedies of the last generation. Looking at the depopulation of the northern Great Plains, planners began to speculate about returning large chunks of whole states to the wild: the “[Buffalo Commons](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buffalo_Commons)” idea that would have taken up to 20 million acres out of private hands. The buffalo will have to move over now for the oil rigs and the people who work them; North Dakota will not be reverting to the wild anytime soon.

But there are large oil and/or gas reserves in other downtrodden areas. Western New York State and much of Pennsylvania and Ohio appear to have commercial quantities of fossil fuel. The revival of the Rustbelt may be getting under way. And Dixie will not lose out: the US share of the Gulf of Mexico is now believed to have the potential to produce 2 to 3 million more barrels per day than the 1.2 million that it currently pumps.

Overall, the new energy geography points toward a revival of the Mississippi-Ohio-Missouri river system as the axis of American growth. That’s likely among other things to be good for America’s political climate; the Midwest has traditionally been something of a swing region — less liberal than the coastal northeast and less aggressively conservative than Dixie. Middle Westerners have tended to be pragmatic optimists over time, and it would be interesting to see how a revival of this political tendency would work out in our politics today. In any case, we may be looking at a decline in the power of the northeast and (unless California embraces its inner tycoon and begins to exploit its own energy riches) the Pacific, while Dixie continues current rates of growth and the Middle West booms. Energy frontiers tend to be individualistic places. Canada, where the oil boom is a few years ahead of the US, [has shifted to the right](http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/politics/article/1177845--tim-harper-alberta-premier-alison-redford-holds-the-key-to-environmental-peace) as power and money flow from blue Ontario and Quebec to Alberta. Prosperous blue collar workers and aspiring oil tycoons are not generally the strongest supporters of expensive welfare states, and American greens are already feeling the political consequences of a newly energized hydrocarbon sector. They are also not very interested in subsidizing the fiscal problems of other states; should California’s woes worsen and the state come to Washington for more help, the energy rich states and their representatives are likely to take a hard, skeptical look at its requests. Even so, the Middle West’s traditional moderation is going to soften the rough edges a bit; much of the oil is coming to places where people historically have valued community ties and concerned themselves about the well being of the less fortunate. This won’t be the second coming of Ayn Rand. Heartland Economics There are significant economic benefits in having all this prosperity in the heartland. North Dakota and Wyoming are states where shipping costs from China and Japan are high — but Chicago and St. Louis are much better placed to serve them. Put cheap and secure energy in the Middle West, and build large new cities and centers of economic demand in the neighborhood, and the energy revival in a few states will support general economic growth in many more. The long term outlook for the dollar and even for the federal government’s accounts will also improve. Even quite recently people assessing the long term health of the United States pointed toward inexorably rising energy imports as an important drain on the balance of trade and on the health of the dollar. But oil imports are going to decline, and exports — especially of natural gas — will help offset them. The federal government is also going to be collecting taxes on the new energy production — and on all the incomes of the individuals and companies involved, directly or indirectly, in the new energy boom. The United States will be a more attractive place for foreign investment. Building the infrastructure required to get the new energy industry up and running and to transport its products to the market offers some very profitable and secure investment opportunities. And with the US much less dependent on foreign oil (and with the foreign oil it does need coming largely from Canada), the US economy will be much less exposed to the risks associated with turmoil in the Middle East. That is the kind of thing investors look for: high growth in safe places. Few places are going to look more secure in the 21st century than America between the Rockies and the Appalachians, between the Gulf of Mexico and the Canadian frontier. Some of the world’s largest energy reserves will be sited next to the world’s most fertile crop land. Geopolitically, few places on earth are as secure from war; politically few can match its record of stable governance; legally, few offer as much protection for property rights and few have as long a record of offering foreign investors the equal protection of the law. Avoiding the Pitfalls Every silver lining has a cloud, and the energy bonanza isn’t all good. We will have to watch out, for example, that the hydrocarbon boost to the dollar doesn’t price American manufacturing goods out of world markets. Here we will need to look at Europe, and see how some countries — like Germany — responded in a more disciplined way through the years when the euro was high to reduce costs and improve quality so that German goods remained internationally competitive. We will also have to work to keep the political classes from distributing the oil wealth to the rent-seekers. We don’t want to be either the Nigeria or the Russia of the new century, in which corrupt rent-seeking elites hijacked the political process and appropriated the lions’ share of the hydrocarbon wealth to themselves. Cheap, attractive subsidies for the masses, while the real wealth goes into the Swiss bank accounts of the well connected and the unscrupulous: that could very well happen here and there are plenty of people in leading positions in American life — in both parties — who stand willing and ready to sequester the loot. But the first great wave of oil discoveries did not turn America into a corrupt petrostate when the oil discoveries of the late 19th and early 20th centuries made the US the world’s greatest producer of fossil fuels. One important reason that still holds true today is that the US economy was so diversified and so high tech (by the standards of the day) that the oil tsunami was only one part of a much larger story of innovation and development. Innovation remains a big part of the American energy picture. The United States has very large reserves of these new fuels, but we are not alone on the planet in having this wealth. But America is getting to the energy revolution early because our oil companies and drillers were ahead of other people in developing the technologies that can bring the new resources on line. We don’t just happen — like the Saudis and others — to be sitting on incredibly large pools of oil which the skills of other people discover and pump out of the ground. We haven’t exactly made our own luck, but we’ve made the discoveries that enabled us to take advantage of it. That spirit of innovation and the culture that supports it are the true sources of American wealth. That is how we found oil in the first place and built our first energy economy; it is what enables us to benefit from these additional reserves — and it is what will get us on to the next thing when the new energy sources begin to run dry. Thankfully, the United States is not a Russia or a Nigeria. Our economy and our political system are strong enough and diverse enough to benefit from an energy boom without being overwhelmed by it. The energy boom will stimulate the development of new technologies and new products in the non-energy sectors and will likely to usher in an era of broad prosperity and social advance across many industries and regions rather than just in a few. Nature — or perhaps Nature’s God — seems to love mocking pundits. Just when the entire punditocracy, it sometimes seemed, had bought into the “American decline” meme, Europe collapsed and huge energy reserves were discovered underneath the United States. The “special providence” that observers have from time to time discerned in America’s progress through history doesn’t seem to be quite finished with us yet. Getting the new oil and gas raises complicated technical and environmental issues, and it may take some time before the dust settles and we understand exactly what we are looking at here. And drilling is a notoriously uncertain business. The energy revolution may fall short of the full hopes it stirs up. Yet the rapid progress of extraction technology is making these unconventional reserves look more real and more ‘gettable’ all the time. Rather than coping gracefully with the consequences of inevitable decline, America’s job in the 21st century looks like handling its new set of opportunities wisely and well.

#### Ikenberry’s wrong --- liberal internationalism impossible --- it kills China relations

**Layne**, Christopher, Texas A & M University, (20**12**) This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana. International Studies Quarterly

After Unipolarity: Can the Post-1945 International Order Be Preserved? What effect will China’s rise—and unipolarity’s concomitant end—and the United States’ internal economic and fiscal troubles have on the Pax Americana? Not much, according to prominent scholars such as **Ikenberry** (2001, 2011), Zakaria (2008), and Brooks and Wohlforth (2008). They **have argued that the United States can cushion itself against any future loss of hegemony by acting now to ‘‘lock in’’ the Pax Americana’s essential features— its institutions, rules, and norms—so that they outlive unipolarity**.11 As Ikenberry puts it, the United States should act today to put in place an institutional framework ‘‘that will safeguard our interests in future decades when we will not be a unipolar power’’ (Ikenberry 2011:348). **This is not a persuasive argument**. First, there is a critical linkage between a great power’s military and economic standing, on the one hand, and its prestige and soft power, on the other. **The ebbing of the United States’ hegemony raises the question of whether it has the authority to take the lead in reforming the post-1945 international order.** **The Pax Americana projected the United States’ liberal ideology abroad, and asserted its universality as the only model for political, economic, and social development. Today, however, the American model of free market, liberal democracy—which came to be known in the 1990s as the Washington consensus—is being challenged by an alternative model**, the Beijing consensus (Halper 2010). Moreover, the Great Recession discredited America’s liberal model. Consequently, it is questionable whether the United States retains the credibility and legitimacy to spearhead the revamping of the international order. As Financial Times columnist Martin Wolf says, ‘‘The collapse of the western financial system, while China’s flourishes, marks a humiliating end to the ‘unipolar moment.’ As western policy makers struggle, their credibility lies broken. Who still trusts the teachers?’’ (Wolf 2009). The second reason a US lock-in strategy is unlikely to succeed is because the United States does not have the necessary economic clout to revitalize the international order. Ikenberry defines the task of securing lock-in as ‘‘renewing and rebuilding the architecture of global governance and cooperation to allow the United States to marshal resources and tackle problems along a wide an shifting spectrum of possibilities’’ (Ikenberry 2011:353) To do this, the United States will need to take the lead in providing public goods: security, economic leadership, and a nation building program of virtually global dimension to combat the ‘‘socioeconomic backwardness and failure that generate regional and international instability and conflict’’ (Ikenberry 2011:354, 359). At the zenith of its military and economic power after World War II, the United States had the material capacity to furnish the international system with public goods. In the Great Recession’s aftermath, however, a financially strapped United States increasingly will be unable to be a big time provider of public goods to the international order.12 The third reason the post-World War II international order cannot be locked in is the rise of China (and other emerging great and regional powers). The lock-in argument is marred by a glaring weakness: if they perceive that the United States is declining, the incentive for China and other emerging powers is to wait a decade or two and reshape the international system themselves in a way that reflects their own interests, norms, and values (Jacques 2009). China and the United States have fundamental differences on what the rules of international order should be on such key issues as sovereignty, non-interference in states’ internal affairs, and the ‘‘responsibility to protect.’’ While China has integrated itself in the liberal order to propel its economic growth, it is converting wealth into hard power to challenge American geopolitical dominance. And although China is working ‘‘within the system’’ to transform the post-1945 international order, it also is laying the foundations—through embryonic institutions like the BRICs and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization—for constructing an alternative world order that, over the next twenty years or so, could displace the Pax Americana. As Martin Jacques has observed, China is operating ‘‘both within and outside the existing international system while at the same time, in effect, sponsoring a new China-centric international system which will exist alongside the present system and probably slowly begin to usurp it’’ (Jacques 2009:362). Great power politics is about power. Rules and institutions do not exist in vacuum. Rather, they reflect the distribution of power in the international system. In international politics, who rules makes the rules. The post-World War II international order is an American order that privileges the United States’ interests. Even the discourse of ‘‘liberal order’’ cannot conceal this fact. This is why the notion that China can be constrained by integrating into the post-1945 international order lacks credulity. For US scholars and policymakers alike, China’s successful integration hinges on Beijing’s willingness to accept the Pax Americana’s institutions, rules, and norms. In other words, China must accept playing second fiddle to the United States. Revealingly, Ikenberry makes clear this expectation when he says that the deal the United States should propose to China is for Washington ‘‘to accommodate a rising China by offering it status and position within the regional order in return for Beijing’s acceptance and accommodation of Washington’s core interests, which include remaining a dominant security provider within East Asia’’ (Ikenberry 2011:356). It is easy to see why the United States would want to cut such a deal but it is hard to see what’s in it for China. American hegemony is waning and China is ascending, and there is zero reason for China to accept this bargain because it aims to be the hegemon in its own region. The unfolding SinoAmerican rivalry in East Asia can be seen as an example of Dodge City syndrome (in American Western movies, one gunslinger says to the other: ‘‘This town ain’t big enough for both of us’’) or as a geopolitical example of Newtonian physics (two hegemons cannot occupy the same region at the same time). From either perspective, the dangers should be obvious: unless the United States is willing to accept China’s ascendancy in East (and Southeast) Asia, Washington and Beijing are on a collision course.

***Heg collapse doesn’t cause global nuclear war – conflicts would be small and managable***

Richard **Haas** (president of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies) April **2008** “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask\_the\_expert.html

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.

***Transition is smooth – decline in power causes global cooperation***

Carla **Norrlof** (an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto) **2010** “America’s Global Advantage US Hegemony and International Cooperation” p. 50

Keohane and Snidal’s predictions – that the waning of American power did not have to jeopardize cooperation – were in this context reassuring. As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, Keohane explained the persistence of cooperation in terms of states’ continued demand for regimes.40 Snidal demonstrated that collective action depends as much on the hegemon’s size, as it does on the size of other actors in the international system. By paying attention to the size of all Great Powers, not just the hegemon, Snidal opened up the possibility that a more symmetrical distribution of power might enhance the prospects for the provision of public goods, thus offering a potential explanation for the otherwise puzzling persistence of cooperation in the 1980s despite America’s relative decline. The likelihood for cooperation increases with American decline because the hegemon can no longer singlehandedly provide the good as it declines, so smaller states have to chip in for the good to be provided. If one were to use Snidal’s production function in the revised model (i.e., by plugging the numbers from his production function into the revised model), the waning hegemon continues to be taken advantage of. While Snidal was modeling a theory he did not believe in, these distributional implications haunt the literature and cast decline as inescapable and continuous

#### No risk of US/China war

---Chinese heg isn’t a threat, economic interdependence checks, miscalc won’t happen and deterrence checks escalation

Art ’10 (Robert J, Christian A. Herter Professor of [International Relations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Relations) at Brandeis University and Fellow at [MIT Center for International Studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT_Center_for_International_Studies) Fall, Political Science Quarterly, Volume 125, #3, “The United States and the Rise of China: Implications for the Long Haul” <http://www.psqonline.org/99_article.php3?byear=2010&bmonth=fall&a=01free>, jj)

China does not present the type of security threat to the United States that Germany did to Britain, or Britain to Germany. Americaʼs nuclear forces make it secure from any Chinese attack on the homeland. Moreover, China clearly presents a potentially different type of threat to the United States than the Soviet Union did during the Cold War, because the geopolitics of the two situations are different. The Soviet geopolitical (as opposed to the nuclear) threat was two-fold: to conquer and dominate the economic–industrial resources of western Eurasia and to control the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf. Europe and the Persian Gulf constituted two of the five power centers of the world during the Cold War—Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States being the other three. If the Soviets had succeeded in dominating Europe and the Persian Gulf through either conquest or political–military intimidation, then it would have controlled three of the five power centers of the world. That would have been a significant power transition. Chinaʼs rise does not constitute the same type of geopolitical threat to the United States that the Soviet Union did. If China ends up dominating the Korean peninsula and a significant part of continental Southeast Asia, so what? As long as Japan remains outside the Chinese sphere of influence and allied with the United States, and as long as the United States retains some naval footholds in Southeast Asia, such as in Singapore, the Philippines, or Indonesia, Chinaʼs domination of these two areas would not present the same type of geopolitical threat that the Soviet Union did. As long as Europe, the Persian Gulf, Japan, India, and Russia (once it reconstitutes itself as a serious great power) remain either as independent power centers or under U.S. influence, Chinese hegemony on land in East and Southeast Asia will not tip the world balance of power. The vast size and central position of the Soviet Union in Eurasia constituted a geopolitical threat to American influence that China cannot hope to emulate. If judged by the standards of the last three dominant power-rising power competitions of the last 100 years, then, the U.S.–China competition appears well placed to be much safer. Certainly, war between the two is not impossible, because either or both governments could make a serious misstep over the Taiwan issue. War by miscalculation is always possible, but the possession of nuclear weapons by both sides has to have a restraining effect on each by dramatically raising the costs of miscalculation, thereby increasing the incentives not to miscalculate. Nuclear deterrence should work to lower dramatically the possibility of war by either miscalculation or deliberate decision (or if somehow such a war broke out, then nuclear deterrence should work against its escalation into a large and fearsome one). Apart from the Taiwan issue or some serious incident at sea, it is hard to figure out how to start a war between the United States and China. There are no other territorial disputes of any significance between the two, and there are no foreseeable economic contingencies that could bring on a war between them. Finally, the high economic interdependence and the lack of intense ideological competition between them help to reinforce the pacific effects induced by the condition of mutual assured destruction. The workings of these three factors should make us cautiously optimistic about keeping Sino-American relations on the peaceful rather than the warlike track. The peaceful track does not, by any means, imply the absence of political and economic conflicts in Sino-American relations, nor does it foreclose coercive diplomatic gambits by each against the other. What it does mean is that the conditions are in place for war to be a low-probability event, if policymakers are smart in both states (see below), and that an all-out war is nearly impossible to imagine. By the historical standards of recent dominant-rising state dyads, this is no mean feat. In sum, there will be some security dilemma dynamics at work in the U.S.–China relationship, both over Taiwan and over maritime supremacy in East Asia, should China decide eventually to contest Americaʼs maritime hegemony, and there will certainly be political and military conflicts, but nuclear weapons should work to mute their severity because the security of each stateʼs homeland will never be in doubt as long as each maintains a secondstrike capability vis-à-vis the other. If two states cannot conquer one another, then the character of their relation and their competition changes dramatically.

#### No impact---US has a huge nuclear advantage

Lieber and Press, ‘7 (July/August, Keir and Daryl, “Superiority Complex,” The Atlantic Monthly, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200707/china-nukes>)

In the 1990s, with the Cold War receding, nuclear weapons appeared to be relics. Russian and Chinese leaders apparently thought so. Russia allowed its arsenal to decline precipitously, and China showed little interest in modernizing its nuclear weapons. The small strategic force that China built and deployed in the 1970s and early 1980s is essentially the same one it has today. But meanwhile, the United States steadily improved its “counterforce” capabilities—those nuclear weapons most effective at targeting an enemy’s nuclear arsenal. Even as it reduced the number of weapons in its nuclear arsenal, the U.S. made its remaining weapons more lethal and accurate. The result today is a global nuclear imbalance unseen in 50 years. And nowhere is U.S. nuclear primacy clearer—or potentially more important—than in the Sino-U.S. relationship. China has approximately 80 operationally deployed nuclear warheads, but only a few of them—those assigned to single-warhead DF-5 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs)—can reach the continental United States. (There is no definitive, unclassified count of China’s DF-5 ICBMs, but official U.S. statements have put the number at 18.) China has neither modern nuclear ballistic-missile submarines nor long-range nuclear bombers. Moreover, China’s ICBMs can’t be quickly launched; the warheads are stored separately, and the missiles are kept unfueled. (Unlike the solid fuel used in U.S. missiles, the liquid fuel used to propel Chinese ICBMs is highly corrosive.) Finally, China lacks an advanced early-warning system that would give Beijing reliable notice of an incoming attack.

***Russia’s not aggressive***

**de Waal ‘11** (Thomas, senior associate in the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, Winter, Vol. 35, Iss. 1; pg. 17, “Moving Beyond Mirages: THOMAS DE WAAL DISCUSSES A NEW PARADIGM FOR FOREIGN INTERVENTION IN THE SOUTH CAUCASUS” proquest, jj)

DE WAAL: I suppose the issue that I would like to raise again is Russia. I think Russia is clearly a very difficult neighbor, with a long colonial interest in the region, but I think **it's a mistake to see Russia as being a hegemon that wants to dominate this region**. I think **Russia has moved into a postimperialist phase, in which it does not want to dominate this region and actually does not have the capacity to do so**. Clearly, there are constituencies in Russia, such as the military, who still have an interest in this. And, of course, Russia is still in charge of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. However, I think that in **looking at the broader region- Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan-Russia is slowly adjusting to the new reality, where it realizes that it is one actor among many in the Caucasus**. Therefore, **framing policy to keep Russia out of the region is a waste of time and is counterproductive. I think it should be possible to look at ways of working with Russia in the region**. And that applies also to Turkey and Iran. Basically**, it's a matter of accepting that there should be some kind of Great Power truce in the Caucasus in which everyone's interest is acceptable as long as it is benign.**

## Block

### Add-On

#### ( ) Deterrence failure inevitable --- START and atrophy

Bendikova 12 Michaela Bendikova, 5-15-12, Heritage Foundation, Protect America, Not New START <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/05/15/protect-america-not-new-start/>, jj

New START mandates U.S. unilateral reductions and does not serve U.S. interests. Both authors assert that if the National Defense Authorization Act passes in its entirety—that is, including provisions tying the treaty’s implementation funding with funding for the nuclear weapons complex—Russia would be allowed to rebuild “its nuclear forces above the treaty ceiling of 1,550 deployed strategic warheads and increase the number of nuclear weapons aimed at the U.S.” This is just not so. The State Department’s own data exchanges indicate that Russia was under New START’s limits when the treaty entered into force and built above its limits while the U.S. keeps unilaterally reducing its nuclear arsenal. Russia intends to build up to New START’s limits regardless how much the U.S. spends on modernization of its nuclear weapons complex. The treaty’s degraded verification regime does not provide for the strategic insight that the U.S. needs, given that Moscow launched the most robust nuclear modernization program since the end of the Cold War after the treaty entered into force. Kimball and Collina complain about levels of spending for the U.S. nuclear weapons complex. In fact, this complex has been under-funded for years. Even the Obama Administration acknowledged the importance of this funding. It committed to request funding for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement facility, the very facility Kimball and Collina criticize as too expensive and of little value. Indeed, the Administration’s enduring commitment has not endured for a year since the treaty entered into force. Since the end of the Cold War, U.S. nuclear weapons have contributed to global stability and prevented attacks on the U.S. homeland, forward-deployed troops, and U.S. allies. It is essential that the U.S. provides funding for its nuclear weapons complex and avoids “disarmament by atrophy.” As the numbers of U.S. nuclear weapons go down, other countries will be incentivized to develop their own capabilities or build up nuclear weapons to achieve “parity” with the U.S. Instead of unilaterally disarming, the U.S. should move toward a “protect and defend” strategy combining offensive, defensive, conventional, and nuclear weapons. This is the best way the U.S. could respond to the challenges of today’s environment.

#### ( ) No impact --- conventional deterrence solves

Perkovich 9  
(Adviser to the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations Task Force on US Nuclear Policy, “Extended Deterrence on the way to a nuclear free world” International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, May 2009, pg. [www.icnnd.org/research/Perkovich \_Deterrence.pdf](http://www.icnnd.org/research/Perkovich%20_Deterrence.pdf))

The most credible and perhaps least dangerous way to assure allies of U.S. commitments to defend them is to station U.S. conventional forces on allied territories, as is already the case in original NATO states and in Japan and South

Korea. With U.S. conventional forces in harm’s way, an adversary attacking a U.S. ally would draw the U.S. into the conflict with greater certainty than if nuclear weapons were directly and immediately implicated. Indeed, the greater credibility that U.S. conventional forces bring to extended deterrence is one reason why Poland has been keen to have U.S. missile defense personnel based on Polish soil. Were U.S. personnel attacked, the U.S. would respond forcefully. Arguably the best way to strengthen the credibility of U.S. extended deterrence would be to stress that conventional capabilities of the U.S. and its allies alone are sufficient to defeat all foreseeable adversaries in any scenario other than nuclear war. And as long as adversaries can threaten nuclear war, the U.S. will deploy nuclear weapons to deter that threat. Of course, basing U.S. conventional forces on allied territory also invites controversy in many places, including Japan. Such controversies are much less intense than would flow from proposals to base nuclear weapons, but they point to the fundamental underlying political-psychological challenge of extended deterrence. Allies want the protection that the U.S. can provide, and worry about abandonment, but they also don’t want to be implicated in U.S. policies that could entrap them in conflicts not entirely of their making. This tension is the heart of the extended deterrence challenge. To repeat, rather than focusing on nuclear weapons, the U.S. and its allies should concentrate on building cooperation and confidence in overall political-security strategies in each region. Indeed, it is worthwhile to honestly consider whether in Northeast Asia and Central Europe and Turkey the recently expressed concerns over the future credibility of extended U.S. nuclear deterrence is a proxy for deeper concerns that are more difficult to express. For example, in Poland, Russia’s rhetoric and foreign policy, including the conflict with Georgia, elicit private worries that NATO would not actually risk confrontation with Russia to defend Poland against Russian bullying. Can NATO as a collection of 26 states with diverse interests and capabilities be relied upon stand up forcefully in behalf of Poland (and other new NATO states)? Doubts about the answer to this question at least partially explain why Poland has sought special guarantees from the U.S. It is not clear that focusing on the nuclear element of extended deterrence in this situation helps produce policies and capabilities that actually would deter or dissuade Russia from bellicosity. The types of scenarios in which Russia might bully Poland are not likely to include credible threats of Russian coercion that would make countervailing use of nuclear weapons realistic or desirable. Indeed, raising the specter of nuclear threats could undermine the credibility of extended deterrence because allied states, including the American public, would probably become alarmed in ways that would weaken resolve to push back firmly against Russian pressure. This resembles the credibility problems of extended nuclear deterrence during the Cold War.

### Da

***Latin American instability forces US intervention and global conflict --- only relations solve this and guarantee energy security --- answers empirically denied***

**Sabatini & Berger 12** Christopher Sabatini is the editor-in-chief of Americas Quarterly and senior director of policy at Americas Society/Council of the Americas. Ryan Berger is a policy associate at the Americas Society/Council of the Americas. 6-13-12, CNN, Why the U.S. can't afford to ignore Latin America, <http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/13/why-the-u-s-cant-afford-to-ignore-latin-america/>, jj

**3. There are security and strategic risks in the region.**

Hugo **Chavez’s systematic deconstruction of the Venezuelan state and alleged ties between FARC rebels and some of Chavez’s senior officials have created a volatile cocktail that could explode south of the U.S. border.**

FARC, a left-wing guerrilla group based in Colombia, has been designated as a “significant foreign narcotics trafficker” by the U.S. government.

At the same time, **gangs, narcotics traffickers and transnational criminal syndicates are overrunning Central America.**

In 2006, Mexican President Felipe **Calderón launched a controversial “war on drugs” that has since resulted in the loss of over 50,000 lives and increased the levels of violence and corruption south of the Mexican border in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras and even once-peaceful Costa Rica**. Increasingly, **these already-weak states are finding themselves overwhelmed by the corruption and violence that has come with the use of their territory as a transit point for drugs heading north.**

**Given their proximity and close historical and political connections with Washington, the U.S. will find it increasingly difficult not to be drawn in**. Only this case, it won’t be with or against governments — as it was in the 1980s — but **in the far more complex, sticky situation of failed states.**

**There are many other reasons why Latin America is important to U.S. interests.**

It is a market for more than 20% of U.S. exports. With the notable exception of Cuba, it is nearly entirely governed by democratically elected governments — a point that gets repeated ad nauseum at every possible regional meeting. **The Western Hemisphere is a major source of energy that has the highest potential to seriously reduce dependence on Middle East supply**. And through immigration, Latin America has close personal and cultural ties to the United States. These have been boilerplate talking points since the early 1990s.

But **the demands of the globe today are different, and they warrant a renewed engagement with Latin America — a strategic pivot point for initiatives the U.S. wants to accomplish elsewhere. We need to stop thinking of Latin America as the U.S. “backyard” that is outside broader, global strategic concerns.**

***Disad outweighs on timeframe --- up for a vote this Spring --- aff solvency takes decades***

**Bryce ‘10** Robert Bryce, has been writing about energy for nearly two decades. His articles have appeared in dozens of publications ranging from The Atlantic Monthly to The Guardian, and The Nation to The American Conservative. He is the author of Pipe Dreams: Greed, Ego, and the Death of Enron, and Cronies: Oil, the Bushes, and the Rise of Texas, America’s Superstate. Bryce is a fellow at the Institute for Energy Research, as well as the managing editor of Energy Tribune and a contributing writer for The Texas Observer. “Power Hungry: The Myths of "Green" Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future” pg 18-20, jj

Gore may be right. It’s also possible that he’s wrong. In many ways, Gore’s opinion doesn’t matter; because **no matter how much the U**nited **S**tates **may want to lead the effort to reduce carbon emissions, it cannot, and will not, be able to substantially slow the increasing global use of coal, oil, and natural gas.** Why? **There are simply too many people living in dire energy poverty for them to forgo the relatively low-cost power that can be derived From hydrocarbons**. (1 will discuss carbon dioxide emissions at length in Part 2) For proof of that, consider the per-capita carbon dioxide emissions in the world’s most populous coun tries, From 1990 to 2007, the per-capita emissions of carbon dioxide in the United States fell by 1.8 percent. But during that same time period, per-capita emissions soared in Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, and Pak istan. Those five countries contain more than 3 billion people, and their energy-consumption patterns are being replicated in nearly every major developing country on the planet. That reality was reflected in Copenhagen in December 2009 when leaders from 192 countries met for what the Associated Press called “the largest and most important UN climate change conference in history. After two weeks of wrangling and lofty rhetoric, the meeting ended with an eminently predictable result: no legally binding agreement on any re ductions in carbon emissions, only a promise to reduce emissions indi vidually or jointly,” and an agreement to meet again a year later in Mexico City to discuss all of the same contentious issues one more time.22 In short, all of these concerns, from worries that we have reached (or will soon reach) a peak in oil production and are (or will soon be) enter ing a period of inevitable decline, to the **alarmist cries over impending global warming and the supposed solutions to them----hinge on the belief that the transition away from hydrocarbons to renewable resources can be done quickly, cheaply, and easily. That. Is. Not. True.** Tomorrow’s energy sources will look a lot like today’s, because **energy transitions are always difficult and lengthy. “There is one thing all en ergy transitions have in common: they are prolonged affairs that take decades to accomplish**,” wrote Vaclav Smil in November 2008. “**And the greater the scale of prevailing uses and conversions, the longer the subs stitutions will take**.”23 Smil, the polymath, prolific author on energy issues, and distinguished professor at the University of Manitoba, wrote that while a “world without fossil fuel combustion is highly desirable… getting there will demand not only high cost but also considerable pa tience: **coming energy transitions will unfold across decades, not years**.”24

**Turns Oil/Gas**

***CIR solves high skill worker shortages***

**Kiplinger 12/18** The Kiplinger Washington Editors, 12-18-12, Why Immigration Reform Is Likely in 2013, <http://www.kiplinger.com/columns/washington/archives/immigration-reform-likely-in-2013.html#lObtuiMB6R9j3TdG.99>, jj

Details of a legislative package must still be worked out, but **any deal is likely to have four elements**:

**1. Stronger security along U.S. borders, especially with Mexico**. Look for provisions allowing the National Guard and U.S. troops to get involved when needed.

**2. A path to citizenship for** many of the estimated 11.2 million **undocumented immigrants now in the U.S**. **This will incorporate Obama’s** e**x**ecutive **o**rder **that bans** the **deportation of younger illegals** who came here as children. Some Republicans join Democrats in seeing immigration as an economic issue. One study by a conservative think tank suggests that **giving illegal immigrants a chance to stay in the U.S. would add $1.5 trillion to GDP over 10 years, mostly because of higher tax revenues and increased consumer spending.**

**3. An expansion of the temporary worker program, which is favored by many businesses**. **Firms have difficulty filling key jobs in science and technology because too few Americans are qualified to do the work and visa limits keep out many skilled workers from India and elsewhere**. **And some folks in the agriculture industry say that crops rot in the fields for want of workers to harvest them. Many Americans won’t take such jobs because the pay is low and the work is seasonal.** Overall, business groups want to more than triple the number of work visas that are issued. That’s unlikely, but **the number will go up.**

4. **More responsibility for employers to verify the legal status of workers. Look for use of an electronic eligibility program to expand from federal contractors to all employers**. In return, **business owners want an exemption from state laws that also govern employment status, and assurances that they won’t be charged with violations if they act in good faith to comply.**

**Turns Manufacturing**

***Immigration reform key to manufacturing***

**Dodson 11** Andrew Dodson, 10-10-11, Michigan Live, Manufacturing sector needs skilled migrants to stay in country, says Dow Chemical CEO, <http://www.mlive.com/business/mid-michigan/index.ssf/2011/10/manufacturing_sector_needs_ski.html>, jj

**Dow Chemical Co. CEO** Andrew N. **Liveris says the manufacturing sector requires immigration rules that allow more highly-skilled workers to stay in the country, according to a report.**

An Australian newspaper reports that Liveris, who is from that country, said Australia "must avoid a situation such as **in the U.S**., where **highly-skilled immigrants were returning home once they had completed their training."**

### Turns Heg

***Immigration reform key leadership --- turns 1ac Karl evidence which is about soft power***

**Nye 12/10** Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University. His most recent book is The Future of Power. 12/10/12, Project Syndicate, Immigration and American Power, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye>, jj

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.”

**In recent years**, however, **US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant**, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans.

**As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the decline of American power.**

Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades.

During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008.

Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively.

But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors.

While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, **immigration strengthens US power**. **It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population.**

For example, **to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years,** which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. **In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades.**

Today, **the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third** (after only China and India). **This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.**

In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition, **skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth**. **There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US**. **At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies.**

**Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power**. **The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them**. **Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US.**

Likewise, **because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both.**

Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that **China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century**, precisely **because the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity**. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.

That is a view that Americans should take to heart. **If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.**

**2nc Wall**

***Prefer the direction of the link --- PC creates momentum as long as Obama stays focused on immigration --- that’s St. Augustine --- more evidence***

This card also feeds our link arguments --- he has to stay focused and make it clear immigration is a high priority or congress will get distracted --- Obama’s capital will create momentum for CIR now, but the plan muddles his message and distracts Congress.

**Hesson 1-2** Ted Hesson is the immigration editor for Univision News. Before joining the team in 2012, he served as online editor for Long Island Wins, a non-profit organization focusing on local and national immigration issues. Ted has written for a variety of magazines, newspapers, and online publications, including The Huffington Post, Time Out New York, and the Philadelphia City Paper. He earned his master’s degree at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and his bachelor’s degree at Boston College. Born and raised in Philadelphia, Ted has lived in New York City since 2003. Jan. 2, 2013, ABC News, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, <http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOTU-OSx-Sp>, jj

1. Be a Leader

**During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground**. **The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around**, according to Chishti. "**He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his,**" he said. "**He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power**." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but **he needs to follow through.**

***Big push coming this month --- passage likely***

Expect him to spotlight it in his State of the Union --- this will create momentum and give passage a good shot

**Sarlin 1-3** Benjy Sarlin is a reporter for Talking Points Memo and co-writes the campaign blog, TPM2012. He previously reported for The Daily Beast/Newsweek as their Washington Correspondent and covered local politics for the New York Sun. JANUARY 3, 2013, Talking Points Memo, Debt Fight Threatens To Overshadow Obama’s Immigration Push, <http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2013/01/debt-fight-threatens-to-overshadow-obamas-immigration-push.php>, jj

Immigration **advocates are** still **expecting big movement this month from the White House on comprehensive reform, especially in the president’s State of the Union address**. **With Republican leaders publicly calling for a debate on the issue** before the 2014 elections in the hopes of winning over Latino voters, **Obama still has his best shot yet at moving a bill through Congress**.

***Fiscal cliff deal creates momentum***

Fiscal cliff provides momentum --- shows congress can make deals, Congress views immigration as a rare opportunity for compromise

Has unique momentum that can’t be slowed down by deficit battles --- it won’t get bogged down by partisan gridlock now

Boehner provides momentum --- he broke the “Hastert Rule” and brought fiscal cliff to vote even though Tea Party didn’t like the deal --- proves he is willing to stand up to the right wing, makes immigration passage likely

**Foley & Stein 1-2** Elise Foley is a reporter for the Huffington Post in Washington, D.C. She previously worked at The Washington Independent. Sam Stein is a Political Reporter at the Huffington Post, based in Washington, D.C. Previously he has worked for Newsweek magazine, the New York Daily News and the investigative journalism group Center for Public Integrity. He has a masters from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and is a graduate of Dartmouth College. Sam can be reached at [stein@huffingtonpost.com](mailto:stein@huffingtonpost.com). 1-2-13, Huffington Post, Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>, jj

WASHINGTON -- **Despite a** bruising **fiscal cliff battle** that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack **Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda.**

An Obama administration official said **the president plans to push for immigration reform this January**. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that **coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities**. **The White House plans to push forward quickly**, not just **on immigration** reform but gun control laws as well.

The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit.

With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished.

"The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill."

It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. **Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.)** will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push.

Lofgren **expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill**. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

Advocates have vowed to keep pushing for reform. As part of their efforts, they plan to remind Republican members of Congress about their presidential nominee's defeat among Latino and Asian voters, a majority of whom support a fix to the immigration system.

"They can procrastinate as long as they want, but they're going to have a serious day of reckoning next election cycle," said Angela Kelley, vice president for immigration policy and advocacy at the Center for American Progress. "**We're going to have a lot of near-death experiences with this issue, but I'm pretty confident it's never going to go completely to a flatline."**

**Good news for immigration advocates may have come Tuesday night, when Boehner broke the so-called "Hastert Rule" and allowed the fiscal cliff bill to come for a vote without support from a majority of his Republican conference. Given opposition to immigration reform by many Tea Party Republicans, the proof that Boehner is willing to bypass them on major legislation is a good sign, the Democratic aide said.**

"If something is of such importance that the GOP establishment [is] telling Boehner, 'You must do this. You need to get this off the table soon,'" the Democratic aide said, **the speaker could break the Hastert Rule again.**

"**He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority,**" the aide continued.

Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-immigration reform group America's Voice, also said he thinks **the House could pass an immigration bill in the same way it did last night, relying on support from both parties. He's hopeful that the fiscal cliff fight could even make them happy to work out legislation in a more standard way.**

"I never thought I'd say this, **but after bruising battles over the future of the American and world economy, the chance to legislate through regular order on immigration reform might have leaders in both parties working together and singing 'Kumbaya**,'" Sharry said.

***Immigration reform will pass --- unique area for compromise***

Passage very likely --- Republicans know they need to soften --- Obama’s PC ensures the deal includes citizenship measures --- immigration is seriously the most likely area for cooperation all year

**Malone 12/31** JIM MALONE, After a stint in the Peace Corps in Swaziland, Jim joined VOA in 1983 as a reporter and anchor on English broadcasts to Africa. He served as East Africa correspondent, then covered Congress in the early 1990′s. Since 1995, Jim has served as VOA national correspondent responsible for coverage of U.S. politics, elections, the Supreme Court and Justice Department. Jim has been involved in VOA’s election coverage since the 1984 presidential campaign and has co-anchored live VOA broadcasts of numerous national political conventions, candidate debates and election night coverage. 12/31/12, Voice of America News, Political Battle Lines for 2013, <http://blogs.voanews.com/usa-politics/2012/12/31/political-battle-lines-for-2013/>, jj

Prospects for **Immigration Reform**

This is an area that **holds** perhaps **the greatest promise of cooperation between the two parties** in the year ahead. **Democrats will make a bigger push for comprehensive immigration reform in 2013 because they benefited so much from Hispanic support in the November election**. At the same time **a number of Republicans will be clamoring for a different approach on immigration given how poorly they did with Hispanic voters in 2012 and the prospects for even more defeats in the years to come without trimming the Democrat’s huge advantage with minority voters.**

**The two sides diverge somewhat on whether the path to legalization should result in citizenship**, as many Hispanic activists would like, or simply legalization of their status inside the U.S., a path many Republicans prefer. Either way, the **Republicans are much more likely to engage in a debate about immigration reform in the wake of the election**. One of the things that hurt Mitt Romney badly last year was the tone of the Republican primary debates on immigration that made several of the Republican presidential contenders sound extreme on immigration, something voters remembered when it came time to cast their ballots in November. In fact, **of all the issues that will come up this year this one might have the best chance of actually bringing the two parties together.**

***Will pass but it will be a fight --- PC key***

2013 is the year of immigration --- political winds have shifted --- a bill will sneak through the house now

**Kiplinger 12/18** The Kiplinger Washington Editors, 12-18-12, Why Immigration Reform Is Likely in 2013, <http://www.kiplinger.com/columns/washington/archives/immigration-reform-likely-in-2013.html#lObtuiMB6R9j3TdG.99>, jj

**Is 2013 the year for immigration reform? It sure seems that way**. **Even as Congress remains divided on many other issues, the prospects for a major overhaul are the best they’ve been in years**.

**The Senate, for sure, will pass a broad immigration package, backed by Democrats and** some **moderate Republicans**. **The fight will be more difficult in the** GOP-controlled **House, where hard-line conservatives will try to resist the push** by more-mainstream Republicans **to make big changes.**

But, in the end, **don’t be surprised if a bill sneaks through and is signed by** President **Obama** this fall, with House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) at his side.

**The reason? The political winds have shifted** since 2007, when a coalition of strange bedfellows -- conservatives and some in organized labor -- lined up to doom President George W. Bush’s initiatives to allow many illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. and work.

This time, organized labor stands united. **It’s the Republican Party that’s divided. One on side are conservatives , fighting to derail any immigration reform. On the other, party members who want to mend fences with Hispanics and other minority voters before 2016**, when the next president will be chosen. GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney won just 27% of the Hispanic vote this year, down from 44% for Bush in 2004. If the downward trend continues, some in the party worry that even Republican strongholds such as Texas and Arizona will tilt toward the Democrats, as Colorado, Florida, New Mexico and Nevada did this time around.

**Top of Docket – A2: General Thumpers**

***It’s Obama’s top priority --- it’s the healthcare of his 2nd term***

Stephen **Dinan 1-7**-13, Washington Times, Obama’s promised push on immigration sets up early test, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jan/7/obamas-promised-push-immigration-sets-early-test/>, jj

President **Obama**, who strongly carried the Hispanic vote in his 2012 re-election drive, **has vowed to push immigration early in the new year, comparing it to the all-consuming health care fight that dominated his first term in office.**

“**I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority**. **I will introduce legislation in the first year to get that done,**” he said on NBC’s “Meet the Press” program in December.

***Higher priority than fiscal issues***

**Weber 1-1** Joseph Weber, January 01, 2013, Fox News, Guns, immigration, fiscal issues emerge as top priorities for Obama, new Congress, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/01/gun-control-immigration-reform-fiscal-issues-emerge-as-top-issues-for-new/>, jj

**After an election year in which legislative business practically ground to a halt, Congress is poised to make up for lost time in 2013.**

**The new Congress will begin its next session with an agenda expected to focus largely on issues that re-emerged over the past several weeks and months, with** gun legislation and **immigration reform near the top.**

**Though fiscal issues will remain a priority**, how much work lawmakers put into them depends on whether, or to what extent, President Obama and congressional Republicans resolve the fiscal crisis in the closing days of this session.

A basic deal to prevent some of the $600 billion mix of tax increases and automatic spending cuts from kicking in Jan. 1 would still leave the 113th Congress to address debt ceiling and tax code issues.

But **in the near term, immigration legislation appears to be high on the docket** **in the next Congress and second Obama administration term.**

Washington has tried for years to change the country's immigration policy -- to strengthen border security and stem the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S.; to reform the visa system for the benefit of those legal immigrants following the rules; and figure out how to address the millions of illegal immigrants already here.

Legislative efforts by Democrats and Republicans on comprehensive immigration reform had reached a standstill -- until the issue re-emerged during this election cycle when Obama suspended deportation for many young immigrants brought to the U.S. illegally by their parents.

**Republicans have since signaled their intentions to be the first to introduce and pass more comprehensive legislation to deal with the roughly 11 million illegal immigrants in the United States, especially after Obama won re-election with roughly 71 percent of the Hispanic vote.**

However, **Obama appeared** to re-stake his turf Sunday, **saying he would introduce legislation next year to fix “our broken immigration system.”**

***Their thumpers are backwards --- immigration is drawing attention from other issues***

**Burritt 1/2**

Chris. CEOs Give U.S. Politicians Incomplete Grade on Fiscal Cliff Work. 1/2/13. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-03/ceos-give-u-s-politicians-incomplete-grade-on-fiscal-cliff-work.html. Citing Matthew Shay, CEO of the National Retail Federation in Washington.

Even so, **passage of a limited deal offers no guarantee that Congress will tackle broader fiscal reform** later **because** gun control, **immigration reform** and other issues **are going to draw attention from fiscal matters, Shay said.**

“**We should be more realistic about prospects for whether or not we’re going to get the so-called big deal, because once we get over the cliff and we get resolution to some of the basic elements, then obviously all of the pressure is off and you lose that opportunity to do the big deal**,” he said. “**It’s going to be much more difficult to get the big deal because people are going to lose their enthusiasm.”**

**A2: Hagel Appointment Thumper**

***Hagel won’t be a fight---DC press analysis doesn’t reflect reality***

Josh **Marshall 1-6**, editor of Talking Points Memo, 1/6/13, “Crack Pipe,” <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/archives/2013/01/crack_pipe_1.php>

**I’m watching** a lot of neoconservative policy activists and a lot of **people in the press telling me that** **it’s** a very **up in the air** thing **whether** Chuck **Hagel gets confirmed** as Secretary of Defense. **These folks should stop smoking crack. Because crack isn’t good for you.**

Maybe I’m just out of the loop because I’m not reporting aggressively myself. Or maybe — I think much more likely — I’m not in the same crack den with the rest of these good people so the air I’m breathing is clear and **I know what is happening in the real world**.

**Will Republicans** uniformly **oppose a former member of their** own **caucus** when the issues at stake are complaints that look comical when held up to the light of day? One who was one of the top foreign policy Republicans in the Senate? **I doubt it**.

**Will Democratic senators deny** a reelected President **Obama his choice for one of the top four cabinet positions when he is quite popular and the expansion of their caucus is due in significant measure to his popularity?** **Please**. Chuck Schumer will oppose the President? Not likely.

So I look forward to Republican crocodile tears on gay rights — seemingly in large part over something Hagel said in the 90s in support of the Senate Republican caucus’s efforts to pillory an openly gay nominee. And yes, perhaps it really will pave the way for a LGBT upsurge of support for Richard Grinnell for President in 2016. But I doubt it.

Otherwise, **assuming** President **Obama nominates him** tomorrow, **get ready for a Hagel Pentagon.**

***Appointments don’t drain PC---empirics***

**Hutchinson 12/2** Earl Ofari, "Rice Nomination Fight Won't Drain President Obama's Political Capital, 2012, [www.eurweb.com/2012/12/rice-nomination-fight-wont-drain-president-obamas-political-capital/](http://www.eurweb.com/2012/12/rice-nomination-fight-wont-drain-president-obamas-political-capital/)

**It won’t hurt him. All presidents from time to time face some backlash from** real or manufactured **controversies by opponents over a potential nominee to the Supreme Court, a cabinet or diplomatic post**. In 2008, Obama faced backlash when he nominated Eric Holder as Attorney General. **A pack of GOP senators huffed and puffed at Holder for alleged transgressions involving presidential pardons he signed off on as Clinton’s Deputy Attorney General. In the end he was confirmed. The mild tiff over Holder didn’t** dampen, diminish, or **tarnish Obama in his hard pursuit of his major first term initiative**, namely **health care** reform.¶ **This was true three years earlier when then** President **Bush nominated** Condoleezza **Rice** for Secretary of State. Rice was slammed hard by some Democratic senators for being up to her eyeballs in selling the phony, conniving Bush falsehood on Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction. **The threat to delay Rice’s confirmation in the Senate quickly fizzled out, and she was confirmed. This did not** distract or **dampen Bush in his pursuit of his key initiatives**. There was not the slightest inference that in nominating Rice, and standing behind her in the face of Democrats grumbles about her would threaten his push of his administration’s larger agenda items.¶ Susan Rice will continue to be a handy and cynical whipping person for the GOP to hector Obama. But the political reality is that the legislative business that Congress and the White House must do never has been shut down by any political squabble over a presidential appointee. The fiscal cliff is an issue that’s too critical to the fiscal and economic well-being of too many interest groups to think that Rice’s possible nomination will be any kind of impediment to an eventual deal brokered by the GOP and the White House.¶ The Rice flap won’t interfere in any way with other White House pursuits for another reason. By holding Rice hostage to a resolution of the fiscal cliff peril and other crucial legislative issues, the GOP would badly shoot itself in the foot. It would open the gate wide to the blatant politicizing of presidential appointments by subjecting every presidential appointment to a litmus test, not on the fitness of the nominee for the job, but on whether the appointee could be a bargaining chip to oppose a vital piece of legislation or a major White House initiative. This would hopelessly blur the legislative process and ultimately could be turned against a future GOP president. This is a slippery slope that Democrats and the GOP dare not risk going down.¶ **Rice will not be Obama’s only appointment at the start of his second term**. He will as all presidents see a small revolving door of some cabinet members and agency heads that will leave, and must be replaced. **There almost certainly will be another Obama pick that will raise some eyebrows and draw inevitable fire** from either the GOP or some interests groups. **Just as other presidents**, Obama will have to weigh carefully the political fall-out if any from his pick. But as is usually the case **the likelihood of any lasting harm to the administration will be** minimal to **nonexistent.**

**A2: Debt Ceiling Thumper**

***GOP already backing down on debt ceiling***

**Sargent 1-7** Greg Sargent writes The Plum Line blog, a reported opinion blog with a liberal slant -- what you might call “opinionated reporting” from the left. He joined the Post in early 2009, after stints at Talking Points Memo, New York Magazine and the New York Observer. January 7, 2013, The Washington Post, Republicans getting weak-kneed about debt ceiling fight, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/01/07/republicans-getting-weak-kneed-about-debt-ceiling-fight/>, jj

House Speaker John Boehner spoke at length with the Wall Street Journal’s Stephen Moore about the coming confrontation over the debt ceiling, the sequester, and the spending cuts Republicans will try to achieve. Buried in the interview is a highly newsworthy nugget, in which **Boehner** implicitly **admitted that the debt limit does not give Republicans the leverage they’ve suggested it does**.

Indeed, it’s hard to read this exchange as anything other than a sign that **Republicans may be backing off the fight over the debt ceiling:**

I ask Mr. Boehner if he will take the debt-ceiling talks to the brink — risking a government shutdown and debt downgrade from the credit agencies — given that it didn’t work in 2011 and President Obama has said he won’t bargain on the matter.

**The debt bill** is “one point of leverage,” Mr. Boehner says, but he also hedges, noting that it **is “not the ultimate leverage**.” He says that Republicans won’t back down from the so-called Boehner rule: that every dollar of raising the debt ceiling will require one dollar of spending cuts over the next 10 years. **Rather than forcing a deal, the insistence may result in a series of monthly debt-ceiling increases.**

The Republicans’ stronger card, Mr. Boehner believes, will be the automatic spending sequester trigger that trims all discretionary programs — defense and domestic. It now appears that the president made a severe political miscalculation when he came up with the sequester idea in 2011.

As Moore rightly notes, Boehner “hedged.” He acknowledged that the real leverage point Republicans have is not their threat not to raise the debt ceiling; now the GOP’s leverage lies in the Dem desire to avoid the spending cuts that will kick in as part of the sequester! **Of course, half of those constitute defense cuts that Republicans, more so than Dems, oppose at any cost.**

It’s true that Boehner insists above that Republicans won’t back down from the demand that spending get cut by the same amount as the debt ceiling rises. But all that really means is that **they will use the size of the debt ceiling hike as a metric to set the amount of their spending cut demand — not that the threat of default will be used to extract those cuts**. **Remember, GOP leaders well know that if they do that, the entire business community will join with Obama and Democrats to tell them to back off or take the blame for cratering the economy, leaving Republicans further isolated. So Boehner is letting it be known that Republicans don’t see the debt ceiling as their primary leverage point in the battle to come.**

Boehner does this by threatening to only agree to “monthly” debt ceiling hikes. But **this should be read**, if anything, **as a sign of weakness**. **It’s essentially a concession that the debt limit has to be raised; Boehner is merely threatening to drag his feet as he allows the inevitable to happen**. But it’s just nonsense. **The business community is not going to go for such a course of action, to put it mildly. And it risks dragging the country through monthly threats of default, a terrible thing to inflict on the American people.**

Ultimately, **what this highlights is the utter incoherence of the GOP position on the debt ceiling.** **Republican leaders know they have to raise the debt limit** **— they know the threat not to do this isn’t credible, and they need to signal to the business community that they don’t view this option seriously** — yet they want to continue to use it as leverage to get what they want, anyway. Hence Boehner’s above dance. And Boehner isn’t the only one: On Face the Nation yesterday, when Mitch **McConnell was asked directly whether Republicans would really withhold support for a debt ceiling hike if it weren’t paid for by spending cuts of equivalent size, he repeatedly refused to answer**.

Boehner’s and McConnell’s equivocations will only embolden the White House and Democrats to stick with their strategy of refusing to negotiate over the debt ceiling, and treating the Republicans’ refusal to commit to raising it up front as their problem, and their problem only.

***Obama won’t spend PC***

Zeke **Miller**, BuzzFeed Staff, **1-1**-13, Obama: I Won't Negotiate Over The Debt Ceiling, <http://www.buzzfeed.com/zekejmiller/obama-i-wont-negotiate-over-the-debt-ceiling>, jj

WASHINGTON — President Barack **Obama reiterated his pledge not to negotiate over the nation's borrowing limit** Tuesday night, as he marked the passage of a bill to avert the fiscal cliff.

Speaking from the White House briefing room 20 minutes after the House of Representatives passed the bill — and minutes before his own return to a vacation in his native Hawaii — Obama offered Republicans brief, tough talk.

"While I will negotiate over many things, **I will not have another debate with this Congress** over whether they should pay the bills for what they've racked up," Obama said. "We can't not pay bills that we've already incurred."

***Debt ceiling will be raised without a fight***

Bob **Adelmann, 11-7**-12, the New American, Debt Ceiling Likely to be Raised Without Fanfare This Time, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/congress/item/13565-debt-ceiling-likely-to-be-raised-without-fanfare-this-time>, jj

Of course, the election intervened and likely changed that rhetorical conversation. **With voters holding Congress in the lowest regard in years, the debt ceiling this time around is likely to be raised without a fuss**. It’s mostly symbolic, anyway, according to economist Gary North: **The Federal debt-ceiling is always raised. There are no exceptions. As surely as night follows day, so does the national debt-ceiling get raised. Everyone in Congress knows this.** Everyone in the media knows this. Those few voters who pay any attention suspect this. North explains that it’s a ritual without meaning because there is little incentive to apply financial discipline. He says that the deficit is out of control because government spending is out of control. And that’s because the electorate is out of control. Rep. Ron Paul paints a picture of how the average citizen views government spending: Imagine you had a pesky neighbor who somehow took out a mortgage on his house in your name and by some legal trickery you were obligated to pay for it. Imagine watching this neighbor throw drunken parties, buy expensive cars, add more rooms to the house, and hire dozens of people to wait on him hand and foot. Imagine that he also managed to take out several credit cards in your name. One by one, he would max them out and then use your good name and credit to obtain another credit card, then another and then another. Each time, this neighbor would claim that he needed the new credit card to pay interest on the other maxed out credit cards. If he defaulted on those cards, your credit score would be hurt and when you wanted to buy something for yourself, it would be more difficult to get a loan and the interest you paid would be higher. Imagine that you mulled this over, and time after time, said nothing as he filled out more credit applications so he would not have to default on the other debt taken out in your name. Meanwhile, another shiny new Mercedes appears in his driveway. At what point do you think you might get tired of this game? And, even though you are left with no really good options, do you think you might eventually tell him to go ahead and default, just stop spending your money? Until and unless the American taxpayer realizes he is the one paying for government’s profligacy, he will remain content to ignore the issue. As long as his government entitlement checks keep coming, he’ll ignore the debt ceiling conversation altogether. With the incoming 113th Congress likely to reflect more of this entitlement mentality and with the Treasury Department’s willingness to use “extraordinary measures” to push off the conversation until that Congress is seated**, the debt ceiling will be raised again, for the 81st time since 1940. Just like it always has been.**

**\*PC Key**

***Capital is key --- it bridges support from both parties.***

**D**allas **M**orning **N**ews, **1/2**/2012 (Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge, p. http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece)

**The president’s words** to NBC’s David Gregory **are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task this year**. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. **The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that** some **Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill**, either. **And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while** also **reaching out to Republicans**. In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. **If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support** substantial parts of an answer. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But **the leadership that matters most will come from the White House**. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count. HE SAID IT … “**I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority**. I will introduce legislation in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.” President Barack **Obama, in an interview on Meet the Press Sunday**

***Obama’s leverage is crucial***

**Bennett 12/9** BRIAN BENNETT McClatchy News Service, 12-9-12, Portland Press Herald, Obama's next goal: comprehensive immigration reform, <http://www.pressherald.com/politics/immigration-law-next-big-goal-on-presidents-plate_2012-12-09.html>, jj

But Angela **Kelley, an immigration expert** with the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank in Washington, **believes that Obama will have to step into the limelight, as he has over budget negotiations, to get something done on immigration.**

"**The congressional conversation has started**," Kelley said. "**It isn't something (Obama) can take his time on, because the cameras and the microphones will be on him asking, 'What are you doing about it?' and he will have to have a ready answer."**

**Link 2nc – NG**

***Natural gas costs PC --- GOP is sensitive to oil interests and dems hate fracking***

**Dicker ‘12**

Daniel Dicker. Oil trader; CNBC Contributor and TheStreet.com columnist; Author, 'Oil’s Endless Bid', Huffington Post, 3-13-12, Time to Pass the Natural Gas Bill, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daniel-dicker/time-to-pass-the-natural-_b_1343080.html>?, jj

**It is at least politically clear why this bill is such a difficult one** to get approved. **Republican fiscal conservatives are opposed to** new federal spending **and are sensitive to oil interests in their home states**. They view this bill as anti-free market, an example of government looking to "pick winners."

Democrats are opposed to any measure that would encourage environmentally sensitive hydraulic fracturing for natural gas from shale. Between the two, despite being a virtual no-brainer, two iterations of the original "Pickens" bill have failed and so likely will this latest rewritten 'Natural gas act.'

***Coal lobbies are entrenched and powerful --- ensures resistance***

**Bryce ‘10**

Robert Bryce, has been writing about energy for nearly two decades. His articles have appeared in dozens of publications ranging from The Atlantic Monthly to The Guardian, and The Nation to The American Conservative. He is the author of Pipe Dreams: Greed, Ego, and the Death of Enron, and Cronies: Oil, the Bushes, and the Rise of Texas, America’s Superstate. Bryce is a fellow at the Institute for Energy Research, as well as the managing editor of Energy Tribune and a contributing writer for The Texas Observer.

“Power Hungry: The Myths of "Green" Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future” pg 224, jj

Although N2N is the obvious way forward, **we must be realistic**. Adding significant quantities of new nuclear power capacity in the United States will take decades. In the meantime, the United States should focus on the first N: natural gas. But **emphasizing natural gas will be difficult, particularly given the strength of the coal lobby in Congress.** **It will also require Congress and federal regulators to overcome** Cades 1ong parade of **bad legislation that has had the perverse effect of stifling U.S. natural gas production and reducing gas’s share of the U.S. primary energy market.** **Much of that legislation was based on a mistaken notion that America’s natural gas resources were running out.**

***Obama can only lose political capital by advocating offshore drilling***

**Hobson 4/18** Margaret is a writer for E&E Publishing. “**OFFSHORE DRILLING: Obama's development plans gain little political traction in years since Gulf spill**,” 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/04/18/1

President **Obama is embracing** the **offshore oil and gas development** policies he proposed in early 2010 but were sidelined in the shadow of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.¶ Two years after the BP PLC oil rig exploded, killing 11 people and causing the worst oil spill in U.S. history, Obama's "all of the above" energy policy includes offshore drilling provisions that are nearly identical to his aggressive March 2010 drilling plan.¶ Since the moratorium on offshore oil drilling ended in late 2010, the administration expanded oil and gas development in the western and central Gulf of Mexico and announced plans for lease sales in the eastern Gulf. The White House appears poised to allow Royal Dutch Shell PLC to begin exploring for oil this summer in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas and to open oil industry access to the Cook Inlet, south of Anchorage. The administration is also paving the way for oil and gas seismic studies along the mid- and south Atlantic coasts, the first such survey in 30 years.¶ While opening more offshore lands to oil and gas development, the Obama administration has also taken steps to make offshore oil drilling safer, according to a report card issued yesterday by Oil Spill Commission Action, an oversight panel formed by seven members of President Obama's oil spill commission.¶ That report criticized Congress for failing to adopt new oil spill safety laws but praised the Interior Department and industry for making progress in improving offshore oil development safety, environmental protection and oil spill preparation.¶ An environmental group was less complimentary. A report yesterday by Oceana charged that the measures adopted by government and industry are "woefully inadequate."¶ As the 2012 presidential campaign heats up and gasoline prices remain stuck near $4 per gallon, **Obama's offshore** oil **development policies aren't winning him any political capital. The environmental community hates the drilling proposals.** The **Republicans and oil industry officials complain that the White House hasn't gone far enough. And independent voters are confused by the president's rhetoric.**

***No turns---liberals hate the plan and conservatives won’t give Obama credit for it***

**Walsh 11**, Bryan, TIME Senior editor, November 9, “Why Obama’s Offshore Drilling Plan Isn’t Making Anyone Happy,” http://science.time.com/2011/11/09/why-obamas-offshore-drilling-plan-isnt-making-anyone-happy/#ixzz26snhDbbI

Nonetheless, Obama has set a target of reducing U.S. oil imports by a third by 2025, and greater domestic oil production is going to have to be a part of that—including oil from the Arctic. Unfortunately for the President, ***no one’s likely to cheer him***. Conservatives and the oil industry ***won’t be happy*** until just about ***every*** square ***foot*** of the country is available for drilling—though it is worth noting that oil production offshore has actually increased under Obama—and environmentalists aren’t going to rally to support ***any sort of expanded drilling***. With energy, as with so many other issues for Obama, ***it’s lonely at the center***.

***Relaxing drilling restrictions empirically causes backlash---no risk of offense***

**Broder 10** John is a writer for the New York Times. “Obama to Open Offshore Areas to Oil Drilling for First Time,” March 31, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/31/science/earth/31energy.html?\_r=0

But while Mr. Obama has staked out middle ground on other environmental matters — supporting nuclear power, for example — the sheer breadth of the **offshore drilling** decision **will take some of his supporters aback. And it is no sure thing that it will win support** for a climate bill **from undecided senators close to the oil industry**, like Lisa Murkowski, Republican of Alaska, or Mary L. Landrieu, Democrat of Louisiana.¶ The Senate is expected to take up a climate bill in the next few weeks — the last chance to enact such legislation before midterm election concerns take over. Mr. Obama and his allies in the Senate have already made significant concessions on coal and nuclear power to try to win votes from Republicans and moderate Democrats. The new plan now grants one of the biggest items on the oil industry’s wish list — access to vast areas of the Outer Continental Shelf for drilling.¶ But even as Mr. Obama curries favors with pro-drilling interests, **he risks a backlash from some coastal governors, senators and environmental advocates, who say that the relatively small amounts of oil to be gained in the offshore areas are not worth the environmental risks.**

**PC Key – Dems**

***Obama’s PC key to get dems on board***

**Carmago 12/4** Raisa Carmago, 12/4/12, Voxxi, Immigration reform advocates hopeful Obama will lead, <http://www.voxxi.com/immigration-reform-hopeful-obama-lead/>, jj

Pressuring the White House

The same was echoed by Luis Cortes, president of Esperanza. He said where they’re both balancing the debate is the guest worker programs. Cortes told VOXXI **it’s going to be difficult to get a bill passed from the Democratic Party on the temporary worker provision because of their union alliance.**

Brent Wilkes, executive director of the League of United Latin American Citizens, explained in a previous interview with VOXXI that **the reason they opposed guest worker provisions is because when the Bush administration championed immigration reform in 2007, it required a worker to return to their home country. There was no pathway to become a permanent legal resident. He said that could potentially lead to workers being more easily exploited.**

Cortes added that **he’s hopeful the president will begin negotiations on the immigration reform debate**. Faith based leaders and business stakeholders indicated that the margin of victory between winning and losing within the Republican Party has narrowed.

Administration officials within the White House are also playing a pivotal role including key figures such as Cesar Chávez’s granddaughter, Julie Chávez. The next step will be to meet with them. A coalition of faith and business leaders will be discussing their efforts with White House staff tomorrow.

Yet, **the bigger question still centers on the president’s image.**

“**The question is can the president reach across the aisle?”** said Cortes.

**A2: Minnesota Olive Branch Turn**

***Not an olive branch – supercharges the link***

**Sheppard, ’10** (Kate Sheppard, Mother Jones, 7 May 2010, “How $4 Gas Drove Us All Crazy,” http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2010/05/4-dollar-gas-oil-spill)//CC

**The drilling question is also seeping into** climate bill **politics**, as **opponents threaten to filibuster any measure that expands offshore drilling. Obama's** offshore **proposal was offered as an olive branch** to apprehensive legislators in return for a comprehensive bill; **now, it puts his *entire*** energy ***agenda* in jeopardy**. The bill's authors have indicated that they are likely to maintain drilling provisions and downplayed the tension over the issue. But **drilling opponents have a renewed fervor**.

**A2: No Link – Obama Doesn’t Push Plan**

***2) Energy debates drain capital --- presidential leadership key***

**National Journal 12** (“Former Sen. Trent Lott, Ex-Rep. Jim Davis Bemoan Partisanship on Energy Issues” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/2012-election/former-members-bemoan-partisanship-on-energy-issues-20120829>)

**In a climate where everything from transportation issues to the farm bill have gotten caught in political gridlock, it will take serious willingness to compromise to get formerly bipartisan energy issues moving from the current partisan standstill.**

“**If we get the right political leadership and the willingness to put everything on the table, I don’t think this has to be a partisan issue**,” former Rep. Jim Davis, D-Fla., said during a Republican National Convention event on Wednesday in Tampa hosted by National Journal and the American Petroleum Institute.

Former Senate Republican Leader Trent Lott of Mississippi said that “**Republicans who want to produce more of everything have to also be willing to give a little on the conservation side.”**

The event focused on the future of energy issues and how they are playing out in the presidential and congressional races. Four years ago, the major presidential candidates both agreed that climate change needed to be addressed. However, since then, **the science behind global warming has come into question by more and more Republicans.**

But casting energy as a defense or jobs issue, in the current political climate, will allow debates between lawmakers to gain some steam, Lott and Davis agreed.

The export of **coal and natural gas, hydraulic fracturing, and how tax reform will affect the energy industries are all issues that will have to be dealt with by the** next **president** and Congress.

“**The job of the** next **president is critical on energy and many of these issues, and the job is very simple: adult supervision of the Congress**,” Davis said.

To that, Lott acknowledged that “**Congress is gridlocked because of who is there.… The middle is gone.”**

***3) Obama will get the blame***

**Nicholas and Hook 10**(Peter and Janet, Tribune Washington Bureau, July 30, "Obama the Velcro president", http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730)jn

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. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Il.) said: “The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It’s naïve to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office.”

**Ext – Energy Costs Not Key**

***Manufacturing decreasing reliance on nat gas***

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

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

**2nc – Energy Not Key – Inshoring inev**

***Manufacturing inshoring is bigger than any one variable --- energy prices aren’t key***

Fishman 12 Charles Fishman is the author, most recently, of The Big Thirst: The Secret Life and Turbulent Future of Water. DECEMBER 2012 ATLANTIC MAGAZINE, The Insourcing Boom, <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/12/the-insourcing-boom/309166/?single_page=true>, jj

Many offshoring decisions were based on a single preoccupation—cheap labor. The labor was so cheap, in fact, that it covered a multitude of sins in other areas. The approach to bringing jobs back has been much more thoughtful. ***Jobs are coming back not for a single, simple reason, but for many intertwined reasons—which means they won’t slip away again when one element of the business, or the economy, changes.***

***Manufacturing jobs are returning to the US***

Martha C White, NBC News, 4/20/2012, "As factory jobs return to US, the need for technical training grows," economywatch.nbcnews.com/\_news/2012/04/20/11308730-as-factory-jobs-return-to-us-the-need-for-technical-training-grows?lite

According to a survey by the Boston Consulting Group of executives at 106 manufacturing companies with $1 billion or more in sales, ***37 percent*** said they ***are planning or "actively considering" onshoring***. Among companies with more than $10 billion in revenue, that percentage shot up to nearly half. Leading the movement were companies that make rubber and plastic products, industrial machinery and electronics and computer equipment. Manufacturing executives cite several factors driving their decision, said BCG senior partner Harold Sirkin. The first is that the cheap Chinese labor that looked so appealing 10 years ago isn't so cheap anymore. "Chinese labor has been rising at 20 to 50 percent a year since 2001," Sirkin said. "We're expecting it to be somewhere around $6 an hour in 2015." While this is still low compared to the average $26 hourly wage BCG predicts an American manufacturing employee will earn in 2015, Sirkin added that ***the productivity of American workers is*** between ***3***.2 and 3.4 ***times higher than that of their Chinese counterparts***. Also, American factories tend to be more automated, which means robots rather than paid workers do many tasks. Rising energy costs also play a big role. The price of oil has jumped from around $25 a barrel at the turn of the century to around $100 today, which significantly ***increases the cost of shipping goods from Asia***. In a recent interview, Charles Bunch, chairman and CEO of PPG Industries, told CNBC's Jim Cramer that the cost of energy within China also is much higher. "***The China cost advantage in many energy-intensive industries is diminishing***," he told Cramer. "Now, the U.S. is going to be much more competitive on the global scene in terms of manufacturing costs." Sirkin said American manufacturers also are concerned about protecting intellectual property and effective quality control in Chinese factories. Seventy percent of survey respondents agreed with the statement, "Sourcing in China is more costly than it looks on paper." These companies won't abandon their operations in China entirely, Sirkin said. As a result of that country's burgeoning growth, many factories can be repurposed to serve the domestic market. "Ironically, the growth in China is making it easier for companies to onshore back in the United States," he said.

***Manufacturing is doing good – government incentives***

Trivett and Krueger 12, Vincent Trivett, Minyanville, Alan B. Krueger is Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, 8/3/2012, "Manufacturing: A Silver Lining to the July Jobs Numbers," www.minyanville.com/business-news/the-economy/articles/manufacturing-manufacturing-jobs-millenials-unemployment-rate/8/3/2012/id/42946

***One bright spot*** shone through the numbers. The sector with the second-biggest gain in employment in July ***was manufacturing***, after leisure and hospitality. The US gained 25,000 manufacturing jobs and 27,000 jobs in the hospitality business. As Alan Kreuger wrote on the White House Blog: After losing millions of manufacturing jobs in the years before and during the recession, ***the economy has added 532,000 manufacturing jobs since January 2010*** – the strongest growth for any 30-month period since June 1989. Within manufacturing, motor vehicles and parts added 12,800 jobs in July, its strongest monthly growth since January 2011, partly reflecting fewer seasonal layoffs last month. To continue the revival in manufacturing jobs and output, President Obama has proposed tax incentives for manufacturers, enhanced training for the workforce, and measures to create manufacturing hubs and discourage sending jobs overseas.

### Defense

***1. Global economy resilient***

**Zakaria ‘9 -** PhD Poli Sci @ Harvard, Zakaria, Editor of Newsweek, 12/12/’9 (Fareed, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425>)

**A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets.** So consider this: **the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year**. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but **it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled**. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "**We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual**?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, **governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s,** when governments played a tiny role in national economies**. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles:** the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. **Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force.** When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.**

***2. Economic collapse doesn’t cause war***

Fareed **Zakaria** was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 20**09**, “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html>

**Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries.** At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. **One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks** (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). **Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran.** Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But **overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**.

***3. US isn’t key to the world economy***

John **Curran, 9-2-2010,** “Can World Economy Keep Growing If U.S. Doesn’t?” Time,<http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/can-world-economy-keep-growing-if-u-s-doesnt/?xid=rsstopstories&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed:+time/topstories+%28TIME:+Top+Stories%29>

A worrying economic question these days is the possibility of a return to negative GDP growth in the U.S, the dreaded double dip. If it happened it could pull much of the world back into recession, possibly triggering another round of financial crisis. Though all but a few consider this a low possibility, it's not so low as to be off the radar. Economists I follow generally put the risk of a U.S. double dip at somewhere between 20% and 35%. There's ample evidence that the U.S. economy is not out of the woods yet. U.S. consumers picked up spending slightly last month, but they are still tentative and their debt levels remain high. Businesses are watching consumers closely because managers are reluctant to commit to new hiring and investment while so many people are out of work. Consumer spending picked up slightly in July, but confidence is weak and retailers are hurting. The latest signs of this come from back-to-school shopping, where price cutting ruled, and tumbling U.S. auto sales (down 21% in August). There is talk of a second federal stimulus but nobody can count those chickens until they hatch. The chicken you can count on, though, is the economic energy coming from developing markets, specifically the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China). Though the BRICs will advance in fits and starts—for more on this, see Michael Schuman's insightful [post](http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2010/09/02/is-red-hot-india-too-hot/) on India and China—the fact of their increasing consumption power now feeds into the global growth calculation in a meaningful way. **The good news is that BRIC growth increasingly makes U.S. growth shortfalls in the years ahead less of a threat for the world economy**. According to work by Jim O'Neill, who heads Goldman Sachs' global economics team, the current value of consumption in the BRIC countries is roughly $4 trillion, still less than half of the $10.5 trillion that U.S. consumers spend. But **O'Neill sees a powerful lift from these countries in the years just ahead. With BRIC consumption growing by roughly 15% per year, he estimates, it should rival that of U.S. consumption by the end of the decade. The world will feel the beneficial effects sooner.**  BRIC consumption is already growing by roughly $600 billion a year and should rise to $1 trillion a year by the middle of the decade, says O'Neill. **Such demand does not all land at the U.S. doorstep but it does flow to the world, providing a nice offset to what is likely to be long-term weakness in U.S. consumption. That's good news for all.**

### Ext #5 – No Impact – Collapse Doesn’t Cause War

#### Prefer our evidence --- their authors overestimate the US’s ability to shape the international system

Christopher **Layne** (Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University) **2006** “The Peace of Illusions” p 176-7

A second contention advanced by proponents of American hegemony is that the United States cannot withdraw from Eurasia because a great power war there could shape the post conflict international system in ways harmful to U.S. interests. Hence, the United States "could suffer few economic losses during a war, or even benefit somewhat, and still find the postwar environment quite costly to its own trade and investment."sa This really is not an economic argument but rather an argument about the consequences of Eurasia's political and ideological, as well as economic, closure. Proponents of hegemony fear that if great power wars in Eurasia occur, they could bring to power militaristic or totalitarian regimes. Mere, several points need to be made. First, proponents of American hegemony overestimate the amount of influence that the United States has on the international system. There are numerous possible geopolitical rivalries in Eurasia. Most of these will not culminate in war, but it's a good bet that some will. But regardless of whether Eurasian great powers remain at peace, the outcomes are going to be caused more by those states' calculations of their interests than by the presence of U.S. forces in Eurasia. The United States has only limited power to affect the amount of war and peace in the international system, and whatever influence it does have is being eroded by the creeping multipolarization under way in Eurasia. Second, the possible benefits of "environment shaping" have to be weighed against the possible costs of U.S. involvement in a big Eurasian war. Finally, distilled to its essence, this argument is a restatement of the fear that U.S. security and interests inevitably will be jeopardized by a Eurasian hegemon. This threat is easily exaggerated, and manipulated, to disguise ulterior motives for U.S. military intervention in Eurasia.

### Ext #6 – No Transition Wars

#### Withdrawal is smooth

Charles A. **Kupchan**, Political Science Quarterly, 00323195, Summer **2003**, Vol. 118, Issue 2 “The Rise of Europe, America's Changing Internationalism, and the End of U.S. Primacy” Database: Academic Search Premier

As this new century progresses, unipolarity will give way to a world of multiple centers of power. As this transition proceeds, American grand strategy should focus on making both Europe and East Asia less reliant on U.S. power, while at the same time working with major states in both regions to promote collective management of the global system. The ultimate vision that should guide U.S. grand strategy is the construction of a concert-like directorate of the major powers in North America, Europe, and East Asia. These major powers would together manage developments and regulate relations both within and among their respective regions. They would also coordinate efforts in the battle against terrorism, a struggle that will require patience and steady cooperation among many different nations. Regional centers of power also have the potential to facilitate the gradual incorporation of developing nations into global flows of trade, information, and values. Strong and vibrant regional centers, for reasons of both proximity and culture, often have the strongest incentives to promote prosperity and stability in their immediate peripheries. North America might, therefore, focus on Latin America; Europe on Russia, the Middle East, and Africa; and East Asia on South Asia and Southeast Asia. Mustering the political will and the foresight to pursue this vision will be a formidable task. The United States will need to begin ceding influence and autonomy to regions that have grown all too comfortable with American primacy. Neither American leaders, long accustomed to calling the shots, nor leaders in Europe and East Asia, long accustomed to passing the buck, will find the transition an easy one. But it is far wiser and safer to get ahead of the curve and shape structural change by design than to find unipolarity giving way to a chaotic multipolarity by default. It will take a decade, if not two, for a new international system to evolve. But the decisions taken by the United States early in the twenty-first century will play a critical role in determining whether multipolarity reemerges peacefully or brings with it the competitive jockeying that has so frequently been the precursor to great power war in the past.[\*]

### 2nc Solvency

***The cards they cite --- carey:***

***Takes out the price spikes arg in the un-underlined parts --- says prices will remain low and current supply is enough to meet domestic needs***

. The outlook for unconventional gas is exceptionally bright—with expectations for relatively low future natural gas prices, enough supply to meet domestic needs, and surplus enough to export to other countries. While the unconventional oil story continues to unfold and evolve, an abundance of domestic crude oil is expected. And, thus, an opportunity to not only significantly reduce the country’s dependence on oil imports, but to also increase energy security. Currently, crude oil prices are out of balance as new supply regions are isolated, making it difficult to get crude oil to market.

#### Griles says the plan may speed up exploration --- doesn’t say that it can build the pipelines fast enough to help the manufacturing sector --- also doesn’t say that the plan speeds up the process of getting the gas after the exploration process

#### Medlock is talking about oil, not gas --- says oil drilling helps prices, not gas

### Hurricanes Turn Ext

***Conclusive evidence --- offshore gas production not key --- onshore production key to prevent hurricane price spikes***

**Gas to Power Journal ‘12**

8-31, US: Abundance of shale gas production reduces industry's blow from of Hurrican Isaac <http://gastopowerjournal.com/index.php/markets/item/808-us-abundance-of-shale-gas-production-reduces-industrys-blow-from-of-hurrican-isaac>, jj

**Despite most** of the oil and **gas production in the Gulf of Mexico being shut down following** the landfall of **Hurricane Issac, natural gas market in the US barely reacted**. ***The abundance of shale gas supply has reduced the significance of offshore production***, analysts say. "**Shale-gas production is so high that the Gulf is a much smaller player than it used to be**," said James Williams, an energy economist at WTRG Economics. "**Bottom line is that [Gulf of Mexico] production is not critical anymore."** The US Energy Information Administration (**EIA) expects shale gas to account for around 49% of total output in 2035. The abundance of shale gas production has caused a wave of coal-to-gas switching as US utilities are preferring cheaper and less carbon emissions intensive natural gas over coal.** US power plant owners and operators plan to retire almost 27 GW of coal-fired capacity between 2012 and 2016, shifting the energy balance further towards gas generation, the EIA said in its Annual Electric Generator Report. An unabated speed of the current switch from coal to gas generation in the U.S. would place at least 49 GW of coal-fired capacity at risk for retirement by 2020, according to the reference case in EIA's Annual Energy Outlook 2012 (AEO2012). **Key drivers behind the rise in coal plant closures are the modest growth in US energy demand combined with a continuous drop in relative fuel prices of gas compared with coal. The variable costs of operating natural gas-fired capacity have fallen relative to those of coal-fired plants as gas as domestic gas prices in the US plunged to record lows. Natural gas prices as delivered to power plants in the U.S. plunged to a ten-year low in April**, allowing gas to reach parity with coal in net electric power generation for the first time since the EIA began collecting data.

***Offshore gas irrelevant --- onshore fills in and shields us from hurricanes***

**Saefong ‘12**

Myra P. Saefong, 8-31-12, Market Watch, Hurricanes don’t scare natural gas anymore <http://stream.marketwatch.com/story/markets/SS-4-4/SS-4-10173/>, jj

SAN FRANCISCO (MarketWatch) — **Even with much of the Gulf of Mexico’s energy production shut down as Hurricane Isaac approached the region earlier this week, the natural-gas market barely blinked — and that’s exactly what analysts said would happen.** “**Natural gas did not react like it has in previous storms because, with the rapid development of shale gas over the last several years, the Gulf is increasingly less important to overall gas supply,”** said Kim Pacanovsky, managing director and senior research analyst for oil and gas at MLV & Co. in New York. As of Thursday, about 72.5% of the current daily natural-gas production in the Gulf was shut-in because of Isaac, according to U.S. government data. **Price action in natural-gas market over the past few days**, however, **indicates just how little concern the market has for the production disruption.** On Wednesday, after Isaac made landfall as a Category 1 hurricane, natural-gas futures prices climbed 2%. That’s not much of a move considering that when Hurricane Katrina made landfall in Louisiana as a Category 3 hurricane on August 29, 2005, prices for the commodity rallied nearly 14%. The muted reaction to Isaac may have been a surprise to some, especially since the storm brought back memories of Katrina as it took a similar trajectory. To others, though, it wasn’t surprising at all. In terms of the outlook for natural gas, the market’s reaction, or lack thereof, is “an indication of a reduction in the upside potential for prices,” said Kevin Greiner, chief executive officer of Gas South in Atlanta. “**With a much greater diversity of supply than in the past, it is now harder for the prices to increase.”** The Gulf loses its edge **Natural-gas production from the Gulf of Mexico, as a percentage of total U.S. output, has significantly declined over the past few years, and shale gas is mostly to blame.** While the hurricane hit the Gulf “where there are some offshore natural-gas drilling wells, the predominance of U.S. natural-gas resources are landlocked, which means they were not affected by the coastal impact of Hurricane Isaac,” said Rick Scott, chief investment offer and managing director of Los Angeles-based L&S Advisors Inc. “Even if a major hurricane or other weather event were to disrupt natural-gas supplies temporarily, it wouldn’t even be a blip on the radar,” he said. In other words, **the Gulf has lost its edge as a major source**. **Federal offshore natural-gas production in the Gulf accounts for about 7% of total U.S. dry natural-gas output, down from about 20%** in 2005, according to data from the Energy Information Administration. James Williams, WTRG Economics “**Shale-gas production is so high that the Gulf is a much smaller player than it used to be,”** said James Williams, an energy economist at WTRG Economics. “Bottom line is that [**Gulf of Mexico] production is not critical anymore.”** Shale gas, as defined by the EIA, refers to natural gas trapped within shale formations — sedimentary rocks that can offer a rich source of the commodity. It accounted for 27% of overall U.S. natural-gas production in 2010, according to America’s Natural Gas Alliance. And the EIA expects shale gas to account for around 49% of total output in 2035. See archived Commodities Corner column: Shale sparks natural-gas revolution built to last. “In the seven years since Katrina caused a record run-up in natural-gas prices, **the industry has changed away from dependence on offshore wells**,” said Phil Van Horne, chief executive offer of BlueRock Energy, a Syracuse, N.Y.–based private energy service company. “**The change to shale-well production has limited the impact of these extreme weather events on natural gas**,” he said.

### Defense – extend

***No risk of US/China war***

---Chinese heg isn’t a threat, economic interdependence checks, miscalc won’t happen and deterrence checks escalation

**Art ’10** (Robert J, Christian A. Herter Professor of [International Relations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Relations) at Brandeis University and Fellow at [MIT Center for International Studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT_Center_for_International_Studies) Fall, Political Science Quarterly, Volume 125, #3, “The United States and the Rise of China: Implications for the Long Haul” <http://www.psqonline.org/99_article.php3?byear=2010&bmonth=fall&a=01free>, jj)

**China does not present the type of security threat to the United States that Germany did to Britain, or Britain to Germany**. **Americaʼs nuclear forces make it secure from any Chinese attack on the homeland.** Moreover, China clearly presents a potentially different type of threat to the United States than the Soviet Union did during the Cold War, because the geopolitics of the two situations are different. The Soviet geopolitical (as opposed to the nuclear) threat was two-fold: to conquer and dominate the economic–industrial resources of western Eurasia and to control the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf. Europe and the Persian Gulf constituted two of the five power centers of the world during the Cold War—Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States being the other three. If the Soviets had succeeded in dominating Europe and the Persian Gulf through either conquest or political–military intimidation, then it would have controlled three of the five power centers of the world. That would have been a significant power transition. **Chinaʼs rise does not constitute the same type of geopolitical threat to the United States that the Soviet Union did.** **If China ends up dominating the Korean peninsula and a significant part of continental Southeast Asia, so what?** As long as Japan remains outside the Chinese sphere of influence and allied with the United States, and as long as the United States retains some naval footholds in Southeast Asia, such as in Singapore, the Philippines, or Indonesia, **Chinaʼs domination of these two areas would not present the same type of geopolitical threat that the Soviet Union did. As long as Europe, the Persian Gulf, Japan, India, and Russia** (once it reconstitutes itself as a serious great power) **remain either as independent power centers or under U.S. influence, Chinese hegemony on land in East and Southeast Asia will not tip the world balance of power**. The vast size and central position of the Soviet Union in Eurasia constituted a geopolitical threat to American influence that China cannot hope to emulate. **If judged by the standards of the last three dominant power-rising power competitions of the last 100 years, then, the U.S.–China competition appears well placed to be much safer**. Certainly, war between the two is not impossible, because either or both governments could make a serious misstep over the Taiwan issue. **War by miscalculation is always possible, but the possession of nuclear weapons by both sides has to have a restraining effect on each by dramatically raising the costs of miscalculation, thereby increasing the incentives not to miscalculate. Nuclear deterrence should work to lower dramatically the possibility of war by either miscalculation or deliberate decision** (**or if somehow such a war broke out, then nuclear deterrence should work against its escalation into a large and fearsome one)**. Apart from the Taiwan issue or some serious incident at sea, **it is hard to figure out how to start a war between the United States and China. There are no other territorial disputes of any significance between the two, and there are no foreseeable economic contingencies that could bring on a war between them. Finally, the high economic interdependence and the lack of intense ideological competition between them help to reinforce the pacific effects induced by the condition of mutual assured destruction. The workings of these three factors should make us** **cautiously optimistic about keeping Sino-American relations on the peaceful rather than the warlike track.** The peaceful track does not, by any means, imply the absence of political and economic conflicts in Sino-American relations, nor does it foreclose coercive diplomatic gambits by each against the other. What it does mean is that the **conditions are in place for war to be a low-probability event,** if policymakers are smart in both states (see below), **and that an all-out war is nearly impossible to imagine**. By the historical standards of recent dominant-rising state dyads, this is no mean feat. In sum, **there will be some security dilemma dynamics at work in the U.S.–China relationship**, both over Taiwan and over maritime supremacy in East Asia, should China decide eventually to contest Americaʼs maritime hegemony, and there will certainly be political and military conflicts, **but nuclear weapons should work to mute their severity because the security of each stateʼs homeland will never be in doubt as long as each maintains a secondstrike capability vis-à-vis the other.** If two states cannot conquer one another, then the character of their relation and their competition changes dramatically.

***No impact---US has a huge nuclear advantage***

**Lieber and Press, ‘7** (July/August, Keir and Daryl, “Superiority Complex,” The Atlantic Monthly, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200707/china-nukes>)

In the 1990s, with the Cold War receding, nuclear weapons appeared to be relics. Russian and Chinese leaders apparently thought so. Russia allowed its arsenal to decline precipitously, and **China showed little interest in modernizing its nuclear weapons. The small strategic force that China built and deployed in the 1970s and early 1980s is essentially the same one it has today. But meanwhile, the United States steadily improved its “counterforce” capabilities—those nuclear weapons most effective at targeting an enemy’s nuclear arsenal. Even as it reduced the number of weapons in its nuclear arsenal, the U.S. made its remaining weapons more lethal and accurate. The result today is a global nuclear imbalance unseen in 50 years. And nowhere is U.S. nuclear primacy clearer—or potentially more important—than in the Sino-U.S. relationship. China has approximately 80 operationally deployed nuclear warheads, but only a few of them—those assigned to single-warhead DF-5 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs)—can reach the continental United States**. (There is no definitive, unclassified count of China’s DF-5 ICBMs, but official U.S. statements have put the number at 18.) China **has neither modern nuclear ballistic-missile submarines nor long-range nuclear bombers. Moreover, China’s ICBMs can’t be quickly launched; the warheads are stored separately, and the missiles are kept unfueled.** (Unlike the solid fuel used in U.S. missiles, the liquid fuel used to propel Chinese ICBMs is highly corrosive.) **Finally, China lacks an advanced early-warning system that would give Beijing reliable notice of an incoming attack.**

***Russia’s not aggressive***

**de Waal ‘11** (Thomas, senior associate in the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, Winter, Vol. 35, Iss. 1; pg. 17, “Moving Beyond Mirages: THOMAS DE WAAL DISCUSSES A NEW PARADIGM FOR FOREIGN INTERVENTION IN THE SOUTH CAUCASUS” proquest, jj)

DE WAAL: I suppose the issue that I would like to raise again is Russia. I think Russia is clearly a very difficult neighbor, with a long colonial interest in the region, but I think **it's a mistake to see Russia as being a hegemon that wants to dominate this region**. I think **Russia has moved into a postimperialist phase, in which it does not want to dominate this region and actually does not have the capacity to do so**. Clearly, there are constituencies in Russia, such as the military, who still have an interest in this. And, of course, Russia is still in charge of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. However, I think that in **looking at the broader region- Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan-Russia is slowly adjusting to the new reality, where it realizes that it is one actor among many in the Caucasus**. Therefore, **framing policy to keep Russia out of the region is a waste of time and is counterproductive. I think it should be possible to look at ways of working with Russia in the region**. And that applies also to Turkey and Iran. Basically**, it's a matter of accepting that there should be some kind of Great Power truce in the Caucasus in which everyone's interest is acceptable as long as it is benign.**