#### Aerospace key to new tech to solve climate change – turns wind, solar, nuclear, ccs

Scott and Piper 9 [\*John Scott is Head of Risk Insight at Zurich Global Corporate UK, a part of Zurich Financial Services Group, an insurance-based financial services provider. Adam Piper is Director, Corporate Risks UK & Europe at Miller Insurance Services Limited, an independent specialist insurance and reinsurance broker; “ Aerospace, Defence and Climate Change: The Risk Dimension”; June 2009; <http://www.zurich.com/NR/rdonlyres/B7D44964-EA09-4E31-8D46-55D10B416203/0/E2DIJune15.pdf>; Boyce]

#### The aerospace and defence industry has been a powerhouse of technology R&D in the search for ever more powerful and power-efficient systems for military use. Harnessing this activity to meet the challenges of climate change could bring significant advances to reducing CO2e. The products available from the insurance industry have been designed to protect private assets, whereas the climate is a public good. Despite this limitation, there are many examples where insurance has been used to encourage the use of new carbon reducing technologies and the adoption of adaptive behaviours. This is especially so in the areas of power generation and transportation, but also in energy efficiency and building resilience. Examples include insurance covers for solar and wind power generation, as well as liability cover for carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) and insurance covers for ‘green’ and weather resilient construction. The majority of anthropogenic CO2e comes from burning fossil fuels for power generation - roughly 50% (gas, coal and oil) - and from land transportation (car, truck, bus) or sea transport (ship), around 20%. A relatively small amount of anthropogenic CO2e comes from air transport. Technologies that significantly reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from these activities are imperative if Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) GHG reduction targets are to be met. In power generation, a move to a mix of nuclear, renewable and CCS coal- or gas-fired power stations would help meet GHG reduction commitments and improve fuel security (i.e. make western economies less reliant on Middle Eastern and Russian oil and gas).

### PC-

#### First, Obama only has one last PC shot for the debt ceiling-capital is finite

Gold Jan. 3rd

[Howard R. Gold, business and financial journalist and an independent-minded citizen who is deeply concerned about the challenges facing our country, January 3rd, 2013, Four Political Predictions for 2013, <http://www.independentagenda.com/politics-and-2012-election/four-political-predictions-for-2013/>, uwyo//amp]

2. The president won’t get much of his agenda through Congress this year. There’s such bad blood between the president and House Republicans and between Democrats and Republicans on Capitol Hill that the atmosphere is beyond dysfunctional. On Wednesday Politico reported that House Speaker John Boehner told Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to go f—k himself—in the White House, no less–and then bragged about it. Oh, behave! President Obama and Vice President Joe Biden in the White House on New Year’s night after the House passed a bill to settle the “fiscal cliff.” Photo: YouTube. Once the ugly debt ceiling battle is over (see above), the president’s political capital will be almost shot and Republicans will have little incentive to work with him, except on one thing—immigration. There they have a compelling self-interest to come up with a compromise immigration reform bill this year—they want to keep from losing more than the 70%+ of Hispanic and Asian voters President Obama won against Mitt Romney last year.

#### Obama has PC- leverage

Zasloff 1-2

[Jonathan, Professor of Law at UCLA, PhD in American Foreign Policy from Harvard and JD from Yale Law, "Obama’s New Leverage: Implement The Defense Sequester", Same Facts, 2013, <http://www.samefacts.com/2013/01/national-security/obamas-new-leverage-implement-the-defense-sequester/>]

President Obama needs to use the leverage that the defense sequester gives him. The Republicans want to get rid of the defense sequester — badly. By now, we should all be past the silly notion that the GOP wants to reduce spending: it only wants to reduce spending that could possibly assist low-income and working Americans. Very well, the President has to say: I will veto any bill that gets rid of the defense sequester unless I get my own priorities in spending and revenue. End of story. And conversely, if the President does not use this leverage, and instead agrees to benefit cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and crucial domestic priorities, he will have no one to blame but himself.

#### Obama caved on fiscal cliff to save his pc for the debt ceiling-tougher 2nd term stance

Gandelman Jan 2nd

[Joe Gandelman, syndicated columnist, Jan 2nd, 2013, 12 predictions for the new year, <http://www.dailyworld.com/article/20130103/OPINION/301030315/12-predictions-new-year>, uwyo//amp]

3. Despite being already under fire for "caving" (the 21st century partisans' word for America's centuries-old, respected, tradition of political compromise) on the fiscal cliff, a tougher second-term Obama will use his political capital to battle Republicans' opposition to his positions on immigration reform, gun control and the debt ceiling. A form of immigration reform will pass.

#### Second, His pc is key-

#### [a.] key to persuade Republicans over new revenue versus new cuts

Financial Times Jan. 2nd

[FinancialTimes.com, Jan 2, 2013, Obama trades one US cliff for another,http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/b983357c-54d8-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html#axzz2Gt9dH0xY, uwyo//amp]

Mr Obama has said consistently he will not negotiate with the Republicans over the debt ceiling. But it is difficult to see how he will be able to delink his request for a debt-ceiling increase from the parallel negotiations over the sequester. Republicans are demanding a dollar in spending cuts for every dollar they approve in higher borrowing limits. Mr Obama insists that any spending cuts must be matched equally by new taxes. Quite how, or whether, these divisions can be reconciled in time to avert a technical sovereign default is worryingly unclear. In the next eight weeks Mr Obama must persuade Republicans to avoid triggering a sovereign default. Given Mr Boehner’s tenuous position as Speaker, Mr Obama will need to make a serious offer of reforming entitlements, notably Medicare and Social Security. These are reasonable trade-offs, as the president’s own SimpsonBowles commission pointed out.

#### [b.] needs to use the bully pulpit-casts blame on Republicans

Shear & Calmes Jan. 2nd

[MICHAEL D. SHEAR, chief writer for The Caucus, the political blog for The New York Times., and JACKIE CALMES, Lawmakers Gird for Next Fiscal Clash, on the Debt Ceiling, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/03/us/politics/for-obama-no-clear-path-to-avoid-a-debt-ceiling-fight.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, uwyo//amp]

In saying he will refuse to bargain over the debt limit, Mr. Obama is counting on help from the business community, given its traditional ties to Republicans. Recently, for example, the head of the Business Roundtable, John Engler, a Republican and former governor of Michigan, called for extending the debt limit for five years. “You don’t put the full faith and credit of the United States’ finances at risk,” said David M. Cote, chairman of Honeywell and a Republican member of the 2010 Simpson-Bowles fiscal commission. “The whole idea of using debt ceiling that way or saying ‘I’ll do this horrible thing to all of us unless you give in’ just doesn’t make any sense for anybody. It makes me very nervous. It’s not a smart way to run the country.” Mr. Obama might also take to the road again, using the power of his office in an effort to convince the public that another fight over the debt ceiling risks another economic crisis. Public polls after the last debt ceiling fight suggested that more people blamed Republicans for the threat of a shutdown.

#### [c.] k2 get Democrats on board with spending reductions

Bigelow Jan. 3rd

[William Bigelow, Breitbart writer, Jan. 3rd, 2013, MCCONNELL: A DEBT-CEILING FIGHT WITH OBAMA WHETHER HE WANTS IT OR NOT, <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/01/03/McConnell-A-Debt-Ceiling-Fight-With-Obama-Whether-He-Wants-It-Or-Not?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+BreitbartFeed+(Breitbart+Feed)>, uwyo//amp]

Mitch McConnell is gearing up for a massive battle with Barack Obama over the debt limit. He wrote in a Yahoo op-ed that there is going to be a fight with Obama "whether he wants it or not." The present $16.4 trillion debt ceiling is the line in the sand for Republicans now; as McConnell wrote, The president may not want to have a fight about government spending over the next few months, but it’s the fight he is going to have, because it’s a debate the country needs … For the sake of our future, the president must show up to this debate early and convince his party to do something that neither he nor they have been willing to do until now. Over the next two months they need to deliver the same kind of bipartisan resolution to the spending problem we have now achieved on revenue — before the eleventh hour.

### Link

#### Wind incentives drain PC – the issue is politicized, it can barely get enough congressional support and only as rider to other bills

Jacobs and Noble, 12

[Jennifer Jacobs and Jason Noble, Des Moines Register, 8/15, lexis]

All the huff and puff on the campaign trail in Iowa aside, it’s likely that the wind energy tax credit will pass this fall, Iowans who follow the issue say. It’s a topic that Iowa voters typically don’t bring up. But President Barack Obama loves to talk about it because it gives him an opening to bash GOP rival Mitt Romney for being opposed to an incentive that all of Iowa’s top politicians consider important. “If he really wants to learn something about wind,” Obama said Tuesday, “all he’s got to do is pay attention to what you’ve been doing here in Iowa.” Obama is keeping up a drumbeat on the issue at every campaign stop. At a wind farm in Haverhill on Tuesday, he said the tax credits help create jobs while the rest of the country benefits from “clean American energy.” Iowa’s congressional delegation is cautiously optimistic the wind production tax credit will pass after the Nov. 6 elections as part of a larger bill, staffers told The Des Moines Register on Tuesday. All seven in the delegation support the tax credit. But Republican political operatives in Iowa say Obama has politicized the issue. They say he’s trying to manufacture an issue where there isn’t one — and that he’s just trying to distract from his own record on jobs and the economy. The debate on the campaign trail highlights that presidential candidates sometimes play up differences that are real, but may not have real effect on any legislation. Action on the tax credit won’t happen before the election, aides for Iowa’s congressional delegation said. After Nov. 6, when there’s more clarity to the political landscape, language is likely to get tacked onto a bigger bill and squeak through amid debate about the farm bill and George W. Bush-era tax cuts, staffers said. But Jeff Giertz, an aide to Democratic U.S. Rep. Bruce Braley, said he thinks it’s appropriate for Obama to focus on wind right now. “If you get status quo in Congress after this election and a president who won’t sign it into law, then it’s gone,” he said. Despite the expected likelihood of eventual passage, the uncertainty has fed turmoil in the wind energy industry, similar to delays in renewing the biodiesel tax credit two years ago, staffers said.

#### - Growing coalition against wind support – wind lobby efforts aren’t compelling congressional response

Paul Driessen, senior policy adviser for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and columnist, “We Need to Terminate Big Wind Subsidies” Townhall.com, May 9, 2012.

Unprecedented! As bills to extend seemingly perpetual wind energy subsidies were again introduced by industry lobbyists late last year, taxpayers finally decided they’d had enough. Informed and inspired by a loose but growing national coalition of groups opposed to more giveaways with no scientifically proven net benefits, thousands of citizens called their senators and representatives – and rounded up enough Nay votes to run four different bills aground. For once, democracy worked. A shocked American Wind Energy Association and its allies began even more aggressive recruiting of well-connected Democrat and Republican political operatives and cosponsors – and introducing more proposals like HR 3307 to extend the Production Tax Credit (PTC). Parallel efforts were launched in state legislatures, to maintain mandates, subsidies, feed-in tariffs, renewable energy credits, and other “temporary” ratepayer and taxpayer obligations. This “emerging industry” is “vitally important” to our energy future, supporters insisted. It provides “clean energy” and “over 37,000” jobs that “states can’t afford to lose.” It helps prevent global warming. None of these sales pitches holds up under objective scrutiny, and their growing awareness of this basic reality has finally made many in Congress inclined to eliminate this wasteful spending on wind power.

#### – Ideological opposition and congressional loggerheads

Diane Cardwell,” Energy Tax Breaks Proposed, Despite Waning Support for Subsidies”, New York Times, January 26, 2012.

Lobbyists for both industries say the new tax breaks need to be passed quickly and are trying to get Congress to include them in a bill to extend the payroll tax cut. That bill, like all tax cuts these days, has Congress at loggerheads. “But true performance-based incentives, where incentives are only provided when actual production occurs, seem to be maintaining their support,” said Robert Gramlich, senior vice president for public policy for the American Wind Energy Association. How this will play out in Congress is anybody’s guess, lawmakers say. Mr. Reichert said the credits were not yet part of the negotiations over the payroll tax cut, which is due to expire at the end of February. Republican leaders may look to revive the Keystone XL oil pipeline — as proposed, the pipeline would run 1,700 miles from oil sands in Canada to refineries on the Gulf Coast — as part of a compromise to approve the renewable energy credits, according to lobbyists and lawmakers involved in the discussions. But there is a lot of ideological opposition to more tax credits, said Senator Jeff Bingaman, Democrat of New Mexico and the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, who supports the extension. “The rhetoric is that the government should get out of the way,” he said. “That gets translated into opposition to a lot of these things.”

### U/Q

#### Will start negotiating in the next few days

Hennesey & Lauter Dec. 31st

[Kathleen Hennessey and David Lauter, Washington Bureau, December 31st, 2012, Obama wins 'fiscal cliff' victory, but at high cost, Obama wins 'fiscal cliff' victory, but at high cost http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-fiscal-cliff-analysis-20130101,0,6417926.story, uwyo//amp]

The agreement to freeze income tax rates for most Americans while allowing them to rise for the wealthiest dealt only with the most pressing elements of the fiscal storm Congress and the president created last year. A newly elected Congress will begin work in a few days and immediately will need to start negotiating yet another deal. That next fight will be aimed at further reducing the long-term deficit and raising the debt ceiling before the government runs out of money to pay its bills — a deadline that will hit sometime in late February or March.

#### Second,

#### Gun control measures won’t come up for months, nor will it be pushed by the white house

Foxnews 1/8

[Staff writer, AP Press contributed to the Report, “White House ramps up talks on gun control measures”, January 08, 2013, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/08/white-house-ramps-up-talks-on-gun-control-measures/#ixzz2HQPWontd, \\wyo-bb]

Accelerated efforts to draft new gun control measures have alarmed gun rights groups, including the NRA, at the national and local levels. A separate last-minute effort to craft a restrictive semi-automatic weapon ban in Illinois was put on hold amid a tight deadline and intense opposition. On Capitol Hill, California Sen. Dianne Feinstein is again pushing a renewal of the federal assault-weapons ban. But Congress is also slammed with a pressing set of deadlines regarding a host of fiscal issues -- the debt ceiling, automatic spending cuts and the federal budget itself. Kentucky Sen. Mitch McConnell, the top Republican in the Senate, said the next round of fiscal deadlines will occupy the attention of Congress and push off the consideration of gun legislation for at least three months. "There will be plenty of time to take a look at their recommendations once they come forward," McConnell said of Biden's upcoming proposals during an interview Sunday on ABC's "This Week." Obama aides say the president still plans to act quickly on Biden's proposals. They worry that as the shock of the Newtown shooting fades, so, too, will the prospects that pro-gun lawmakers will work with the White House to tighten restrictions.

#### Third, The debate is irrelevant- PC impacts are not perceived until the vote when legislation crosses Obama’s desk

Drum 10

[Kevin, Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming off the back-burner”, <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>, March]

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

#### Fourth, Obama won’t touch energy policy due to its potential for polarization

PIW 12

[Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, 1/9/12, Obama Plays Safe on Energy Policy, Lexis]

With less than a year to go until he faces re-election, US President Barack Obama is trying to avoid controversial energy policy decisions, postponing the finalization of restrictions on oil refinery and power plant emissions and delaying the approval of a major crude pipeline project. The president’s caution will prolong the status quo on issues where the industry both opposes and supports the administration’s plans, and also illustrates what's at stake for energy policy depending on whether or not Obama is given another four years in office. Most of Obama's original campaign pledges on promoting alternatives to fossil fuels and tackling climate change have not passed muster with Congress, most notably an ambitious plan for national carbon controls, a subsequent toned-down clean energy standard floated after the carbon legislation failed, and repeated efforts to repeal $30 billion-$40 billion worth of oil industry tax deductions over 10 years ( PIW May9'11 ). The one exception has been the passage of $90 billion in clean energy funding as part of an economic stimulus bill passed early in Obama's term, but the White House has been unable to repeat this success in other energy policy areas ( PIW Feb.23'09 ).

### Impact K

#### Says ontology comes first- 1NC Jervis- pushes q’s of praxis to burner

#### Ontological or epistemological first frameworks abdicate responsibility for solving real world problems

Jarvis 2K (D.S.L., Lecturer n Government - U of Sydney, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE CHALLENGE OF POSTMODERNISM, p. 128-9)

Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to suppose that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggles as actors in international politics. What does Ashley's project his deconstructive efforts, or valiant tight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the emigres of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rarionality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to suppose that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or is in some, way bad—is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and these theories tne ultimate question, “So what?” to what purpose do they deconstruct problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this "debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics" be judged pertinent relevant helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate.

#### Even if reality is constructed, or our ontology or epistemology is flawed, it doesn’t change the need to act upon state structures to create change

Darryl S. L. Jarvis, Director of the Research Institute for International Risk and Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Sydney, 2K (International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending the Discipline, Published by the University of South Carolina Press, ISBN 1570033056, p. 129-130)

If the relevance of Ashley's project is questionable, so too is its logic and cogency. First, we might ask to what extent the postmodern "emphasis on the textual, constructed nature of the world" represents "an unwarranted extension of approaches appropriate for literature to other areas of human practice that are more constrained by an objective reality."39 All theory is socially constructed and realities like the nation-state, domestic and international politics, regimes, or transnational agencies are obviously [end page 129] social fabrications. But to what extent is this observation of any real use? Just because we acknowledge that the state is a socially fabricated entity, or that the division between domestic and international society is arbitrarily inscribed does not make the reality of the state disappear or render invisible international politics. Whether socially constructed or objectively given, the argument over the ontological status of the state is of no particular moment. Does this change our experience of the state or somehow diminish the political-economic-juridical-military functions of the state? To recognize that states are not naturally inscribed but dynamic entities continually in the process of being made and reimposed and are therefore culturally dissimilar, economically different, and politically atypical, while perspicacious to our historical and theoretical understanding of the state, in no way detracts from its reality, practices, and consequences. Similarly, few would object to Ashley's hermeneutic interpretivist understanding of the international sphere as an artificially inscribed demarcation. But, to paraphrase Holsti again, so what? This does not make its effects any less real, diminish its importance in our lives, or excuse us from paying serious attention to it. That international politics and states would not exist without subjectivities is a banal tautology. The point, surely, is to move beyond this and study these processes. Thus, while intellectually interesting, constructivist theory is not an end point as Ashley seems to think, where we all throw up our hands and announce there are no foundations and all reality is an arbitrary social construction. Rather, it should be a means of recognizing the structurated nature of our being and the reciprocity between subjects and structures through history. Ashley, however, seems not to want to do this, but only to deconstruct the state, international politics, and international theory on the basis that none of these is objectively given but fictitious entities that arise out of modernist practices of representation. While an interesting theoretical enterprise, it is of no great consequence to the study of international politics. Indeed, structuration theory has long taken care of these ontological dilemmas that otherwise seem to preoccupy Ashley.40

#### Preventing widespread death through the aff takes precedence to ontological questioning

Arnold I. Davidson, coeditor of Critical Inquiry, Assoc Prof of Philosophy, U of Chicago, Critical Inquiry, Winter 1989. 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 throu gh 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.

#### It’s impossible to determine an answer to being – ontological questioning results in an infinite regress and total political paralysis

Emmanuel Levinas, professor of philosophy, and Philippe Nemo, professor of new philosophy, Ethics and Infinity, 1985, pg. 6-7

Are we not in need of still more precautions? Must we not step back from this question to raise another, to recognize the obvious circularity of ask­ing what isthe “What is . .?“ question? It seems to beg the question. Is our new suspicion, then, that Heidegger begs the question of metaphysics when he asks “What is poetry?” or “What is thinking?”? Yet his thought is insistently anti-metaphysical. Why, then, does he retain the metaphysical question par excellence? Aware of just such an objection, he pro­poses, against the vicious circle of the *petitio principi,* an alternative, productive circularity: hermeneutic questioning. To ask “What is. . .?“ does not partake of onto-theo-logy if one acknowledges (1) that the answer can never be fixed absolutely, but calls essen­tially, endlessly, for additional “What is . . .?“ ques­tions. Dialectical refinement here replaces vicious circularity. Further, beyond the openmindedness called for by dialectical refinement, hermeneutic questioning (2) insists on avoiding subjective impositions, on avoid­ing reading into rather than harkening to things. One must harken to the things themselves, ultimately to being, in a careful attunement to what is. But do the refinement and care of the herme­neutic question — which succeed in avoiding onto­theo-logy succeed in avoiding all viciousness? Certainly they convert a simple fallacy into a produc­tive inquiry, they open a path for thought. But is it not the case that however much refinement and care one brings to bear, to ask what something is leads to asking what something else is, and so on and so forth, ad infinitum*?* What is disturbing in this is not so much the infinity of interpretive depth, which has the virtue of escaping onto-theo-logy and remaining true to the way things are, to the phenomena, the coming to be and passing away of being. Rather, the problem lies in the influence the endlessly open horizon of such thinking exerts on the way of such thought. That is, the problem lies in what seems to be the very virtue of hermeneutic thought, namely, the doggedness of the “What is . . .?“ question, in its inability to escape itself, to escape being and essence.

#### The prioritization of method, or other philosophical approaches over all else, trades off with real world change and creates a vicious cycle that prevents concrete solutions to problems

Owen 02, Reader in Political Theory at the University of Southampton (David, “Reorienting International Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning”, Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 31, No. 3, <http://mil.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/3/653>)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

#### Method can’t be evaluated in a vacuum- to do so is useless

Mario Bunge, Treatise on basic Philosophy Vol 6: Epistemology and Methodology II: Understanding the world, 1983 p. 207

Tenth, the methodics of any science includes not only its peculiar techniques but also the scientific method (Ch. 7, Section 2.2). A collection of techniques, e.g. for producing high pressures or high vacua, or for measuring the effects of reinforcement on the learning of philosophy does not constitute a science: methods are means not ends, and they cannot be applied or evaluated apart from a problematics and an aim. Merely exploiting a given technique for obtaining or processing data without any ulterior purposes is not doing science but just keeping busy and possibly salaried.

#### Overemphasis on method destroys effectiveness of the discipline

Wendt, Handbook of IR, 2k2 p. 68

It should be stressed that in advocating a pragmatic view we are not endorsing method-driven social science. Too much research in international relations chooses problems or things to be explained with a view to whether the analysis will provide support for one or another methodological ‘ism’. But the point of IR scholarship should be to answer questions about international politics that are of great normative concern, not to validate methods. Methods are means, not ends in themselves. As a matter of personal scholarly choice it may be reasonable to stick with one method and see how far it takes us. But since we do not know how far that is, if the goal of the discipline is insight into world politics then it makes little sense to rule out one or the other approach on a priori grounds. In that case a method indeed becomes a tacit ontology, which may lead to neglect of whatever problems it is poorly suited to address. Being conscious about these choices is why it is important to distinguish between the ontological, empirical and pragmatic levels of the rationalist-constructivist debate. We favor the pragmatic approach on heuristic grounds, but we certainly believe a conversation should continue on all three levels.