# Case Ext.

### AT: South Korea troops solve

#### Ext Kamiya – only Guam relocation solves because it is close enough to hotspots if needed for defense but far enough away from the mainland to avoid attacks

### Guam k2 credibility

#### Failure to move troops to Guam damages credibility

Tritten 8/2

Travis J Tritten, veteran writer for the stars and Stripes, 8/2/12, “Lawmakers told failure to realign US Pacific forces would pose security risks,” <http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/pacific-base-relocation/lawmakers-told-failure-to-realign-us-pacific-forces-would-pose-strategic-risks-1.184656>

The United States faces serious strategic risks if it does not push ahead with plans to shift military forces in the Pacific, experts told House lawmakers Wednesday.Failure to begin redeploying Marines from Okinawa to Guam and elsewhere in the region could violate the trust of allies and damage U.S. credibility in the Pacific, according to members of the Center for Strategic and International Studies.The testimony before a House Armed Services subcommittee was part of the first congressional hearing on a Department of Defense-commissioned independent review of the realignment plans released by the Washington D.C. think tank last week. The long-awaited review largely validated the DOD effort to shift forces despite skepticism by powerful members of the Senate.“We have to live up to the commitments we have made [to relocate Marines] or we lose credibility with the very partners with whom we are trying to increase engagement,” David Berteau, director of the center’s international security program, told the House subcommittee on military readiness.

### US-Japan Alliance k2 everything

#### An effective alliance solves every transnational threat --- specifically, it prevents war over Taiwan

Nye 8 (Joseph, Joseph S. Nye, Jr., assistant secretary of defense under Clinton. Currently, Sultan of Oman Professor of International Relations and dean at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Father of Soft Power, “The Future of the Japan-U.S. Alliance,” 5/21,http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/commentary/data/000057)

Many analysts currently detect malaise in Japan about its alliance with the United States. Some of this relates to North Korea's nuclear weapons and a concern that the United States will not adequately represent Japan's interests (such as accounting for Japanese citizens abducted by North Korea years ago.) Other issues concern the basing of U.S. marines in Okinawa and sharing the costs of moving some to Guam. The list is long, but they might best be thought of as "housekeeping" issues: many a couple can quarrel over them without contemplating divorce.¶ There is a deeper level of concern, however, which relates to Japan's fear of being marginalized as the United States turns toward a rising China. For example, some Japanese complain that China receives far more attention than Japan in the American election campaign. Such anxiety is not surprising: U.S. and Japanese defense capabilities are not symmetrical, and that is bound to agitate the more dependent party.¶ Over the years, various suggestions have been made with a view to making the alliance more symmetrical, including that Japan become a "normal" country with a full panoply of military capabilities, even nuclear weapons. But such measures would raise more problems than they would solve. Even if Japan implemented them, they would still not equal the capacity of the United States or eliminate the asymmetry. It is worth noting that during the Cold War, America's European allies had similar anxieties about dependency and abandonment, despite their own military capabilities.¶ The real guarantee of American resolve to defend Japan is the presence of U.S. troops and bases, and cooperation on issues—such as ballistic missile defense—aimed at protecting both Americans and Japanese. Moreover, there are two good answers to the question of whether the United States would abandon Japan in favor of China: values and threat.¶ Japan and the United States, unlike China, are both democracies, and they share many values. In addition, both Japan and the United States face a common challenge from China's rise and have a strong interest in ensuring that it does not become a threat. The United States regards a triangular Japan-China-U.S. relationship as the basis of stability in East Asia, and wants good relations between all three of its legs. But the triangle is not equilateral, because the United States is allied with Japan, and China need not become a threat to either country if they maintain that alliance.¶ On the other hand, China's power should not be exaggerated. A recent poll indicates that one-third of Americans believe that China will "soon dominate the world," while 54 percent see its emergence as a "threat to world peace." To be sure, measured by official exchange rates, China is the world's fourth largest economy, and it is growing at 10 percent annually. But China's income per capita is only 4 percent that of the United States. If both countries' economies continue to grow at their current rates, China's could be larger than America's in 30 years, but U.S. per capita income will still be four times greater. Furthermore, China lags far behind in military power, and lacks America's "soft power" resources, such as Hollywood and world-class universities.¶ China's internal evolution also remains uncertain. It has lifted 400 million people out of poverty since 1990, but another 400 million live on less that $2 per day. Along with enormous inequality, China has a migrant labor force of 140 million, severe pollution, and rampant corruption. Nor has its political evolution matched its economic progress. While more Chinese are free today than ever before in Chinese history, China is far from free. The danger is that Party leaders, trying to counter the erosion of communism, will turn to nationalism to provide ideological glue, which could lead to an unstable foreign policy—including, for example, conflict over Taiwan.¶ Faced with such uncertainty, a wise policy combines realism with liberalism. By reinforcing their alliance, the United States and Japan can hedge against uncertainty while at the same time offering China integration into global institutions as a "responsible stakeholder." The greatest danger is that an escalating fear of enmity in the three countries becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. In that sense, the U.S.-Japan alliance rests on deeply rooted joint interests.¶ There is a new dimension to the alliance, however, and to the relationship with China. This year, China surpassed the United States as the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases. China argues, correctly, that it is still behind the United States and Japan in per capita emissions, but this does not reduce the costs imposed on the world (including Japan and the United States). A cooperative program that helps China to burn its coal more cleanly is in the interests of all three countries.¶ In general, transnational threats such as climate change or pandemics can cause damage on a scale equivalent to military conflict. (In 1918, avian flu killed more people than died in World War I). Responding to such threats requires cooperation, soft power, and nonmilitary instruments, and this is an area in which Japan is a much more equal and important ally. If anything, the new and growing dimension of transnational threats, when added to traditional security concerns, makes the future of the Japan-U.S. alliance look more promising than ever.

### Guam Funding Frozen

#### Guam Funding Frozen

Cohen 12

SHARLA TORRE MONTVEL-COHEN, 1/3/12, Secretary Panetta Will Share Vision Of Trimmer U.S. Military; Clues To Fate Of Guam Military Buildup Possible, <http://guambuildupnews.com/News-Analysis/Secretary-Panetta-Will-Share-Vision-of-Trimmer-U.S.-Military-Clues-to-Fate-of-Guam-Military-Buildup-Possible.html>

The 2012 National Defense Authorization Act (signed by President Obama on Dec. 31) has officially frozen funding for Marine-related construction projects on Guam this year. And Mr. Panetta's forward-looking assessment could indicate whether Pentagon cuts for next fiscal year -- expected to be around $25 billion -- will continue to defer resources for the Asia-Pacific realignment and its Guam buildup component.

### A2: Cultural Genocide

#### 1. Double bind – either the existing troops in Guam make the turn N/U or there is no brink to how many troops are needed to trigger the impact

#### 2. The US would relocate if the site was culturally insensitive – normal means

Tritten 12 (TRAVIS J. TRITTEN “US restarts efforts to move Okinawa Marines to Guam,” Stars and Stripes, Published: November 8, 2012, http://www.stripes.com/news/us-restarts-efforts-to-move-okinawa-marines-to-guam-1.196367 //nimo)

The Navy originally proposed using an ancient ancestral burial ground, called Pagat, as a location for the Marines to train with machine guns and grenades. It was strongly opposed by many citizens groups, sparking a lawsuit against the service and the Department of Defense. The military eventually agreed to conduct another study of sites.¶ In the meantime, the U.S. and Japan signed a revised agreement in April that reduced the number of Marines slated to move to Guam. The island is now set to become one of several key locations in a new Marine Corps presence that will arc across the Pacific, from joint bases in Australia to domestic bases in Hawaii.

#### 3. Extinction comes before morals

**Bok, 1988** (Sissela, Professor of Philosophy, Brandeis, “Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory,” Ed. David Rosenthal and Fudlou Shehadi)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice.To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously—perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, evenkilling an innocent person, in order that the world not perish.

### AT: Japan troops solves deterrence

#### US Marines are useless in Japan – they don’t help deterrence and they wouldn’t be used in conflict

Doug Bandow 2010, is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and Vice President of Policy for Citizen Outreach, June 18th, 2010 [“Get Out of Japan”, National Interest Online, June 18th, 2010, available online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592, accessed June 28, 2010]

The claim is oft-made that the presence of American forces also help promote regional stability beyond Japan. How never seems to be explained. Bruce Klingner of the Heritage Foundation contends: “the Marines on Okinawa are an indispensable and irreplaceable element of any U.S. response to an Asian crisis.” But the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF), while packing a potent military punch, actually has little to do. The MEF isn’t necessary to support manpower-rich South Korea, which is capable of deterring a North Korean attack. The Marines wouldn’t be useful in a war against China, unless the Pentagon is planning a surprise landing in Tiananmen Square to seize Mao Zedong’s mausoleum. If conflict breaks out over Taiwan or various contested islands, America would rely on air and naval units. Where real instability might arise on the ground, only a fool would introduce U.S. troops—insurgency in Indonesia, civil strife in the Solomon Islands or Fiji, border skirmishes between Thailand and Burma or Cambodia. General Ronald Fogleman, a former Air Force Chief of Staff, argued that the Marines “serve no military function. They don’t need to be in Okinawa to meet any time line in any war plan. I’d bring them back to California. The reason they don’t want to bring them back to California is that everyone would look at them and say, ‘Why do you need these twenty thousand?

### Japan-China relations Zero Sum

#### 1. Empirically denied – the US has relations with both in the status quo

#### 2. No brink – Us has had relations with both countries for a long time – working with one now doesn’t trigger the impacts

#### Bad relations inevitable but no collapse

Economy 10 [Elizabeth C. Economy, Director of Asia Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, A Pleasant Surprise While in China…Then Back to Reality Posted on http://blogs.cfr.org/asia/2010/09/16/a-pleasant-surprise-while-in-china-then-back-to-reality/ Thursday, September 16, 2010]

This looks to be the new norm—a perpetual, rapid cycling of upswings and downswings in the relationship. We’re unlikely to have a sustained expansion of trust and ties; rather we are going to claw our way to small victories of cooperation and understanding. The good news is that there really is a ballast—the fact that neither the United States nor China wants the relationship to spiral down out of control. It may be the only thing we really agree on, but it will have to be enough for the time being.

#### No cooperation – remiliteraization and territorial claims.

Chang 10 [Gordon G., author of Nuclear Showdown: North Korea Takes On the World, released by Random House in January 2006. Showdown focuses on nuclear proliferation in general and the North Korean crisis in particular. His first book is The Coming Collapse of China (Random House, August 2001). He is a columnist at Forbes.com. He lived and worked in China and Hong Kong for almost two decades, most recently in Shanghai, as Counsel to the American law firm Paul Weiss and earlier in Hong Kong as Partner in the international law firm Baker & McKenzie. His writings on China and North Korea have appeared in The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, the Far Eastern Economic Review, the International Herald Tribune, Commentary, The Weekly Standard, National Review, and Barron's. He has spoken at Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, Yale, and other universities and at The Brookings Institution, The Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, RAND, the American Enterprise Institute, the Council on Foreign Relations, and other institutions. He has given briefings at the National Intelligence Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, and the Pentagon. He has also spoken before industry and investor groups including Bloomberg, Sanford Bernstein, and Credit Lyonnais Securities Asia. Chang has testified before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission and has delivered to the Commission a report on the future of China’s economy. , Trouble in Fishing Waters China’s military provocations. October 11, 2010, Vol. 16, No. 04 http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/trouble-fishing-waters?page=2]

So why did Beijing make the strategic shift from subtle diplomacy to outright confrontation? “China wants to **change the rules of the game,”** Yuan Peng, a high-level Chinese foreign policy specialist, noted recently. The Communist party had always hoped to do so, but beginning late last year it began to unveil what veteran China watcher Willy Lam calls its “new-look foreign policy.” And why last year? Perhaps because Beijing for the first time thought it had the ability to implement its game-changing ambitions. China’s new policy approach came about the same time Jeffrey Bader of the National Security Council publicly suggested, in remarks delivered in November, that no important issue could be solved without the cooperation of the Chinese. Bader, in effect, gave Beijing a veto over American policy. Soon after Bader made his ill-advised comments, President Obama went to the Chinese capital for his disastrous summit, returning both humiliated and empty-handed. Since then, China has been **especially uncooperative**. In short, the ruthlessly pragmatic Chinese believed the Obama administration was weak and pressed what they perceived to be an advantage. The president has evidently—and wrongly—believed that relations with China soured because Washington had not tried hard enough to build bridges to Beijing. So as the Chinese acted more belligerently, we became even more friendly. For instance, when the People’s Liberation Army broke off military ties with the Pentagon in the first months of this year, the administration redoubled efforts to reestablish them. Yet that effort looks **futile** because China’s flag officers, who are evidently calling the tune in Beijing these days, obviously **do not want better relations** with the United States. During the 1990s, China’s top brass lost influence in top Communist party organs. Yet they recouped much of their losses in the middle of this decade when they essentially acted as arbiters in a low-level political struggle between supremo Hu Jintao and his predecessor, Jiang Zemin, who was trying to linger in the limelight. Top officers at this moment appear to be making further political gains as the party prepares for the next transition, when the so-called Fourth Generation leaders give way to the Fifth, scheduled to occur at the end of 2012. So as the civilians squabble, generals and admirals have been exploiting deep splits in the party’s leadership to gain even more prominence in decision-making circles. Tellingly, senior officers now feel free to speak out on matters once considered the province of civilian officials. The remilitarization of Chinese policy is perhaps the **most important factor** fueling Beijing’s recent aggressiveness in asserting territorial claims—as well as other matters. Tokyo released Captain Zhan Qixiong on September 24, but that conciliatory gesture only spurred Beijing to issue more demands to the Japanese. As a result, China’s government looks like it is entering a phase where it cannot be placated, appeased, or, to use the term of the moment, “engaged.” In July, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton executed a partial pivot by telling Beijing that the peaceful settlement of competing claims in the South China Sea was a U.S. “national interest.” That was an important start, but Washington still thinks China’s autocrats can be integrated into a liberal international order they had no hand in creating. Recent events demonstrate that the Chinese will not become cooperative members of the global community anytime soon. Beijing’s new militancy means that Washington has **fundamentally misunderstood** China—and that we now need to adjust our assumptions and our policies fast.

# 2AC Add-On Water

#### Guam reallocation key to OTEC development

Matthews 9 (William Matthews, reporter for Defense News, 6/1/09, “U.S. Navy Plans Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Plants” originally published in defense news, available online at <http://edelalon.com/blog/2009/06/electricity-from-the-sea/>)

Heat from the tropical sun warms the ocean surface off Guam to an inviting 80 degrees Fahrenheit. But 3,000 feet below, the ocean remains a bone-chilling 40 degrees.¶ That temperature difference promises to provide the U.S. Navy with a limitless supply of electricity.¶ Good thing, too – the U.S. military plans to move 8,000 Marines and 17,000 family members to Guam from Okinawa, Japan, by 2014. But these new residents and the expanded military installations are likely to overwhelm Guam’s power grid, which today generates all of its electricity from imported oil.¶ The Navy thinks “ocean thermal energy conversion” may be the answer to Guam’s future electricity needs – and Diego Garcia’s, Kwajalein’s and Hawaii’s, too.¶ Turning the ocean’s temperature differentials into electricity is not a new idea. The concept was developed in 1881, and the first functioning ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) power plant was built in Cuba in 1930.¶ But the economics and politics of oil and OTEC have never aligned quite right for the thermal technology to take off – until, possibly, now. With oil prices uncertain, supplies limited and demand growing, a power plant that runs on warm and cold water has fresh appeal.¶ The concept sounds relatively simple. Surface water warmed by the sun is pumped through a heat exchanger, where it heats a fluid with a very low boiling point. Ammonia works, as do fluorinated carbons and some hydrocarbons. The fluid expands rapidly as it vaporizes, and pressure from the expanding vapor turns a turbine that turns a generator that produces electricity.¶ Once it passes through the turbine, the vapor is piped into a condenser, where cold water from deep in the ocean chills it, returning it to its liquid state. The liquid is then pumped back to the warm water heat exchanger to repeat the cycle.¶ That’s it. There’s no fuel other than temperature differentials. There’s no pollution. And OTEC offers an alternative to dependence on foreign oil.¶ Interest in OTEC was high in the early 1970s, when an Arab oil embargo against the United States drove oil prices up and made supplies scarce. But when the embargo ended in 1974, interest in OTEC and other alternative energy sources waned.¶ Startup Costs¶ Interest is reviving today, but ocean thermal energy conversion still faces some big hurdles. One is initial cost.¶ An OTEC plant that generates 100 to 200 megawatts of electricity could produce power at a cost that’s competitive with imported oil, said Robert Varley, who manages OTEC business ventures for Lockheed Martin. That’s enough electricity for 25,000 to 50,000 homes. Such a plant would cost $1.5 billion – a lot more than anyone so far has been willing to invest, Varley said.¶ And before building a 100-megawatt plant, it would be smart to build a smaller plant – say, 10 megawatts – to prove the concept and answer engineering questions, he said. That, too, has been prohibitively expensive.¶ “You can’t recoup the cost” of a 10-megawatt plant because it produces too little power to be profitable, Varley said. So for decades, ocean thermal energy conversion has remained an intriguing on-again, off-again science experiment.¶ But that, too, may be changing. In April, the U.S. Navy announced plans to award a contract late this year for OTEC plant designs to be used at its base on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean and at other Navy locations.¶ And in February, the Navy began feasibility studies for an OTEC plant to meet “a significant amount of the current and future electrical power needs” for Guam. The Navy wants plants that can also produce fresh drinking water.¶ That’s a slightly different design from the OTEC plant described above. That first plan is a “closed-cycle” generator, so-called because the fluid that is converted into vapor and back into liquid is used over and over again and never leaves the system.¶ The Navy favors an “open-cycle” system in which warm seawater is injected into a low-pressure chamber. There, because of the low pressure, a portion of the water flashes into steam, which drives a turbine to generate electricity.¶ When it turns into steam, the seawater leaves its salt behind, and when it leaves the turbine, it can be condensed into fresh water for drinking, irrigation and other uses.¶ In 1993, an experimental land-based open-cycle OTEC plant in Hawaii was able to produce 50 kilowatts of “net power,” according to the U.S. Energy Department. Net power is the total power produced minus the electricity that’s needed to keep the power plant running.¶ The pumps that OTEC plants use to draw cold water up from the deep require a lot of electricity. In 1979, for instance, a 50-kilowatt OTEC plant mounted on a Navy barge moored off Hawaii produced 52 kilowatts of electricity, but consumed all but 15 kilowatts.¶ Technical Challenges¶ Although the science is sound, there remain some technical challenges to building a large OTEC power plant. One is building a 3,000-foot-long, large-diameter, cold-water pipe that can withstand the ocean environment.¶ Lockheed is working under a $1.2 million contract with the Energy Department to build prototype pipes out of fiberglass and composite materials. “From an engineering standpoint, it’s doable,” Varley said. “The actual metric is how cheap can we build it.”¶ Passing electrical current through water breaks the water molecules into hydrogen and oxygen, which are then captured. Hydrogen can be used as a fuel or it can be combined with nitrogen from the air to make ammonia. Ammonia is also a fuel – it has been used to power buses and rocket planes – and has a plethora of industrial purposes.¶ “If we got significant funding soon, we could have a pilot OTEC plant in the water in 2013,” said Dennis Cooper, Lockheed’s OTEC program manager.¶ That wouldn’t be soon enough to meet the electricity needs of the Marines arriving on Guam. But it could start a process that within a generation could have ocean thermal energy conversion providing all the electricity Guam – or Hawaii or Diego Garcia – needs, Lockheed officials say.

#### Solves water shortages, tech now

Magesh 10 (R. Magesh is with Coastal Energen Pvt. Ltd., “OTEC Technology- A World of Clean Energy and Water, Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering”, July 2, 2010 <http://www.iaeng.org/publication/WCE2010/WCE2010_pp1618-1623.pdf>

Scientists all over the world are making ¶ predictions about the ill effects of Global warming and its ¶ consequences on the mankind. Conventional Fuel Fired Electric ¶ Power Stations contribute nearly 21.3% of the Global Green ¶ House Gas emission annually. Hence, an alternative for such ¶ Power Stations is a must to prevent global warming. One fine ¶ alternative that comes to the rescue is the Ocean thermal energy ¶ conversion (OTEC) Power Plant, the complete Renewable Energy ¶ Power Station for obtaining Cleaner and Greener Power. Even ¶ though the concept is simple and old, recently it has gained ¶ momentum due to worldwide search for clean continuous energy ¶ sources to replace the fossil fuels. The design of a 5 Megawatt ¶ OTEC Pre-commercial plant is clearly portrayed to brief the ¶ OTEC technical feasibility along with economic consideration ¶ studies for installing OTEC across the world. OTEC plant can be ¶ seen as a combined Power Plant and Desalination plant. ¶ Practically, for every Megawatt of power generated by hybrid ¶ OTEC plant, nearly 2.28 million litres of desalinated water is ¶ obtained every day. Its value is thus increased because many ¶ parts of the globe are facing absolute water scarcity. OTEC could ¶ produce enough drinking water to ease the crisis drought-stricken ¶ areas. The water can be used for local agriculture and industry, ¶ any excess water being given or sold to neighboring communities.¶ Index Terms—Desalinated water, Ocean Temperature ¶ Differences, Rankine Cycle, Renewable Energy.¶ I. INTRODUCTION¶ CEAN thermal energy conversion is a hydro energy ¶ conversion system, which uses the temperature difference ¶ that exists between deep and shallow waters in tropical seas to ¶ run a heat engine. The economic evaluation of OTEC plants ¶ indicates that their commercial future lies in floating plants of ¶ approximately 100 MW capacity for industrialized nations and ¶ smaller plants for small-island-developing-states (SIDS). The ¶ operational data is needed to earn the support required from ¶ the financial community and developers. Considering a 100 ¶ MW (4-module) system, a 1/5-scaled version of a 25 MW ¶ module is proposed as an appropriate size. A 5 MW precommercial plant is directly applicable in some SIDS. OTEC ¶ works on Rankine cycle, using a low-pressure turbine to ¶ generate electric power. There are two general types of OTEC ¶ design: closed-cycle plants utilize the evaporation of a working¶ fluid, such as ammonia or propylene, to drive the turbinegenerator, and open-cycle plants use steam from evaporated ¶ R. Magesh is with Coastal Energen Pvt. Ltd., Chennai 600 006, ¶ Tamilnadu, India (e-mail: wellingtonmagesh@ gmail.com). ¶ sea water to run the turbine. Another commonly known design, ¶ hybrid plants, is a combination of the two. In fact, the plants ¶ would cool the ocean by the same amount as the energy ¶ extracted from them. Apart from power generation, an OTEC ¶ plant can also be used to pump up the cold deep sea water for ¶ air conditioning and refrigeration, if it is brought back to ¶ shore. In addition, the enclosed sea water surrounding the ¶ plant can be used for aquaculture. Hydrogen produced by ¶ subjecting the steam to electrolysis during the OTEC process ¶ can fuel hybrid automobiles, provided hydrogen can be ¶ transported economically to sea shore. Another undeveloped ¶ opportunity is the potential to mine ocean water for its 57 ¶ elements contained in salts and other forms and dissolved in ¶ solution. The initial capital cost of OTEC power station would ¶ look high, but an OTEC plant would not involve the wastetreatment or astronomical decommissioning costs of a nuclear ¶ facility. Also, it would offset its expense through the sale of ¶ the desalinated water.¶

#### Water is needed and is a human right comes before all other impacts- moral obligations oblige governments to provide water -leads to legal entitlements, rights, and stops discrimination

Rights and Humanity 11 Right to Water- http://www.righttowater.info/about/ “Information portal on human rights to water and sanitation” Date of information 2008-2011

Why recognising water and sanitation as human rights is important Water and sanitation are essential for life, for health, for dignity, empowerment and prosperity. A human rights framework encompasses a broad spectrum from the rights based approach on the one side to the legal right to water at the other.  The rights based approach promotes participation in and information about people’s access to decision making forums that affect their access to water, sanitation and hygiene services.  The legal approach promotes national and international justifiable approaches that promote accountability and transparency and provide mechanisms to progressively realise increasing peoples access to water and sanitation. Further benefits include: Improved accountability The right to water and sanitation confirms that access to minimum essential supplies of safe water and basic sanitation is a legal entitlement, rather than a charity or only a moral priority. The right to water provides a basis for individuals and groups to hold governments and other actors to account. Full recognition of access to water and sanitation as a right gives a real mandate to government officials to promote access to water and sanitation for all. Communities and other organisations can use the right to lobby the responsible agencies for improvements and call on them to fulfil their obligations. Genuine participation and full access to relevant information Human rights oblige governments to provide full access to information and  engage in genuine consultation and participation with communities in all decision-making. Although participation is now acknowledged as best practice in the development sector, centralised planning processes remain prevalent and can neglect the input of various users, particularly those traditionally neglected, such as women or people living in informal settlements. The right to water and sanitation can help empower and enable communities to organise themselves, seek and obtain information, and legitimately take part in and influence the outcomes of relevant decision-making processes. Priorityfor people without basic access The right to water and sanitation entails that governments must prioritise ensuring access to minimum essential supplies to safe water services and basic sanitation for all people and use available resources accordingly. Governments spending their water and sanitation budgets on upgrading existing services to middle-class areas, while people in informal settlements or rural areas are left with no access at all, violate their international human rights obligations. Prohibition of discrimination and attention to marginalised and vulnerable groups Denial of access to water is often a deliberate choice of governments, or local authorities, to exclude communities seen as undesirable. Informal settlements the world over are often denied water services as a matter of policy. The right to water and sanitation prohibits discrimination on illegitimate grounds and requires that laws and policies provide special focus on vulnerable and marginalised groups, such as persons living in informal settlements. Affordability of services Water and sanitation services must be affordable to the user and not limit their access to other essential goods and services. Policies for service providers that require full cost recovery must also include subsidies or other grants to ensure that all residents are able to access services. Studies show that the most appropriate targeted subsidies are connection subsidies, rather than consumption subsidies For more information please read through the links in the left hand menu.

# Heg Good

#### Heg sustainable-decline requires fundamental change

Norrlof 10 (Carla Norrlof, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto, America’s Global Advantage: US Hegemony and International Cooperation, 2010, <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=lMfuht7crW4C&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=hegemony+us&ots=hI5qlsjyxd&sig=ST9DlbxtORsbXAgyH15DAlFf_Hg#v=onepage&q&f=false>)

We have seen erroneous predictions of American decline before. In the 1970s, the combination of high inflation, high interest rates, high unemployment, the Vietnam War, political and military challenges from China and the Soviet Union, and the economic rise of Japan led to eerily similar forecasts. Pessimists then, as today, underestimated the longevity of American power. The main reason the United States has continued to occupy a unique place in the international system is because a sufficient number of major and lesser powers have a strong interest in maintaining America at the top of the hierarchy. To bring America down would take a deliberate, coordinated strategy on the part of others and this is simply not plausible. As much as the United States benefits from the space it has carved out for itself in the current world order, its ability to reap unequal gains will remain unless and until allies start to incur heavy losses under American dominance. Even that, by itself, will not be sufficient to sink American hegemony. A strong alternative to American rule will have to come into view for things to fundamentally change. At present, no credible alternative is in sight. The United States is not invincible but its dominance is currently steady. Those who are incline to think that American hegemony will persist – at least for a while – tend to dwell on the claim that the United States is providing a range of public goods to the benefit of all at its own expense. This is a chimera. The United States is self-interested, not altruistic. The illusion of benevolence has meant that very little attention has been given to uncovering the mechanism through which the United States gains disproportionately from supplying a large open market, the world’s reserve currency, and a military machine capable of stroking or foiling deadly disputes. This book exposes the mechanism through which the United States reaps unequal gains and shows that the current world system, and the distribution of power that supports it, has built-in stabilizers that strengthen American power following bouts of decline. Although all dominant powers must eventually decline, I will show that the downward progression need not be linear when mutually reinforcing tendencies across various power dimensions are at play. Specifically, I will demonstrate how the United States’ reserve currency status produces disproportionate commercial gains; how commercial power gives added flexibility in monetary affairs; and, finally, how military preponderance creates advantages in both monetary and trade affairs.

#### **Empirics prove transition wars – Arab-Israeli war, WWI, Britain vs. Germany 1939**

Fogg, 9 (Erik, Master of Science in Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Generalizing Power Transitions as a Cause of War, MIT, June 2009, http://web.mit.edu/efogg/Public/ErikFoggThesis.pdf, BM)

The 1948 Arab-Israeli War. In this case, it was Israel (and the West, in general) that sought to change the status quo (specifically, the territorial boundaries of Trans-Jordan and the existence of an Israeli Palestine). Arab states that initiated war against Israel were fighting to maintain the status quo, and were generally considered somewhat more powerful. It became clear that Israel and the Arab states had gone through an extremely high-speed power transition, as Israel's military coercive ability started out very small at its inception, but by the end of the war was high enough to drive out the Arabs and occupy large swaths of territory. This was clearly a power transition war initiated by the status quo powers. World War I. While the German aspirations for territory strongly influenced decision-making in all involved states, it was forceful preservations of the status quo that led to the first two declarations of war in World War I. The Austro-Hungarian declaration of war against Serbia was designed to coerce the Serbian government into preventing Bosnian-Serb nationalists within Serbia from continuing operations against the Empire. The Russian declaration of war against Austria-Hungary, in turn, was intended to prevent Austria-Hungary from acquiring territory in the Slavic Balkans. Both initiations of hostilities were meant to enforce elements of the status quo important to each country, rather than significantly change the international order.43The British declaration of war against Germany, 1939. While Nazi Germany had indeed severely provoked the Allies in the late 1930's by invading Czechoslovakia and Poland, the United Kingdom did not respond until the invasion of Poland, when Germany's total military might finally surpassed that of the United Kingdom. Specifically, Germany did not declare war on the United Kingdom: Germany was content to continue its conquest of smaller states until it had achieved much43 Van Evera, “The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War,” 1984.40 greater strength. Britain's declaration of war against Germany was a status quo-initiated war in an attempt to maintain the continental status-quo.44 These are a few examples that illustrate the relatively muddled nature of revisionist initiation of war in power transitions. While this paper does not attempt to predict whether the revisionist state will declare war, nor does it predict what conditions lead to revisionism by a state, these issues are discussed in the final section of the paper.

#### Elites will inevitably pursue hegemony

(Calleo 10)

David P. Calleo (Director – European Studies Program and Professor at SAIS), Survival, July 21, 2010, “American Decline Revisited", Volume 52, Issue 4, Pg. 215 – 227, accessed March 13, 2012, Taylor and Francis Online Database

The history of the past two decades suggests that adjusting to a plural world is not easy for the United States. As its economic strength is increasingly challenged by relative decline, it clings all the more to its peerless military prowess. As the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have shown, that overwhelming military power, evolved over the Cold War, is less and less effective. In many respects, America's geopolitical imagination seems frozen in the posture of the Cold War. The lingering pretension to be the dominant powereverywhere has encouraged the United States to hazard two unpromising land wars, plus a diffuse and interminable struggle against 'terrorism'. Paying for these wars and the pretensions behind them confirms the United States in a new version of Cold War finance. Once more, unmanageable fiscal problems poison the currency, an old pathology that firmly reinstates the nation on its path to decline. It was the hegemonic Cold War role, after all, that put the United States so out of balance with the rest of the world economy. In its hegemonic Cold War position, the United States found it necessary to run very large deficits and was able to finance them simply by creating and exporting more and more dollars. The consequence is today's restless mass of accumulated global money. Hence, whereas the value of all global financial assets in 1980 was just over 100% of global output, by 2008, even after the worst of the financial implosion, that figure had exploded to just under 300%.25 Much of this is no doubt tied up in the massive but relatively inert holdings of the Chinese and Japanese. But thanks to today's instantaneous electronic transfers, huge sums can be marshalled and deployed on very short notice. It is this excess of volatile money that arguably fuels the world's great recurring bubbles. It can create the semblance of vast real wealth for a time, but can also (with little notice) sow chaos in markets, wipe out savings and dry up credit for real investment. What constitutes a morbid overstretch in the American political economy thus ends up as a threat to the world economy in general. To lead itself and the world into a more secure future the United States must put aside its old, unmeasured geopolitical ambitions paid for by unlimited cheap credit. Instead, the United States needs a more balanced view of its role in history. But America's post-Soviet pundits have, unfortunately, proved more skilful at perpetuating outmoded dreams of past glory than at promoting the more modest visions appropriate to a plural future. One can always hope that newer generations of Americans will find it easier to adjust to pluralist reality. The last administration, however, was not very encouraging in this regard. III What about Barack Obama? So far, his economic policy has shown itself probably more intelligent and certainly more articulate than his predecessor's. His thinking is less hobbled by simple-minded doctrines. It accepts government's inescapable role in regulating markets and providing a durable framework for orderly governance and societal fellowship. To be sure, the Obama administration, following in the path of the Bush administration, has carried short-term counter-cyclical stimulation to a previously unimagined level. Perhaps so radical an expansion of credit is unavoidable under present circumstances. The administration is caught between the need to rebalance by scaling back and the fear that restraint applied now will trigger a severe depression. Obama's chief aide, Rahm Emanuel, is famous for observing: 'Rule one: Never allow a crisis to go to waste. They are opportunities to do big things.'26 So far, Obama's administration has made use of its crisis to promote an unprecedented expansion of welfare spending.27 Much of the spending is doubtless good in itself and certainly serves the administration's strong counter-cyclical purposes. But at some point the need to pass from expansion to stabilisation will presumably be inescapable. Budget cuts will have to be found somewhere, and demographic trends suggest that drastic reductions in civilian welfare spending are unlikely. Elementary prudence might suggest that today's financial crisis is an ideal occasion for America's long-overdue retreat from geopolitical overstretch, a time for bringing America's geopolitical pretensions into harmony with its diminishing foreign possibilities and expanding domestic needs. The opportunities for geopolitical saving appear significant. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), current military plans will require an average military budget of $652bn (in 2010 dollars) each year through 2028. The estimate optimistically assumes only 30,000 troops will be engaged abroad after 2013. As the CBO observes, these projections exceed the peak budgets of the Reagan administration's military build-up of the mid-1980s (about $500bn annually in 2010 dollars). This presumes a military budget consuming 3.5% of GDP through 2020.28 Comparable figures for other nations are troubling: 2.28% for the United Kingdom, 2.35% for France, 2.41% for Russia and 1.36% for China.29 Thus, while the financial crisis has certainly made Americans fear for their economic future, it does not yet seem to have resulted in a more modest view of the country's place in the world, or a more prudent approach to military spending. Instead, an addiction to hegemonic status continues to blight the prospects for sound fiscal policy. Financing the inevitable deficits inexorably turns the dollar into an imperial instrument that threatens the world with inflation.

#### AND, Leadership transition causes apolarity and competition

(Brezezinski, 12)

Zbigniew Brzezinski (Robert E. Osgood Professor of American Foreign Policy at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University) Foreign Policy “After America” January/February 2012

For if America falters, the world is unlikely to be dominated by a single preeminent successor -- not even China. International uncertainty, increased tension among global competitors, and even outright chaos would be far more likely outcomes. While a sudden, massive crisis of the American system -- for instance, another financial crisis -- would produce a fast-moving chain reaction leading to global political and economic disorder, a steady drift by America into increasingly pervasive decay or endlessly widening warfare with Islam would be unlikely to produce, even by 2025, an effective global successor. No single power will be ready by then to exercise the role that the world, upon the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, expected the United States to play: the leader of a new, globally cooperative world order. More probable would be a protracted phase of rather inconclusive realignments of both global and regional power, with no grand winners and many more losers, in a setting of international uncertainty and even of potentially fatal risks to global well-being. Rather than a world where dreams of democracy flourish, a Hobbesian world of enhanced national security based on varying fusions of authoritarianism, nationalism, and religion could ensue. The leaders of the world's second-rank powers, among them India, Japan, Russia, and some European countries, are already assessing the potential impact of U.S. decline on their respective national interests. The Japanese, fearful of an assertive China dominating the Asian mainland, may be thinking of closer links with Europe. Leaders in India and Japan may be considering closer political and even military cooperation in case America falters and China rises. Russia, while perhaps engaging in wishful thinking (even schadenfreude) about America's uncertain prospects, will almost certainly have its eye on the independent states of the former Soviet Union. Europe, not yet cohesive, would likely be pulled in several directions: Germany and Italy toward Russia because of commercial interests, France and insecure Central Europe in favor of a politically tighter European Union, and Britain toward manipulating a balance within the EU while preserving its special relationship with a declining United States. Others may move more rapidly to carve out their own regional spheres: Turkey in the area of the old Ottoman Empire, Brazil in the Southern Hemisphere, and so forth. None of these countries, however, will have the requisite combination of economic, financial, technological, and military power even to consider inheriting America's leading role. […] At the same time, the security ofa number of weakerstates locatedgeographicallynext to majorregional powers**also**depends on the international status quo reinforced by America's global preeminence -- and would be made significantly more vulnerable in proportion to America's decline. The states in that exposed position -- including Georgia, Taiwan, South Korea, Belarus, Ukraine, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Israel, and the greater Middle East -- are today's geopolitical equivalents of nature's most endangered species. Their fates are closely tied to the nature of the international environment left behind by a waning America, be it ordered and restrained or, much more likely, self-serving and expansionist. A faltering United States could also find its strategic partnership with Mexico in jeopardy. America's economic resilience and political stability have so far mitigated many of the challenges posed by such sensitive neighborhood issues as economic dependence, immigration, and the narcotics trade. A decline in American power, however, would likely undermine the health and good judgment of the U.S. economic and political systems. A waning United States would likely be more nationalistic, more defensive about its national identity, more paranoid about its homeland security, and less willing to sacrifice resources for the sake of others' development. The worsening of relations between a declining America and an internally troubled Mexico could even give rise to a particularly ominous phenomenon: the emergence, as a major issue in nationalistically aroused Mexican politics, of territorial claims justified by history and ignited by cross-border incidents. Another consequence of American decline could be a corrosion of the generally cooperative management of the global commons -- shared interests such as sea lanes, space, cyberspace, and the environment, whose protection is imperative to the long-term growth of the global economy and the continuation of basic geopolitical stability. In almost every case, the potential absence of a constructive and influential U.S. role would fatally undermine the essential communality of the global commons because the superiority and ubiquity of American power creates order where there would normally be conflict.

# Off Case

## T

### T – In the US

#### 1. We meet – Guam is “in the United States” - It’s a U.S. territory

DOI ’12 (Department of the Interior profile of Guam, last updated 1-05-12, accessed 7/9/12, <http://www.doi.gov/archive/oia/Islandpages/gumpage.htm>, YX)

Political Status **Guam became a U.S. territory in** [**1898**](http://www.doi.gov/oia/Islandpages/treaty1898.html) **and placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Navy. The Guam Organic Act of 1950** conferred U.S. citizenship on Guamanians and established the territory’s government. The Act also **transferred Federal jurisdiction over Guam from the U.S. Navy to the Department of the Interior**. First elections were held in 1970.

#### 2. That counts

Cornell University Law School, no date (Cornell University Law School’s Legal Information Institute citing US Code, <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/2340>, accessed 7/9/12, YX)

18 USC § 2340 - DEFINITIONS

This preliminary release may be subject to further revision before it is released again as a final version. As with other online versions of the Code, the [U.S. Code Classification Tables](http://uscode.house.gov/classification/tables.shtml" \t "_blank) should be consulted for the latest laws affecting the Code. Those using the USCPrelim should verify the text against the printed slip laws available from [GPO](http://www.gpo.gov/)(Government Printing Office), the laws as shown on [THOMAS](http://thomas.loc.gov/) (a legislative service of the Library of Congress), and the final version of the Code when it becomes available.

Current through Pub. L. [112-123](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-112publ123/html/PLAW-112publ123.htm" \t "_blank" \o "Pub. L. 112-123). (See [Public Laws for the current Congress](http://thomas.loc.gov/home/LegislativeData.php?n=PublicLaws).)

As used in this chapter—

(1) “torture” means an act committed by a person acting under the color of law specifically intended to inflict severe physical or mental pain or suffering (other than pain or suffering incidental to lawful sanctions) upon another person within his custody or physical control;

(2) “severe mental pain or suffering” means the prolonged mental harm caused by or resulting from—

(A) the intentional infliction or threatened infliction of severe physical pain or suffering;

(B) the administration or application, or threatened administration or application, of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or the personality;

(C) the threat of imminent death; or

(D) the threat that another person will imminently be subjected to death, severe physical pain or suffering, or the administration or application of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or personality; and

(3) “**United States” means the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.**

#### 3. We meet – the investment takes place in the U.S. In the US modifies investment not the actual infrastructure

#### 4. Lit checks - Federal transportation laws apply – solves ground

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Local Government Guam is an organized, unincorporated territory of the US, which means that in some cases federal laws do not automatically apply to the island. For example, U.S. import tariff laws do not apply, and Guam is considered to be a duty free port. On the other hand, federal banking and transportation laws and regulations apply to Guam, with some exemptions, to address the island’s unique political, geographical, and social circumstances.

#### 5. Limits – Even if you buy their definition we only allow for 1 more aff, transportation on Guam, which isn’t a huge research burden for the neg. Guam, is key to education because it is in a strategic position in the pacific allowing for better topic education

#### 6. Don't vote on potential abuse

#### 7. Default to reasonability and T is not a voter

### T – Military

#### 1. We meet – the Guam road network would be used for both military and civilian transportation – it is public roads that's DON 10

#### 2. C/I – Public Physical objects are topical such as roads and rail

Cantarelli 10 (Chantal C., Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management – Delft University of Technology, et al., “Cost Overruns in Large-scale Transportation Infrastructure Projects: Explanations and Their Theoretical Embeddedness”, European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research, 10(1), March, p. 7)

We define transportation infrastructure projects as follows: ‘Transport infrastructures include roads, rail lines, channels, (extensions to) airports and harbours, bridges and tunnels. Of these projects it is the ‘hardware’ that is considered, and the “software”, i.e. projects relating to deregulations, liberalization, privatization, and so forth is excluded’. The literature did not provide one minimum cost level that is generally applied to mark a large-scale project. A large-scale project is defined in this paper by a minimum cost level of 500 million euros.

#### 3. Standards

#### 4. Potential abuse is not a voter

#### 5. Default to reasonability and T is not a voter

### T – Subs

#### 1. We meet – plan text mandates a substantial increase well defend their interp for purposes of DA

#### Guam infrastructure costs $23 billion – high budget pressures

Harlan and Whitlock 12 (Chico Harlan and Craig Whitlock, February 8, 2012, Washington Post, “U.S. likely to scale down plans for bases in Japan and Guam,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-likely-to-scale-down-plans-for-bases-in-japan-and-guam/2012/02/08/gIQAjEPI0Q\_print.html //nimo)

TOKYO — The U.S. military will probably scale back plans to build key bases in Japan and Guam because of political obstacles and budget pressures, according to U.S. and Japanese officials, complicating the Obama administration’s efforts to strengthen its troop presence in Asia.¶ Under a deal announced Wednesday with Japanese officials, the U.S. government said it will accelerate plans to withdraw 8,000 Marines from the island of Okinawa. The decision came after several years of stalled talks to find a site for a new Marine base nearby.¶ Washington’s inability to resolve its basing arrangements on Okinawa, as well as the rising price tag of a related plan for a $23 billion military buildup on Guam, underscore the challenges facing the Obama administration as it seeks to make a strategic “pivot” toward the Pacific after a decade of fighting wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

#### 2. Counter Interp - Substantial means “of considerable amount” --- not some contrived percentage or number

Prost 4 (Judge – United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, “Committee For Fairly Traded Venezuelan Cement v. United States”, 6-18, http://www.ll.georgetown.edu/federal/judicial/fed/opinions/04opinions/04-1016.html)

The URAA and the SAA neither amend nor refine the language of § 1677(4)(C).  In fact, they merely suggest, without disqualifying other alternatives, a “clearly higher/substantial proportion” approach.  Indeed, the SAA specifically mentions that no “precise mathematical formula” or “‘benchmark’ proportion” is to be used for a dumping concentration analysis.  SAA at 860 (citations omitted); see also Venez. Cement, 279 F. Supp. 2d at 1329-30.  Furthermore, as the Court of International Trade noted, the SAA emphasizes that the Commission retains the discretion to determine concentration of imports on a “case-by-case basis.”  SAA at 860.  Finally, the definition of the word “substantial” undercuts the CFTVC’s argument.  The word “substantial” generally means “considerable in amount, value or worth.”  Webster’s Third New International Dictionary 2280 (1993).  It does not imply a specific number or cut-off.  What may be substantial in one situation may not be in another situation.  The very breadth of the term “substantial” undercuts the CFTVC’s argument that Congress spoke clearly in establishing a standard for the Commission’s regional antidumping and countervailing duty analyses.  It therefore supports the conclusion that the Commission is owed deference in its interpretation of “substantial proportion.”  The Commission clearly embarked on its analysis having been given considerable leeway to interpret a particularly broad term.

#### 3. We meet – plan is a considerable amount of infrastructure investment compared to status quo funding, which is nothing

#### Prefer our definition:

#### 1. Limits: our definition requires affs be a considerable and important change to the status quo – that limits out squirrelly affs

#### 2. “Contextual” defs bad - There’s no central authority saying what substantial means in the context of space policy – their so-called “contextual” definitions are just descriptions that say such-and-such amount of money is a “substantial increase,” they’re not written with the intent to define what does and does not count as substantial, while our definitions are.

#### 3. Encourages arbitrary definition – for instance, if an aff cost 1 billion and the neg read a definition that said “substantial = 1.2 billion” – creates incentive for neg to run silly T args instead of debating on substance

#### 4. Good is good enough - as long as the aff has a good interpretation of the topic don’t vote us down because the neg’s is marginally better – encourages the neg to look for the most arbitrarily limiting definition

#### 5. Don’t vote on potential abuse – make them prove in round abuse, rounds don’t set a precedent

#### 6. T is not a voter

## DA

### Fiscal D Politics Sequestration

#### GOP opposition on White House tax deal hinders any progress to compromise

Kane, 11/30 (Paul Kane, the Washington Post, “Obama, GOP still far apart on a deal”, November 30 2012, http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/2012/11/29/20121129obama-gop-still-far-apart-deal.html. NP)

President Barack Obama offered Republicans a detailed plan Thursday for averting the year-end "fiscal cliff" that calls for $1.6 trillion in new taxes, $50 billion in fresh spending on the economy and an effective end to congressional control over the size of the national debt.¶ The proposal, delivered to the Capitol by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, mirrors previous White House deficit-reduction plans and satisfies Democrats' demands that negotiations begin on terms dictated by the newly re-elected president.¶ But the offer lacks any concessions to Republicans, most notably on the core issue of where to set tax rates for the wealthiest Americans. After two weeks of talks between the White House and aides to House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, it seemed to take Republicans by surprise.¶ Boehner quickly rejected the proposal and was trying late Thursday to decide how to respond, aides said. After meeting with Geithner for about 45 minutes Thursday morning, the speaker announced his frustration with a negotiation process in which nearly three weeks have lapsed since the election with "no substantive progress." "I'm disappointed in where we are, and disappointed in what's happened over the last couple weeks," Boehner told reporters. "Going over the fiscal cliff is serious business. And I'm here seriously trying to resolve it. And I would hope the White House would get serious as well."¶ Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., called the proposal a "step backward" from compromise -- with time running out for policymakers to agree on a plan to prevent more than $500 billion in tax increases and spending cuts that could rattle the economy.¶ "This is a real problem," McConnell said. "Every day, the delay brings us one step closer to the fiscal cliff that we simply must avoid."¶ Democratic leaders, meanwhile, were triumphant after receiving similar briefings from Geithner and White House legislative liaison Rob Nabors. Top Democrats have insisted for months that an Obama victory would entitle them to demand far more in new taxes than Republicans have been willing to consider, to seek new measures to boost economic growth, and to avoid major cuts to entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare.¶ "Democrats are on the same page," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev. "The president has made his proposal; we need a proposal from them."¶ Although the White House offer seemed to startle Republicans, it contains little that would be unfamiliar to anyone following the president's recent statements. The exception was his proposal on the federal debt limit. GOP aides said Obama is seeking to permanently enact procedures that were temporarily adopted in the summer of 2011 that allow the White House to unilaterally increase the debt ceiling unless two-thirds of lawmakers disapprove.¶ That process, initially proposed by McConnell, was not intended to become permanent. By trying to make it so, Obama is seeking to avoid another damaging battle over the debt ceiling that would again risk a national default. This change, however, would also deprive Congress of its historic authority over federal borrowing.¶ Unless Congress acts on the fiscal cliff, taxes will rise significantly in January for nearly 90 percent of Americans, and about $65 billion will be sliced from the budgets of the Pentagon and other agencies, probably triggering a recession. Simply canceling the changes, however, risks undermining confidence in the nation's ability to manage its rising debt.¶ Financial markets, which in recent weeks have been optimistic about the prospects of a deal to replace the cliff with a less traumatic deficit-reduction plan, were whipsawed by Thursday's declarations. The Dow Jones industrial average took a nose dive during Boehner's 11:30 a.m. news conference, dropping nearly 60 points in eight minutes. It closed with a gain of nearly 37 points, or 0.3 percent.¶ Obama's offer comes nearly two weeks after Boehner and other congressional leaders opened talks at the White House. Since then, administration officials have negotiated directly with Boehner's staff. Senior Republican aides said relations deteriorated in recent days, prompting Boehner to call the White House on Wednesday evening to request to speak with the president.¶ Boehner's aides declined to comment on the 28-minute call, but Republicans in the Capitol said Obama dominated the conversation and was forceful in demanding that Boehner pass legislation to maintain tax rates for the middle class and let them rise on income over $250,000 a year.¶ Boehner called the discussion "frank and direct" and said he remains "hopeful that productive conversations can be had in the days ahead." But both sides confirmed that no additional meetings have been planned and emphasized that talks will continue.¶ Obama's proposal, as outlined by Republicans, would purportedly trim the debt by about $4 trillion over the next decade, in part through spending cuts already in force and savings from ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Also included are $1.6 trillion in taxes and about $400 billion in savings from changes to federal health and entitlement programs.¶ With regard to taxes, the White House wants about $1 trillion in new revenue from the year-end expiration of the George W. Bush-era tax cuts on income over $250,000. Obama also is demanding that dividends be taxed as normal income and that the estate tax be raised to 45 percent and expanded to cover estates worth as little as $3.5 million -- policies for which the Democratic Senate was unable to win approval earlier this year.¶ Remaining tax increases and the entitlement savings would come next year, through congressional revisions to the tax code and retirement programs.¶ The White House plan would delay automatic cuts at federal agencies for one year while funding other Democratic priorities, including $50 billion for a new infrastructure bank and more unemployment benefits.¶ The plan also calls for extending the payroll tax cut, or adopting a similar tax break for working families, in addition to extending income tax cuts for the vast majority of taxpayers.¶ "Right now, the only thing preventing us from reaching a deal that averts the fiscal cliff and avoids a tax hike on 98 percent of Americans is the refusal of congressional Republicans to ask the very wealthiest individuals to pay higher tax rates," White House spokeswoman Amy Brundage said. "We remain willing to do tough things to compromise, and it's time for Republicans in Washington to join the chorus of other voices ... who support a balanced approach that asks more from the wealthiest Americans."

#### The effects of the cuts won’t be felt immediately

Babington and Taylor, 11/14 (Charles Babington, Andrew Taylor, The Associated Press “Effects of Fiscal Cliff Gradual, but Widespread,” 11/14/12, http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20121114/POLITICS03/211140328/Effects-fiscal-cliff-gradual-widespread?odyssey=mod%7Cnewswell%7Ctext%7CFRONTPAGE%7Cs

If the "fiscal cliff" takes effect, congressional Republicans would feel pressure to give ground in several areas to achieve their top goal: restoring tax cuts for as many people as possible. That's why Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., and other Democrats have said their party's leaders should seriously consider letting the Jan. 1 deadline pass and then negotiate with Republicans under sharply different circumstances. Some or most of any new agreements could be made retroactive to Jan. 1, they say.¶ If Republicans refuse to let tax cuts expire for the wealthy, Murray told ABC's "This Week," "we will reach a point at the end of this year where all the tax cuts expire and we'll start over next year. And whatever we do will be a tax cut for whatever package we put together. That may be the way to get past this."¶ Murray's allies say voters would blame Republicans for refusing to yield, especially on tax rates, given that Obama won re-election. A recent Pew Research poll supports that view. More than half of the respondents said they would chiefly blame congressional Republicans if there's no compromise on the fiscal cliff; 29 percent would blame Obama.¶ It's questionable whether Obama and Congress' Democratic leaders would let the government go over the fiscal cliff. Numerous financial analysts say the event would frighten markets, alarm employers and probably trigger a new recession.¶ However, there's a school of thought that the cliff is actually a slope, and the economy could withstand the effects of the automatic spending cuts and the renewal of Clinton-era tax rates for at least a few weeks to give time for negotiations to continue. Liberals note that tax rate increases would be felt gradually.

#### Congress will support Guam infrastructure funding – studies prove it’s necessary and efficient

Defense Communities 11/13 (Defense Communities 360, 11/13/12, “Navy Anticipates Political Support for Guam Realignment” http://www.defensecommunities.org/navy-anticipates-political-support-for-guam-realignment/#)

There’s every reason to expect Congress to restore its support for the move to Guam of thousands of Marines from Okinawa, a senior Navy official said Sunday.¶ “We’ve answered their concerns; we’ve done the study; we have this process for the environmental impact study completed with some pretty good detailed information,” Joseph Ludovici, principal deputy assistant secretary (energy, installations and environment) said prior to a scoping meeting on Guam to gather public input for the environmental review.¶ Since U.S. lawmakers froze funding for the buildup on the island last year, the United States and Japan scaled back the number of Marines moving to Guam from 8,600 to 5,000. And last week the Navy began to reassess where on Guam it will house the Marines and construct a firing range now that scope of the relocation has been dramatically scaled down.

#### Sequestration irrelevant --- no impact on the plan

Preble 12 (Christopher A. Preble, vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, 7/17/12, “Let Sequestration Happen”<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/let-sequestration-happen-7204?page=show>)

Sequestration likely won’t be as bad as special interests and those in favor of ever-increasing military spending claim. The reductions would only apply to FY 2013 budget authority, not outlays. The Pentagon and Congress will then have greater flexibility starting in FY 2014 to adjust the reductions under the BCA spending caps. In the meantime, many programs could continue on funding already authorized.¶ We also must keep the cuts in proper perspective. The DOD base budget under sequestration would total $469 billion, about what we spent in 2006, not exactly a lean year for the Pentagon. And as for the claim that the military cuts will result in perhaps one million lost jobs, that seems implausible considering that the cuts would amount to less than three tenths of 1 percent of GDP.

#### No impact – debt ceiling proves

#### No deal on fiscal cliff - both parties have incentive to go off – at worst, Congress fixes it later

David Barno et al., Lt. General, U.S. Army, "Brace Yourself," FOREIGN POLICY, 11--7--12, [www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace\_yourself?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace_yourself?page=full)

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

#### Petraeus thumps the disad

Task, 11-12-12 (Aaron Task is the host of the Daily Ticker and editor-in-chief of Yahoo! Finance, “Sex Trumps Economics: Will Petraeus Scandal Scuttle a Fiscal Cliff Deal?” http://finance.yahoo.com/blogs/daily-ticker/sex-trumps-economics-petraeus-scandal-scuttle-fiscal-cliff-181125111.html)

As a result, the Petraeus scandal could potentially scuttle — or delay — a deal on the fiscal cliff, which is a hugely important economic issue but isn't nearly as sexy, literally and figuratively. The conventional wisdom today is that the Petraeus scandal and the fiscal cliff are separate issues and never the twain shall meet. But given the incredibly partisan nature of Washington, D.C., it's not so unthinkable that both parties could get bogged down in the Petraeus hearings to the detriment of the fiscal cliff negotiations. First and foremost, U.S. Attorney General [Eric Holder knew about the Petraeus affair](http://professional.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324073504578113460852395852.html?mod=ITP_pageone_0&#38;mg=reno64-wsj) "as far back as late summer" while House Majority Leader Eric Cantor learned of the FBI's investigation into Paula Broadwell in October, according to The WSJ. That alone has the potential to mushroom into a couple of mini-scandals: If Holder knew, when did President Obama know? Why didn't Cantor try to use the scandal for political advantage ahead of the election? If Cantor knew, does the FBI have its own problem with leaks? While it now appears that Petraeus was involved in a legitimate scandal, some Americans will likely feel his resignation had something to do with Benghazi and the administration's response to the Sept. 11 consulate attack. Prior to his sudden resignation, Petraeus was scheduled to testify on Benghazi this Thursday; his Deputy Mike Morell will now take his place but [Sen. Lindsey Graham](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505266_162-57548240/petraeus-resignation-just-sex-scandal-or-serious-security-concern/) (R-S.C.) told CBS's "Face the Nation" this weekend: "I don't see how in the world you can find out what happened in Benghazi before, during and after the attack if General Petraeus doesn't testify." On Fox News this weekend, Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) described Petraeus' resignation and revelations about his affair as "like a lightning bolt." Given all the dry tinder in Washington, don't be surprised if that lightning bolt doesn't ignite a broader brush fire, and one that could consume the fiscal cliff negotiations — even if just by providing a distraction from this most critical economic issue.

**Supporting forward deployments is always popular – key to maintain political and professional credibility**

**Logan 10** (Justin, associate director of foreign policy studies at the CATO Institute, World Politics Review, “The Domestic Bases of America’s Grand Strategy, 3-23-10)

Or take, as another example, the striking explanation offered in 2009 by Leslie Gelb, the president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, describing why he supported the invasion of Iraq: My initial support for the war was symptomatic of unfortunate tendencies within the foreign policy community, namely the disposition and incentives to support wars to retain political and professional credibility. (Emphasis added.) At the time of Gelb's initial support for the Iraq war, he was president of the Council on Foreign Relations — a position that, in theory, should allow the person who holds it to establish conventional wisdom, or at least offer him or her the luxury of not following it. If anyone should be immune from domestic political pressure, after all, it should be the president of Council on Foreign Relations. And yet even as powerful and influential a policy maven as Gelb reports having felt the pull of "incentives" that induced him to "support wars to retain political and professional credibility." Academic perceptions of how American strategy is formed largely concur: **Domestic politics are the most important drivers of U.S. grand strategy**. In ITPIR's 2008-2009 survey, academics were asked to assess the importance of different foreign policy influences. Thirty-nine percent gave primacy to "preferences of domestic elites," 36 percent to "powerful interest groups," 15 percent to strategic interests, 9 percent to norms, and 2 percent to public opinion

#### Political capital doesn’t solve

James Warren, "President Obama's Hill Challenge in Avoiding Fiscal Cliff," DAILY BEAST, 11--9--12, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/11/09/president-obama-s-hill-challenge-in-avoiding-fiscal-cliff.html>

Obama “has to change the way he operates,” argues Cook. “The White House motto seems to be ‘No New Friends,’” his allusion to the small and tight group of mostly Chicago chums with whom the president and Michelle Obama socialize. But even longtime Washington hands are unclear how the system will resolve what a prominent Republican lobbyist calls a “three-ring policy circus” of huge automatic spending cuts due to kick in on Jan. 1; a decision on whether to extend Bush-era tax cuts; and a decision next year on raising the debt ceiling. A longer recession and higher unemployment could be in the offing if there’s no resolution. And it may be equally unclear whether a more overtly engaged Obama would alter the bargaining landscape, given underlying political frictions in both parties—and changes in the capital’s own political and social culture.

### Fiscal D Politics Econ

**Ninety-three economic downturns since World War Two disprove the link between economy and war**

**Miller 2k** (Morris Miller, Adjunct Professor of Administration at the University of Ottawa, 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol 24 No 4)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that: Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong…The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes…(or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence…In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### GOP opposition on White House tax deal hinders any progress to compromise

Kane, 11/30 (Paul Kane, the Washington Post, “Obama, GOP still far apart on a deal”, November 30 2012, http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/2012/11/29/20121129obama-gop-still-far-apart-deal.html. NP)

President Barack Obama offered Republicans a detailed plan Thursday for averting the year-end "fiscal cliff" that calls for $1.6 trillion in new taxes, $50 billion in fresh spending on the economy and an effective end to congressional control over the size of the national debt.¶ The proposal, delivered to the Capitol by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, mirrors previous White House deficit-reduction plans and satisfies Democrats' demands that negotiations begin on terms dictated by the newly re-elected president.¶ But the offer lacks any concessions to Republicans, most notably on the core issue of where to set tax rates for the wealthiest Americans. After two weeks of talks between the White House and aides to House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, it seemed to take Republicans by surprise.¶ Boehner quickly rejected the proposal and was trying late Thursday to decide how to respond, aides said. After meeting with Geithner for about 45 minutes Thursday morning, the speaker announced his frustration with a negotiation process in which nearly three weeks have lapsed since the election with "no substantive progress." "I'm disappointed in where we are, and disappointed in what's happened over the last couple weeks," Boehner told reporters. "Going over the fiscal cliff is serious business. And I'm here seriously trying to resolve it. And I would hope the White House would get serious as well."¶ Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., called the proposal a "step backward" from compromise -- with time running out for policymakers to agree on a plan to prevent more than $500 billion in tax increases and spending cuts that could rattle the economy.¶ "This is a real problem," McConnell said. "Every day, the delay brings us one step closer to the fiscal cliff that we simply must avoid."¶ Democratic leaders, meanwhile, were triumphant after receiving similar briefings from Geithner and White House legislative liaison Rob Nabors. Top Democrats have insisted for months that an Obama victory would entitle them to demand far more in new taxes than Republicans have been willing to consider, to seek new measures to boost economic growth, and to avoid major cuts to entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare.¶ "Democrats are on the same page," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev. "The president has made his proposal; we need a proposal from them."¶ Although the White House offer seemed to startle Republicans, it contains little that would be unfamiliar to anyone following the president's recent statements. The exception was his proposal on the federal debt limit. GOP aides said Obama is seeking to permanently enact procedures that were temporarily adopted in the summer of 2011 that allow the White House to unilaterally increase the debt ceiling unless two-thirds of lawmakers disapprove.¶ That process, initially proposed by McConnell, was not intended to become permanent. By trying to make it so, Obama is seeking to avoid another damaging battle over the debt ceiling that would again risk a national default. This change, however, would also deprive Congress of its historic authority over federal borrowing.¶ Unless Congress acts on the fiscal cliff, taxes will rise significantly in January for nearly 90 percent of Americans, and about $65 billion will be sliced from the budgets of the Pentagon and other agencies, probably triggering a recession. Simply canceling the changes, however, risks undermining confidence in the nation's ability to manage its rising debt.¶ Financial markets, which in recent weeks have been optimistic about the prospects of a deal to replace the cliff with a less traumatic deficit-reduction plan, were whipsawed by Thursday's declarations. The Dow Jones industrial average took a nose dive during Boehner's 11:30 a.m. news conference, dropping nearly 60 points in eight minutes. It closed with a gain of nearly 37 points, or 0.3 percent.¶ Obama's offer comes nearly two weeks after Boehner and other congressional leaders opened talks at the White House. Since then, administration officials have negotiated directly with Boehner's staff. Senior Republican aides said relations deteriorated in recent days, prompting Boehner to call the White House on Wednesday evening to request to speak with the president.¶ Boehner's aides declined to comment on the 28-minute call, but Republicans in the Capitol said Obama dominated the conversation and was forceful in demanding that Boehner pass legislation to maintain tax rates for the middle class and let them rise on income over $250,000 a year.¶ Boehner called the discussion "frank and direct" and said he remains "hopeful that productive conversations can be had in the days ahead." But both sides confirmed that no additional meetings have been planned and emphasized that talks will continue.¶ Obama's proposal, as outlined by Republicans, would purportedly trim the debt by about $4 trillion over the next decade, in part through spending cuts already in force and savings from ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Also included are $1.6 trillion in taxes and about $400 billion in savings from changes to federal health and entitlement programs.¶ With regard to taxes, the White House wants about $1 trillion in new revenue from the year-end expiration of the George W. Bush-era tax cuts on income over $250,000. Obama also is demanding that dividends be taxed as normal income and that the estate tax be raised to 45 percent and expanded to cover estates worth as little as $3.5 million -- policies for which the Democratic Senate was unable to win approval earlier this year.¶ Remaining tax increases and the entitlement savings would come next year, through congressional revisions to the tax code and retirement programs.¶ The White House plan would delay automatic cuts at federal agencies for one year while funding other Democratic priorities, including $50 billion for a new infrastructure bank and more unemployment benefits.¶ The plan also calls for extending the payroll tax cut, or adopting a similar tax break for working families, in addition to extending income tax cuts for the vast majority of taxpayers.¶ "Right now, the only thing preventing us from reaching a deal that averts the fiscal cliff and avoids a tax hike on 98 percent of Americans is the refusal of congressional Republicans to ask the very wealthiest individuals to pay higher tax rates," White House spokeswoman Amy Brundage said. "We remain willing to do tough things to compromise, and it's time for Republicans in Washington to join the chorus of other voices ... who support a balanced approach that asks more from the wealthiest Americans."

#### Congress will support Guam infrastructure funding – studies prove it’s necessary and efficient

Defense Communities 11/13 (Defense Communities 360, 11/13/12, “Navy Anticipates Political Support for Guam Realignment” http://www.defensecommunities.org/navy-anticipates-political-support-for-guam-realignment/#)

There’s every reason to expect Congress to restore its support for the move to Guam of thousands of Marines from Okinawa, a senior Navy official said Sunday.¶ “We’ve answered their concerns; we’ve done the study; we have this process for the environmental impact study completed with some pretty good detailed information,” Joseph Ludovici, principal deputy assistant secretary (energy, installations and environment) said prior to a scoping meeting on Guam to gather public input for the environmental review.¶ Since U.S. lawmakers froze funding for the buildup on the island last year, the United States and Japan scaled back the number of Marines moving to Guam from 8,600 to 5,000. And last week the Navy began to reassess where on Guam it will house the Marines and construct a firing range now that scope of the relocation has been dramatically scaled down.

#### No impact – debt ceiling proves

#### No deal on fiscal cliff - both parties have incentive to go off – at worst, Congress fixes it later

David Barno et al., Lt. General, U.S. Army, "Brace Yourself," FOREIGN POLICY, 11--7--12, [www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace\_yourself?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/07/brace_yourself?page=full)

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

#### Petraeus thumps the disad

Task, 11-12-12 (Aaron Task is the host of the Daily Ticker and editor-in-chief of Yahoo! Finance, “Sex Trumps Economics: Will Petraeus Scandal Scuttle a Fiscal Cliff Deal?” http://finance.yahoo.com/blogs/daily-ticker/sex-trumps-economics-petraeus-scandal-scuttle-fiscal-cliff-181125111.html)

As a result, the Petraeus scandal could potentially scuttle — or delay — a deal on the fiscal cliff, which is a hugely important economic issue but isn't nearly as sexy, literally and figuratively. The conventional wisdom today is that the Petraeus scandal and the fiscal cliff are separate issues and never the twain shall meet. But given the incredibly partisan nature of Washington, D.C., it's not so unthinkable that both parties could get bogged down in the Petraeus hearings to the detriment of the fiscal cliff negotiations. First and foremost, U.S. Attorney General [Eric Holder knew about the Petraeus affair](http://professional.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324073504578113460852395852.html?mod=ITP_pageone_0&#38;mg=reno64-wsj) "as far back as late summer" while House Majority Leader Eric Cantor learned of the FBI's investigation into Paula Broadwell in October, according to The WSJ. That alone has the potential to mushroom into a couple of mini-scandals: If Holder knew, when did President Obama know? Why didn't Cantor try to use the scandal for political advantage ahead of the election? If Cantor knew, does the FBI have its own problem with leaks? While it now appears that Petraeus was involved in a legitimate scandal, some Americans will likely feel his resignation had something to do with Benghazi and the administration's response to the Sept. 11 consulate attack. Prior to his sudden resignation, Petraeus was scheduled to testify on Benghazi this Thursday; his Deputy Mike Morell will now take his place but [Sen. Lindsey Graham](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505266_162-57548240/petraeus-resignation-just-sex-scandal-or-serious-security-concern/) (R-S.C.) told CBS's "Face the Nation" this weekend: "I don't see how in the world you can find out what happened in Benghazi before, during and after the attack if General Petraeus doesn't testify." On Fox News this weekend, Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) described Petraeus' resignation and revelations about his affair as "like a lightning bolt." Given all the dry tinder in Washington, don't be surprised if that lightning bolt doesn't ignite a broader brush fire, and one that could consume the fiscal cliff negotiations — even if just by providing a distraction from this most critical economic issue.

**Supporting forward deployments is always popular – key to maintain political and professional credibility**

**Logan 10** (Justin, associate director of foreign policy studies at the CATO Institute, World Politics Review, “The Domestic Bases of America’s Grand Strategy, 3-23-10)

Or take, as another example, the striking explanation offered in 2009 by Leslie Gelb, the president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, describing why he supported the invasion of Iraq: My initial support for the war was symptomatic of unfortunate tendencies within the foreign policy community, namely the disposition and incentives to support wars to retain political and professional credibility. (Emphasis added.) At the time of Gelb's initial support for the Iraq war, he was president of the Council on Foreign Relations — a position that, in theory, should allow the person who holds it to establish conventional wisdom, or at least offer him or her the luxury of not following it. If anyone should be immune from domestic political pressure, after all, it should be the president of Council on Foreign Relations. And yet even as powerful and influential a policy maven as Gelb reports having felt the pull of "incentives" that induced him to "support wars to retain political and professional credibility." Academic perceptions of how American strategy is formed largely concur: **Domestic politics are the most important drivers of U.S. grand strategy**. In ITPIR's 2008-2009 survey, academics were asked to assess the importance of different foreign policy influences. Thirty-nine percent gave primacy to "preferences of domestic elites," 36 percent to "powerful interest groups," 15 percent to strategic interests, 9 percent to norms, and 2 percent to public opinion

#### Political capital doesn’t solve

James Warren, "President Obama's Hill Challenge in Avoiding Fiscal Cliff," DAILY BEAST, 11--9--12, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/11/09/president-obama-s-hill-challenge-in-avoiding-fiscal-cliff.html>

Obama “has to change the way he operates,” argues Cook. “The White House motto seems to be ‘No New Friends,’” his allusion to the small and tight group of mostly Chicago chums with whom the president and Michelle Obama socialize. But even longtime Washington hands are unclear how the system will resolve what a prominent Republican lobbyist calls a “three-ring policy circus” of huge automatic spending cuts due to kick in on Jan. 1; a decision on whether to extend Bush-era tax cuts; and a decision next year on raising the debt ceiling. A longer recession and higher unemployment could be in the offing if there’s no resolution. And it may be equally unclear whether a more overtly engaged Obama would alter the bargaining landscape, given underlying political frictions in both parties—and changes in the capital’s own political and social culture.

#### The effects of the cuts won’t be felt immediately

Babington and Taylor, 11/14 (Charles Babington, Andrew Taylor, The Associated Press “Effects of Fiscal Cliff Gradual, but Widespread,” 11/14/12, http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20121114/POLITICS03/211140328/Effects-fiscal-cliff-gradual-widespread?odyssey=mod%7Cnewswell%7Ctext%7CFRONTPAGE%7Cs

If the "fiscal cliff" takes effect, congressional Republicans would feel pressure to give ground in several areas to achieve their top goal: restoring tax cuts for as many people as possible. That's why Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., and other Democrats have said their party's leaders should seriously consider letting the Jan. 1 deadline pass and then negotiate with Republicans under sharply different circumstances. Some or most of any new agreements could be made retroactive to Jan. 1, they say.¶ If Republicans refuse to let tax cuts expire for the wealthy, Murray told ABC's "This Week," "we will reach a point at the end of this year where all the tax cuts expire and we'll start over next year. And whatever we do will be a tax cut for whatever package we put together. That may be the way to get past this."¶ Murray's allies say voters would blame Republicans for refusing to yield, especially on tax rates, given that Obama won re-election. A recent Pew Research poll supports that view. More than half of the respondents said they would chiefly blame congressional Republicans if there's no compromise on the fiscal cliff; 29 percent would blame Obama.¶ It's questionable whether Obama and Congress' Democratic leaders would let the government go over the fiscal cliff. Numerous financial analysts say the event would frighten markets, alarm employers and probably trigger a new recession.¶ However, there's a school of thought that the cliff is actually a slope, and the economy could withstand the effects of the automatic spending cuts and the renewal of Clinton-era tax rates for at least a few weeks to give time for negotiations to continue. Liberals note that tax rate increases would be felt gradually.

### CyberSecurity Politics

#### Nothing before fiscal cliff

Christian Science Monitor, 11-8-12, Obama's new foreign and security team, Lexis

Barack Obama's reelection was barely sealed before some international voices began trumpeting how the president's victory would mean a renewed American focus on foreign policy issues that languished during the campaign. President Obama could now revive the search for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, international Middle East envoy Tony Blair said. The US will be bolder now in pressing for a resolution of Syria's deadly and dangerous civil war, some US allies, including Turkish officials, predicted. Have these foreign friends heard of the "fiscal cliff"? Mr. Obama will no doubt be looking broadly to bolster his legacy, and that will include his stewardship of America's role in the world. But after an election in which - according to exit polls - foreign policy barely registered as a priority and a campaign in which Obama spoke frequently of a need for "nation-building here at home," it seems likely that domestic issues such as America's fiscal health, job creation, taxation, and even immigration reform will dominate the president's attention. "The president laid out his agenda in his victory speech, when he talked about priorities like continuing the economic recovery, avoiding the fiscal cliff, and getting people back to work, so he made it clear he'll be investing his political capital in those kinds of domestic battles," says Mark Siegel, a former deputy assistant to the president in the Carter White House who is now a partner at Locke Lord Strategies in Washington. "I just don't see him pushing any new initiative in terms of Middle East peace, not right away," he adds. "And he certainly won't be launching any kind of military involvement in Syria or Iran."

#### Congress will support Guam infrastructure funding – studies prove it’s necessary and efficient

Defense Communities 11/13 (Defense Communities 360, 11/13/12, “Navy Anticipates Political Support for Guam Realignment” http://www.defensecommunities.org/navy-anticipates-political-support-for-guam-realignment/#)

There’s every reason to expect Congress to restore its support for the move to Guam of thousands of Marines from Okinawa, a senior Navy official said Sunday.¶ “We’ve answered their concerns; we’ve done the study; we have this process for the environmental impact study completed with some pretty good detailed information,” Joseph Ludovici, principal deputy assistant secretary (energy, installations and environment) said prior to a scoping meeting on Guam to gather public input for the environmental review.¶ Since U.S. lawmakers froze funding for the buildup on the island last year, the United States and Japan scaled back the number of Marines moving to Guam from 8,600 to 5,000. And last week the Navy began to reassess where on Guam it will house the Marines and construct a firing range now that scope of the relocation has been dramatically scaled down.

**Supporting forward deployments is always popular – key to maintain political and professional credibility**

**Logan 10** (Justin, associate director of foreign policy studies at the CATO Institute, World Politics Review, “The Domestic Bases of America’s Grand Strategy, 3-23-10)

Or take, as another example, the striking explanation offered in 2009 by Leslie Gelb, the president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, describing why he supported the invasion of Iraq: My initial support for the war was symptomatic of unfortunate tendencies within the foreign policy community, namely the disposition and incentives to support wars to retain political and professional credibility. (Emphasis added.) At the time of Gelb's initial support for the Iraq war, he was president of the Council on Foreign Relations — a position that, in theory, should allow the person who holds it to establish conventional wisdom, or at least offer him or her the luxury of not following it. If anyone should be immune from domestic political pressure, after all, it should be the president of Council on Foreign Relations. And yet even as powerful and influential a policy maven as Gelb reports having felt the pull of "incentives" that induced him to "support wars to retain political and professional credibility." Academic perceptions of how American strategy is formed largely concur: **Domestic politics are the most important drivers of U.S. grand strategy**. In ITPIR's 2008-2009 survey, academics were asked to assess the importance of different foreign policy influences. Thirty-nine percent gave primacy to "preferences of domestic elites," 36 percent to "powerful interest groups," 15 percent to strategic interests, 9 percent to norms, and 2 percent to public opinion

Political capital is irrelevant – issues are compartmentalized  
Dickinson 9 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt 5/26, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” [http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/](http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/" \t "_blank))

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns 1for its summer recess in early August.  So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5.  (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power.  Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress.  That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences?  How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes?  These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power.  This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does.  Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence.  Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants.  (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying.  But this is not to say that presidents lack influence.  Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose.  That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting.   And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination.  Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox.

**It’s empirically denied – US infrastructure is subject to constant cyber-attacks**

**CNN, 10** – respected news source [2/16, “Fact Check: Cyberattack threat”, CNN News, <http://articles.cnn.com/2010-02-16/tech/fact.check.cyber.threat_1_cyberattack-infrastructure-threat?_s=PM:TECH>, AL]

Fact Check: Is there consensus on the likelihood of a cyberattack against the United States? -- According to the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), "Critical infrastructure owners and operators report that their networks and control systems are under repeated cyberattack, often from high-level adversaries like foreign nation-states." Sixty percent of U.S. Internet technology and infrastructure executives questioned in a recent CSIS survey expect to see a "major cyberincident" (an outage of at least 24 hours, a loss of life or a failure of a company) within two

**FBI cybersecurity is being funded now and solves cyberthreats**

**Pelofsky 6-21** (Jeremy, correspondent for Reuters, “New round of cyber attacks heightens focus on FBI”, <http://ca.reuters.com/article/technologyNews/idCATRE75K6EN20110621?pageNumber=1&virtualBrandChannel=0>)

A senior official in the FBI's cyber division said his team has recently received more backing from Congress. Now, about 60 percent of cases focus on national security and criminal intrusions, up from 50 percent about two years ago. Most of the remainder deal with child pornography. "As we've received enhancements to personnel and non-personnel resources, we've specifically trained them in the areas of intrusion," Steven Chabinsky, deputy assistant director of the FBI's cyber division, told Reuters. A Senate Judiciary subcommittee on Tuesday weighed beefing up cyber laws. But the critical issue of finding more money could be difficult as Obama and Congress are under intense pressure to cut the budget deficit. National security matters tend to get spared the budget ax, but the chances of a large boost in resources are slim. Obama's proposed budget for fiscal 2012, which starts October 1, includes a request for almost $19 million more for 42 new positions at the FBI focusing on investigating and protecting against cyber attacks, including 14 special agents.

**No cyberwar**

**Sommer & Brown 11,** Peter and Ian, “Reducing Systemic Cybersecurity Risk,” OECD Project on future global shocks 1/14/11 http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/57/44/46889922.pdf

It is unlikely that there will ever be a true cyberwar. The reasons are: many critical computer systems are protected against known exploits and malware so that designers of new cyberweapons have to identify new weaknesses and exploits; the effects of cyberattacks are difficult to predict – on the one hand they may be less powerful than hoped but may also have more extensive outcomes arising from the interconnectedness of systems, resulting in unwanted damage to perpetrators and their allies. More importantly, there is no strategic reason why any aggressor would limit themselves to only one class of weaponry.

**Cyberterorrism is highly unlikely – multiple warrants.**

**Conway 11**, Maura, “Against Cyberterrorism,” *Communications of the ACM*, Feb. 2011, Vol. 54, No. 2, EBSCO

Violent jihadis’ IT knowledge is not superior. For example, in research carried out in 2007, it was found that of a random sampling of 404 members of violent Islamist groups, 196 (48.5%) had a higher education, with information about subject areas available for 178 individuals. Of these 178, some 8 (4.5%) had trained in computing, which means that out of the entire sample, **28 communications of the acm** | februa ry 2011 | vol. 54 | no. 2 viewpoints less than 2% of the jihadis came from a computing background.3 And not even these few could be assumed to have mastery of the complex systems necessary to carry out a successful cyberterrorist attack. Real-world attacks are difficult enough. What are often viewed as relatively unsophisticated real-world attacks undertaken by highly educated individuals are routinely unsuccessful. One only has to consider the failed car bomb attacks planned and carried out by medical doctors in central London and at Glasgow airport in June 2007. Hiring hackers would compromise operational security. The only remaining option is to retain “outsiders” to undertake such an attack. This is very operationally risky. It would force the terrorists to operate outside their own circles and thus leave them ripe for infiltration. Even if they successfully got in contact with “real” hackers, they would be in no position to gauge their competency accurately; they would simply have to trust in same. This would be very risky. So on the basis of technical knowhow alone cyberterror attack is not imminent, but this is not the only factor one must take into account. The events of Sept. 11, 2001 underscore that for a true terrorist event spectacular moving images are crucial. The attacks on the World Trade Center were a fantastic piece of performance violence; look back on any recent roundup of the decade and mention of 9/11 will not just be prominent, but pictures will always be provided. The problem with respect to cyberterrorism is that many of the attack scenarios put forward, from shutting down the electric power grid to contaminating a major water supply, fail on this account: they are unlikely to have easily captured, spectacular (live, moving) images associated with them, something we—as an audience—have been primed for by the attack on the World Trade Center on 9/11. The only cyberterrorism scenario that would fall into this category is interfering with air traffic control systems to crash planes, but haven’t we seen that planes can much more easily be employed in spectacular “real-world” terrorism? And besides, aren’t all the infrastructures just mentioned much easier and more spectacular to simply blow up? It doesn’t end there, however. For me, the third argument against cyberterrorism is perhaps the most compelling; yet it is very rarely mentioned. In 2004, Howard Schmidt, former White House Cybersecurity Coordinator, remarked to the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary regarding Nimda and Code Red that “we to this day don’t know the source of that. It could have very easily been a terrorist.”4 This observation betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature and purposes of terrorism, particularly its attention-getting and communicative functions. A terrorist attack with the potential to be hidden, portrayed as an accident, or otherwise remain unknown is unlikely to be viewed positively by any terrorist group. In fact, one of the most important aspects of the 9/11 attacks in New York from the perpetrators viewpoint was surely the fact that while the first plane to crash into the World Trade Center could have been accidental, the appearance of the second plane confirmed the incident as a terrorist attack in real time. Moreover, the crash of the first plane ensured a large audience for the second plane as it hit the second tower. Alternatively, think about the massive electric failure that took place in the northeastern U.S. in August 2003: if it was a terrorist attack—and I’m not suggesting that it was—but *if it was*, it would have been a spectacular failure. **Conclusion** Given the high cost—not just in terms of money, but also time, commitment, and effort—and the high possibility of failure on the basis of manpower issues, timing, and complexity of a potential cyberterrorist attack, the costs appear to me to still very largely outweigh the potential publicity benefits. The publicity aspect is crucial for potential perpetrators of terrorism and so the possibility that an attack may be apprehended or portrayed as an accident, which would be highly likely with regard to cyberterrorism, is detrimental. Add the lack of spectacular moving images and it is my belief that cyberterrorism, regardless of what you may read in newspapers, see on television, or obtain via other media sources, is not in our near future.

### Generic Politics

#### Congress will support Guam infrastructure funding – studies prove it’s necessary and efficient

Defense Communities 11/13 (Defense Communities 360, 11/13/12, “Navy Anticipates Political Support for Guam Realignment” http://www.defensecommunities.org/navy-anticipates-political-support-for-guam-realignment/#)

There’s every reason to expect Congress to restore its support for the move to Guam of thousands of Marines from Okinawa, a senior Navy official said Sunday.¶ “We’ve answered their concerns; we’ve done the study; we have this process for the environmental impact study completed with some pretty good detailed information,” Joseph Ludovici, principal deputy assistant secretary (energy, installations and environment) said prior to a scoping meeting on Guam to gather public input for the environmental review.¶ Since U.S. lawmakers froze funding for the buildup on the island last year, the United States and Japan scaled back the number of Marines moving to Guam from 8,600 to 5,000. And last week the Navy began to reassess where on Guam it will house the Marines and construct a firing range now that scope of the relocation has been dramatically scaled down.

#### Public wants transportation spending even if it results in more taxes

**Madland and Bunker**. 3/22/**2012** (David – Director of the American Worker Project at American Progress, and Nick – Research Assistant with the Economic Policy team at the Center for American Progress, Ties that Bind: How a Strong Middle Class Supports Strong Public Infrastructure, p. <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/03/middle_class_infrastructure.html/print.html>)

And make no mistake, the broader American public supports increased investments in infrastructure. Ninety-three percent feel making improvements to infrastructure is important; 72 percent support “increasing federal spending to build and repair roads, bridges, and schools”; and 81 percent are prepared to pay more in taxes to do so.

**Supporting forward deployments is always popular – key to maintain political and professional credibility**

**Logan 10** (Justin, associate director of foreign policy studies at the CATO Institute, World Politics Review, “The Domestic Bases of America’s Grand Strategy, 3-23-10)

Or take, as another example, the striking explanation offered in 2009 by Leslie Gelb, the president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, describing why he supported the invasion of Iraq: My initial support for the war was symptomatic of unfortunate tendencies within the foreign policy community, namely the disposition and incentives to support wars to retain political and professional credibility. (Emphasis added.) At the time of Gelb's initial support for the Iraq war, he was president of the Council on Foreign Relations — a position that, in theory, should allow the person who holds it to establish conventional wisdom, or at least offer him or her the luxury of not following it. If anyone should be immune from domestic political pressure, after all, it should be the president of Council on Foreign Relations. And yet even as powerful and influential a policy maven as Gelb reports having felt the pull of "incentives" that induced him to "support wars to retain political and professional credibility." Academic perceptions of how American strategy is formed largely concur: **Domestic politics are the most important drivers of U.S. grand strategy**. In ITPIR's 2008-2009 survey, academics were asked to assess the importance of different foreign policy influences. Thirty-nine percent gave primacy to "preferences of domestic elites," 36 percent to "powerful interest groups," 15 percent to strategic interests, 9 percent to norms, and 2 percent to public opinion

7. Political capital is irrelevant – issues are compartmentalized  
Dickinson 9 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt 5/26, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” [http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/](http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/" \t "_blank))

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns 1for its summer recess in early August.  So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5.  (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power.  Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress.  That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences?  How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes?  These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power.  This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does.  Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence.  Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants.  (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying.  But this is not to say that presidents lack influence.  Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose.  That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting.   And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination.  Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox.

### JV Agenda PTX

#### 1. Not reverse causal – JV doesn’t collapse Russia relations just helps them

#### 2. Wont pass – Russia bashing, Magnesky, and seen as supporting human rights abuse

Jim Abrams, 7-18-12 (Staff Writer, Huffington Post, " Senate panel approves trade relations with Russia", http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huff-wires/20120718/us-us-russia-trade/ :)

Getting the trade bill through Congress has been a top priority for business and farm groups, which see it as a jobs creator and a boost to the economy. "Without PNTR, U.S. companies and workers will be at a distinct disadvantage in the Russian market as our competitors in Europe, Asia and elsewhere begin to lock in sales and long-term contracts," said Caterpillar Inc. chairman and CEO Doug Oberhelman, who also chairs the Business Roundtable's International Engagement Committee. But it has struggled to gain momentum because of poor relations between the two countries. "It is with some trepidation that we undertake this task," said Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah, top Republican on the committee. "Despite President Obama's reset policy, U.S.-Russian relations remain rocky at best." The bill only advanced to a committee vote after Baucus agreed to link it to legislation, pushed by Sens. Ben Cardin, D-Md., and Jon Kyl, R-Ariz., that imposes sanctions such as visa denials and asset freezes on Russian government officials involved in human rights violations. The legislation, which has sparked strong criticism from Russian officials, specifically targets those involved in the case of Sergei Magnitsky, a lawyer who died in a Russian jail in 2009 after allegedly being subject to torture. Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, proposed an amendment stating that the legislation would not go into effect until the president certifies that Russia is no longer supplying arms to Syria. "If it's important to vindicate the rights of a single person," he said, referring to Magnitsky, "how much more compelling is it" to ensure that Russian arms aren't being used to kill thousands of Syrian civilians. It was defeated, with opponents saying withholding permanent trade status would only hurt U.S. businesses, not Russia. How to proceed with the trade issue has divided both parties. Last month Hatch and seven other Finance Committee members sent Baucus a letter listing the many troubling aspects of U.S.-Russia relations and questioning whether Russia would comply with WTO findings when disputes arise. But earlier this week 73 House Republican freshmen wrote President Barack Obama saying that "we will only hurt ourselves and lose out on economic opportunities and needed jobs" if full trade relations with Russia are not established. It's a "Hobson's choice," said Sen. Mike Crapo, R-Idaho, at Wednesday's committee meeting. By moving to help U.S. exporters Congress was put in the situation of rewarding the bad behavior of the Moscow government, he said. While adding the Magnitsky provision to the bill, the measure eliminates another human rights act that has been the main stumbling block to permanent normal trade relations. The bill repeals the 1974 Jackson-Vanik act that tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow's allowing Jews and other minorities to leave the country. While Jackson-Vanik has long outlived its purpose, it has remained on the books, a mark of the continued difficult relations between the two countries. It appears unlikely that Congress can act on the trade bill before Russia formally enters the WTO. Congress has only two more weeks before it takes off for its August recess, time likely to be taken up by election-related tax and spending bills. On the House side, Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, R-Mich., welcomed the Senate's action and said he intended to introduce a bill in the next few days. He said he was working with the White House to find a Democratic co-sponsor so the bill could move through his committee on a bipartisan basis. The bill also establishes permanent normal trade relations with Moldova. Baucus said the former Soviet republic, which joined the WTO in 2001, is the only WTO member that does not have permanent trade status with the United States

#### 3. Obama won't be able to lobby Jackson-Vanik to pass before it's too late.

Carroll Colley, 6-21-12 (Carroll Colley is the director of Eurasia Group’s Eurasia practice, Foreign Policy, "Presidential campaign politics delays U.S. recognition of Russia at WTO", http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/21/presidential\_campaign\_politics\_delays\_us\_recognition\_of\_russia\_at\_wto :)

The Obama administration has sent contradictory messages about its support for the Magnitsky bill. While originally opposing the bill, the administration seems to have accepted the inevitable and has been working with its primary author, Democratic Sen. Ben Cardin of Maryland. One recent Senate version provides for the public list as well as a confidential annex, which would largely allow the administration to circumvent the thrust of the bill by invoking national security exemptions. This is strongly opposed by a number of senior lawmakers, including Sen. John McCain, who was a co-sponsor of the effort to repeal Jackson-Vanik on the caveat of corresponding passage of the Magnitsky bill. As the August recess rapidly approaches, the window for graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik prior to its WTO accession closes. Obama appears to have little room to maneuver in expending political capital on the matter without raising the risk of elevating Russia-and its collateral baggage including Syria, Georgia, Iran, and domestic protests-to a legitimate campaign issue. Unless Congress moves forward on its own prerogative-which appears unlikely-the repeal of Jackson-Vanik won't get passed before November, or later, leaving the world's largest economy unable to take advantage of the accession of the WTO's newest member.

#### 4. A rational policy maker could do the plan and pass Jackson-Vanik repeal – the DA is not a logical reason to reject the plan.

#### 5. Alt causes damaging Russian relations – WTO, BMD, trade ties, and nukes

**Charap 11** (3/11/11, Samuel, Associate Director for Russia and Eurasia and a member of the National Security and International Policy team at the Center for American Progress, interview with Rianovosti, a Russian news agency, “U.S.-Russian relations: The reset process may not be irreversible,” <http://en.rian.ru/valdai_op/20110311/162949812.html>)

I don’t think Vice President Joe Biden’s visit was at all connected to the upcoming presidential elections in the United States. But the fact that he met with both members of the Russian governing tandem in Moscow indicates that the United States is ready to cooperate with either man after the elections, whoever the Russians elect. In my opinion, domestic political processes and election results in Russia and the United States could influence the relationship. If the current presidents are re-elected, the elections’ outcome will not influence it, but internal political tensions during the election period sometimes affect a country’s foreign policy actions… As for the most promising areas of U.S.-Russian relations, bilateral cooperation is possible in many spheres, **from economic development to strategic nuclear weapons. The immediate issues on their agenda include Russia’s accession to the World Trade Organization, cooperation on ballistic missile defense, and developing trade and economic ties**. I am not sure that we have entered a phase of bilateral relations where the current positive atmosphere could be said to be irreversible. In my opinion, **we have not yet disarmed all the time bombs that still threaten to take our relations back to where they were 2.5 years ago**. I think that, unfortunately, should certain circumstances arise, this process could be reversed.

#### 6. Public wants transportation spending even if it results in more taxes

**Madland and Bunker**. 3/22/**2012** (David – Director of the American Worker Project at American Progress, and Nick – Research Assistant with the Economic Policy team at the Center for American Progress, Ties that Bind: How a Strong Middle Class Supports Strong Public Infrastructure, p. <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/03/middle_class_infrastructure.html/print.html>)

And make no mistake, the broader American public supports increased investments in infrastructure. Ninety-three percent feel making improvements to infrastructure is important; 72 percent support “increasing federal spending to build and repair roads, bridges, and schools”; and 81 percent are prepared to pay more in taxes to do so.

7. Political capital is irrelevant – issues are compartmentalized  
Dickinson 9 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt 5/26, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” [http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/](http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/" \t "_blank))

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns 1for its summer recess in early August.  So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5.  (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power.  Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress.  That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences?  How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes?  These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power.  This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does.  Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence.  Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants.  (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying.  But this is not to say that presidents lack influence.  Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose.  That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting.   And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination.  Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox.

#### 8. Relations are resilient – mutual deterrence

Fenenko 6/21 [Alexei Fenenko is a Leading Research Fellow, Institute of International Security Studies of RAS, “The cyclical nature of Russian-American relations,” 6/21/11, <http://en.rian.ru/valdai_op/20110621/164739508.html>]

There is nothing special or unusual about the current difficulties. Over the past twenty years, both Russia and the United States have experienced several cycles of convergence and divergence in their bilateral relations. It seems that Moscow and Washington are doomed to repeat these cycles time and again. Such changes in bilateral relations are no mere coincidence. Russia and the United States base their relations on mutual nuclear deterrence. The material and technical foundations for Russian-American relations differ little from those underpinning the Soviet-American relations of the 1980s. Thus, these cycles of Russian-American rapprochement are due to two factors. First comes the desire to consistently reduce aging nuclear systems so that during disarmament neither party risked destroying the military-strategic parity. Second, the reaction to a major military-political crisis after which the parties seek to reduce confrontation and update the rules of conduct in the military-political sphere. After confronting these tasks, Russia and the United States returned to a state of low intensity confrontation.

### Elections – Obama Good Impact Turn Short

#### \*\*\*Insert UQ\*\*\*

#### Voters to focused on economy to let foreign policy change the election

Cook 12

Charlie Cook, Editor and Publisher of The Cook Political Report, and political analyst for National Journal, 4/13/12, “Down to the Wire,”http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-down-to-the-wire-20120412

Romney must quickly reverse directions, probably grinding some gears in the process, but Obama’s fate is less in his own hands than in the economy’s. As of now, foreign policy is a good news/bad news proposition. The good news for the president is that the public generally approves of his handling of foreign policy. Indeed, if judged on that performance alone, he would win the election quite comfortably today. The bad news for him is that foreign policy doesn’t seem to be a driver for many voters; their focus is the economy.

#### The plan won’t change the election – voters have already decided

Helling 12 DAVE HELLING, McClatchy Newspapers Miami Herald 7-22-12 "Is the race for president already over?"

http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/07/22/2906564/peoples-minds-are-made-up-unlikely.html

But a growing number of political scientists and campaign consultants - backed by the latest polling data - think the daily campaign back-and-forth is having no significant effect on voters. Most Americans have locked in their presidential decisions, polls released Thursday suggested, and the already small number of persuadable voters shrinks by the hour. Put another way: America could vote for president next week, and the outcome would probably be the same as it will be in November. "That's accurate, barring some really big, big event or change in the political environment," said Alan Abramowitz, a political science professor at Emory University in Atlanta, who has studied presidential voting patterns. Kenneth Warren, a political science professor at St. Louis University, agreed. "Most people have decided who they're going to vote for early on," he said. Recent polls show those who have decided are split almost evenly between Obama and Romney. In a CBS/New York Times poll, Romney led by 1 point. In a Fox News poll, he trailed Obama by 4 points. A National Public Radio poll found Obama leading by 2 points. A Gallup tracking poll over the same time period showed the race dead even. The average of polls puts the Obama advantage at 1.2 percent, according to Real Clear Politics, a political aggregation website. The incumbent has led Romney in that average by a one- to two-point margin since last October. Political scientists and consultants said there were several reasons for early presidential decision-making. In an Internet-cable-TV age, voters are pounded with political messages daily, helping them make up their minds far in advance of the election. An incumbent in the race makes at least one of the candidates a known quantity. And American voters are deeply divided, further cementing their choices.

#### \*\*\*Insert Impact Defense \*\*\*

#### Romney election results in Iran strikes – Obama avoids them

Daily Kos, 4/16/2012 (President Obama versus Romney on Iran, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>)

3. Approach to foreign policy: Romney says he will “not apologize” for America and advocates a return to the Bush cowboy “my way or the highway” approach to dealing with other nations. When John Bolton is an endorser, that scares me. To me, however the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran. Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come. (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia."But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent a needless war. You can be sure that Mitt Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”. As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. Bottom line, if somehow the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a more than likely bombardment of Iran. If the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.

#### Iran first strike is inevitable - just a question of the effectiveness and the time—strike key to prevent nuclear escalation

Matthew Kroenig is Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, he was a Special Adviser in the Office of the U.S. Secretary of Defense, responsible for defense strategy and policy on Iran, January/February 2012, “Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike Is the Least Bad Option”, http://online.physics.uiuc.edu/courses/phys280/spring12/archive/Time-to-Attack-Iran.pdf; hhs-ab

In early October, U.S. officials accused Iranian operatives of planning to assassinate Saudi Arabia's ambassador to the United States on American soil. Iran denied the charges, but the episode has already managed to increase tensions between Washington and Tehran. Although the Obama administration has not publicly threatened to retaliate with military force, the allegations have underscored the real and growing risk that the two sides could go to war sometime soon--particularly over Iran's advancing nuclear program. For several years now, starting long before this episode, American pundits and policymakers have been debating whether the United States should attack Iran and attempt to eliminate its nuclear facilities. Proponents of a strike have argued that the only thing worse than military action against Iran would be an Iran armed with nuclear weapons. Critics, meanwhile, have warned that such a raid would likely fail and, even if it succeeded, would spark a full-fledged war and a global economic crisis. They have urged the United States to rely on nonmilitary options, such as diplomacy, sanctions, and covert operations, to prevent Iran from acquiring a bomb. Fearing the costs of a bombing campaign, most critics maintain that if these other tactics fail to impede Tehran's progress, the United States should simply learn to live with a nuclear Iran. But skeptics of military action fail to appreciate the true danger that a nuclear armed Iran would pose to U.S. interests in the Middle East and beyond. And their grim forecasts assume that the cure would be worse than the disease--that is, that the consequences of a U.S. assault on Iran would be as bad as or worse than those of Iran achieving its nuclear ambitions. But that is a faulty assumption. The truth is that a military strike intended to destroy Iran's nuclear program, if managed carefully, could spare the region and the world a very real threat and dramatically improve the long-term national security of the United States. Years of international pressure have failed to halt Iran's attempt to build a nuclear program. The Stuxnet computer worm, which attacked control systems in Iranian nuclear facilities, temporarily disrupted Tehran's enrichment effort, but a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency this past May revealed that the targeted plants have fully recovered from the assault. And the latest IAEA findings on Iran, released in November, provided the most compelling evidence yet that the Islamic Republic has weathered sanctions and sabotage, allegedly testing nuclear triggering devices and redesigning its missiles to carry nuclear payloads. The Institute for Science and International Security, a nonprofit research institution, estimates that Iran could now produce its first nuclear weapon within six months of deciding to do so. Tehran's plans to move sensitive nuclear operations into more secure facilities over the course of the coming year could reduce the window for effective military action even further. If Iran expels IAEA inspectors, begins enriching its stockpiles of uranium to weapons-grade levels of 90 percent, or installs advanced centrifuges at its uranium-enrichment facility in Qom, the United States must strike immediately or forfeit its last opportunity to prevent Iran from joining the nuclear club. Some states in the region are doubting U.S. resolve to stop the program and are shifting their allegiances to Tehran. Others have begun to discuss launching their own nuclear initiatives to counter a possible Iranian bomb. For those nations and the United States itself, the threat will only continue to grow as Tehran moves closer to its goal. A nuclear-armed Iran would immediately limit U.S. freedom of action in the Middle East. With atomic power behind it, Iran could threaten any U.S. political or military initiative in the Middle East with nuclear war, forcing Washington to think twice before acting in the region. Iran's regional rivals, such as Saudi Arabia, would likely decide to acquire their own nuclear arsenals, sparking an arms race. To constrain its geopolitical rivals, Iran could choose to spur proliferation by transferring nuclear technology to its allies--other countries and terrorist groups alike. Having the bomb would give Iran greater cover for conventional aggression and coercive diplomacy, and the battles between its terrorist proxies and Israel, for example, could escalate. And Iran and Israel lack nearly all the safeguards that helped the United States and the Soviet Union avoid a nuclear exchange during the Cold War-- secure second-strike capabilities, clear lines of communication, long flight times for ballistic missiles from one country to the other, and experience managing nuclear arsenals. To be sure, a nuclear-armed Iran would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war. But the volatile nuclear balance between Iran and Israel could easily spiral out of control as a crisis unfolds, resulting in a nuclear exchange between the two countries that could draw the United States in, as well. These security threats would require Washington to contain Tehran. Yet deterrence would come at a heavy price. To keep the Iranian threat at bay, the United States would need to deploy naval and ground units and potentially nuclear weapons across the Middle East, keeping a large force in the area for decades to come. Alongside those troops, the United States would have to permanently deploy significant intelligence assets to monitor any attempts by Iran to transfer its nuclear technology. And it would also need to devote perhaps billions of dollars to improving its allies' capability to defend themselves. This might include helping Israel construct submarine-launched ballistic missiles and hardened ballistic missile silos to ensure that it can maintain a secure second-strike capability. Most of all, to make containment credible, the United States would need to extend its nuclear umbrella to its partners in the region, pledging to defend them with military force should Iran launch an attack. In other words, to contain a nuclear Iran, the United States would need to make a substantial investment of political and military capital to the Middle East in the midst of an economic crisis and at a time when it is attempting to shift its forces out of the region. Deterrence would come with enormous economic and geopolitical costs and would have to remain in place as long as Iran remained hostile to U.S. interests, which could mean decades or longer. Given the instability of the region, this effort might still fail, resulting in a war far more costly and destructive than the one that critics of a preemptive strike on Iran now hope to avoid. A nuclear Iran would impose a huge burden on the United States. But that does not necessarily mean that Washington should resort to military means. In de-ciding whether it should, the first question to answer is if an attack on Iran's nuclear program could even work. Doubters point out that the United States might not know the location of Iran's key facilities. Given Tehran's previous attempts to hide the construction of such stations, most notably the uraniumenrichment facilities in Natanz and Qom, it is possible that the regime already possesses nuclear assets that a bombing campaign might miss, which would leave Iran's program damaged but alive. This scenario is possible, but not likely; indeed, such fears are probably overblown. U.S. intelligence agencies, the IAEA, and opposition groups within Iran have provided timely warning of Tehran's nuclear activities in the past-- exposing, for example, Iran's secret construction at Natanz and Qom before those facilities ever became operational. Thus, although Tehran might again attempt to build clandestine facilities, Washington has a very good chance of catching it before they go online. And given the amount of time it takes to construct and activate a nuclear facility, the scarcity of Iran's resources, and its failure to hide the facilities in Natanz and Qom successfully, it is unlikely that Tehran has any significant operational nuclear facilities still unknown to Western intelligence agencies. Even if the United States managed to identify all of Iran's nuclear plants, however, actually destroying them could prove enormously difficult.

#### Proliferation causes extinction

Victor A **Utgoff,** Deputy Director of Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of Institute for Defense Analysis, Summer 20**02**, Survival, p.87-90

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed towards a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear “six shooters” on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather together on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

#### Terrorism causes extinction

Alexander, professor and director of the Inter-University for Terrorism Studies 2003 (Yonah;) “Terrorism myths and realities” Washington Times 8/28 l/n WBW

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that the international community failed, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers. Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements [hudna]. Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist "surprises"? There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism's expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns.

**\*\*\*READ IF TIME\*\*\***

#### Preemptive strikes by Israel will unleash a global nuclear war.

J. Adams 1997 “THE SHOCK!: War In The Middle East?”, May 3, http://www.gold-eagle.com/gold\_digest/anon504.html

Israel is increasingly concerned by Iran's development of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles. Iran has had a long-running, aggressive program to develop chemical, biological and nuclear weaponry and now the Iranians, according to the London Telegraph, "have....taken delivery of a consignment of the North Korean Nudong surface-to-surface missiles which would enable them to launch attacks against Israel". I doubt Tel Aviv will be patient in acting to mitigate the emerging threat of mass destruction from the radical regime in Teheran. And now, as both the U.S. and Europe are aligning against Iran in response to prior terrorism that is being linked back to Iran's leaders, an opportunity may be emerging for Tel Aviv to launch a debilitating preemptive attack against Iran's growing military prowess that was recently flaunted in wargames code-named the "Road To Jerusalem". (That Israel is willing to take such preemptive action is revealed by previous preemptive Israel strikes against the Arab powers as they were preparing to attack the Jewish State in the 1950's and 1960's.) Even if Israel isn't about to set-off a regional Middle Eastern war with a preemptive strike against Iran and/or Syria, the odds are war is going to erupt there one way or another in the near-future. Clearly the hard-line Arab states like Syria and Iran are getting ready to unleash a massive attack against the Jewish State, so it's not going to take much to ignite the region into a catastrophe of mass destruction. Inevitably, this will lead to a global nuclear war that Russia, now openly allied with China, has been preparing to unleash on the West.

#### Strikes critical to prevent conventional war – prevents Israel from striking

Matthew Kroenig is Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, he was a Special Adviser in the Office of the U.S. Secretary of Defense, responsible for defense strategy and policy on Iran, January/February 2012, “Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike Is the Least Bad Option”, http://online.physics.uiuc.edu/courses/phys280/spring12/archive/Time-to-Attack-Iran.pdf; hhs-ab

None of these outcomes is predetermined, however; indeed, the United States could do much to mitigate them. Tehran would certainly feel like it needed to respond to a U.S. attack, in order to reestablish deterrence and save face domestically. But it would also likely seek to calibrate its actions to avoid starting a conflict that could lead to the destruction of its military or the regime itself. In all likelihood, the Iranian leadership would resort to its worst forms of retaliation, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching missiles at southern Europe, only if it felt that its very existence was threatened. A targeted U.S. operation need not threaten Tehran in such a fundamental way. To make sure it doesn't and to reassure the Iranian regime, the United States could first make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government. It could then identify certain forms of retaliation to which it would respond with devastating military action, such as attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz, conducting massive and sustained attacks on Gulf states and U.S. troops or ships, or launching terrorist attacks in the United States itself. Washington would then need to clearly articulate these "redlines" to Tehran during and after the attack to ensure that the message was not lost in battle. And it would need to accept the fact that it would have to absorb Iranian responses that fell short of these redlines without escalating the conflict. This might include accepting token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships in the region--several salvos over the course of a few days that soon taper off--or the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels. To avoid the kind of casualties that could compel the White House to escalate the struggle, the United States would need to evacuate nonessential personnel from U.S. bases within range of Iranian missiles and ensure that its troops were safely inbunkers before Iran launched its response. Washington might also need to allow for stepped-up support to Iran's proxies in Afghanistan and Iraq and missile and terrorist attacks against Israel. In doing so, it could induce Iran to follow the path of Iraq and Syria, both of which refrained from starting a war after Israel struck their nuclear reactors in 1981 and 2007, respectively. Even if Tehran did cross Washington's redlines, the United States could still manage the confrontation. At the outset of any such violation, it could target the Iranian weapons that it finds most threatening to prevent Tehran from deploying them. To de-escalate the situation quickly and prevent a wider regional war, the United States could also secure the agreement of its allies to avoid responding to an Iranian attack. This would keep other armies, particularly the Israel Defense Forces, out of the fray. Israel should prove willing to accept such an arrangement in exchange for a U.S. promise to eliminate the Iranian nuclear threat. Indeed, it struck a similar agreement with the United States during the Gulf War, when it refrained from responding to the launching of Scud missiles by Saddam Hussein. Finally, the U.S. government could blunt the economic consequences of a strike. For example, it could offset any disruption of oil supplies by opening its Strategic Petroleum Reserve and quietly encouraging some Gulf states to increase their production in the run-up to the attack. Given that many oil-producing nations in the region, especially Saudi Arabia, have urged the United States to attack Iran, they would likely cooperate. Washington could also reduce the political fallout of military action by building global support for it in advance. Many countries may still criticize the United States for using force, but some--the Arab states in particular--would privately thank Washington for eliminating the Iranian threat. By building such a consensus in the lead-up to an attack and taking the outlined steps to mitigate it once it began, the United States could avoid an international crisis and limit the scope of the conflict. Critics have another objection: even if the United States managed to eliminate Iran's nuclear facilities and mitigate the consequences, the effects might not lastlong. Sure enough, there is no guarantee that an assault would deter Iran from attempting to rebuild its plants; it may even harden Iran's resolve to acquire nuclear technology as a means of retaliating or protecting itself in the future. The United States might not have the wherewithal or the political capital to launch another raid, forcing it to rely on the same ineffective tools that it now uses to restrain Iran's nuclear drive. If that happens, U.S. action will have only delayed the inevitable. Yet according to the IAEA, Iran already appears fully committed to developing a nuclear weapons program and needs no further motivation from the United States. And it will not be able to simply resume its progress after its entire nuclear infrastructure is reduced to rubble. Indeed, such a devastating offensive could well force Iran to quit the nuclear game altogether, as Iraq did after its nuclear program was destroyed in the Gulf War and as Syria did after the 2007 Israeli strike. And even if Iran did try to reconstitute its nuclear program, it would be forced to contend with continued international pressure, greater difficulty in securing necessary nuclear materials on the international market, and the lurking possibility of subsequent attacks. Military action could, therefore, delay Iran's nuclear program by anywhere from a few years to a decade, and perhaps even indefinitely. Skeptics might still counter that at best a strike would only buy time. But time is a valuable commodity. Countries often hope to delay worst-case scenarios as far into the future as possible in the hope that this might eliminate the threat altogether. Those countries whose nuclear facilities have been attacked--most recently Iraq and Syria-- have proved unwilling or unable to restart their programs. Thus, what appears to be only a temporary setback to Iran could eventually become a game changer. Yet another argument against military action against Iran is that it would embolden the hard-liners within Iran's government, helping them rally the population around the regime and eliminate any remaining reformists. This critique ignores the fact that the hard-liners are already firmly in control. The ruling regime has become so extreme that it has sidelined even those leaders once considered to be right-wingers, such as former President Ali Akbar HashemiRafsanjani, for their perceived softness. And Rafsanjani or the former presidential candidate Mir Hossein Mousavi would likely continue the nuclear program if he assumed power.

### Downgrade

#### 1. The DA is empirically denied, MAP-21 should have triggered a downgrade in the US economy but it didn’t, the plan would be less funding than the transportation bill

#### 2. Double dip inevitable – either the fiscal cliff will cause a recession or Moody’s will downgrade us for preventing it

Thompson 9/12 (Derek is a senior editor at The Atlantic, where he oversees business coverage, 9/12/12, “Double-Dip or Downgrade? Moody's Tells the U.S. 'Cut or Be Cut'” [www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/09/double-dip-or-downgrade-moodys-tells-the-us-cut-or-be-cut/262274/](http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/09/double-dip-or-downgrade-moodys-tells-the-us-cut-or-be-cut/262274/))

Before January 1, Washington has two choices. The first option is to do nothing. The Bush/Obama tax cuts would expire. The Budget Control Act would cut spending, as scheduled. In this scenario, the U.S. economy could fall into recession. The second option is to do something, anything, to avoid the so-called "fiscal cliff." That might include extending the tax cuts in some form, pushing off spending cuts, or enacting some combination of the two. But this scenario has its own downside: Moody's said yesterday it would downgrade our credit rating from a sterling AAA if the agency isn't properly convinced of our seriousness to cut the deficit.

#### 3. Empirics flow overwhelmingly aff – austerity fails and hurts confidence – infrastructure spending is uniquely good

Michael Shields, Chief Correspondent in Vienna for Reuters, 4-27-12, “Europe’s austerity drive is suicidal: Stiglitz,” <http://ca.reuters.com/article/businessNews/idCABRE83Q0GJ20120427>

Europe's attempt to save its way back to health is tantamount to economic suicide that could wreck the euro currency block, Nobel Prize-winning U.S. economist Joseph Stiglitz said, calling for the continent to focus instead on fostering growth. "I think Europe is headed to a suicide...There has never been any successful austerity program in any large country," the former World Bank economist told a panel discussion in Vienna late on Thursday. Austrian radio on Friday broadcast some of his comments, which chime with a growing backlash in Europe against the German-led push for more fiscal discipline as the way to end the debt crisis. "Decreasing growth is causing the deficit, not the other way around. I think that austerity approach is going to lead to high levels of unemployment that will be politically unacceptable and make deficits get worse," Stiglitz said. He urged rich European countries like Germany to invest more in infrastructure, education and technology, arguing that "the returns on those investments are an order of magnitude greater than the cost of capital". Insisting on cutting debt and deficits as the way to shore up confidence in euro zone countries - as agreed by the currency bloc's leaders late last year - could end up having the opposite impact, Stiglitz said. "What they have agreed to do last December is a recipe to make sure that (the euro zone) dies as we know it," he said, although he imagined a "core euro" shared among a handful of countries with the strongest economies could survive. "I hope...the debate will be what are the things we can do to promote growth rather than how do we strangle each other together."

4. Economic collapse doesn’t cause war

Ferguson 6

(Niall Ferguson is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University, September/October 2006, “ The Next War of the World”,http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61916/niall-ferguson/the-next-war-of-the-world)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### 5. Downgrade inevitable, plan won’t hurt the economy

Detrixhe 12(John Detrixhe, Bloomberg Businessweek writer, 6-8-12,“S&P Sees Possible U.S. Downgrade by 2014” www.businessweek.com/news/2012-06-08/u-dot-s-dot-political-risk-may-spur-another-downgrade-by-2014-s-and-p-says**)**

Political and fiscal risks may lead to another downgrade of the U.S.’s credit rating by 2014 by Standard & Poor’s, which affirmed its negative outlook on the nation’s debt. S&P stripped the U.S. of its top AAA ranking on Aug. 5, cutting it to AA+ while criticizing the nation’s political process and saying that spending cuts agreed on by lawmakers wouldn’t be enough to reduce record deficits. Treasuries surged after the move. While Moody’s Investors Service and Fitch Ratings have kept their top grades on the U.S., both have a negative outlook. “The credit strengths of the U.S. include its resilient economy, its monetary credibility and the U.S. dollar’s status as the world’s key reserve currency,” S&P said today in a report. Weaknesses “include its fiscal performance, its debt burden, and what we perceive as a recent decline in the effectiveness, stability, and predictability of its policymaking and political institutions, particularly regarding the direction of fiscal policy.”

#### 6. **Transportation investment solves downgrade**

Szakonyi 12 (“S&P: Lack of US Infrastructure Plan Could Spur Credit Crisis,” Mark Szakonyi, Associate Editor | Apr 5, 2012 5:23PM GMT *The Journal of Commerce Online - News Story)hhs-ps*

Agency says crisis possible if infrastructure, transportation funding not met Standard & Poor’s said the U.S. government’s inability to provide long-term infrastructure and transportation funding could create another credit crisis. The warning from the rating agency, which downgraded the U.S. credit rating in August, comes as Congress struggles to approve a multiyear surface transportation bill. Congress on March 29 [approved a three-month extension of highway funding](http://www.joc.com/washington/congress-votes-90-day-extension-highway-bill" \t "_blank) after the House failed to pass its five-year, $260 billion plan to match the Senate’s already approved two-year, $109 billion bill. S&P warns “[reduced or unpredictable federal support](http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2012/04/04/SP-Credit-Risk-from-Highway-Funding-Delays.aspx" \l "page1" \t "_blank) and lower demand could result in deferred maintenance projects that would keep our nation’s transportation infrastructure in good repair,” according to The Fiscal Times. Few transportation analysts expect [Congress to approve a plan](http://www.joc.com/hopes-dim-surface-bill-year" \t "_blank) by the end of the year, making it difficult for state transportation agencies to commit to long-term projects.

#### 7. No link – plan doesn’t cost that much

DOD 12 (Feb 8th 2012, “Report on the Program and Contract Infrastructure Technical Requirements Development for the Guam Realignment Program”, http://www.dodig.mil/Inspections/PDFs/DODIG-2012-052.pdf // Veevz)

The final Guam road construction cost was estimated to be approximately $1.03 million per lane mile. In comparison, construction costs per lane mile are $1.0 million in Hawaii, $0.41 million in Maryland, and $0.33 million in California (see Figure 8).

#### 8. Lack of cooperation in both houses leaves Congress with no solution to the economy

Sahadi (Senior Writer for CNNMoney. Specializing in taxes and deficit spending) 7/16/12 (Jeanne, “Fiscal Cliff Fight is On, and Economy Suffers” LexisNexis)

The inability of Democrats and Republicans to work out their differences on the fiscal cliff is already becoming a problem for the economy. And that problem will grow the longer the standoff lasts. In the latest turn of events, Sen. Patty Murray, a leading Senate Democrat, said Monday that no deal will be cut until Republicans agree to raise taxes on high-income households. "If we can't get a good deal, a balanced deal that calls on the wealthy to pay their fair share, then I will absolutely continue this debate into 2013 rather than lock in a long-term deal this year that throws middle class families under the bus," Murray said in prepared remarks at the Brookings Institution. The cliff represents a host of expiring tax cuts -- including the Bush tax cuts -- and nearly $1 trillion in across-the-board spending cuts that everyone agrees is a terrible way to reduce deficits. Republicans want to replace the scheduled defense cuts with deeper cuts in non-defense domestic programs. And they'd like to extend the Bush tax cuts for everyone. Democrats don't like the spending cuts either -- which will total roughly $110 billion next year. But if they're going to be averted or postponed, Democrats want a package deal. "None of the automatic cuts are good policy. They were packaged together ... and they will be replaced, or not, as a package," Murray said. And Democrats want the portion of Bush tax cuts that apply to high-income households to expire. Economists -- most recently at the International Monetary Fund - have urged lawmakers to ratchet back the effect of the fiscal cliff in 2013, lest it throw the economy back into recession. In 2013 alone, the combination tax increases and spending cuts would be a more than $500 billion hit to the economy. Practically, no one expects Congress to let the fiscal cliff take effect in full. But the uncertainty of how and when lawmakers will resolve the issue is hurting business confidence and weighing heavily on companies' investment and hiring decisions, said Nariman Behravesh, chief economist for IHS Global Insight. It won't kill the economy, Behravesh stressed, but it will curtail growth. "It'll mean growth -- employment growth, GDP growth -- will grind down," Behravesh said. Defense contractors have already indicated they're in a hiring lockdown and could have to send out layoff warning notices this fall. Federal agencies are also likely to put off signing contracts and making new hires. Uncertainty is also likely to cause tumult in the stock market. "Stocks have been under pressure, and will remain this way until there is some resolution," said Alex Hamilton, an analyst at EarlyBirdCapital, a boutique investment bank. Not everyone is worried that Murray's ultimatum - or House Speaker John Boehner's insistence that more spending cuts will be needed before the debt ceiling is raised again - are quite so inflexible. "Both sides will have to dial down tension ... as interest groups and market participants increase pressure for a path forward. ... Any politician who says they are willing to go over the ledge is likely bluffing to build leverage," said Sean West, director of U.S. policy at the Eurasia Group. West believes that if there's no sign of a deal near year's end, they would sign on to a short-term package to avert the cliff temporarily. That may be cold comfort, though, to those actually trying to run a business and hire people.

### Auto T/O DA

#### 1. No link – funds for the auto industry have already been appropriated

#### 2. Auto Industry not long term, won’t recover fully

Smitka 12 (Michael Smitka, April 26, 2012, professor of economics at Washington and Lee University, has conducted research on the auto industry for more than two decades, Washington and Lee University, http://news.blogs.wlu.edu/2012/04/26/the-auto-industry-and-the-economy/ “The Auto Industry and the Economy”)

But looked at from another angle, the news remains grim. Sales may be up sharply but are still 2.5 million units below the 16.3 million average pace of the previous 15 years. In the mid-2000s, the industry employed 3 million workers. Despite the recent gains, we are still more than 500,000 jobs below peak. On the employment front, the glass is not yet half full. Will recovery add back all these jobs? On the negative side, the U.S. is now the third-largest car market, behind China and the European Union. As the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China) and other economies grow, sales will rise and investment to assemble cars locally will increase. Over time, design and engineering jobs will follow. We face long-term, and not just short-term, challenges as the industry continues to globalize. China, for example, is serious about electric cars. But in the face of an outcry by Congress over a failed solar panel venture, the U.S. has pulled the plug on electric vehicle startups, refusing to disburse funds for firms that have finished the engineering stage to hire the workers and buy the parts needed to commence production. If the Chinese market grows, we can expect to see technology — high-tech jobs — flow to where the money is. It's not just batteries, either. For the first time ever, more than half of the finalists for the Automotive News PACE supplier innovation competition were based outside the U.S. As an independent judge for the competition, one firm I visited this year was Continental, a German company launching a new telematics system that will facilitate hands-free services outside the luxury segment. The first company to adopt the system is GM — but it will be on Chevys sold in China, not in the U.S. That's where the growth is. The hardware was developed at Continental's telematics R&D center outside Chicago, but the software engineering was done in Shanghai, where the electronics "black box" is also assembled. We're a player, but with globalization, we're not as big a player as in the past. On the flip side, there is encouraging news: BMW and Mercedes chose to base plants in the U.S. to make key global products, while Korean and Japanese assemblers and suppliers continue to move jobs here: Production follows sales, and Toyota, Honda and Nissan — the Japanese Big Three — now have full-fledged vehicle engineering capabilities in the U.S. Given current exchange rates, we remain an attractive production base, with a wide array of suppliers and specialized engineering firms, good infrastructure, stable politics and a robust ability to overcome shocks. But the slower the recovery, the more we will see new technologies and the accompanying skilled jobs shift to where the sales are. On net, I doubt we'll ever fully recover.

#### 3. Normal means requires Congress to pass entitlement spending bill

Castle 01

(Michael, FEDERAL DOCUMENT CLEARING HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY, March 8)

Briefly, here is how the account would work: Under current law, "emergency" spending is not subject to annual budget limits and deficit reduction requirements. When a disaster strikes, Congress simply appropriates emergency funds which are often not offset by other cuts, thereby adding to the debt and spending the surplus. In addition, funds are often added for unrelated, non-emergency "pork-barrel" projects.

#### 4. Congressional appropriation bill is normal means.

National Peace Corps Association 06

(February 10, http://www.rpcv.org/pages/sitepage.cfm?id=735)

Congress makes a distinction between authorization bills and appropriation bills. Money spent by the federal government must first be authorized by Congress. However, authorizing money to be spent does not permit the expenditure. The allocation of money to a government agency or program requires an appropriation. The Peace Corps Charter for the 21st Century Act is an example of an authorization bill. Authorization bills provide the authority for an agency or program to exist. They establish or continue the program or agency. They determine its policy. They also recommend spending levels, but these levels are not binding. Appropriations bills provide funds for authorized programs. The funds appropriated are sometimes lower than the levels recommended in the authorization.

#### 5. Auto Industry death good – solves systemic death and saves the environment

Mason 8 Cliff Mason, CNBC, Nov 5, 2008, “Save The Auto Industry? Nope, Let Them "Die", http://www.cnbc.com/id/27558718/Save\_The\_Auto\_Industry\_Nope\_Let\_Them\_Die

If we let the auto-makers live, can we at least question our reliance on them, given the perennial problems of the automobile industry and the fact that cars are practically weapons of mass destruction, killing 37,248 people in this country last year? We're talking about vehicles that weigh about a ton and can travel at speeds upwards of a hundred miles per hour? And we give them to 16 year olds? Frankly, I'd feel safer just giving every teenager in this country an AK-47. Last week The New York Times ran a feature about lowering the drinking age and accidents caused by drunk driving. I've always been a proponent of lowering the drinking age, but how come no one ever suggests raising the driving age? I get that if you're a kid growing up in the suburbs, like I was, you have no social life without a car. In fact, pretty much anyone living in suburbia is stranded without a car. But that's not because suburbia is inherently automobile dependent, it's at least in part because of public policy. We spend billions on highways, we already bailed out Chrysler once, and meanwhile Amtrak is constantly struggling to get funding. We need to stop fretting about deaths caused by drunk driving and realize that in addition to being worse for the environment than mass transit, having everyone driving around in cars is dangerous period, drunk or sober.

#### 6. Alt causes - Oil prices

Bloomberg 7/29 ("Oil Trades Near Week High Before Central Banks Meet on Economy," 7/29/12, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-07-29/oil-trades-near-week-high-before-central-banks-meet-on-economy)

Oil traded near the highest level in a week in New York on speculation that U.S. and European policy makers will act to boost growth and concern that unrest in the Middle East may spread and disrupt supplies. Futures were little changed, heading for the first monthly gain in three. The European Central Bank and the U.S. Federal Reserve are scheduled to meet separately this week to discuss the economy. The Syrian government’s use of “indiscriminate violence” will hasten its collapse, U.S Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said. The Middle East produces about a third of the world’s crude. Enbridge Energy Partners LP (EEP) (EEP) said it’s unsure how soon it can resume an pipeline that supplies oil to Chicago-area refineries after a leak. “The market is riding high on the talk of stimulus,” said Jonathan Barratt, the chief executive officer of Barratt’s Bulletin, a commodity-markets newsletter in Sydney. “We also have some geopolitical concerns.”

#### 7. Oil price shocks kill the industry

Hamilton 08 (James, "How Oil Prices Are Affecting the Auto Industry," 8/4/08, http://seekingalpha.com/article/88819-how-oil-prices-are-affecting-the-auto-industry)

This is very much the pattern we observed in previous oil price shocks, with an abrupt drop in the demand for Detroit's money makers and shift into more gas-stingy imports. The resultant hit to incomes in the auto sector is one of the mechanisms whereby an oil price increase can contribute to an overall U.S. recession. It's interesting to compare what we've observed so far this year with what happened during the oil price shock and economic recession that followed Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990. With the loss of oil production from both Iraq and Kuwait, the price of oil shot up quickly, nearly doubling between July and October, after which it fell back down almost as dramatically. By contrast, the oil shock of 2008 has been a more gradual affair, caused by booming demand from China confronting stagnating global production. Although the price increases occurred more gradually, in percentage terms the cumulative change in oil prices over the last year is almost as big as we observed in the fall of 1990. In terms of the consequences for auto sector employment, the number of U.S. workers employed in motor vehicles and parts fell by 62,000 workers in the month of November 1990, with a cumulative loss of 94,000 auto jobs before the recovery began in April 1991. By comparison, auto employment this past year fell by 83,000 workers, cumulatively about the same size disruption as in 1990, but spread out over a longer period. In terms of the effect on GDP, the contribution of motor vehicles and parts to real GDP fell by $15 billion between 1990:Q3 and 1990:Q4 and an additional $15 billion between 1990:Q4 and 1991:Q1. That corresponds to about 0.2% of GDP each quarter, or a hit to the annual growth rate of real GDP of about 0.8% each quarter.

### Protectionism DA

#### 1. Exports high now

Bank of the US 10/11

Export/Import Bank of the United States, October 11, 2012, “US exports in August reach $181.3 billion,”http://www.sacbee.com/2012/10/11/4904070/us-exports-in-august-reach-1813.html

WASHINGTON, Oct. 11, 2012 -- The United States exported $181.3 billion in goods and services in August 2012, according to data released today by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) of the U.S. Commerce Department. "I am pleased that U.S. exports remain high, because they are a major contributor to our economic recovery, and help create and sustain jobs across the country," said Export-Import Bank Chairman and President Fred P. Hochberg. "Going forward, we encourage more American companies to compete in international markets, where 95 percent of the world's customers are located."¶ Exports of goods and services over the past twelve months totaled $2.173 trillion, which is nearly 37.6 percent above the level of exports in 2009. Over the past twelve months, exports have been growing at an annualized rate of 12.7 percent when compared to 2009.¶ In June of this year, the U.S. recorded exports of $185.2 billion, an all-time record high.¶ Read more here: <http://www.sacbee.com/2012/10/11/4904070/us-exports-in-august-reach-1813.html#storylink=cpy>

#### 2. No link – the plan doesn’t increase exports

3. Protectionism now and EU checks

ECT, European Trade Commission, 06/06/’12, [EU sounds alarm over sharp rise in protectionism across G20, <http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=804>] VN

Between September 2011 and 1 May 2012, on average more than 15 new measures were introduced each month as compared to less than 12 new measures per month the year before: the pace of introduction of new restrictive measures has accelerated. Overall, 123 new trade-restrictive measures have been introduced in the last eight months.The state of G20 countries' compliance with regards to the removal of existing measures remains clearly insufficient. Between September 2011 and 1 May 2012, the roll-back of measures slowed down: only 13 measures have been removed, compared to 40 measures between October 2010 and September 2011. Overall, only about 17% (89) of the measures have so far been removed or lapsed since October 2008.At the global level, trade is showing signs of good recovery, even with a short-lived contraction observed mid-2011. Despite their growing economic weight and increasing role in the global economy, emerging economies continue to resort to the highest number of trade-restrictive measures, often as part of new national industrialisation plans. Restrictions affecting foreign direct investment, such as Argentina's decision to expropriate 51% of YPF shares owned by the Spanish company Repsol, substantially impact EU investors' confidence to invest abroad as it increases unpredictability. Russia deserves close scrutiny as one of the most frequent users of trade-restrictive measures that may not be in conformity with its obligations as an upcoming member of the WTO. The EU calls on G20 Members to implement the pledge more effectively by reinforcing transparency and enhancing the timely and full notification of all measures, which would enable closer monitoring of protectionism. It will address this issue at the upcoming G20 Mexico Summit on 18 and 19 June 20

#### 4. No brink – there has been protectionism in the past, no extinction

### Buy America DA

#### 1. Buy American popular policy now

AmericanManufacturing.org 12 (manufacturethis, “Senate Passes Amendment for Stronger Buy America Preferences in Transportation Projects,” 03/13/2012, http://americanmanufacturing.org/blog/senate-passes-amendment-stronger-buy-america-preferences-transportation-projects)

Today the U.S. Senate passed an amendment offered by Senators Sherrod Brown (D-OH) and Jeff Merkley (D-OR) to strengthen Buy America preferences for transportation projects.¶ The Brown-Merkley amendment #1819 improves the effectiveness of existing Buy America preferences for transportation projects by boosting transparency, requiring annual reporting on the use of waivers, and closing an egregious "segmenting" loophole that can be used to evade Buy America.¶ The amendment was adopted unanimously by voice vote. Meanwhile, in the House of Representatives, Representative Chip Cravaack (R-MN) was successful in attaching similar language to a House version during consideration by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.¶ The Alliance for American Manufacturing (AAM) AAM congratulates Senators Brown and Merkley for their leadership on Buy America. Together, these improvements will help to ensure that tax dollars spent on transportation projects support American workers and do not unnecessarily subsidize workers in China or elsewhere

#### 2. Empirically denied – MAP 21 did not have the buy American rider attached. If it would have been attached, it would have occurred then.

#### 3. 93 economic downturns disprove your impact

Miller 2K (Morris, Adjunct Professor of Administration at the University of Ottawa, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol 24 No 4)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that: Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong…The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes…(or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence…In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### 4. Congress wants ‘Buy American’

Rahall 12 (Nick Rahall, US Rep and Ranking Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Donna F. Edwards, “Edwards, Rahall lead 69 Members of Congress to Urge President Obama to Protect "Buy American" Policies in TPP,” 05/03/12, http://www.donnaedwards.house.gov/index.cfm?sectionid=24&parentid=23&sectiontree=23,24&itemid=511)

“We must buy American to build America, and government procurement policy is no exception,” said Congresswoman Edwards. “We are focused on creating jobs and revitalizing our manufacturing base, and our trade agreements must not take away this important policy tool. Since 1933, Buy American policies have helped invest large sums of U.S tax dollars to create jobs, grow our economy, and strengthen domestic manufacturing. That is why my 68 colleagues and I urge President Obama to ensure that this trade pact does not limit our rights to spend U.S. tax dollars on U.S. goods and services. Let’s continue to use government procurement to support our manufacturing sector and create good, high-wage American jobs.”¶ “American innovation is once again fueling our nation’s manufacturing base. The American taxpayer has invested mightily in education, research and development to drive innovative manufacturing. We have waivered goodbye to too many good American jobs through trade agreements signed on a tilted table somebody cleverly decided to name, ‘free trade.’ The American taxpayer and worker deserve a fair shot at the global marketplace. While trading partners may initially have concerns about fair trade, a vibrant marketplace supported by American ingenuity and hard work will lift all economies. It’s time we stood our ground for this basic American value.” – U.S. Rep. Nick Rahall

### China Steel DA

#### 1. Map-21 should have triggered the link; it was a new transportation project in the US

#### 2. China steel industry collapsing – no infrastructure for global markets – all domestic projects

New York Times May 3 2012 “In China's Floundering Steel Sector, the Burden of Politics”,

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/04/business/global/in-chinas-floundering-steel-sector-the-burden-of-politics.html?pagewanted=all

Chinese steel exports, a small fraction of total business in the country, have not recovered to pre-2008 levels, and the national steel association routinely points to an increase in international protectionism. Brazil, Europe and the United States, for example, have all added anti-dumping taxes on Chinese products. That being the case, the domestic market is expected to remain the primary focus of the industry. “China is still in the middle of a construction period, and demand for steel will at least remain strong,” said Henry Yu, the founder and chairman of General Steel. Mr. Yu said the company was particularly confident about demand from the country’s west, where road and factory construction are strong. Only one major Chinese enterprise — Bayi Iron and Steel, which is owned by Baosteel — covers Xinjiang, a large region in the far northwest of the country. Baosteel plans to move two advanced, but unprofitable, iron-making furnaces to Xinjiang and to double Bayi’s capacity to 15 million tons per year by 2015. Also in Xinjiang, Shandong Iron and Steel has nearly completed a 2.5 million-ton steel project, and Xinxing Ductile Iron Pipes will build a special steel plant with 3 million tons of annual capacity. The consulting firm Mysteel said that 91 billion renminbi would be spent in Xinjiang from 2011 to 2015 to raise annual steel capacity to 32 million tons but that demand from the western part of the country would not be able to prop up the sector for very long. “The supply tightness is expected to ease by 2013, and the region could also face a glut given the current investment frenzy,” said Hu Yanping, an analyst with the Custeel consulting firm. “It will also be hard to ship out the surplus steel products due to limited transportation capacity.” Despite recent losses in the steel industry, bankruptcies are not expected to be widespread, analysts say, as neither Beijing nor local governments are willing to risk such blows to their reputations, employment levels and tax receipts. Small, regional state-owned companies like Jiyuan Steel and Valin could be vulnerable to takeovers, but debt-ridden industry giants are not likely to volunteer for punishing restructuring programs. Anshan Steel’s protracted merger with Benxi Iron and Steel is still mired in bureaucracy five years after it was proposed. Specialists say that problems in the industry will not be solved until Beijing ends its desire to create state-owned Goliaths rather than address underlying political problems. Indeed, Chinese steel giants, which have benefited from cheap loans and easy access to lucrative contracts, have served the needs of local governments, hiring hundreds of thousands of workers and providing cradle-to-grave welfare services. Mr. Jiang of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences said that mills could thrive if they were just allowed to do so. “The steel sector could develop very steadily as long as there is no great policy interference,” he said. “But there has been a lot of policy interference.”

#### 3. Steel industry key to heg, econ, and competitiveness

Buyer 2k7(Member of the House of Representatives, 7-31-7 (Steve, Before the International Trade Commission, Regarding the five-year sunset review on Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina, China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Netherlands, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine (Inv. Nos. 701-TA-404-408 and 731-TA-898-908 )

A robust steel industry is fundamental to the security and economic viability of this nation. If you were to contemplate the ten resources considered essential to the successful establishment of a nation, steel would be high on that list. A fruitful domestic steel industry maintains its viability by being adaptive, technologically savvy, and flexible so that it can maintain its competitive edge in the world market. That competitive edge lends itself to economic security and stability here at home. Both of those elements are vital ingredients to a nation's ability to develop and maintain an adequate defense. I believe we must remain vigilant to protect ourselves from a future without a steelmaking infrastructure sufficient to meet our national defense needs. In the years that have followed the tragic events of September 11, 2001, national defense has dominated public attention. When contemplating the tumultuous nature of this global war against terror in which we are immersed, I think it is apparent that we cannot accept a situation in which we are reliant on the kindness of strangers to meet our security-related steel needs. Depending on trusted friends and allies may not be wise, since they have requirements of their own for steel. Simply put, the defense of our nation depends on steel. Our aircraft carriers, cruisers, tanks, HUMMVEES, are all made of steel. We cannot become dependent on foreign sources for this material so vital to our national defense. The United States is the only superpower in the world. We cannot project our force around the globe, which from time to time is necessary, without the ability to move people and equipment quickly. It is in our national interest to maintain a vigorous steel industry. The economic stability of the steel industry here at home, and our ability to remain competitive abroad, directly impacts our national security. The efficient low-cost producers that comprise the membership of our domestic steel market can compete effectively against any foreign producer in the global economy. To ensure their stature, the steel industry has invested billions of dollars in modernizing itself while simultaneously improving environmental compliance. It has learned the hard way the benefit of cutting-edge technology. These producers are heavily concentrated in northwest Indiana and at the end of 2006 they employed over19,000 Americans in that region. Companies like Nucor of Crawfordsville and Steel Dynamics of Pittsboro contribute substantially to the ensuring a healthy local economy and thereby contribute to a stable and healthy national economy. The nation's annual production of over 100 million tons of steel, of which Indiana is the second-largest producer among the states, keeps this country at the top of the worldwide steel industry. However, if the competitive nature of this market is unfairly influenced by steel dumping or by illegal subsidies given to foreign producers by their governments or other entities, the integrity of the domestic and global market is jeopardized. In those instances, the domestic market loses its ability to effectively compete with its global rivals. When that occurs, it negatively impacts the economic stability of our domestic steel industry which in turn threatens our national security. We need to ensure that companies like Nucor and Steel Dynamics have the opportunity to modernize and grow to adequately meet the demands of the global market without the fear of sustaining financial damage from unfair or illegal trade practices. To ensure that our nation's defense remains adequate and capable, we must continue to enable mechanisms that will influence other countries to play by the rules Simultaneously, we must be cognizant, and take appropriate action, to recognize those instances in which anti-dumping and countervailing duties are no longer required to safeguard our economic and security interests. In either instance, we cannot allow to go unchallenged the continuous violations of international and U.S. trade laws that lend to a skewed market and undercut the ability for fair competition to flourish in the global economy. The preservation of the economic integrity of our domestic steel industry is fundamental to our ability to protect our very existence as a nation.

### Bomber T/O DA

1. The F-35 is in no danger because it is too big to fail

**Haddick 5/27** (Robert is Robert Haddick is Managing Editor of Small Wars Journal. He writes the “This Week at War” column for Foreign Policy and is a member of the Small Wars Journal management team. 5/27/11 “This Week at War: The Jet That Ate the Pentagon” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/05/27/this\_week\_at\_war\_the\_jet\_that\_ate\_the\_pentagon)

The Government Accountability Office reported that although Pentagon management of the program is improving, developers have only completely verified 4 percent of the F-35's capabilities. The program received another blow this week when the Senate Armed Services Committee learned that the Pentagon will likely have to spend $1 trillion over the next 50 years to operate and maintain the fleet of F-35s. Evidently reeling from sticker shock, Sen. John McCain demanded that "we at least begin considering alternatives." But is it too late to prevent the F-35 program from devouring the Pentagon's future procurement budgets? Air Force officials themselves may now doubt the wisdom of the size of the commitment to the F-35. According to a recent Aviation Week story, Air Force Undersecretary Erin Conaton placed new emphasis on the importance of the Air Force's next-generation long-range bomber. With procurement funds sure to be tight in the decade ahead, Conaton hinted that the Air Force may have to raid the F-35's future budgets in order to help pay for the new bomber. The rapidly changing strategic situation in Asia and the western Pacific should compel policymakers to reexamine the size of the commitment to the F-35. Yet another critical report on the F-35 from the Pentagon's acquisition office dated Dec. 31, 2010, revealed that the Air Force version of the attack jet would have a combat mission radius of 584 miles, just short of the original stated requirement of 590 miles, and significantly less than a recent expectation by program officials that the jet would be able to strike targets 690 miles away without midair refueling. A combat radius of 584 miles leaves planners with few options when contemplating operations over the vast distances in the Asia-Pacific region. As I discussed in a recent column, China's growing inventories of ballistic and cruise missiles are already capable, according to the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, of striking the U.S. Air Force's main bases in the region. These missiles are also putting the Navy's aircraft carriers increasingly at risk, which could compel the Navy to move the vessels out of the F-35's strike range. The solution is combat aircraft with much longer ranges, which would operate from distant bases less vulnerable to missile attack. This would explain Conaton's increased emphasis on the new long-range bomber and the Navy's interest in a long-range combat drone that would launch from its aircraft carriers and some of its amphibious ships. There are still significant roles for the F-35 and many of its leading-edge stealth and electronic capabilities. The F-35 can defend against enemy aircraft, can collect and distribute intelligence from over a battlefield, and can attack heavily defended targets within its range. In any case, the program is "too big to fail," or at least "too big to kill," and it is far too late in the day to now consider alternatives. But it seems increasingly likely that the Air Force and Navy will eventually truncate their planned purchases and redirect those savings into new long-range platforms. Doing so would cause the unit cost of the F-35 to spike even higher which would likely lead many foreign partners to drop out. But that regrettable consequence may be necessary if the Air Force and Navy are to have the money to buy capabilities that will actually be useful in the vast stretches of the Pacific.

#### 2. Normal means requires Congress to pass entitlement spending bill

Castle 01

(Michael, FEDERAL DOCUMENT CLEARING HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY, March 8)

Briefly, here is how the account would work: Under current law, "emergency" spending is not subject to annual budget limits and deficit reduction requirements. When a disaster strikes, Congress simply appropriates emergency funds which are often not offset by other cuts, thereby adding to the debt and spending the surplus. In addition, funds are often added for unrelated, non-emergency "pork-barrel" projects.

#### 3. Congressional appropriation bill is normal means.

National Peace Corps Association 06

(February 10, http://www.rpcv.org/pages/sitepage.cfm?id=735)

Congress makes a distinction between authorization bills and appropriation bills. Money spent by the federal government must first be authorized by Congress. However, authorizing money to be spent does not permit the expenditure. The allocation of money to a government agency or program requires an appropriation. The Peace Corps Charter for the 21st Century Act is an example of an authorization bill. Authorization bills provide the authority for an agency or program to exist. They establish or continue the program or agency. They determine its policy. They also recommend spending levels, but these levels are not binding. Appropriations bills provide funds for authorized programs. The funds appropriated are sometimes lower than the levels recommended in the authorization.

4. The F-35 is a “dog” and is inferior to the F-22

**Jensen 8** (Dr Dennis Jensen MP Federal Member for Tangney “The F-35’s Air-to-Air Capability Controversy” <http://www.defenseindustrydaily.com/The-F-35s-Air-to-Air-Capability-Controversy-05089/>)

“Even without new problems, the F-35 is a ‘dog.’ If one accepts every performance promise the DoD currently makes for the aircraft, the F-35 will be: “Overweight and underpowered: at 49,500 lb (22,450kg) air-to-air take-off weight with an engine rated at 42,000 lb of thrust, it will be a significant step backward in thrust-to-weight ratio for a new fighter…. [F-35A and F-35B variants] will have a ‘wing-loading’ of 108 lb per square foot…. less manoeuvrable than the appallingly vulnerable F-105 ‘Lead Sled’ that got wiped out over North Vietnam…. payload of only two 2,000 lb bombs in its bomb bay…. With more bombs carried under its wings, the F-35 instantly becomes ‘non-stealthy’ and the DoD does not plan to seriously test it in this configuration for years. As a ‘close air support’... too fast to see the tactical targets it is shooting at; too delicate and flammable to withstand ground fire; and it lacks the payload and especially the endurance to loiter usefully over US forces for sustained periods…. What the USAF will not tell you is that ‘stealthy’ aircraft are quite detectable by radar; it is simply a question of the type of radar and its angle relative to the aircraft…. As for the highly complex electronics to attack targets in the air, the F-35, like the F-22 before it, has mortgaged its success on a hypothetical vision of ultra-long range, radar-based air-to-air combat that has fallen on its face many times in real air war. The F-35’s air-to-ground electronics promise little more than slicker command and control for the use of existing munitions.”

### Federalism

#### 1. Non-unique—transportation programs on Guam now

#### 2. No Link – the plan doesn’t drastically change the squo

#### 3. No impact—federalism isn’t important to democratic governance

Lane and Errson, 05(Jan-Erik Lane, professor in political science at the University of Geneva, and Svante Errson, Lecturer in Political Science at Umeå University, 2005, Democratization, Vol. 12 Issue 2, “The riddle of federalism: does federalism impact on democracy?”, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13510340500069220)

Federalization has been recommended as a strategy to enhance institutional performance. **Federalism is often seen as a basic dimension in constitutional democracy, promoting democratic vitality.** And future state building may be done on the basis of political unions taking on the characteristics of federations. However, there is the puzzle of federalism: if federal institutions are supposed to improve upon outcomes, **then why is the actual performance record of many federal countries so unimpressive?**¶We suggest that **democratic stability is fostered by other institutions and factors than federalism. The evidence from regression analysis suggests an entirely new answer, namely that federalism does not constitutes a genuine positive for democracy.** Other **institutions such as for instance the legal system** (Ombudsman) **or the executive** (parliamentarism) **or the electoral system** (proporotional representation, for instance) **matter more positively for democracy.** Thus when analysing data for the post-cold war period the findings corroborate the sceptical view suggesting that **federalism has no or little positive impact on the cross-country variation in constitutional democracy**, generally speaking.

#### 4. Countries don’t model the US

Stepan, 99 (Alfred Stepan, Wallace Sayre Professor of Governmentt, the founding Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy, Toleration, & Religion (CDTR), &the Co-Director of the Institute for Religion, Culture, and Public Life (IRCPL) at Columbia University, ’, Journal of Democracy, Vol. 10, No. 4)

One of the most influential political scientists to write about federalism in the¶ last half-century, the late William H. Riker, stresses three factors present in the¶ U.S. form of federalism that he claims to be true for federalism in general. 1¶ First, Riker assumes that every longstanding federation, democratic or not, is the¶ result of a bargain whereby previously sovereign polities agree to give up part of¶ their sovereignty in order to pool their resources to increase their collective¶ security and to achieve other goals, including economic ones. I call this type of¶ federalism coming-together federalism. For Riker, it is the only type of¶ federalism in the world.¶ Second, Riker and many other U.S. scholars assume that one of the goals of¶ federalism is to protect individual rights against encroachments on the part of¶ the central government (or even against the "tyranny of the majority") by a¶ number of institutional devices, such as a bicameral legislature in which one¶ house is elected on the basis of population, while in the other house the subunits¶ are represented equally. In addition, many competences are permanently granted¶ to the subunits instead of to the center. If we can call all of the citizens in the¶ polity taken as a whole the demos, we may say that these devices, although¶ democratic, are "demosconstraining."¶ Third, as a result of the federal bargain that created the United States, each of¶ the states was accorded the same constitutional competences. U.S. federalism is¶ thus considered to be constitutionally symmetrical. By contrast, asymmetrical¶ arrangements that grant different competencies and group-specific rights to¶ some states, which are not now part of the U.S. model of federalism, are seen as¶ incompatible with the principled equality of the states and with equality of¶ citizens' rights in the post-segregation era.¶ Yet although these three points are a reasonably accurate depiction of the¶ political structures and normative values associated with U.S. federalism, most¶ democratic countries that have adopted federal systems have chosen not to¶ follow the U.S. model. Indeed, American-style federalism embodies some¶ values that would be very inappropriate for many democratizing countries,¶ especially multinational polities. To explain what I mean by this, let me review¶ each of these three points in turn.¶ "Coming-Together" vs. "Holding-Together"¶ First of all, we need to ask: How are democratic federal systems actually¶ formed? Riker has to engage in some "concept-stretching" to include all the¶ federal systems in the world in one model. For example, he contends that the¶ Soviet Union meets his definition of a federal system that came about as the¶ result of a "federal bargain." Yet it is clearly a distortion of history, language,¶ and theory to call what happened in Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia, for¶ example, a "federal bargain." These three previously independent countries were¶ conquered by the 11th Red Army. In Azerbaijan, the former nationalist prime¶ minister and the former head of the army were executed just one week after¶ accepting the "bargain."¶ Many democratic federations, however, emerge from a completely different¶ historical and political logic, which I call holding-together federalism. India in¶ late 1948, Belgium in 1969, and Spain in 1975 were all political systems with¶ strong unitary features. Nevertheless, political leaders in these three¶ multicultural polities came to the decision that the best way--indeed, the only¶ way--to hold their countries together in a democracy would be to devolve power¶ constitutionally and turn their threatened polities into federations. The 1950¶ Indian Constitution, the 1978 Spanish Constitution, and the 1993 Belgian¶ Constitution are all federal.¶ Let us briefly examine the "holding-together" characteristics of the creation of¶ federalism in India to show how they differ from the "coming-together"¶ characteristics correctly associated with the creation of American-style¶ federalism. When he presented India's draft constitution for the consideration of¶ the members of the constituent assembly, the chairman of the drafting¶ committee, B.R. Ambedkar, said explicitly that it was designed to maintain the¶ unity of India--in short, to hold it together. He argued that the constitution was¶ guided by principles and mechanisms that were fundamentally different from¶ those found in the United States, in that the Indian subunits had much less prior¶ sovereignty than did the American states. Since they had less sovereignty, they¶ therefore had much less bargaining power. Ambedkar told the assembly that¶ although India was to be a federation, this federation was created not as the¶ result of an agreement among the states, but by an act of the constituent¶ assembly. 2 As Mohit Bhattacharya, in a careful review of the constituent¶ assembly, points out, by the time Ambedkar had presented the draft in¶ November 1948, both the partition between Pakistan and India and the¶ somewhat reluctant and occasionally even coerced integration of virtually all of¶ the 568 princely states had already occurred. 3 Therefore, bargaining conditions¶ between relatively sovereign units, crucial to Riker's view of how and why¶ enduring federations are created, in essence no longer existed.¶ Thus one may see the formation of democratic federal systems as fitting into a¶ sort of continuum. On one end, closest to the pure model of a largely voluntary¶ bargain, are the relatively autonomous units that "come together" to pool their¶ sovereignty while retaining their individual identities. The United States,¶ Switzerland, and Australia are examples of such states. At the other end of the¶ democratic continuum, we have India, Belgium, and Spain as examples of¶ "holding-together" federalism. And then there is what I call "putting-together"¶ federalism, a heavily coercive effort by a nondemocratic centralizing power to¶ put together a multinational state, some of the components of which had¶ previously been independent states. The USSR was an example of this type of¶ federalism. Since federal systems have been formed for different reasons and to¶ achieve different goals, it is no surprise that their founders created¶ fundamentally different structures. This leads us to our next point.

#### 5. Devolution is biased—balance is okay now—additional devolution would be bad

**Freemark ’12** (Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures” – Feb 16th – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/)

**The federal government has already devolved** **most of its transportation powers to** local and **state governments**. And **there is little evidence that further reducing the power of Washington will produce better transportation investments.** The reaction to President Obama’s 2013 budget for transportation has ranged from the dismissive — “it’s too big to be part of the discussion” — to the supportive (myself, among others), most of the commentary revolving around the proposed program’s large size. Another theme, however, has reemerged in the discussion: The role of the federal government in funding transportation. It’s not a new conversation, of course; in American transportation circles, the roles of the three major levels of government are constantly being put into question. **The argument goes** something like this: **The federal government**, because of its national power and ability to collect revenues from the fuel taxes it administers, **is a wasteful spender** **and it chooses** to invest in **projects that are inappropriate** enough that they wouldn’t be financed by local governments if they were in charge. Harvard Economist Edward Glaeser argues for the de-federalization of transport spending, suggesting “Whenever the person paying isn’t the person who benefits, there will always be a push for more largesse and little check on spending efficiency. Would Detroit’s People Mover have ever been built if the people of Detroit had to pay for it? We should move toward a system in which states and localities take more responsibility for the infrastructure that serves their citizens.” He also suggests, somewhat contradictorily, that federal funding “tie spending to need or performance.“\* USC’s Lisa Schweitzer asserts that if cities want improved sidewalks or public transportation, they should pay for them themselves. ”The typical arguments [are] that “those things are good for us!”,” she writes. “Of course they are. Why can’t you fund them at the city, or in the case of transit, the state level?” [She adds that she will defend federal investment in a future discussion.] Bruce Katz of Brookings chimes in. “The states and metropolitan areas are once again playing their traditional roles as “laboratories of democracy” and centers of economic and policy innovation,” he adds. “An enormous opportunity exists for the next president to mobilize these federalist partners in a focused campaign for national economic renewal.” The federal government, it is implied, is just too intrusive to make the right decisions. **Here’s the thing: The** large **majority** of decisions on **transportation spending with federal dollars is already made at the state** and local **level**s. And state and local governments already contribute huge sums to the operation, maintenance, and expansion of their transportation programs. Once **the federal government** collects tax revenue, it **distributes funding to the states** based on formulas agreed upon by members of Congress. For the most, part, the money goes back to the states and to metropolitan areas, which then fund projects based on the priority lists that they generate. It is true that Washington allocates some money for transit and some for highways, but within those categories, **states** and local governments **generally have power to pay for the projects they want.** Washington does run very competitive grant programs — exactly the type of performance-based financing Mr. Glaeser demands — for transit investment projects and for programs like TIGER (and, indeed, for the much-hated high-speed rail program). Federal guidelines require most of these projects (unlike those funded by formula) to meet cost-effectiveness and ridership standards. This was not true at the time of the Detroit People Mover (a project I admit I abhor), but it is certainly true now.\*\*\* While earmarks (now out of the equation entirely) got a lot of attention as being wasteful, even at the height of the process they only accounted for about 5% of transportation spending from Washington. I can think of plenty of expensive and arguably inappropriate transit projects paid for by local governments that would not meet the guidelines to be funded by the federal government under its competitive programs. Should we hail Mr. Katz’s “laboratories of democracy” that produced these? Would Mr. Glaeser have these federal grant programs dismantled so states or localities could fund underperforming transit? Meanwhile, states and local governments are contributing massively to transportation funding already, just as Ms. Schweitzer asks them to. I studied Oregon and Illinois a year and a half ago and found that only about a quarter of Oregon’s Department of Transportation budget comes from Washington; about a third of Illinois’ comes from the national capital. What about those profligate transit agencies that are egged on by the federal government’s wasteful spending? Their operations spending comes from local, state, and fare revenues — not Washington. And expansion projects — especially the big ones — are mostly financed by local revenues, like dedicated sales taxes that voters across the country have approved repeatedly over the past twenty years. The six largest transit expansion projects currently receiving or proposed to receive funding from the Obama Administration this year each rely on the federal government to contribute less than 43% of total costs. Perhaps Detroit would have paid for the People Mover even if it had had to use its own revenues to do so. Now, even if we were to recognize the high level of devolution of power and funds that currently does exist in the U.S., **some** might **still argue that the federal government exercises too much power.** Its distribution formula for fuel tax revenues results in certain states getting more money than their drivers contributed (“donor” states) and certain states getting less (“donee” states). Why not simply allow states to collect their own revenues and spend money as they wish? Why should Washington be engaged in this discussion at all? For one, as I have noted above, **states** and municipalities **have no clear record of choosing** to invest in **better projects when they are fully in charge** of collecting the revenues to do so. States have too often proven a complete disregard for public transportation investments when they’re left fully in charge — see state infrastructure banks as evidence for that fact. While federal investments in transportation have been far from perfect, they have nonetheless provided for the significant expansion in transit offerings we’re now seeing. **From the** 19**80s on**, the **Congress has maintained** a **steady** stream of **funding for transit** from the fuel tax revenues it collects. **How many states**, which collect a huge amount of fuel tax revenues themselves, **can say the same?** But **the most important role of the federal government** in transportation financing **is to ensure that funding is maintained during economic downturns.** The **Obama** Administration actually **increased spending on** roads and **transit** projects **following the** 2008 **recession**, despite a decline in federal fuel tax revenues, **because it was able to use** its power of **deficit spending (an authority state** and local **governments do not have**\*\*) to maintain investments when the country needed them. **Devolution is overrated.**

#### 6. Transportation policy causes Congress to focus on US federalism

**Dilger 11** - Senior Specialist in American National Government - (Robert Jay, “Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present,” January 5th, 2011 http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40431.pdf)

American federalism, which shapes the roles, responsibilities, and interactions among and between the federal government, the states, and local governments, is continuously evolving, adapting to changes in American society and American political institutions. The nature of federalism relationships in surface transportation policy has also evolved over time, with the federal government’s role becoming increasingly influential, especially since the Federal-Aid to Highway Act of 1956 which authorized the interstate highway system. In recent years, state and local government officials, through their public interest groups (especially the National Governors Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) have lobbied for increased federal assistance for surface transportation grants and increased flexibility in the use of those funds. They contend that they are better able to identify surface transportation needs in their states than federal officials and are capable of administering federal grant funds with relatively minimal federal oversight. They also argue that states have a long history of learning from one another. In their view, providing states flexibility in the use of federal funds results in better surface transportation policy because it enables states to experiment with innovative solutions to surface transportation problems and then share their experiences with other states. Others argue that the federal government has a responsibility to ensure that federal funds are used in the most efficient and effective manner possible to promote the national interest in expanding national economic growth and protecting the environment. In their view, providing states increased flexibility in the use of federal funds diminishes the federal government’s ability to ensure that national needs are met. Still others have argued for a fundamental restructuring of federal and state government responsibilities in surface transportation policy, with some responsibilities devolved to states and others remaining with the federal government. Congressional attention to federalism issues in surface transportation policy tends to increase during reauthorizations of the federal highway and mass transit program. The current highway and mass transit program, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA; P.L. 109-59), after being extended several times, is set to expire on March 4, 2011. Its reauthorization generated considerable legislative activity during the 111 th Congress. Issues addressed by Congress include SAFETEA’s funding level and financing, especially proposals addressing the Highway Trust Fund’s fiscal sustainability, state funding guarantees, and congressional earmarks.

#### 7. Unique turn—the bank would empower states and reduce angst over failed federal transportation bills

Thomasson, 11 (Scott Thomasson, Economic and Domestic Policy Director Progressive Policy Institute, October 12, 2011, United States House Of Representatives Committee On Transportation And Infrastructure: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit “National Infrastructure Bank: More Bureaucracy and Red Tape” October 12, 2011, http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyHighways/2011-10-12%20Thomasson.pdf)

Reality: **A properly structured national infrastructure bank would not be a monolithic central planning authority that would tie states’ hands and impose its judgment on state funding priorities. To the contrary, a well designed bank would empower states by giving them a new option to pursue low-cost financing of projects of their own choosing, and it would provide them the opportunity to benefit from large-scale projects that cross state borders** or that may be too expensive or unwieldy for states to execute alone. In this way, **a national bank could complement state infrastructure banks and Highway Trust Fund allocations, and it could also avoid the kind of frustration states have now over the failure of Congress to pass long-term reauthorization bills.**

#### 8. No unique link—the bank retains status quo federalism

Rohatyn, 08 (Felix G. Rohatyn and Everett Ehrlich, October 9, 2008 “A New Bank to Save Our Infrastructure,” http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2008/oct/09/a-new-bank-to-save-our-infrastructure/?page=1)

**The bank would have no preconceived, overarching plan for the nation’s infrastructure**. **Proposals for infrastructure investment would still predominantly come from state and local governments.** **Our plan would preserve almost entirely the existing balance of power between federal, state, and local government**, but would change dramatically the way priorities are set and projects funded. That is because it would proceed project-by-project, and dollar-by-dollar, to find the best use of federal resources.

### Urban Sprawl DA

#### 1. Non-Unique—**Urban sprawl already high—suburban expansion 10x faster—and growing**

Ortiz 4, Franscesa – Professor of Law and the Presidential Research Professor for South Texas College of Law, J.D. 1989, Harvard Law School, Council Member of both the Animal Law Section and the Environmental Law Section of the Houston Bar Association, January 2004 (“Smart Growth and Innovative Design: An Analysis of the New Community,” ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REPORTER News and Analysis, Issue 34, via Lexis)

This process of suburban growth, commonly referred to as urban sprawl, n20 has become a way of life around major United States cities. Although the initial outward move from a city's central core may have been based mostly on population growth, affluence, and transportation accessibility, sprawled growth today is based largely on highway policy and unwise land use practices. n21 Suburban growth has rapidly escalated to a point where suburban inhabitants now make up over one-half of metropolitan populations. n22 Whereas new suburban rings surrounding a city used to take years to complete, suburban rings now seem to develop annually. n23 Indeed, one commentator notes that suburban growth has grown 10 times faster than the populations of urban centers, n24 and continued growth is expected for at least the next 25 years. n25

#### 2. No Link—we don’t fiat that we create new modes of transportation and doing so would make us extra topical, we also repair existing infrastructure, which doesn’t cause expansion.

#### 3. Their Internal link evidence just says urban sprawl will contribute to global warming not that it will push it over the brink.

#### 4. Their impact is inevitable because too many alt causes to air pollution

**Brook et al. 04** (Brook, M.D. and several other doctors writing for Circulation magazine from the American Heart Association [Circulation magazine Robert D. Brook, MD; Barry Franklin, PhD, Chair; Wayne Cascio, MD; Yuling Hong, MD, PhD; George Howard, PhD; Michael Lipsett, MD; Russell Luepker, MD; Murray Mittleman, MD, ScD; Jonathan Samet, MD; Sidney C. Smith, Jr, MD; Ira Tager, MD, “Air Pollution and the Cardiovascular Disease” June 1, 2004, <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/109/21/2655#SEC1/>)

**A brief description of several individual air pollutants is provided first for background.** A complete discussion is beyond the scope of this statement, and interested readers may find a more comprehensive review on this subject elsewhere.26 Particulate Matter **Airborne Particulate Matter consists of a heterogeneous mixture of solid and liquid particles suspended in air,** continually varying in size and chemical composition in space and time (Figure 1). Primary particles are emitted directly into the atmosphere, such as diesel soot, whereas secondary particles are created through physicochemical transformation of gases, such as nitrate and sulfate formation from gaseous nitric acid and sulfur dioxide (SO2), respectively. **The numerous natural and anthropogenic sources of PM include motor vehicle emissions, tire fragmentation and resuspension of road dust, power generation and other industrial combustion, smelting and other metal processing, agriculture, construction and demolition activities, residential wood burning, windblown soil, pollens and molds, forest fires and combustion of agricultural debris, volcanic emissions, and sea spray.** Although there are thousands of chemicals that have been detected in PM in different locations, some of the more common constituents include nitrates, sulfates, elemental and organic carbon, organic compounds (eg, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons), biological compounds (eg, endotoxin, cell fragments), and a variety of metals (eg, iron, copper, nickel, zinc, and vanadium).

#### 5. **Urban sprawl leads to multiple economics benefits.**

Kahn, 3/8/06, Matthew E. Kahn, Professor of economics @ UCLA, http://greeneconomics.blogspot.com/2006/03/benefits-of-sprawl.html, “The Benefits of Sprawl”

Additional Benefits of Sprawl This section briefly highlights a variety of potentially important benefits of sprawl. Data limitations preclude presenting original data analysis measuring the size of each of these effects but I believe that each contributes to household well being in sprawled cities. The Location of Employment Within the Metro Area In the year 2000, only 21% of Atlanta’s jobs were located in zip codes within 10 kilometers of the CBD. In Boston, 52% of this area’s jobs were located within 10 kilometers of the CBD (Baum-Snow and Kahn 2005). Firms gain by having the option of locating some of their employment further from the high land priced CBD. The key reasons for why firms choose particular locations include 1. land costs, 2, access to ideas, 3. access to workers and 4. transport cost savings for inputs and output. For example, manufacturing industries which are more land intensive are more likely to decentralize while skill intensive industries are less likely to decentralize (Glaeser and Kahn 2001). Those firms that gain from “Jane Jacobs” learning from other types of firms have an incentive to locate in diverse high density downtowns. Within firms, non-management occupations are increasingly being sited at the edge of major cities (Rossi-Hansberg, Sarte and Owens 2005). This cost savings increases firm profits. Firms that are able to split their activities between headquarters and production plants are likely to gain greatly from sprawl. Standard agglomeration forces encourage firms to only keep those workers at the center city headquarters who benefit from interactions in the denser downtown (Rossi-Hansberg, Sarte and Owens 2005). Other firms may gain by being able to construct large campuses where members of the firm can interact across divisions. Microsoft’s Richmond, Washington campus will be ten million square feet after it completes its expansion and there will be 12,000 workers there. Google now has 5,680 employees and is adding 1 million square feet to the 500,000 it now occupies in Mountain View, California. There are at least two quality of life benefits from employment suburbanization. The previous section documented the reduction in commute times in suburban communities as more suburbanites now live closer to their jobs rather than commuting downtown. A second quality of life benefit from suburbanized employment is that this creates a type of separation of land uses. In the past, when cities were much more compact, millions of people lived too close to dirty, noisy manufacturing and slaughterhouse activity (Melosi 2001). Declining transportation costs have allowed a separation of where goods are produced and where people live. Suburban Consumer Prices and the “Walmart” Effect Walmart and other “superstores” could not exist in an urban world of compact cities with binding zoning laws. “Wal-Mart has sometimes had difficulty in receiving planning approval for its stores. Currently, Wal-Mart has either no presence or an extremely limited presence in New England, the New York metro area, California, and the Pacific Northwest. However, its expansion into new areas has proceeded over the past few years (Hausman and Leibtag 2005).” These stores require large physical spaces and large parking lots to accommodate their inventory and to attract shoppers. Such stores offer one stop shopping and prices that can be 25% lower than regular supermarkets (see Hausman and Leibtag 2005). The diffusion of these stores may mean that the U.S consumer price index over-states inflation because this index does not properly reflect the prices that people face for core goods. These stores are disproportionately located in suburban and rural areas where land is cheap. Center city residents often drive to suburban locations to shop at such stores. While the popular media often reports stories critiquing Walmart’s employee compensation and its effects on driving out of business smaller “mom and pop” stores, it cannot be denied that consumers gain from having access to such stores. The key counter-factual here is what prices would residents face in a compact monocentric city without Walmart and other superstores.

## CP

### States CP

**The CP is illegal – Guam is a U.S. territory under federal jurisdiction**

**DOI ’12** (Department of the Interior profile of Guam, last updated 1-05-12, accessed 7/9/12, <http://www.doi.gov/archive/oia/Islandpages/gumpage.htm>, YX)

Political Status **Guam became a U.S. territory in** [**1898**](http://www.doi.gov/oia/Islandpages/treaty1898.html) **and placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Navy. The Guam Organic Act of 1950** conferred U.S. citizenship on Guamanians and established the territory’s government. The Act also **transferred Federal jurisdiction over Guam from the U.S. Navy to the Department of the Interior**. First elections were held in 1970.

#### That ensures the CP links to the NB

Louis **Fisher** 19**72**, senior specialist in separation of powers with the Congressional Research Service of the

Library of Congress.. "Presidential Spending Discretion and Congressional Controls”. Law and Contemporary

Problems, Vol. 37, No. 1, Administrative Discretion (Winter, 1972), pp. 135-172. Published by Duke University of

Law. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1191125

**Legislative efforts to monitor reprogramming occasionally go beyond the review responsibilities of designated committees**. For instance, early in I97I Secretary Laird expressed interest in' obtaining funds to begin a fourth nuclear-powered carrier (CVAN-70). If it became necessary to submit a budget amendment or initiate a reprogramming request, he would be willing to give up $139.5 million that had been requested for an oil tanker and three salvage ships.99 Senators Case and Mondale were able to enlist the support of Senator Ellender, chairman' of the Appropriations Committee, and of Senator Stennis, chairman of Armed Services. The two chairmen agreed that reprogramming would be an improper technique for providing funds. **The Administration would have to follow normal budgetary procedures: a budget request from the President followed by Congressional authorization and appropriation**. The Administration decided to postpone making that request until a sub- sequent fiscal year.10 Thus, **in the case of controversial reprogramming requests, the review role extends beyond the designated committees to involve Congress as a whole**. To take another example, the Defense Department submitted a reprogramming request in I97I for an additional $61.2 million for the Cheyenne helicopter. That covered approx- imately $35 million to reimburse the contractor for services performed, $9.3 million to continue the development program during fiscal I972, and approximately $17 million to continue it during fiscal I973. Since the Cheyenne had been under attack by members of Congress in recent years, only the reimbursement portion of the reprogramming request was approved. The House Appropriations Committee denied the request for fiscal I973 development on the ground that "it did not seem proper to anticipate the will of Congress with respect to the Cheyenne program that far in advance."10l With regard to fiscal I972 development, $9.3 million was placed in the appropriation bill as a separate and identifiable item so that the full Congress could work its will on the request.102

Too expensive – fed key to cover cost – perm solves best

ADC 12 (Association of Defense Communities, 4/30/12, “DOD Could Support Municipal Services in Guam under Authorization Bill Provision”, [http://www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/dod-could-support-municipal-services-in-guam-under-authorization-bill-provision/#](http://www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/dod-could-support-municipal-services-in-guam-under-authorization-bill-provision/) // Veevz)

Guam would eligible for federal aid to cover the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities stemming from the relocation of Marine Corps personnel, under a provision in the fiscal 2013 defense authorization bill approved by the House Armed Services’ Readiness Subcommittee Friday. DOD would be required to determine “that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by the government of Guam to provide the services and facilities in the absence of the Department of Defense assistance,” according to the provision. The department could take actions needed to mitigate the “significant impacts” identified in the environmental impact statement for the realignment on Guam. DOD could provide assistance through existing federal programs supporting the buildup, and the department would be allowed to help Guam cover cost share requirements. The bill language would allow DOD to transfer funds appropriated for operation and maintenance to another account or federal agency so they could be made available. The authority would expire Sept. 30, 2020. Another provision would repeal a requirement for DOD to complete a government-wide plan for supporting civilian infrastructure on Guam before carrying out the buildup there. A supplemental environmental impact statement the Navy is preparing would be “the correct forum” to consider the impacts of the realignment from the perspective of all federal agencies, according to the subcommittee. “Considering the timing of the Record of Decision, the committee believes that there are discrete elements of the overall realignment that have independent utility and should move forward,” the lawmakers added.

### Random Delay CP

#### Cost overruns and stagnation makes delays worse

Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11 (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Partly related to the devastation in Japan as well as new developments from the U.S. Congress, the terms, magnitude, and timing of the military buildup on Guam might deviate from those spelled out in the 2006 U.S.-Japan Agreement. Much depends on the fiscal health of both the U.S. federal government and the Government of Japan, who initially agreed to share the cost of the military buildup on a 40-60 basis (approximately). The delays may likely increase earlier cost estimates, worsening the fiscal situation. As such, these factors highlight the importance of local economic growth, propelling a sustainable and participatory development path. In addition to strengthening existing markets (tourism and military), additional economic activities need to be explored and developed to diversify Guam’s economic structure in order to create a stronger and more sustainable economic portfolio. In the past five to 10 years, the private sector has become a more significant contributor to the economy. The latest Guam Department of Labor's "Annual Census of Business Establishments" (March 2009) shows the following data: Annual growth rate of number of jobs over the five-year period.

#### Any delay is bad

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Military The military market is also significant in Guam. Expectedly, it claimed a larger share of the economy in the aftermath of World War II but has since decreased, although still notable. It usually reflects itself in construction and engineering services industries, although there are opportunities to get involved in military bases’ maintenance and operation. The concern here is that decisions affecting the military presence on Guam are made externally, in this case, by the U.S. Federal Government, in consultation with foreign government(s). For instance, the U.S. and Japan entered an agreement in 2006 to realign U.S. military forces in Asia. Of particular interest to Guam is the proposal to relocate 8,000 military personnel and their families from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. Such military buildup on Guam was originally valued in excess of $10 billion (2.5 times the size of the current Guam economy) and was originally planned to take place over a short four-year period, after which the military-related construction boom would be expected to decline. More recently, there has been uncertainty regarding the terms, magnitude and timing of this military buildup, in part due to the recent natural disasters in Japan as well as to new developments in the U.S. Congress. Much depends on the fiscal health of both the U.S. Federal Government and the Government of Japan, which initially agreed to share the cost of the military buildup on a 40-60 basis (approximately). Any delay of the military buildup will likely increase earlier estimates of costs.59

#### Certainty key

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

In support of a continuing military presence, government and civic leaders jointly submitted in March 2001, a white paper calling for a greater military presence on Guam. Entitled “Force Structure Redistribution in the Asia-Pacific Region: Guam’s Potential Role”, the purpose of the white paper, which was prepared by the Guam Chamber of Commerce, was to demonstrate Guam’s endorsement of a larger military presence. Also due to tensions in the region and Guam’s strategic location to serve as a staging base and operating location for mobilizing U.S. military forces and equipment within the Western Pacific, there is evidence of increased military activity on Guam. The signing of the “U.S.-Japan Alliance: Transformation and Realignment for the Future” agreement (ATARA) in October 2005 set into motion actions and expectations of a military buildup on Guam for the projected time period of 2010-2014. Although the component of the proposed military buildup on Guam with the largest dollar value and on-island population increase will come from the relocation of 8,000 Marines and 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guam, it will also include construction of a wharf in Apra Harbor to support a transient nuclear power aircraft carrier and construction of facilities and infrastructure to support 600 Army Missile Defense Task Force and their 900 dependents (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2009, page ES-1). As 2010 approached, many developments have given stakeholders a better sense of what to expect from this military buildup. The first set of specific information was contained the U.S. Department of Navy’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), which was released to the public in November 20, 2009. The public was given 90 days to comment on the DEIS, during which more than 10,000 comments were submitted. The final report was released at the end of July 2010, which introduced the “Adaptive Program Management” approach to the military buildup, which will pace of military construction and population increases according to the capacity of Guam’s infrastructure. A Record of Decision occurred as scheduled during September 2010. Since then, old and new issues have surfaced that continue to create uncertainty regarding the magnitude, timing and other details of the proposed military buildup. This includes continued interest in the military’s plan to use of Pagat, a historic burial site on Guam, as a firing range and training site, along with sluggish recovery in of the U.S. economy and the record-high federal government debt, leading to a downgrade of its credit rating; the devastation of northeast Japan from the earthquake and tsunami in March 11, 2011; delay in implementing a $1 billion multiple award construction contracts (MACC) whose funding would come from Japan’s almost 60% share; recent announcements by U.S. senators geared toward a reexamination of the 2006 Agreement; recent 30 leaked information regarding the “real” details of the military buildup, especially on the magnitude of the personnel relocation and project costs. These uncertainties clearly highlight the need for Guam’s economic planners to welcome the military’s contribution to the economy and, at the same time, develop other less uncertain sources of economic activities.

### Consult CP

#### Perm do the CP – it’s normal means

Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11 (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Military The military market is also significant in Guam. Expectedly, it claimed a larger share of the economy in the aftermath of World War II but has since decreased, although still notable. It usually reflects itself in construction and engineering services industries, although there are opportunities to get involved in military bases’ maintenance and operation. The concern here is that decisions affecting the military presence on Guam are made externally, in this case, by the U.S. Federal Government, in consultation with foreign government(s). For instance, the U.S. and Japan entered an agreement in 2006 to realign U.S. military forces in Asia. Of particular interest to Guam is the proposal to relocate 8,000 military personnel and their families from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. Such military buildup on Guam was originally valued in excess of $10 billion (2.5 times the size of the current Guam economy) and was originally planned to take place over a short four-year period, after which the military-related construction boom would be expected to decline.

### EIS CP

#### Environmental impact assessment already underway for relocation

Defense Communities 12 (Defense Communities 360 “Navy Begins to Study Options for Housing Marines on Guam” NOVEMBER 8, 2012 http://www.defensecommunities.org/navy-begins-to-study-options-for-housing-marines-on-guam/# //nimo)

Officials are showing the island’s residents proposed locations for live-fire training ranges and housing, and soliciting their input for the environmental impact statement now under way. The new assessment comes in response to the decision by the United States and Japan earlier this year to revise the plan for how many Marines would relocate to Guam. The change forced the Navy to redo months of work, reported Stars and Stripes.

#### 1. Permute to do the plan and do an environmental assessment. The CP is just plan plus, it results in the same action as the plan just has an environmental assessment before action.

#### 2. The review process could take years

Dill 5 – PhD in Urban Studies

Jennifer, “What Influences the Length of Time to Complete NEPA Reviews? An Examination of Highway Projects in Oregon and the Potential for Streamlining,” http://dot.alaska.gov/stwddes/desenviron/assets/pdf/resources/nepareviewtime.pdf

How long does the environmental review process take? The Louis Berger Group sampled 100 EISs from the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, to help FHWA obtain a baseline for measuring performance (2). They estimated the length of time taken to complete the NEPA process based on the information in the EIS. The end date was the date on the final EIS. The start date varied. In Phase II of the project, the Louis Berger Group collected data on 244 projects from 1995 to 2001 and calculated the length of the NEPA process using the Notice of Intent (NOI) as the start date and the Record of Decision (ROD) as the end date. In addition, for the past five years, FHWA has tracked the length of time to complete the NEPA process, also using the NOI and ROD dates (7). The data from these three sources is shown in FIGURE 1. The two studies by the Louis Berger Group noted that the time to complete NEPA was not normally distributed, and that a handful of very lengthy projects often skewed the data. In such cases, the median may be a better indication of central tendency. For example, the median time to complete NEPA for the projects from the 1970s through 1990s was 3.0 years, compared to a mean of 3.6 years for all three decades. FIGURE 2 shows the medians from the same three data sources. In addition, in 1994 the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed 76 projects with EISs completed between 1988 and 1993 (5). The average time from NOI to ROD was about 4.5 years. This figure is consistent with the Berger Group data. At the request of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), in 2003 TransTech Management, Inc. surveyed 31 state departments of transportation about their most recent final EIS document (8). They found a median time taken from NOI to ROD of 3.7 years, ranging from just over two years to almost 12 years. The difference from the FHWA/Berger Group data was not explained

#### 3. Can’t solve – project will be cancelled and links to PTX. The CP is net worse than the plan.

Conrad and Sarwal 6 (Memebers of the chamber of commerce. Full Date: December 2006. Accessed: 7/12/12. http://www.scotusblog.com/movabletype/archives/06-466Chamber.pdf)

NEPA’s requirements are essentially procedural: An agency must take a “hard look” at potentially significant environmental effects of its proposed actions, but the Act does not purport to control the agency’s ultimate choices. See, e.g., Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 558 (1978). That procedural mandate has served an important role in correcting a situation in which agencies did not take sufficient account of environmental concerns. Over time, however, both NEPA’s procedural requirements and, in particular, litigation challenging the adequacy of an agency’s NEPA compliance have also become “notorious for special interest abuse.” Frank B. Cross, The Judiciary and Public Choice, 50 Hastings L. J. 355, 375 (1999). An expansive judicial view of NEPA’s requirements, which first shapes action at the administrative level and then plays out in follow-on litigation, can introduce significant costs and delay in obtaining agency action—costs and delay that are too often the only real ends of those who use NEPA to impose them. One commentator describes the phenomenon as follows: Delay buys time, which opponents can use to build popular and political opposition to the project. New information may develop, partially through the dis-closures of the NEPA statement. Inflationary pressures, and other costs, could economically doom the project during the delay. NEPA thereby became an important means to the end: stopping the project. Denis Binder, NEPA, NIMBYs and New Technology, 25 Land and Water Law Review 11, 17 (1990). See also, e.g., James Dao, Environmental Groups to File Suit over Missile Defense, N.Y. Times, Aug. 28, 2001, at A10 (reporting plaintiff’s statement that “the hope is that [the NEPA-induced] delay will lead to cancellation…. That’s what we always hope for in these suits**.**”); Daniel Ackman, Highway to Nowhere: NEPA, Environmental Review and the Westway Case, 21 Colum. L.J. & Soc. Probs. 325 (1988). In other words, NEPA can easily become a tool of those interested in scuttling a project for any reason.

#### 4. Condo is a voter – causes strat skew kills aff offense – moots the 2ac and creates too much of a research burden for the aff – key to in depth discussion key to education – condo allows for infinite amount of advocacies– dispo solves all your offense.

#### 5. Big risk of uncertainty – affects politics links

Beder 90 – Professor of Social Sciences

Sharon, “Environmental Impact Statements: The Ethical Dilemma for Engineers,” http://herinst.org/sbeder/engineers/dilemma.html

Naturally, they will want that document to emphasise the advantages of the project to the community and to downplay the disadvantages. To a large extent that environmental impact statement becomes a sales document for the project. Any expression of possible adverse environmental effect or even any mention of uncertainty will certainly be grabbed by opponents of the project, magnified and used against them.

### Guam do it CP

Too expensive – fed key to cover cost – perm solves best

ADC 12 (Association of Defense Communities, 4/30/12, “DOD Could Support Municipal Services in Guam under Authorization Bill Provision”, [http://www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/dod-could-support-municipal-services-in-guam-under-authorization-bill-provision/#](http://www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/dod-could-support-municipal-services-in-guam-under-authorization-bill-provision/) // Veevz)

Guam would eligible for federal aid to cover the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities stemming from the relocation of Marine Corps personnel, under a provision in the fiscal 2013 defense authorization bill approved by the House Armed Services’ Readiness Subcommittee Friday. DOD would be required to determine “that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by the government of Guam to provide the services and facilities in the absence of the Department of Defense assistance,” according to the provision. The department could take actions needed to mitigate the “significant impacts” identified in the environmental impact statement for the realignment on Guam. DOD could provide assistance through existing federal programs supporting the buildup, and the department would be allowed to help Guam cover cost share requirements. The bill language would allow DOD to transfer funds appropriated for operation and maintenance to another account or federal agency so they could be made available. The authority would expire Sept. 30, 2020. Another provision would repeal a requirement for DOD to complete a government-wide plan for supporting civilian infrastructure on Guam before carrying out the buildup there. A supplemental environmental impact statement the Navy is preparing would be “the correct forum” to consider the impacts of the realignment from the perspective of all federal agencies, according to the subcommittee. “Considering the timing of the Record of Decision, the committee believes that there are discrete elements of the overall realignment that have independent utility and should move forward,” the lawmakers added.

#### Guam can’t fund – only federal support shoulders the financial burden

**Jowers ‘8** (Karen, writer for the Air Force Times, May 10, 2008, “Military buildup threatens to overwhelm Guam – governor pleads for immediate federal assistance,” <http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/>)

**If Guam doesn’t** get money soon from the federal government **to help prepare for the massive military buildup coming to the island in the next few years**, it could affect not only the island’s permanent residents but also the quality of life for the service members and families who will move there, the island’s governor told lawmakers. “No American community can shoulder the challenges of a 30 percent increase in population” in such a short time, Guam Gov. Felix Camacho said. Guam’s population of about 171,000 includes about 14,000 people connected to the Defense Department, but that is expected to triple, to more than 40,000, in a five-year period, said David Bice, executive director of the Joint Guam Program Office for the Navy’s assistant secretary for installations and environment. That includes 8,000 Marines and their 9,000 family members relocating from Okinawa to Guam by 2014, as well as the addition of about 1,000 airmen at Andersen Air Force Base. Including active-duty airmen, reservists and dependents, the population of Andersen will swell from about 8,500 to nearly 12,000 by early in the next decade. The people of Guam expect the federal government to underwrite the costs directly related to the military buildup, Camacho told the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on May 1. Guamanians are worried about the potential strains on their port, roads, electrical system, [health care](http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/) system, wastewater system and social programs. Camacho noted that military personnel and their families “will travel the same roads, use the same resources and live in the same community we all share today. ... We want to be ready so we can [continue](http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/) to provide America’s front lines with a home away from home, without jeopardizing the basic services the government of Guam provides to the local community.” Although Guam’s government has been [working](http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/) to improve roads, schools and other infrastructure, it is unfair to expect any community to take on such exponential growth in such a short timeline, he said. Because of its strategic location in the western Pacific and its status as U.S. soil, Air Force leaders envision Guam becoming a major staging ground from which to project air power throughout Asia.

### BAB CP

#### 1. Perm do the CP its just a specification

#### 2. Unsustainable BAB program deters investors

Forsyth, 10 [Randall W, Barron’s Magazine, August 10, <http://online.barrons.com/article/SB50001424052970203880104575420291762686092.html>, “Buy American, as in Build America Bonds”, Accessed July 9]

The higher yields on BABs reflect their lesser liquidity and amount outstanding, factors that make them less attractive to big institutional investors such as pension funds and insurance companies, the traditional stalwarts of the corporate bond market. In addition, the BABs program will expire at the end of the year without Congressional action, which also would make these taxable munis relatively scarce in the marketplace, and thus less liquid.

#### 3. Links to the NB, CP is perceived as piling up the debt which is irresponsible to investors.

#### 4. BABs fail --- hurts economy and states and costs jobs

Maloney, 11 [CJ, Author, Blogger, Liberty and Power on the History News Network, DailyKos, April 22, <http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2011/04/22/good_riddance_to_build_america_bonds_98979.html>, “Good Riddance to Build America Bonds”, Accessed July 9, ]

The mark of sound economic thinking is that one take into account also what is not seen, and by using deductive reasoning we can see that the BABs program did not "create" jobs, it merely moved them around. Since, as Frederick Engels told us in his The Role of Force In History "force, however, cannot make any money; at most it can only take away money that has already been made." The "public" funds used to power the BABs program must, by necessity, have first been taken out of private hands. For every union job "created" by the BABs program, there was at least one private sector job taken away elsewhere. At best it was a wash, and, judging by the historical inefficiency of government run programs, it likely cost more jobs than it created. BAB type programs have been tried before, without success, to "stimulate" an economy. Not surprising (as President Obama greatly admires FDR) infrastructure programs flourished under the New Deal, all to no avail. By 1939, Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau confided to his diary, "We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it does not work...we have never made good on our promises. I say after eight years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started. And enormous debt to boot."In a recent column in the Wall Street Journal David Reilly wrote, "Temporary government programs hatched during a crisis can easily become permanent. That is the danger with Build America Bonds." He is correct. The program was barely a year old when President Obama was already floating the idea of making it permanent.

 The New Deal was a series of "emergency" programs made permanent, and many exist to this day still. Do we need yet another one? BABs were a subsidy, and like all subsidies they distorted the market, pushed scarce capital where it otherwise would not have gone, and (in its worst effect) created a dependent relationship where none should ever exist. We should never lose sight over something more important than the mere dollars and cents of this issue - we need to take into account the effects of the BABs program on the political structure of our nation. For our safety we were specifically designed as a republic, each individual state, sovereign in its own right, is tasked to be a check on federal power.How much of a check can they be, though, when they are constantly sending emissaries to D.C., hat in hand, begging for money? For that reason alone, I am relieved that the Build America Bonds program has been relegated to history's dustbin, and I hope that's where it will stay.

#### 5. Perm do both

#### 6. BAB’s help in the short term, but increase destructive borrowing in the long term

Gandel, 9 [Stephen, Senior writer for TIME, November 17, <http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,1939720,00.html>, “A Stimulus Success: Build America Bonds are Working”, Accessed July 9,]

But if Build America Bonds have proved popular, they may also end up being costly. Already, the volume of bonds issued means the federal government is committed to spending a billion dollars in the first year of the program alone. The final price tag may end up reaching $90 billion."For municipalities, it's been good, but it raises some political-economy questions," says Vincent Reinhart, a resident scholar at the conservative think tank American Enterprise Institute and a former top Federal Reserve economist. "This might encourage even more expansion of government borrowing."

#### 7. None of their evidence says that both investors will see bonds as more responsible than the plan

China Funding CP

#### 1. Perm do the CP – it results in the same action as the aff

#### 2. Chinese intentions are not towards cooperation – Caribbean encroachment proves they’re only interested in owning assets for political and diplomatic leverage – the counterplan will destroy U.S. leadership and competitiveness

**NYT ’12** (Randal C. Archibold, staff writer, “China Buys Inroads in the Caribbean, Catching U.S. Notice”, The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/08/world/americas/us-alert-as-chinas-cash-buys-inroads-in-caribbean.html?pagewanted=all)

NASSAU, the Bahamas — A brand new $35 million stadium opened here in the Bahamas a few weeks ago, a gift from the Chinese government. The tiny island nation of Dominica has received a grammar school, a renovated hospital and a sports stadium, also courtesy of the Chinese. Antigua and Barbuda got a power plant and a cricket stadium, and a new school is on its way. The prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago can thank Chinese contractors for the craftsmanship in her official residence. China’s economic might has rolled up to America’s doorstep in the Caribbean, with a flurry of loans from state banks, investments by companies and outright gifts from the government in the form of new stadiums, roads, official buildings, ports and resorts in a region where the United States has long been a prime benefactor. The Chinese have flexed their economic prowess in nearly every corner of the world. But planting a flag so close to the United States has generated intense vetting — and some raised eyebrows — among diplomats, economists and investors. “When you’ve got a new player in the hemisphere all of a sudden, it’s obviously something talked about at the highest level of governments,” said Kevin P. Gallagher, a Boston University professor who is an author of a recent report on Chinese financing, “The New Banks in Town.” Most analysts do not see a security threat, noting that the Chinese are not building bases or forging any military ties that could invoke fears of another Cuban missile crisis. But they do see an emerging superpower securing economic inroads and political support from a bloc of developing countries with anemic budgets that once counted almost exclusively on the United States, Canada and Europe. China announced late last year that it would lend $6.3 billion to Caribbean governments, adding considerably to the hundreds of millions of dollars in loans, grants and other forms of economic assistance it has already channeled there in the past decade. Unlike in Africa, South America and other parts of the world where China’s forays are largely driven by a search for commodities, its presence in the Caribbean derives mainly from long-term economic ventures, like tourism and loans, and potential new allies that are inexpensive to win over, analysts say. American diplomatic cables released through WikiLeaks and published in the British newspaper The Guardian quoted diplomats as being increasingly worried about the Chinese presence here “less than 190 miles from the United States” and speculating on its purpose. One theory, according to a 2003 cable, suggested that China was lining up allies as “a strategic move” for the eventual end of the Castro era in Cuba, with which it has strong relations. But the public line today is to be untroubled. “I am not particularly worried, but it is something the U.S. should continue to monitor,” said Dennis C. Shea, the chairman of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, a bipartisan Congressional panel. But, he added, “With China you have to be wary of possible policy goals behind the effort.” This archipelago, less than a one-hour flight from Florida, has gotten particular attention from the Chinese. Aside from the new stadium, with its “China Aid” plaque affixed prominently at the entrance, Chinese workers here in the Bahamas are busy helping build the $3.5 billion Baha Mar, one of the region’s largest megaresorts. Beyond that, a Chinese state bank agreed in recent weeks to put up $41 million for a new port and bridge, and a new, large Chinese Embassy is being built downtown. The new stadium here, Bahamian officials said, was in part a reward for breaking ties with Taiwan in 1997 and establishing and keeping relations with China. It is one of several sporting arenas that China has sprinkled in Caribbean and Central American nations as gratitude for their recognition of “one China” — in other words, for their refusal to recognize Taiwan, which Chinese officials consider part of their country. “They offered a substantial gift and we opted for a national stadium,” said Charles Maynard, the Bahamian sports minister, adding that his government could never have afforded to build it on its own. In this enduring tug of war with Taiwan, others have switched, too, with a little financial encouragement. Grenada ended relations with Taiwan in 2004, and it is now in talks with China about getting a new national track and field stadium. The parting has not been entirely amicable; Taiwan and Grenada are now locked in a financial dispute over loans that Grenada received to finance the construction of its airport. Determined not to be sidelined, Taiwan is seeking to solidify its existing relationships with countries like Belize, St. Kitts and Nevis, and St. Lucia — which in 2007 broke relations with China in favor of Taiwan — with a bevy of projects, many of them agricultural, including an agreement signed with Belize in recent weeks to develop the fish farming industry there. Still, Taiwanese diplomats in the region conceded that they could never keep up with China’s largess but continued to make strategic investments in the Caribbean. There are some commodities in the region that China wants. In August, a Chinese company, Complant, bought the last three government sugar estates in Jamaica and leased cane fields, for a total investment of $166 million. Last year, Jamaica for the first time shipped its famed Blue Mountain Coffee to China. The Jamaican government has also received several hundred million dollars in loans from China, including $400 million announced in 2010 over five years to rebuild roads and other infrastructure. “In order to be prosperous you need to build roads first,” said Adam Wu, an executive with China Business Network, a consulting group for Chinese businesses that has been making the case for China in several Caribbean countries. Several analysts in the Caribbean say they believe that China eventually will emerge as a political force in the region, with so many countries indebted to it, at a time when the United States is perceived as preoccupied with the Middle East and paying little attention to the region. “They are buying loyalty and taking up the vacuum left by the United States, Canada and other countries, particularly in infrastructure improvements,” said Sir Ronald Sanders, a former diplomat from Antigua and Barbuda. “If China continues to invest the way it is doing in the Caribbean, the U.S. is almost making itself irrelevant to the region,” he added. “You don’t leave your flank exposed.” In some places, Chinese contractors or workers have stayed on, beginning to build communities and businesses. So many have opened in Roseau, Dominica, that local merchants have complained about being squeezed out. Trinidad and Tobago has had waves of Chinese immigration over the past century, but locals are now seeing more Chinese restaurants and shops, as well as other signs of a new immigrant generation. “I am second-generation Trinidadian-Chinese, and like most of us of this era, we have integrated very well in society, having friends, girlfriends, spouses and kids with people of other ethnicities,” said Robert Johnson-Attin, 36, a mechanical engineer now with his own successful business. “It’ll only be a matter of time before it happens with the Chinese coming in now.” Here in the Bahamas, Tan Jian, the economic counselor at the Chinese Embassy, said he that believed “it’s only the start” of the Chinese presence across the Caribbean, casting it as one developing country using its growing economic power to help other developing ones. The Bahamian government, he said, “cannot afford to build huge projects by itself.” While the Chinese built the stadium, the Bahamas is responsible for utility hookups and the roads and landscaping outside it. The $35 million gift “is costing us $50 million,” said Mr. Maynard, the sports minister. “But at the end of the day it will pay for itself” by putting the Bahamas in position to host major sporting events and reap the tourism revenue that comes with that. For Baha Mar, the Chinese Export-Import Bank is financing $2.6 billion, nearly three-quarters of the cost, and China’s state construction company is a partner. The Bahamas agreed to allow up to 8,000 foreign workers, most of them Chinese, to work on the project in stages, but it also required employment for 4,000 Bahamians, dampening concerns that Chinese workers were taking jobs. American companies will also take part in building and running it. Mr. Jian played down any economic competition with the United States, whose tourists, he asserted, stood to benefit from China’s presence in the Caribbean. The Chinese workers here live in barracks behind the project fences, largely shielded from public view. “We hardly know they are here,” said James Duffy, watching a track practice next to the stadium one recent afternoon, adding with a chuckle: “Except for the big things they build.”

#### 3. Perm do both

**4. China funding gets rejected by US, failure rates and scrutiny**

**Steinbock, 12** — research director of International Business at The India, China, and America Institute, and Visiting Fellow at Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (China), (Dan, “Why Chinese FDI Remains Marginal in the United States”, EconoMonitor, 2/29/12, http://www.economonitor.com/blog/2012/02/why-chinese-fdi-remains-marginal-in-the-united-states/

Between 2005 and 2010, China’s FDI abroad soared from an annual average of below $3 billion to more than $50 billion, bringing its total global FDI stock abroad to over $300 billion. In the past, most of this investment was still concentrated on developing countries and a few resource-rich developed economies. But things are changing. During the ongoing decade, Chinese FDI will shift more toward developed economies. In China, structural adjustment tends to fuel outward investment. Typically, companies invest in a broad array of U.S. industries, especially in sectors hit by adjustment pressures in China, including real estate and renewable energy. In 2010, China’s FDI stock in the U.S. was estimated at $5.9 billion, which indicates an increase of almost 400 percent in comparison to 2008. However, this momentum has not been sustained. As China’s sovereign wealth fund expressed its interest in investing in U.S. and European infrastructure, Chinese investment in telecom infrastructure came under renewed scrutiny. A year ago, Chinese companies recorded a failure rate of 11 percent in their attempts at buying or merging with foreign firms, according to research firm Dealogic. The rate for the US was 2 percent and that for the UK 1 percent, respectively. In Washington, the challenges are often explained by the failure rate of Chinese companies, which is attributed to inexperience. And certainly, it is true that Chinese firms are very young and have substantial challenges in the foreign markets. In the United States, many of the established multinational corporations, from General Motors to Coca-Cola, were founded more than a century ago. Even the leading high-tech firms, such as H-P and Intel, are some half a century old. In contrast, Chinese companies that hope to become global must learn very much very quickly about new markets, competitors, regulatory systems, and cultures. Nonetheless, these challenges do not explain the relatively high failure rate. According to Chinese observers, protectionism has increased against Chinese companies, especially high-tech companies like Huawei and ZTE.

**5. The counterplan links to politics – Chinese investment creates massive congressional suspicion despite perception of benefits**

**Rosen and Hanemann, 11** – professor at Columbia University, Fellow with the Peterson Institute for International Economics, and Senior Advisor for International Economic Policy at the White House National Economic Council and National Security Council, AND\* is Research Director at the Rhodium Group, specializing in China’s macroeconomic development and the implications for global trade and investment flows (Daniel & Thilo, “An American Open Door?: Maximising the Benefits of Chinese Foreign Direct investment”, May 2011, http://www.ogilvypr.com/files/anamericanopendoor\_china\_fdi\_study.pdf)

However, surging Chinese investment has triggered anxieties as well as excitement among Americans. Major Chinese investment overtures have foundered in recent years, creating uncertainty and ill will between the two nations. Though the legally mandated screening organ for national security risks, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), generally has operated in a fair manner, bad publicity stirred up by the threat of congressional interference is having a chilling effect on Chinese readiness to invest in the United States by sending confusing and unclear messages. Nowadays, whenever a Chinese investment proposal is announced, the first question the media poses is not how many jobs it might create, but whether groups in Washington will try to block it, with little regard for whether there is actually any threat entailed. This is ironic, as most China-backed deals are not covered by CFIUS, and those that are almost always receive proper hearings. Moreover, because such hostile receptions scare away needed—and legitimate—investment, invite retaliation against U.S. firms abroad, and distract Americans from the serious task of assessing real security concerns, they are dangerous to the national interest. Here, the example of Japan is instructive. Japan’s first investments in the United States during the 1980s were almost as controversial as China’s, but in the following years, U.S. affiliates of Japanese companies invested hundreds of billions of dollars in the United States, and today employ nearly 700,000 Americans.

**6. Lack of investment expertise dooms short-term solvency**

**McGladrey, 09** – fifth largest U.S. assurance, tax, and consulting firm, (“From inbound to outbound: The gradual shift of Chinese business investments”, McGladrey LLP, http://mcgladrey.com/Business-Climate/From-inbound-to-outbound-The-gradual-shift-of-Chinese-business-investments)

When it comes to outside investments, Chinese business and political leaders are playing most of their cards close to home. The nation?s Commerce Ministry reports that 60 percent of Chinese outbound investment last year went to Asia, most notably to companies in Hong Kong, South Korea,Thailand, Cambodia and Japan. Another 23 percent went to Latin America and Africa, mainly in the form of investments to secure energy products and raw materials for manufacturing. Conversely, North American investments were on a much smaller scale, at just 6.7 percent of the overall outbound cash flow. To date, Bottelier says, the most notable Chinese acquisition in the United States is Lenovo Group?s$1.75 billion purchase of IBM?s personal computing business. But that success ? as well as a failed $1.13 million bid by China?s Haier Group to acquire appliance manufacturer Maytag ? received scant attention compared with the dust-up when China National Offshore Oil (CNOOC) bid a whopping $18.5 billion to buy Unocal. Facing intense public and political pressure over the prospect of foreign ownership of a major energy producer, the California-based oil giant eventually agreed to a purchase by domestic rival Chevron Corp. "The CNOOC management team mishandled this, largely because they were naive in thinking that a large takeover plan in a sensitive industry would not have political ramifications," Bottelier says. "And that experience, combined with the Dubai ports issue [foreign investors seeking to operate selected U.S. ports], really rankled the Chinese. They don?t believe that the U.S.genuinely welcomes Chinese investment." While it?s likely that Chinese investors will gradually play more significant roles as suitors or venture capitalists to U.S. companies, experts say business owners should not expect too much, too soon. In the post-9/11 world, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States is taking a much closer look at deals proposed by overseas interests ? with an especially wary eye cast on China. In a China Business Review article earlier this year, authors David Marchick and Richard Mintz reported findings on a recent survey of 400 U.S. opinion leaders, in which 54 percent said it was "too easy" for foreigners to buy U.S.assets. When the prospective acquirer was identified as Chinese, that number jumped to 69 percent. In some respects, the prospect of substantial Chinese investment in U.S. businesses and infrastructure generates comparisons to the 1980s, when Japanese investors aggressively pushed into U.S. commerce. But experts note at least two distinct differences. First, Japanese investment was mostly private,while Chinese investment is still largely driven by state-owned companies. And, after more than two decades of studying Western business practices, the Japanese executives were much better versed in the art of the deal. "The biggest hurdle the Chinese have right now in growing their outbound foreign investment is a lack of knowledge," Bottelier says. "They have very little experience in developing and closing Western-style acquisitions, so they are really learning how to do this almost from scratch."

**7. Chinese investment will do nothing – funding projects will turn into a slippery slope that results in Chinese labor, companies, and materials**

**WSJ 6/25**/12 (Dinny Mcmahon and Robbie Whelan, “China in Talks With U.S. Home Builder State Bank in Talks to Provide Lennar $1.7 Billion for Two Long-Stalled Projects”, The Wall Street Journal, June 25, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304458604577489062449154168.html)

In recent years, Chinese state money—in large part provided by CDB and its counterpart the Export-Import Bank of China—has been pivotal in funding major infrastructure and resource projects around the world, but the bulk of that activity has been in developing countries in Africa, South America and Asia. That has resulted in the construction of dams, airports, railways, highways and sports arenas that otherwise wouldn't get built, primarily in developing countries. Funding is typically conditional upon Chinese developers and contractors being used to build the projects. And in order to keep costs down, and in many cases to ensure the necessary expertise, at least a portion of the workforce is flown in from China. This would be difficult or impossible in San Francisco, where local regulations and deals cut with local governments generally require developers to use local labor and pay prevailing wages. The CDB and the Lennar partnership have been in discussions to include China Railway Construction Corp., 1186.HK +2.25% a state-run contractor, in the development of Treasure Island and Hunters Point, according to people familiar with the matter. While it is unclear what CRCC's role would be, the company could serve as an adviser or in an consulting role, or could possibly even invest in a local construction company that employs U.S. workers, these people said. With Chinese firms increasingly eyeing opportunities in the U.S. and other developed markets, CDB will likely find itself being approached to fund more deals in the U.S. People familiar with the negotiations said CDB was using the Treasure Island and Hunters Point projects—which both include "green" building and affordable housing components that are of interest to Chinese builders—as a test case to become familiar with what's required for doing such deals in the U.S. Miami-based Lennar, the third-largest U.S. home builder measured by the number of houses built, has a large presence in California, and is well known for its ability to put together complex financial deals, usually involving land.

### Earmarks CP

#### Links to the NB harder – extra media attention

Crespin et al 9

Michael H. Crespin, The University of Georgia, Charles J. Finocchiaro, University of South Carolina¶ ¶ Emily O. Wanless, The University of Georgia, 2009, “Perception and Reality in Congressional¶ ¶ Earmarks,” <http://crespin.myweb.uga.edu/crespin%20forum.pdf>

Earmarks added to appropriations bills have generated a considerable amount of attention¶ from the media, politicians, and fiscal watchdog groups. Taken as a whole, three “truths" about¶ earmarks are frequently discussed: 1) earmarks are the reason for large budget deficits, 2) using¶ omnibus legislation instead of regular order leads to more earmarks, and 3) “airdropped" earmarks¶ added at the conference stage compound the problem of pork. In this paper, we examine these¶ “truths" and find the conventional wisdom does not stand up to empirical tests. Finally, we show¶ how Congress easily worked around new rules concerning the addition of earmarks at the¶ conference stage.

#### Earmarks increase spending, lead to pork-barrel politics, and are unconstitutional – dooms the project

CAP 5/30

Conservative Action Project, 5/30/12, “Don’t bring back Earmarks,” <http://www.redstate.com/conservativeactionproject/2012/05/30/dont-bring-back-earmarks/>

With the Federal government saddled with trillion dollars in deficits and $16 trillion in debt bringing back earmarks would only compound Washington’s spending problem. We urge all organizations and individuals concerned about the size of the federal government to issue op-eds, alerts, blog posts, releases, and other communications warning about the implications of ending or modifying the earmark ban.¶ Earmarks should be permanently eliminated, not resurrected. Time is short, therefore please do not delay.¶ Congress needs to live by the Earmark Moratorium it put in place. Clearly, the practice of putting thousands of earmarks in spending bills, many for projects of a purely local nature, did not originate with the Founding Fathers—it is a recent phenomenon. Congress never extensively earmarked until the 1990s; it is neither necessary nor traditional to buy elections with pork.¶ “…federal money should be limited to great national works only, since if it were unlimited it would liable to abuse and might be productive of evil.”¶ –President James Monroe, 1822¶ “Earmarking” is not just the normal legislative process or Congress using its “power of the purse.” The term “earmark” does not attach to every Congressional funding decision. Earmarking is a phenomenon whereby legislators direct pork barrel spending to their districts outside of a statutory formula-driven or competitive award process for a federal program. The growth in earmarking has directly coincided with the growth in government.

### R&D CP

#### 1. Perm: do both- allows us to solve for both of our advantages and their net benefit faster and better than they ever could. Any additional solvency is a reason to vote AFF because of the increased magnitude of the impact

#### 2. Solvency deficit-

#### The one card read in the 1NC specifies four things that must be done in order to garner complete solvency. They do one of these things meaning that they can’t solve.

#### 3. Perm: do the plan and then the counterplan- Allows us to develop HSR and then Research other ways to effectively eliminate air pollution and create a greener way for the trains to run

#### 4. Links to politics-

#### Tax credits unpopular in congress

Holt 12 (Kelly is senior staff writer for The New American 5/31/12 “ObamaCare Tax Credit Unpopular With Small Business” <http://thenewamerican.com/usnews/item/11562-obamacare-tax-credit-unpopular-with-small-business>” AB)

A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report dated May 2012 revealed that a paltry percentage of small businesses took advantage of the Small Employer Health Insurance Tax Credit in 2010. Of the 1.4 to 4 million small businesses and government agencies estimated to be eligible, only 170,300 claimed it. Part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), commonly known as ObamaCare, the measure that, according to cnsnews.com, “gets strong support in public opinion polls has turned out to be a disappointment.” Of the 170,300 claiming the credit most claimed only a partial percentage, with only 28,100 claiming the full credit. According to the GAO report, “One factor limiting the credit’s use is that most very small employers, 83 percent by one estimate, do not offer health insurance.” Analysts meeting with the GAO reported that “the credit was not large enough to incentivize employers to begin offering insurance.” Other deterrents were the complexity of the rule and the heavy time commitment required to figure it out. Cnsnews added, “The credit, which once had support in principle from lawmakers of both parties, was supposed to help businesses already providing coverage afford the premiums." John Arensmeyer, founder of Small Business Majority, said, "We agree it is not a panacea for all costs.” The advocacy group supports the healthcare law. “The problem is all the negative publicity around the health care law has discouraged business owners from applying for the credit.” He claimed, "There has been more heat than light shone on this,” adding, "There is no reason why small businesses shouldn't be taking advantage of this credit." But his position is at odds with the large number of small businesses who have voluntarily chosen not to take advantage of the credit and with the much larger independent business federation. And the GAO report identified another group whose decision has played a part in the tax credit's failure. Low-wage employees working for small employers generally prefer to receive wages over insurance benefits as part of total compensation. Critics note that employees and employers know what they want, yet the Obama administration is expected to ask Congress for ways to fix the lack of interest by small business. Republicans say they want to repeal ObamaCare, not change it. "They completely missed the target on this thing," said Rep. Sam Graves, R-Mo. (Chair of the House Small Business Committee), according to cnsnews. "I don't think expanding it is going to make any difference whatsoever." The cnsnews report continued, “It doesn't help the administration's plea that the biggest small-business lobbying group is a lead plaintiff asking the Supreme Court to overturn the Affordable Care Act. The National Federation of Independent Business isn't likely to spend much time tinkering with the tax credit or promoting it to members.” The biggest benefits of the tax credit go to very small companies paying low wages. These businesses typically don’t offer coverage, and the tax credit is not sufficient to encourage them to start doing so. An unidentified tax preparer was quoted in the GAO report as saying that "people get exc

#### 5. Perm: Do the counterplan- not severance because the resolution requires that our actor be the USFG, and their counterplans actor is the USFG. Severance is not a voter and should not be considered a valid argument against this perm. Make them specifically prove that the perm itself does not solve

#### 6. Funding R&D is bad for the economy

Bhidé, Professor at Tuffts university, 2010 (Amar, 9/11/10, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704644404575481534193344088.html>, “ Don't Expect Much From the R&D Tax Credit” TG)

President Barack Obama has called for making the on-again, off-again R&D tax credit permanent, as had Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, in the name of promoting long-term economic growth. Big companies with large R&D budgets, unsurprisingly, favor the proposal. But it's a bad idea. Tax credits for R&D don't encourage the broad-based innovation that is crucial for widespread prosperity. Advocates for the tax breaks that riddle our tax code usually invoke a public good that results from an activity that people would not otherwise undertake. Biofuels may be more costly than traditional gasoline, but they reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Renting may be more prudent for individuals with uncertain incomes but homeownership improves neighborhoods. Why not use the tax credits or deductions to tilt the balance? Similarly, investment in research often produces "spillovers" that benefit everyone, not just the business that incurred the expense. If the spillovers are large enough, the argument goes, it behooves society to subsidize research that is only marginally profitable. As it happens, evidence of a large gap between public and private returns cited by advocates of R&D subsidies is underwhelming. The 2005 National Academies of Sciences "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report, which favors public subsidies, cites only eight studies, the most recent of which was published in 1993. Even if it were true that R&D produces higher returns for society, the argument that we would be better off with larger subsidies turns on heroic assumptions. Larger subsidies do little to increase research effort if most capable engineers and scientists are already productively employed. Moreover, larger research programs don't necessarily translate into better results. Huge R&D budgets didn't save Detroit from disaster. Yet this week Gloria Bergquist of the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers told the Detroit News, without irony, that "The auto industry is one of the leading centers of R&D in all industries—even higher than computers and pharmaceuticals. Making a permanent R&D tax credit sends us a strong signal that we should invest in a lot of the technology. To the extent it can encourage R&D and generate investment, that translates into jobs." Most crucially, subsidizing traditional research is a bad idea because it risks diverting resources from more valuable activities. But this does not occur to supporters of public subsidies. They fail to realize that widespread prosperity requires broad-based innovation. A breakthrough microprocessor developed by Intel's R&D staff, for example, has no value unless its production personnel figure out how to manufacture it in high volumes, its marketing staff communicates its benefits to customers, and customers design it into their products and sell the new products to end-users. Everyone's favorite example of innovation—Apple—has certainly benefitted from the R&D investments of its suppliers. But Apple itself does little of the kind of classic R&D that is eligible for tax credits. Nor do the thousands of entrepreneurial companies that develop applications and accessories for iPhones and iPads. Like R&D, innovations in design, marketing, logistics and organization require the investment of funds, time and effort. And although less obvious and visible than technological breakthroughs, these other kinds of developments also generate spillovers. For more than half a century IBM's sales and marketing innovations have helped promote wider and more effective use of its products. They have also served as a model for innumerable high-tech companies. A tax break for R&D doesn't even make political sense, especially under current conditions. Less than 2% of the American work force is now employed in traditional R&D. This proportion is declining as the economy becomes more service based and a relatively small proportion of service innovations fall under the rubric of traditional R&D. The manufacturing sector, which produces just 12% of our gross domestic product, accounts for 42% of R&D undertaken in the country. The inclusive view of innovation I have outlined does not mean that the government should cast a wider net to correct underinvestment in socially desirable activities. Advances undertaken by autonomous entrepreneurs will never be perfectly in sync. But in the shortages that a mainstream economist might call market failures and underinvestment, entrepreneurs see opportunity. The challenge for public policy is to provide evenhanded incentives for all to pursue the opportunities they find most promising.

### NMS CP

#### 1. Perm do the CP – clarification purposes

#### 2. Consultation causes endless debates that undermine policy effectiveness and worsens CMR

Ignatius 9 – David Ignatius, columnist for the Washington Post, October 15, 2009, “Careful to a Fault on Afghanistan,” The Washington Post, online: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/14/AR2009101402872\_pf.html

Afghanistan could be the most important decision of Barack Obama's presidency. Maybe that's why he is, in effect, making it twice.

What's odd about the administration's review of Afghanistan policy is that it is revisiting issues that were analyzed in great detail -- and seemingly resolved -- in the president's March 27 announcement of a new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. The recent recommendations from Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal were intended to implement that "Af-Pak" strategy -- not send the debate back to first principles.

The March document stated that the basic goal was "to prevent Afghanistan from becoming the al-Qaeda safe haven that it was before 9/11." But to accomplish this limited mission, the president endorsed a much broader effort to "reverse the Taliban's gains, and promote a more capable and accountable Afghan government." That gap between end and means has bedeviled the policy ever since.

So now the president is doing it again, slowly and carefully -- as in last Friday's three-hour White House meeting, where, I'm told, he went around the table and quizzed his national security aides one by one.

Obama's deliberative pace is either heartening or maddening, depending on your perspective. Personally, I think he's wise to take his time on an issue in which it's so hard to know the right answer. But I worry that the White House approach will soften the edges so much that the policy itself will be fuzzy and doomed to failure.

As Obama's advisers describe the decision-making process, it sounds a bit like a seminar. National security adviser Jim Jones gathers all the key people so that everyone gets a voice. A top official explains: "We don't get marching orders from the president. He wants a debate. . . . We take the competing views and collapse them toward the middle." This approach produced a consensus on Iran and missile defense, and as National Security Councils go, Obama's seems to work pretty smoothly. Jones is now master of his own house after a rocky start in which he clashed with an inner "Politburo" of aides who had been with Obama during the campaign. Those younger aides are now out or in different jobs, putting Jones more firmly in charge. Obama will be happy to have a retired Marine four-star general at the NSC when it comes time to sell his Afghanistan policy to the military.

#### 3. Solvency deficit – consultation will take lots of time, plan won’t happen soon enough to solve China conflict

#### 4. Perm do plan and enter non binding consultation with the JCS, DoD, and relevant generals and admirals

#### 5. Non-binding consultation solves the entire net-benefit

Feaver 9 - Peter Feaver, Professor of Political Science at Duke University and director of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, May 15, 2009, “Is Obama really getting rolled by the U.S. military?,” online: http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/05/15/is\_obama\_really\_getting\_rolled\_by\_the\_us\_military

It is not shirking, however, when the military is given an opportunity to present its case to the president, and the president changes his mind. Healthy civil-military relations involve civilians giving the military an opportunity to provide candid advice -- check that, requiring the military to provide candid advice -- and then civilians making a decision. Sometimes that decision is different from what the civilians would have made in the absence of that advice. But that is not necessarily "getting rolled." It could just be "getting informed."

#### 6. Perm do both

#### 7. Normal means is consultation

Cook & Ulrich 6 – Martin L. Cook, U.S. Air Force Academy, and Marybeth P. Ulrich, Department of National Security and Strategy, U.S. Army War College, November 2006, “US Civil Military Relations since 9/11: Issues in Ethics and Policy Development,” Journal of Military Ethics, Vol. 5, No. 3, p. 161-182

Professional guidelines for military professionals include the limits of dissent, restraint from leveraging bureaucratic advantage to achieve institutional self-interest, and the acceptance of the principle of non-partisanship. It is essential to the professional development of military officers that they learn to recognize when the bounds of the limits of dissent are breached. Policy advocacy has its place in a collaborative policymaking process, but actions resulting in outcomes counter to the civilian leadership’s policies subvert civilian authority. The military leadership should apply its expertise without ‘shirking’.7

Officers should represent their profession and offer their best military advice. Their core responsibility is to execute policy, avoiding excessive advocacy and insistence of their views. Healthy civilmilitary relationships engender a climate of collaboration within which civilian and military expertise can come together to craft national security policy. The civilian political leadership sets political objectives that the military supports through continued interaction with the political leadership.

#### 8. No backlash - the military will follow orders even if they disagree with them

Ackerman 8 [Spencer, The Washington Independent, 11/13, “Productive Obama-Military Relationship Possible,” <http://washingtonindependent.com/18335/productive-obama-military-relationship-possible>]

Some members of the military community are more sanguine. Several say that if they disagree with the decision, they respect Obama’s authority to make it.

“In the end, we are not self-employed. And after the military leadership provides its best military advice, it is up to the policy-makers to make the decision and for the military to execute those decisions,” said a senior Army officer recently back from Iraq, who requested anonymity because he is still on active duty. “Now, if those in the military do not like the decision, they have two choices. One, salute smartly and execute the missions given them to the best of their ability. Or, the other, leave the military if they do not feel they can faithfully execute their missions. That is one way the military does get to vote in an all-volunteer force.”

Moss agreed. “The military will just follow the order,” he said. “The great majority of Americans want U.S. forces out of Iraq. This is part of the reason Obama was sent to the White House.”

#### 9. Unequal CMR good – Rumsfeld era proves

Desch, 07 - Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security Decision-Making at Texas A&M's George H. W. Bush School of Government and Public Service, (Michael, Foreign Affairs, “Bush and the Generals”, May/June, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20070501faessay86309/michael-c-desch/bush-and-the-generals.html)

Cohen's thesis was that civilian intervention ...) handling of the Iraq war.

Cohen's thesis was that civilian intervention at not only the strategic but also the tactical and operational levels was essential for military success. In order to overcome military resistance or incompetence, civilian leaders needed to be willing to "probe" deeply into military matters through an "unequal dialogue" with their professional military subordinates. Commenting in May 2003 on the Bush administration's performance, Cohen noted approvingly that "it appears that Rumsfeld is a very active secretary of defense, rather along the lines essential for a good civil-military dialogue: pushing, probing, querying. But not, I think, dictating in detail what the military should do. [On Iraq,] the Bush administration was engaged in what was a very intensive dialogue with senior military leadership, and I think that was right." As late as April of 2006, Cohen still thought that "one could say much to defend Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld against the recent attacks of half a dozen retired generals" who criticized his (and his deputies') handling of the Iraq war.

#### 10. CMR is Resilient – Gates and high-ranking Generals respect Obama

Schake 9

Schake, fellow at the Hoover Institution and holds the Distinguished Chair in International Security Studies at the United States Military Academy, 9-4-‘9 (Kori, “So far so good for civil military relations under Obama,” Foreign Policy, http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/09/04/so\_far\_so\_good\_for\_civil\_military\_relations\_under\_obama)

Crucial to Feingold's argument is that the Afghan people resent our military involvement. Both McChrystal, and now Gates, are persuaded that is not true. They argue that how we operate in Afghanistan will determine Afghan support to a much greater degree than the size of the force. Gates for the first time yesterday signaled his support for further force increases on that basis, indicating he will not be a political firewall for the White House if McChrystal and Mullen advocate politically uncomfortable increases.

Afghanistan was always going to be a central national security issue, because President Obama had campaigned and carried over into governance his argument that it was the "right" war and negligently under-resourced during the Bush administration. Even with domestic anti-war sentiment on the rise and a potential rebellion by Congressional Democrats against funding the Afghan mission, Obama is seemingly trapped into supporting the military commander's troop requests. Hard to imagine the Houdini contortion that lets him sustain his claim that his predecessor neglected the most important war and then refuse troops to a commander who you put into position and who is supported by a well-respected Defense Secretary.

Yet the President may -- and perhaps should -- do exactly that, and for reasons that are laudable in our system of civil-military relations. The American way of organizing for warfare has distinct responsibilities for the leading military and civilian participants. To work up the ladder, it's the military commander's job to survey the requirements for success and make recommendations. It's the job of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to evaluate the military judgment of that strategy and resourcing, advising the Secretary and the President on its soundness and other possible courses of military action. It's the Secretary of Defense's job to figure out how to provide those resources from a limited pool of people and equipment, to identify and manage the risk it creates for other operations and objectives (e.g., Iraq, managing China's rise, deterring North Korea, etc). It is the Commander in Chief's job to establish the war's objectives and determine whether they merit the resources it would require to be successful. He may determine the objectives are too costly in themselves, or that achieving them would distract too much effort from other national priorities, or that we do not have the necessary partners in the Karzai government to achieve our objectives.

It should go without saying that it is not the National Security Advisor's job to intimidate military commanders into dialing down their requests to politically comfortable levels, although that is what Jim Jones is reported to have done when visiting Afghanistan during the McChrystal review. Such politicization of military advice ought to be especially noxious to someone who'd been both the Commandant of the Marine Corps and a Combatant Commander. When the Bob Woodward article recounting Jones' attempted manipulation as published, Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen commendably defended McChrystal's independence. It is also curious that the one person invisible in this debate, as in the debate about relieving General McKiernan, is the CENTCOM commander, General Petraeus.

But beneficially and importantly for our country, policy debates over the war in

Afghanistan indicate that the system of civil-military relations is clearly working as designed. We owe much to Gates, Mullen, and McChrystal for shielding the process from politicization and providing military advice the President needs to make decisions only he can make.

## K

### Generic K

1. **Our interpretation is that the negative gets to defend a competitive policy alternative**
2. **Predictability – there are millions of representations that we can’t predict – the resolution says USFG so we should debate that – predictability is key to fairness**
3. **Education – policy discussions foster better informed debate that can be adapted to the real world**

Stefano **Guzzini**, Assistant Professor at Central European University, “The enduring dilemmas of realism in International Relations,” Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, December 2001, http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/gus02/gus02.pdf, accessed 8/13/02

Contrary to Waltz, Gunther Hellmann does not leave the debate at this unfinished stage. Starting from the same Friedmanian pragmatist grounding that a theory is good as long as it works or functions, he wants a return to the common language of academia and practice by pushing academia back to the language of the practitioner, yet by keeping the advantage of the outside observer. More openly than Waltz, he plays down the need for scientific respectability, but by offering a more philosophically grounded argument. The grounding is provided by the recourse to the philosophy of science, more particularly to modern versions of “pragmatism”, represented in particular, but not only, by Richard Rorty. For Hellmann, pragmatism has done the job in undermining the credentials of positivism and all what comes with it. This move takes the ground away for the need of any of the classical justifications in IR theory. Any version of the correspondence theory of truth, any version of scientific realism, any version of falsification is wrong-headed, if understood in a logical theoretical way. Such devices are just this: scholarly habits devised through the tradition of a scientific community. But pragmatism is also not succumbing to the sirens of poststructuralism whose theorising, according to him, is purely de-constructing and has lost any major connection with real problems.

#### 1. The K is a voter—

* 1. **Floating PICs bad – moot the 1AC and kill Aff’s ability to weigh impacts**
  2. **Utopian fiat – kills fairness – the Aff can’t generate any offense against a perfect world**
  3. **Vague alt – no way to generate competitive perms because they can spike out of them – no stable advocacy – justifies perm do the alt**
  4. **At worst we can weigh our impacts against the K**
  5. **And, we can sever our representations – it’s no different than kicking an advantage. Don’t make us defend every possible discursive underpinning of the plan.**

#### 2. Perm do the plan and reject in all other instances; either the alt can’t overcome this one link in which case it’s not strong enough to overcome the status quo or it does solve, meaning the plan isn’t a crucial link.

#### 3. The K cedes the political—

#### a. Cedes the political to right – that dooms their project and makes atrocities and extinction inevitable

Boggs, 97 (CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved -- perhaps even unrecognized -- only to fester more ominouslyinto the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases,technological displacement ofworkers) c**annot be understood outside the larger social and global context** of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. **Paradoxically,** the **widespread retreat from politics**, often inspired by localist sentiment, **comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence.** In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. **By** diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 **In the meantime, the** **fate of the world hangs in the balance**. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United **S**tates, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies.This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites -- an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise -- or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec- tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75

#### b. Perm do both Anti-politics makes extinction inevitable

Small, 06 (Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition,“Moving Forward,” *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, the new century will present challenges that require collective action, unity, and enlightened self-interest. Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability will require cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all solidarity – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. Our very existence depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society. With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation. Unlike any other crisis before, the noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events. Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, we need to teach cooperation, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. It will require a radical transformation of our conception of education. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, civic engagement, and service learning in education will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world. Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government and commerce,have the potential for positive change.Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

#### 4. Discourse doesn’t shape policymaking

**Tuathail, 96** (Gearóid, Professor of Government and International Affairs, Virginia Tech, The patterned mess of history and the writing of critical geopolitics: a reply to Dalby, Political Geography 15:6/7, p 661-

**While theoretical debates** at academic conferences **are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of** foreign-policy **decisionmakers are** quite different, **so different that they constitute a distinctive** problemsolving, theory-averse, **policy-making subculture**. There is a danger that **academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant** in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many that sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby’s fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement-‘Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought’-evades the important question of agency that I noted in my review essay. **The assumption that** it is **representations** that **make action possible is inadequate** by itself. **Political, military and economic** structures, **institutions**, discursive networks and leadership **are** all **crucial** in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby’s reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby’s fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD, not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses, root the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public-policy reasoning on national security. Dalby’s book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and poststructuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby’s interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev’s reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly selfinterested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographers to engage, there is a danger of **fetishizing** this **concern with discourse** so that we **neglect** the **institutional** and the **sociological**, the materialist and the **cultural**, the **political and** the **geographical contexts within which** particular **discursive strategies become significant**. Critical geopolitics, in other words, should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies ‘poststructuralism nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.

#### 5. Vague alternatives jack solvency – it’s impossible to test their claims, allowing them to sketch out of all criticism – specific policy proposals are key to political change.

Galles, 09 (Gary, Professor of Economics at Pepperdine, “Vagueness as a Political Strategy,” http://blog.mises.org/9529/vagueness-as-a-political-strategy/)

In the Los Angeles Times, writer Bob Rosenblatt characterized President Obama’s strategy for his health care proposal as “Give me a bunch of money, and we’ll figure out the details later how we are going to manage this thing.” In other words, its key element is vagueness. The problem with such vagueness is that any informed public policy decision has to be based on specific proposals. Absent concrete details, which is where the devil lurks, no one–including those proposing a “reform”–can judge how it would fare or falter in the real world. So when the President wants approval for a proposal which offers too few details for evaluation, we must ask why. Like private sector salesmen, politicians strive to present their wares as attractively as possible. Unlike them, however, a politician’s product line consists of claimed consequences of proposals not yet enacted. Further, politicians are unconstrained by truth in advertising laws, which would require that claims be more than misleading half-truths; they have fewer competitors keeping them honest; and they face “customers”–voters– far more ignorant about the merchandise involved than those spending their own money. These differences from the private sector explain why politicians’ “sales pitches” for their proposals are so vague. However, if vague proposals are the best politicians can offer, they are inadequate. If rhetoric is unmatched by specifics, there is no reason to believe a policy change will be an improvement, because no reliable way exists to determine whether it will actually accomplish what is promised. Only the details will determine the actual incentives facing the decision-makers involved, which is the only way to forecast the results, including the myriad of unintended consequences from unnoticed aspects. We must remember that, however laudable, goals and promises and claims of cost-effectiveness that are inconsistent with the incentives created will go unmet. It may be that President Obama knows too little of his “solution” to provide specific plans. If so, he knows too little to deliver on his promises. Achieving intended goals then necessarily depends on blind faith that Obama and a panoply of bureaucrats, legislators, overseers and commissions will somehow adequately grasp the entire situation, know precisely what to do about it, and do it right (and that the result will not be too painful, however serious the problem)–a prospect that, due to the painful lessons of history, attracts few real believers. Alternatively, President Obama may know the details of what he intends, but is not providing them to the public. But if it is necessary to conceal a plan’s details to put the best possible public face on it, those details must be adverse. If they made a more persuasive sales pitch, a politician would not hide actual details. They would be trumpeted at every opportunity, proving to a skeptical public he really had the answers, since concealing rather than revealing pays only when better informed citizens would be more inclined to reject a plan. Claiming adherence to elevated principles, but keeping detailed proposals from sight, also has a strategic advantage. It defuses critics. Absent details, any criticism can be parried by saying “that was not in our proposal” or “we have no plans to do that” or other rhetorical devices. It also allows a candidate to incorporate alternatives proposed as part of his evolving reform, as if it was his idea all along. The new administration has already put vague proposals on prominent display. However, adequate analysis cannot rest upon such flimsy foundations. That requires the nuts and bolts so glaringly absent. In the private sector, people don’t spend their own money on such vague promises of unseen products. It is foolhardy to act any differently when political salesmen withhold specifics, because political incentives guarantee that people would object to what is kept hidden. So while vagueness may be good political strategy, it virtually ensures bad policy, if Americans’ welfare is the criterion.

#### 6. Empirically testable physical theories are the only relevant consideration

**Yudkowsky, 06** (Eliezer, Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence, “Cognitive biases potentially affecting judgment of global risks,” forthcoming in *Global Catastrophic Risks*, August 31)

**Every true idea which discomforts you will seem to match the pattern of at least one psychological error.** Robert Pirsig said: "**The world's biggest fool can say the sun is shining, but that doesn't make it dark out." If you believe someone is guilty of a psychological error, then demonstrate your competence by first demolishing their consequential factual errors. If there are no factual errors, then what matters the psychology? The temptation of psychology is that, knowing a little psychology, we can meddle in arguments where we have no technical expertise** - instead sagely analyzing the psychology of the disputants. **If someone wrote a novel about an asteroid strike destroying modern civilization, then someone might criticize that novel as extreme, dystopian, apocalyptic; symptomatic of the author's naive inability to deal with a complex technological society. We should recognize this as a literary criticism, not a scientific one; it is about good or bad novels, not good or bad hypotheses. To quantify the annual probability of an asteroid strike in real life, one must study astronomy and the historical record: no amount of literary criticism can put a number on it**. Garreau (2005) seems to hold that a scenario of a mind slowly increasing in capability, is more mature and sophisticated than a scenario of extremely rapid intelligence increase. But that's a technical question, not a matter of taste; no amount of psychologizing can tell you the exact slope of that curve. **It's harder to abuse heuristics and biases than psychoanalysis. Accusing someone of conjunction fallacy leads naturally into listing the specific details that you think are burdensome and drive down the joint probability**. Even so, do not lose track of the realworld facts of primary interest; **do not let the argument become about psychology**. Despite all dangers and temptations, it is better to know about psychological biases than to not know. **Otherwise we will walk directly into the whirling helicopter blades of life**. But **be very careful not to have too much fun accusing others of biases. That is the road that leads to becoming a sophisticated arguer - someone who, faced with any discomforting argument, finds at once a bias in it. The one whom you must watch above all is yourself.** Jerry Cleaver said: "What does you in is not failure to apply some high-level, intricate, complicated technique. It's overlooking the basics. Not keeping your eye on the ball." **Analyses should finally center on testable real-world assertions. Do not take your eye off the ball**.

### Security K

#### 1. Case outweighs – Our case impacts are real and prevent the total deaths of thousands of people. The root cause of these impacts is not security. And floating PIKs are infinitely regressive, they justify zero topic research on the neg and moots the 1AC. Voting issue for fairness and education

#### 2. Perm do both Threats aren’t arbitrary. Can’t throw out security or wish away threatening postures—we have to develop strategies for coping with threat perceptions.

Olav. F. Knudsen, Prof @ Södertörn Univ College, ‘1 [*Security Dialogue* 32.3, “Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing  Securitization,” p. 360]

In the post-Cold War period,  agenda-setting has been much easier to influence than the securitization approach assumes. That change cannot be credited to the concept; the change in  security politics was already taking place in defense ministries and parlia-  ments before the concept was first launched. Indeed, securitization in my view  is more appropriate to the security politics of the Cold War years than to the  post-Cold War period.  Moreover, I have a problem with the underlying implication that it is unim-  portant whether states ‘really’ face dangers from other states or groups. In the  Copenhagen school, threats are seen as coming mainly from the actors’ own  fears, or from what happens when the fears of individuals turn into paranoid  political action. In my view, this emphasis on the subjective is a misleading  conception of threat, in that it discounts an independent existence for what-  ever is perceived as a threat. Granted, political life is often marked by misper-  ceptions, mistakes, pure imaginations, ghosts, or mirages, but such phenom-  ena do not occur simultaneously to large numbers of politicians, and hardly most of the time. During the Cold War, threats – in the sense of plausible  possibilities of danger – referred to ‘real’ phenomena, and they refer to ‘real’  phenomena now. The objects referred to are often not the same, but that is a  different matter. Threats have to be dealt with both in terms of perceptions and in  terms of the phenomena which are perceived to be threatening.  The point of Wæver’s concept of security is not the potential existence of  danger somewhere but the use of the word itself by political elites. In his 1997  PhD dissertation, he writes, ‘One can view “security” as that which is in  language theory called a speech act: it is not interesting as a sign referring to  something more real – it is the utterance itself that is the act.’   The deliberate  disregard of objective factors is even more explicitly stated in Buzan & Wæver’s joint article of the same year.   As a consequence, the phenomenon of  threat is reduced to a matter of pure domestic politics.   It seems to me that the  security dilemma, as a central notion in security studies, then loses its founda-  tion. Yet I see that Wæver himself has no compunction about referring to the  security dilemma in a recent article.  This discounting of the objective aspect of threats shifts security studies to  insignificant concerns. What has long made ‘threats’ and ‘threat perceptions’  important phenomena in the study of IR is the implication that urgent action  may be required. Urgency, of course, is where Wæver first began his argu-  ment in favor of an alternative security conception, because a convincing sense  of urgency has been the chief culprit behind the abuse of ‘security’ and the  consequent ‘politics of panic’, as Wæver aptly calls it.   Now, here – in the case  of urgency – another baby is thrown out with the Wæverian bathwater. When  real situations of urgency arise, those situations are challenges to democracy;  they are actually at the core of the problematic arising with the process of  making security policy in parliamentary democracy. But in Wæver’s world,  threats are merely more or less persuasive, and the claim of urgency is just an-  other argument. I hold that instead of ‘abolishing’ threatening phenomena  ‘out there’ by reconceptualizing them, as Wæver does, we should continue  paying attention to them, because situations with a credible claim to urgency  will keep coming back and then we need to know more about how they work  in the interrelations of groups and states (such as civil wars, for instance), not  least to find adequate democratic procedures for dealing with them.

#### 4. Permutation do the plan and rethink security logic -

#### Critique Alone is not adequate to alter the current security environment – Political Action is Necessary

Pinar Bilgin, Prof. of IR @ Bilkent Univ, ‘5 [*Regional Security in The Middle East*, p. 60-1]

Admittedly, providing a critique of existing approaches to security, revealing those hidden assumptions and normative projects embedded in Cold War Security Studies, is only a first step. In other words, from a critical security perspective, **self-reflection, thinking and writing are not enough in themselve**s. They should be compounded by other forms of **practice** (that is, action taken on the ground). It is indeed crucial for students of critical approaches to re-think security in both theory and practice by pointing to possibilities for **change immanent in world politics** and suggesting emancipatory practices if it is going to fulfil the promise of becoming a 'force of change' in world politics. Cognisant of the need to find and suggest alternative practices to meet a broadened security agenda without adopting militarised or zero-sum thinking and practices, students of critical approaches to security have suggested the imagining, creation and **nurturing of security** communities **as emancipatory practices** (Booth 1994a; Booth and Vale 1997). Although Devetak's approach to the theory/practice relationship echoes critical approaches' conception of theory as a form of practice, the latter seeks to go further in shaping global practices. The distinction Booth makes between 'thinking about thinking' and 'thinking about doing' grasps the difference between the two. Booth (1997: 114) writes: Thinking about thinking is important, but, more urgently, so is **thinking about doing** .... Abstract ideas about emancipation **will not suffice:** it is important for Critical Security Studies to engage with the real by **suggesting policies**, agents, and sites of change, **to help humankind,** in whole and in part, to move away from its structural wrongs. In this sense, providing a critique of existing approaches to security, revealing those hidden assumptions and normative projects embedded in Cold War Security Studies**, is only a first** (albeit crucial) step. It is vital for the students of critical approaches to re-think security in both theory and **practice**.

#### 5. Rejecting all security destroys the potential for emancipation. The alt prevents Safety, the only foundation for human flourishing

Ken Booth, Prof. of IR @ Wales, ‘5 [*Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, p. 22]

The best starting point for conceptualizing security lies in the real conditions of insecurity suffered by people and collectivities. Look around. What is immediately striking is that some degree of insecurity, as a life determining condition, is universal. To the extent an individual or group is insecure, to that extent their life choices and chances **are taken away**; this is because of the resources and energy they need to invest in seeking safety from domineering threats - whether these are the lack of food for one’s children or organizing to resist a foreign aggressor. The corollary of the relationship between insecurity and a determined life is that **a degree of security creates life possibilities**. Security might therefore be conceived as synonymous with **opening up space in people’s lives.** This allows for individual and collective **human becoming** - the capacity to have some choice about living differently - consistent with the same but different search by others. Two interrelated conclusions follow from this. First, security can be understood as an instrumental value; it frees its possessors to a greater or lesser extent from life-determining constraints and so allows different life possibilities to be explored. Second, security is synonymous simply with survival. One can survive without being secure (the experience of refugees in long-term camps in war-torn parts of the world, for example). Security is therefore **more than mere** animal survival (basic animal existence). It is survival-plus, the plus being the **possibility to explore human becoming**, As an instrumental value, security is sought because it frees people(s) to some degree to do other than deal with threats to their human being. The achievement of a level of security - and security is always relative - gives to individuals and groups some time, energy, and scope to chose **to be or become**, **other than merely survival as human biological organisms**. Security is an important dimension of the process by which the human species can reinvent itself beyond the merely biological.

#### 6. The alternative fails – realism is inevitable

Guzzini 98 (Stefano Guzzini, Professor at the Central European University, 1998 Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy)

Third, this last chapter has argued that although the evolution of realism has been mainly a disappointment as a general causal theory, we haveto deal with it. On the one hand, realist assumptions and insights are used and merged in nearly all frameworks of analysis offered in International Relations or International Political Economy. One of the book's purposes was to show realism as a varied and variably rich theory, so heterogeneous that it would be better to refer to it only in plural terms. On the other hand, to dispose of realism because some of its versions have been proven empirically wrong, ahistorical, or logically incoherent, does not necessarily touch its role in the shared understandings of observers and practitioners of international affairs. Realist theories have a persisting power for constructing our understanding of the present. Their assumptions, both as theoretical constructs, and as particular lessons of the past translated from one generation of decision-makers to another, help mobilizing certain understandings and dispositions to action. They also provide them with legitimacy. Despite realism's several deaths as a general causal theory, it can still powerfully enframe action. It exists in the minds, and is hence reflected in the actions, of many practitioners. Whether or not the world realism depicts is out there, realism is. Realism is not a causal theory that explains International Relations, but as long as realism continues to be a powerful mind-set we need to understand realism to make sense of International Relations. In other words, realism is a still necessary hermeneutical bridge to the understanding of world politics. Getting rid of realism without having a deep understanding of it, not only risks unwarranted dismissal of some valuable theoretical insights that I have tried to gather in this book, it would also be futile. Indeed, it might be the best way to tacitly and uncritically reproduce it.

#### 7. Critiques of State-Centered Security Sacrifice the Most Important Political Actor - Loss Options Far outweighs the danger of Legitimation

Olav. F. Knudsen, Prof @ Södertörn Univ College, ‘1 [*Security Dialogue* 32.3, “Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing Securitization,” p. 364]

Though hardly the first to make this ar-gument, Holsti shows convincingly that internal wars are now by far the most important kind of war. This point has been used to argue that interstate rela- tions have decreased in significance. If we compare two categories of relations, intrastate and interstate, that is of course true in relative quantitative terms. However, one must not overlook what those wars are about: the control of the state apparatus and its territory. Internal wars testify not to the disappearance of the state, but to its continuing importance. Hence, the state must continue to be a central object of our work in IR, not least in security studies. We should study the state – conceived as a penetrated state – specifically because it performs essential security functions that are rarely performed by other types of organization, such as being: • the major collective unit processing notions of threat; • the mantle that cloaks the exercise of elite power; • the organizational expression that gives shape to communal ‘identity’ and ‘culture’; • the chief agglomeration of competence to deal with issue areas crossing ju- risdictional boundaries; • the manager of territory/geographical space – including functioning as a ‘receptacle’ for income; and • the legitimizer of authorized action and possession. Recognizing the problems of state-focused approaches belongs to the **beginner’s lessons in IR.** There is the danger of legitimizing the state as such by placing it at the center of research, and of legitimizing thereby the repression and injustice which on a massive scale have been and still are perpetrated in its name around the globe. Some draw the conclusion on this basis that states should not be studied, a stance which is obviously **unwarranted and pointless.** The state is an instrument of power on a scale beyond most other instruments of power. For this reason alone, **keeping a watch on** how it is used should **be a top priority for social scientists.** The mobilization – the assumption of the mantle – of state power by more or less arbitrarily chosen (or self-selected) individuals or groups, to act on behalf of all, is something which requires continual problematization, not least when it is done vis-à-vis other collectivities. The state **is also the** instrument of de- mocracy on a large scale in its most well-functioning forms. Surveying democ- racy’s state of health is a crucial responsibility for social scientists. Finally, when it comes to performing collective tasks on a large scale, the state is the most **potentially effective organizing instrument** across an almost limitless range of objectives. Security is among them. In short, **the state is too central to** the large-scale business of human life to be ignored or put aside, whether for ideological or idealistic reasons. Still, we need to recognize the historical dimension in this. It is not necessarily the state’s present form which makes it an important object of study; rather, it is its primary function of being the largest universal-purpose collective-action unit around. Such units require study in all civilizations and at all times in human history, regardless of their name or specific functions. The Westpha- lian preoccupation of IR is therefore somewhat **overdrawn**. **There is no need to apologize for focusing on states or state-like units.**

#### 8. Permutation do the plan and reject all other instances of securitized thought – double bind – either the alternative should be able to overcome the residual link to the aff or it can’t solve.

9. Our scenario-evaluations are crucial for ethically responsible politics. A theoretical kritik is insufficient—we need realistic *as if* stories to generate changes in practice.

Michael C. **WILLIAMS** International Politics @ Wales (Aberystwyth) ‘**5** The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations p.165-167

Moreover, the links between sceptical realism and prevalent post-modern themes go more deeply than this, particularly as they apply to attempts by post-structural thinking to reopen questions of responsibility and ethics. In part, the goals of post-structural approaches can be usefully characterised, to borrow Stephen White's illuminating contrast, as expressions of 'responsibility to otherness' which question and challenge modernist equations of responsibility with a 'responsibility to act'. A responsibility to otherness seeks to reveal and open the constitutive processes and claims of subjects and subjectivities that a foundational modernism has effaced in its narrow identification of responsibility with a 'responsibility to act?' Deconstruction can from this perspective be seen as a principled stance unwilling to succumb to modernist essentialism which in the name of responsibility assumes and reifies, subjects and structures, obscures forms of power and violence which are constitutive of them, and at the same time forecloses a consideration of alternative possibilities and practices.

Yet it is my claim that the wilful Realist tradition does not lack an understanding of the

contingency of practice or a vision of responsibility to otherness. On the contrary. its strategy of objectification is precisely an attempt to bring together a responsibility to otherness and a responsibility to act within a wilfully liberal vision. The construction of a realm of objectivity and calculation is not just a consequence of a need to act - the framing of an epistemic context for successful calculation. It is a form of responsibility to otherness, an attempt to allow for diversity and irreconcilability precisely by - at least initially - reducing the self and the other to a structure of material calculation in order to allow a structure of mutual intelligibility, mediation, and stability. It is, in short, a strategy of limitation: a wilful attempt to construct a subject and a social world limited - both epistemically and politically - in the name of a politics of toleration: a liberal strategy that John Gray has recently characterised as one of modus vivendi. If this is the case, then the deconstructive move that gains some of its weight by contrasting itself to a non- or apolitical objectivism must engage with the more complex contrast to a sceptical Realist tradition that is itself a constructed, ethical practice. This issue becomes even more acute if one considers Iver Neumann's incisive questions concerning postmodem constructions of identity, action, and responsibility. 83 Neumann points out, the insight that identities are inescapably contingent and relationally constructed, and even the claim that identities

Inescapably indebted to othemess, do not in themselves provide a foundation for practice, particularly in situations where identities are 'sedimented' and conflictually defined. In these cases, deconstruction alone will not suffice unless it can demonstrate a capacity to counter in practice (and not just in philosophic practice) the essentialist dynamics it confronts)44 Here, a responsibility to act must go beyond deconstruction to consider viable alternatives and counter-practices.

To take this critique seriously is not necessarily to be subject yet again to the straightforward 'blackmail of the Enlightenment' and a narrow 'modernist' vision of responsibility." While an unwillingness to move beyond a deconstructive ethic of responsibility to otherness for fear that an essentialist stance is the only (or most likely) alternative expresses a legitimate concern, it should not license a retreat from such questions or their practical demands. Rather, such situations demand also an evaluation of the structures (of identity and institutions) that might ***viably*** be mobilised in order to offset the worst implications of violently exclusionary identities It requires. as Neumann nicely puts it, the generation of compelling 'as if' stories around which counter-subjectivities and political practices can coalesce. Wilful Realism, 1 submit, arises out of an appreciation of these issues, and comprises an attempt to craft precisely such 'stories' within a broader intellectual and sociological analysis of their conditions of production, possibilities of success, and likely consequences. The question is, to what extent are these limits capable of success-and to what extent might they be limits upon their own aspirations to responsibility? These are crucial questions, but they will not be addressed by retreating yet again into further reversals of the same old dichotomies.

#### 10. Desecuritization Cedes the political - Political engagement is Necessary in order to allow continued progress.

#### 11. Violence results from changes to the system inspired by criticism

Alastair Murray, Politics Department, University of Wales Swansea, Reconstructing Realism, 1997, p. 181-182

This highlights the central difficulty with Wendt's constructivism. It is not any form of unfounded idealism about the possibility of effecting a change in international politics. Wendt accepts that the intersubjective character of international institutions such as self‑help render them relatively hard social facts. Rather, what is problematic is his faith that such change, if it could be achieved, implies progress. Wendt's entire approach is governed by the belief that the problematic elements of international politics can be transcended, that the competitive identities which create these elements can be reconditioned, and that the predatory policies which underlie these identities can be eliminated. Everything, in his account, is up for grabs: there is no core of recalcitrance to human conduct which cannot be reformed, unlearnt, disposed of. This generates a stance that so privileges the possibility of a systemic transformation that it simply puts aside the difficulties which it recognises to be inherent in its achievement. Thus, even though Wendt acknowledges that the intersubjective basis of the self‑help system makes its reform difficult, this does not dissuade him. He simply demands that states adopt a strategy of `altercasting', a strategy which `tries to induce alter to take on a new identity (and thereby enlist alter in ego's effort to change itself) by treating alter *as if* it already had that identity'. Wendt's position effectively culminates in a demand that the state undertake nothing less than a giant leap of faith. The fact that its opponent might not take its overtures seriously, might not be interested in reformulating its own construction of the world, or might simply see such an opening as a weakness to be exploited, are completely discounted. The prospect of achieving a systemic transformation simply outweighs any adverse consequences which might arise from the effort to achieve it. Wendt ultimately appears, in the final analysis, to have overdosed on `Gorbimania'.

12. The Critique’s Obsession with Representations Blocks ANY Productive Change to International Relations - It Creates an Unavoidable epistemological crisis

Morten Valbjørn, PhD in the Department of Political Science @ Aarhus, ‘4 [*Middle East and Palestine: Global Politics and Regional Conflict,* “Culture Blind and Culture Blinded: Images of Middle Eastern Conflicts in International Relations,” p. 67-8]]

As mentioned before, the relational perspective is a critique of both the neglect of the issue of Otherness by the IR mainstream and the way in which proponents of an essentialist approach relate to the Other. For this reason, it would be natural to assume that proponents of this second attempt to "culturalize" the study of international relations would be particularly keen to address the question of how to acknowledge cultural diversity without committing the sins of orientalism. Indeed, this is also what Said is stressing in the introduction to Orientalism: The most important task of all would be to undertake studies in contemporary alternatives to Orientalism, to ask how one can study other cultures and peoples from a libertarian, or nonrepressive and non-manipulative perspective. (1995: 24) However, he then goes on to add that "these are all tasks left embarrassingly incomplete in this study" (Said, 1995: 24). Looking at other analyses based on a relational conception of culture, it becomes apparent that the latter remark is very telling for this kind of understanding of culture as a whole (e.g. Doty, 1993: 315). Despite a blank rejection of the universalism of IR mainstream and, at least in principle, a recognition of the existence of different Others who are not only projections of own fantasies and desires, in practice, proponents of this alternative approach nonetheless usually leave the question of how to address and approach the actual cultural Other unanswered. This might very well be an unintended outcome of the previously mentioned radical constructivism associated with this approach. Thus, by stressing how the representation of the Other is intimately related to the construction of identities or a subtle way of performing power, one risks being caught in a kind of epistemological and moral crisis, characterized by a nagging doubt about whether it really is possible to gain any knowledge of Others or if we are just projecting our own fantasies, and by a pronounced fear that our representations are silencing voices so that we unwittingly are taking part in a subtle performance of power (Hastrup, 1992: 54). In merely dealing with the relationship between the representcr and his representations, these dilemmas can be "avoided." However, at the same time one writes off the opportunity to relate to cultural diversity as anything but discursive products of one's own fantasies and projections. This is precisely the critique that supporters of the relational understanding of culture have been facing. From this perspective, it appears less surprising that Said has had so much more to offer on the dynamics of Western representations of the Middle East than on real alternatives to the orientalist depiction of the region. Unfortunately, this second bid for a culturalistic approach to the study of international relations is not only aligned with a number of very welcome critical qualities that may enrich the study of international relations. It is also related to a problematic tendency to overreact when it comes to addressing the prevalent Blindness to the Self within IR mainstream and among subscribers to the essentialist conception of culture. Thus, aspirations of promoting a larger self consciousness in the study of international relation end up becoming self-centerednes**s**, just as the attempt to promote a larger sensitivity toward the Other in reality becomes oversensitivity to saying anything substantial when it comes to actual Other. This is problematic, partly because we are left without any real idea as to how to approach actual Middle Eastern international relations rather than Western representations of these; and partly because there is the risk of losing sight of the material and very concrete consequences that specific representations may engender (Krishna, 1993). Also, the proponents of this second "culturalistic" alternative seem to be better at asking important and critical questions than at offering attractive answers.

13. Their role of the ballot claims construct an omnipotent theorist—this construct is more dangerous than the provisional and limited claims of security.

Ole **WAEVER** Senior Research Fellow @ Copenhagen Peace Research Inst. **‘2K** in *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration* eds. Kelstrup and Williams p. 282-283

This chapter has largely taken its questions train the traditional agenda and its answers from a much less traditional quarters. The establishment is likely to have some problems accepting the logic a1 the reply (even if it might like where it ends) - and the post-structuralist will hesitate before granting the terms for the question, the phrasing of the problematique. Who says we need security systems? Isn't this to accept 'the anarchy problematique'? Does it presuppose a need for arrangements to curtail sonw kind of natural or inherent violence and anarchy? Yes and no. Yes, world politics is indeed complex unstable - and could easily be called anarchic. Many unpleasant possibilities can be imagined, and some are sufficiently likely to justify a term like pessimism. Still, this is exactly not the anarchy problematique in its traditional IR sense, because as Richard Ashley has pointed out, the anarchy problematique of 'cooperation under anarchy' and other rational choice themes 'assumes to be solved, the burner part of the problem it purports to state' (1988: 229). The lack of central rule can easily be admitted, but the dominant IR agenda is produced by moving immediately from this - the real anarchy - to a specific articulation of the question in the form of sovereign states rationally calculating their mutual relations. Resisting the 'heroic practice' of the sovereignty/anarchy blackmail, we do not get an ordered, peaceful world order - quite the contrary, we are left with that excessive amount of openness and indecision which is mostly held to be intolerable and therefore absorbed into the anarchy problematique. 'The absence of a central agency of rule would mean only that, an absence of a central agency of rule' jibed.. 2391. Like classical realism, this anarchy without the anarchy problematique points to a world of little stability, few guarantees and much violence of many sans. Mainstream canstructivists only avoid this confusing world by de facto riding on much of the disciplining and promises of the anarchy problematique: state-centredness (allegedly only as an academic assumption), domestic order and an agenda of inter-state co-operation. If the existing order is - as the classical realist secretly suspect Ashky 1999, 1996) and the post-structuralists claim - built on ultimately arbitrary instalments of self-evidence, meaning and problems, one should be prepared for change to mean nor necessarily gentle improvement but possibly (or most likely) quite dramatic changes which no-one can guarantee will be for the better. This Ashleyan image of realists as almost knowingly fighting an abyss of indeterminancy, creating limitations but not out of rigidity or narrow- mindedness but in order to create order, contrasts strongly with the dominant self-image of most critical international relationists (most constructivists and some post-structuralists). They usually picture the problem of realism and rationalism as one of superstition or religion, of the main- stream dogmatically holding on to positivist limitations. This naturally endows the critical theorist with a much nicer position: the one of criticizing, transgressing and thinking the new. Paradoxically, this is the arch- modernist position, the **Enlightenment rhetoric in pure form**. In contrast, we could admit that realists and other rationalists are actually Enlightenment- inspired thinkers - often progressives - who want to improve and transgress but of course have problematized in the dual sense of questioning and of imposing a certain set of limitations by defining the relevant problem. When realists and others resist the openings and modifications suggested by critical theorists, it is often **not** because of pure **epistemological conservativism**, but on the contrary a political practice based on their sense that their order is arbitrary and therefore in need of protection, that e.g. the channelling of violence into a state-based order has been an **enormous historical gain** that is too lightly given up if the implied ontological and epistemological decisions are reversed Walker 1993; Williams 1998)? Then, the decision to go ahead, to question and thereby re-open the historical resolution of difficult political problems, is not taken lightly with a sense of progressing towards a new (liberal-constructivist) dawn, but rather with a diffident sense of making a difficult political choice with unknown consequences

### Apoc K

#### 1. Case outweighs -

#### 2. Perm do the alt

#### 3. Combining a focus on discursive power with political practice is the only way to ensure solvency

**Giroux, 6**. Henry (Penn State Chair of Education and Cultural Studies), *Dirty Democracy and States of Terrorism: The Politics of the New Authoritarianism in the United States* in Comparative Studies of South Asia Volume 26 Number 6, p 176-177.

Abstracted from the ideal of public commitment, the new authoritarianism represents a political and economic practice and form of militarism that loosen the connections among substantive democracy, critical agency, and critical education. In opposition to the rising tide of authoritarianism, educators across the globe must make a case for linking learning to progressive social change while struggling to pluralize and critically engage the diverse sites where public pedagogy takes place. In part, this suggests forming alliances that can make sure every sphere of social life is recognized as an important site of the political, social, and cultural struggle that is so crucial to any attempt to forge the knowledge, identifications, effective investments, and social relations that constitute political subjects and social agents capable of energizing and spreading the basis for a substantive global democracy. Such circumstances require that pedagogy be embraced as a moral and political practice, one that is directive and not dogmatic, an outgrowth of struggles designed to resist the increasing depoliticization of political culture that is the hallmark of the current Bush revolution. Education is the terrain where consciousness is shaped, needs are constructed, and the capacity for individual self-reflection and broad social change is nurtured and produced. Education has assumed an unparalleled significance in shaping the language, values, and ideologies that legitimize the structures and organizations that support the imperatives of global capitalism. Efforts to reduce it to a technique or methodology set aside, education remains a crucial site for the production and struggle over those pedagogical and political conditions that provide the possibilities for people to develop forms of agency that enable them individually and collectively to intervene in the processes through which the material relations of power shape the meaning and practices of their everyday lives. Within the current historical context, struggles over power take on a symbolic and discursive as well as a material and institutional form. The struggle over education is about more than the struggle over meaning and identity; it is also about how meaning, knowledge, and values are produced, authorized, and made operational within economic and structural relations of power. Education is not at odds with politics; it is an important and crucial element in any definition of the political and offers not only the theoretical tools for a systematic critique of authoritarianism but also a language of possibility for creating actual movements for democratic social change and a new biopolitics that affirms life rather than death, shared responsibility rather than shared fears, and engaged citizenship rather than the stripped-down values of consumerism. At stake here is combining symbolic forms and processes conducive to democratization with broader social contexts and the institutional formations of power itself. The key point here is to understand and engage educational and pedagogical practices from the point of view of how they are bound up with larger relations of power. Educators, students, and parents need to be clearer about how power works through and in texts, representations, and discourses, while at the same time recognizing that power cannot be limited to the study of representations and discourses, even at the level of public policy. Changing consciousness is not the same as altering the institutional basis of oppression; at the same time, institutional reform cannot take place without a change in consciousness capable of recognizing not only injustice but also the very possibility for reform, the capacity to reinvent the conditions and practices that make a more just future possible. In addition, it is crucial to raise questions about the relationship between pedagogy and civic culture, on the one hand, and what it takes for individuals and social groups to believe that they have any responsibility whatsoever even to address the realities of class, race, gender, and other specific forms of domination, on the other hand. For too long, the progressives have ignored that the strategic dimension of politics is inextricably connected to questions of critical education and pedagogy, to what it means to acknowledge that education is always tangled up with power, ideologies, values, and the acquisition of both particular forms of agency and specific visions of the future. The primacy of critical pedagogy to politics, social change, and the radical imagination in such dark times is dramatically captured by the internationally renowned sociologist Zygmunt Bauman. He writes, Adverse odds may be overwhelming, and yet a democratic (or, as Cornelius Castoriadis would say, an autonomous) society knows of no substitute for education and self-education as a means to influence the turn of events that can be squared with its own nature, while that nature cannot be preserved for long without "critical pedagogy"—an education sharpening its critical edge, "making society feel guilty" and "stirring things up" through stirring human consciences. The fates of freedom, of democracy that makes it possible while being made possible by it, and of education that breeds dissatisfaction with the level of both freedom and democracy achieved thus far, are inextricably connected and not to be detached from one another. One may view that intimate connection as another specimen of a vicious circle—but it is within that circle that human hopes and the chances of humanity are inscribed, and can be nowhere else.

#### 4. Perm do both - Double bind- Either the alternative can solve the links to the plan, or it fails because it cant overcome the squo

#### 5. Perm do the plan and then the alt in all other instances

#### 6. No alt Solvency- Debate about apocalyptic impacts is crucial to activism and effective policy education

Blain – professor of Sociology – 91

Michael Blain, RHETORICAL PRACTICE IN AN ANTI-NUCLEAR WEAPONS CAMPAIGN, Peace & Change

Peace activism can be understood as a sociopolitical performance. It enacts a pattern of discourse that can be rhetorically analyzed in terms of its strategy of incitement. As peace activists mobilized their forces in the 1980s, they built up a discourse -- a repertoire of possible political statements for use against nuclear weapons policies. Such statements as nuclear annihilation, radiation pollution, and strategic madness have been the primary incitements to peace activism. Activists use language pragmatically. As political actors addressing a public audience, they know they must speak a language familiar to that audience. Nineteenth-century activists were educated, middle-class women, clergymen, educators, and businessmen with a reform Christian conscience. Twentieth-century activists have included political leftists and cultural dissidents as well as traditional pacifists and religious liberals.(n1) Middle-class professionals have played prominent roles in the peace movement. For example, medical activists like Helen Caldicott and Robert Lifton have elaborated a discourse on the madness of "nuclearism"(n2) In fact, some analysts interpret the peace movement as a power struggle of middle-class radicals and countercultural rebels against the power elite.(n3) This article presents the results of a rhetorical analysis of activists' discursive practices in a victorious campaign to defeat a U.S. government plan to construct the first new nuclear weapons plant in twenty years in the state of Idaho, the Special Isotope Separator (SIS). It shows how activists in the Snake River Alliance (SRA), a Boise, Idaho, antinuclear organization, mobilized hundreds of "Idahoans" to act as "concerned citizens" and "Life Guards," to lobby, testify, demonstrate, and finally, to kill this plan. The article introduces a perspective on how discourse functions in political movements. An effective movement discourse must accomplish two things: (1) knowledge, or the constitution of the subjects and objects of struggle, and (2) ethics, or the moral incitement of people to political action. I will show how this perspective can illuminate how anti-SIS activists developed an effective discourse to kill this crucial nuclear weapons program. A critical evaluation of this campaign can contribute to peace in at least three ways: it can celebrate the artful practices these activists engaged in to achieve their political objectives; it can add a case study of a victorious campaign to the emerging literature on the tactics of nonviolent action; and finally, it can contribute to the current debate about the future of the peace movement in a post-cold war world. The anti-SIS campaign involved an alliance of environmental and peace groups, which suggests one possible political strategy for future peace actions. POLITICAL MOVEMENTS AS VICTIMAGE RITUALS Political activists must engage in discourse to fight and win power struggles with their adversaries. In political battles, such as the anti-SIS campaign, words are weapons with tactical functions. Michel Foucault clearly articulates this perspective: Indeed, it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together. And for this reason, we must conceive discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable ... as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies. It is this distribution that we must reconstruct ... according to who is speaking, his position of power, the institutional context in which he happens to be situated ... with the shifts and reutilizations of identical formulas for contrary objectives.(n4) A power strategy refers to all means, including discursive practices, put into play by an actor in a particular power relationship to influence the actions of others. The language of political movements, including peace activism, is militaristic; activists talk strategy, tactics, and objectives. And it is important to see that discourse is itself a part of any power strategy. Kenneth Burke's concepts of victimage rhetoric and rituals can be used to illuminate this process.(n5) Political activists use victimage rhetoric to mobilize people to fight and defeat their adversaries. Victimage rhetoric is melodramatic in form. It functions to incite those who identify with it to engage in political acts of ritual scapegoating. Activists mobilize people to engage in activism by getting them to identify with an actual or impending violation of some communal "ideal"--a problem, concern, or danger. Activists mount "education" campaigns to get the public to identify with the imminent danger. A critical knowledge of the nature of this danger is constructed, taking the form of villainous powers inflicting or threatening to inflict some terrible wrong on the world. This rhetorical practice is tactical in the sense that it is designed to generate intense anger and moral outrage at what has, is, or could be happening to the values of those who identify with it. These people can then be mobilized in a campaign to fight the villain. This effect is intensified by emphasizing the negative features of the actions of the agents and agencies responsible for the violation. Once implanted, this knowledge exerts an ethical incitement to activism. Activists, this model suggests, must develop a discourse that does two things: vilify and activate. These two functions correspond to two moments in a melodramatic victimage ritual. These two moments of identification are (1) acts of violation or vilification and (2) acts of redemptive or heroic action. Movement leaders must construct images of both villains and activists fighting villains. They must convince us that acts of violation have occurred or will happen, and then they must goad us into doing something about it. This analysis suggests that a movement discourse is a rhetorical system composed of two elements working in tandem. One of the main features of motive in victimage ritual is the aim to destroy the destroyer. In the anti- SIS campaign, as we shall see, the objective was to kill a Department of Energy (DOE) program to build a nuclear weapons plant. One means of accomplishing that objective was to vilify its proponents. The second element in a movement discourse is redemptive or ethical. Once leaders succeed in convincing their followers that there is a real threat, they must then incite those convinced to act. To accomplish these objectives, peace activists have assembled a discourse charged with peril and power--a knowledge of the scene they confront and an ethic of political activism. They have constituted a "knowledge" of the dangers posed by the nuclear arms race and nuclear war that is infused with a redemptive ethic of political activism. Activists use this knowledge and ethic to goad people into campaigns to achieve antinuclear objectives. For example, activists have invoked the term power in two distinct ethical senses. There is the "bad" power of the agents of the nuclear arms race (politicians such as Ronald Reagan or Margaret Thatcher; agencies such as the U.S. government, NATO, or the Department of Energy). And there is the "good" power that activists produce by their concerted political actions, including a subjective effect called "empowerment." Activists empower themselves by "taking personal responsibility for the fate of the earth," sacrificing time, energy, and money to the cause. By engaging in political activism, peace activists say they transcend psychological despair and obtain a sense of personal power.(n6)

#### Discourse is a poor framework – it trades-off with the political, which is a pre-requisite to remedying their kritik

Jill Taft-**Kaufman**, Speech Professor at Central Michigan University, **1995**

["Other Ways,” Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60. Iss. 3, OCRed]

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness." and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentialitv isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics—conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts. postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness, phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy **academic** **substitute for actual engagement** with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530)

#### 7. Human extinction is the greatest act of suffering imaginable – using scientific methods to forestall extinction is crucial

Epstein and Zhao 9 – Lab of Medicine @ Hong Kong

Richard J. Epstein and Y. Zhao ‘9 – Laboratory of Computational Oncology, Department of Medicine, University of Hong Kong, The Threat That Dare Not Speak Its Name; Human Extinction, Perspectives in Biology and Medicine Volume 52, Number 1, Winter 2009, Muse

Human extinction is 100% certain—the only uncertainties are when and how. Like the men and women of Shakespeare’s As You Like It, our species is but one of many players making entrances and exits on the evolutionary stage. That we generally deny that such exits for our own species are possible is to be expected, given the brutish selection pressures on our biology. Death, which is merely a biological description of evolutionary selection, is fundamental to life as we know it. Similarly, death occurring at the level of a species—extinction—is as basic to biology as is the death of individual organisms or cells. Hence, to regard extinction as catastrophic—which implies that it may somehow never occur, provided that we are all well behaved—is not only specious, but self-defeating.  Man is both blessed and cursed by the highest level of self-awareness of any life-form on Earth. This suggests that the process of human extinction is likely to be accompanied by more suffering than that associated with any previous species extinction event. Such suffering may only be eased by the getting of wisdom: the same kind of wisdom that could, if applied sufficiently early, postpone extinction. But the tragedy of our species is that evolution does not select for such foresight. Man’s dreams of being an immortal species in an eternal paradise are unachievable not because of original sin—the doomsday scenario for which we choose to blame our “free will,” thereby perpetuating our creationist illusion of being at the center of the universe—but rather, in reductionist terms, because paradise is incompatible with evolution. More scientific effort in propounding this central truth of our species’ mortality, rather than seeking spiritual comfort in escapist fantasies, could pay dividends in minimizing the eventual cumulative burden of human suffering.

#### 8. Perm do the plan and non-rejection parts of the alt

#### 9. Turn- Changing representational practices hinders understanding of policy by overlooking questions of agency and material structures

**Tuathail, 96**-(Gearoid, Department of Georgraphy at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Political Geography, 15(6-7), p. 664, science direct)

While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, the discourse and concerns of foreign-policy decision- makers are quite different, so different that they constitute a distinctive problem- solving, theory-averse, policy-making subculture. There is a danger that academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many that sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby’s fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement-‘Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought’-evades the important question of agency that I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. Political, military and economic structures, institutions, discursive networks and leadership are all crucial in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby’s reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby’s fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD, not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses, root the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public-policy reasoning on national security. Dalby’s book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and post- structuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby’s interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev’s reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly self- interested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of discourse are extremely important ones for political geographers to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing this concern with discourse so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. Critical geopolitics, in other words, should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant that sometimes accompanies ‘poststructuralism nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.

Cap K

1. Case outweighs – Our case impacts are real and prevent the total deaths of thousands of people. The root cause of these impacts is not capitalism. Voting negative doesn’t make the problems we present disappear, vote affirmative to solve cap in the future

2. Perm do the plan and reject in all other instances; either the alt can’t overcome this one link in which case it’s not strong enough to overcome the squo or it does solve, meaning the plan isn’t a crucial link

3. Capitalism isn’t the root cause of anything

DANDEKER 2 (CHRISTOPHER, Department of War Studies, King's College, http://books.google.com/books?id=TNhFH5g3sCsC&dq=Effects+of+War+on+Society+Christopher+Dandeker&source=gbs\_navlinks\_s, DA 7/11/11)

Despite the fact that industrial capitalism has produced two world wars, as Aron (1954) and more recently Michael Mann (1984) have argued, there is no 'special relationship1 between capitalism and militarism—or the tendency to war—only one of historical indifference. All the pre-dispositions of 'capitalist states' to use warfare calculatively as a means of resolving their disputes with other states predate the formation of capitalism as an economic system. Of course, it could be argued that capitalism merely changes the form of militarism. That is to say, pre-capitalist patterns of militarism were still expressions of class relations and modern capitalism has just increased the destructive power of the industrialised means of war available to the state. But this argument will not do. Socialist societies in their use of industrialised power show that the technological potential for war is transferable and can be reproduced under non-capitalist conditions. Furthermore, the military activities of socialist states cannot be explained in terms of a defensive war against capitalism or even an aggressive one. as national and geopolitical power motives are arguably just as significant in the determination of state behaviour. Furthermore, imperial expansion not only predates capitalism but it is also difficult to reduce the causes of wars then and now to the interests of dominant economic classes (Mann 1984:25-46).

#### 4. Perm do both: we can work within the system to break down capitalism

**Monthly Review 1990**, March 90, Vol. 41, No. 10, p. 38

No institution is or ever has been a seamless monolith. Although the inherent mechanism of American capitalism is as you describe it, oriented solely to profit without regard to social consequences, this does not preclude significant portions of that very system from joining forces with the worldwide effort for the salvation of civilization, perhaps even to the extent of furnishing the margin of success for that very effort.

#### 5. Their representations of capitalism make resistance impossible.

Gibson-Graham 96- J.K. Gibson-Graham, Feminist Economist (1996, “The End of Capitalism”)

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

#### 6. Cap inevitable and sustainable, solutions can be offered pollution, financial instability, health problems and inequality

Rogoff 11

Kenneth Rogoff, Professor of Economics at Harvard, 12/2/2011, “Is Modern Capitalism Sustainable?,” <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-modern-capitalism-sustainable->, KB

In principle, none of capitalism’s problems is insurmountable, and economists have offered a variety of market-based solutions. A high global price for carbon would induce firms and individuals to internalize the cost of their polluting activities. Tax systems can be designed to provide a greater measure of redistribution of income without necessarily involving crippling distortions, by minimizing non-transparent tax expenditures and keeping marginal rates low. Effective pricing of health care, including the pricing of waiting times, could encourage a better balance between equality and efficiency. Financial systems could be better regulated, with stricter attention to excessive accumulations of debt.

CommentsWill capitalism be a victim of its own success in producing massive wealth? For now, as fashionable as the topic of capitalism’s demise might be, the possibility seems remote. Nevertheless, as pollution, financial instability, health problems, and inequality continue to grow, and as political systems remain paralyzed, capitalism’s future might not seem so secure in a few decades as it seems now.

7. Alt fails – capitalism is too ingrained in society for the alt to cause everyone to reject it

**8. Transition wars resulting from the collapse of capitalism cause extinction**

Harris 2 (Lee, Atlanta writer, policy review, the intellectual origins of America-bashing, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html>)

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe. Without this catastrophic upheaval, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

9. No other means for resource allocation – without capitalism, there is no other way to allocate resources without the use of a corrupt government. Empirically this has been worse than capitalism.

10. The alternative to capitalism leads to extinction

Ebeling 93

Richard M. Ebeling, March 93, vice president of academic affairs for The Future of Freedom Foundation, THE FAILURE OF SOCIALISM, www.fff.org/freedom/0393b.asp

Socialism's failure in the former Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries stands as a clear and unquestionable warning as to which path any rational and sane people should never follow again. Government planning brought poverty and ruin. The idea of collectivist class and ethnic group-rights produced tens of millions of deaths and a legacy of civil war and conflict. And nationalized social services generated social decay and political privilege and corruption.

#### 11. The K cedes the political

#### 12. Capitalism solves war – interdependency, democracy and constructive competition

Griswold, 05 (Daniel, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at Cato, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men”, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282)

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has

also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital.

### Life has Value

#### Life has intrinsic and objective value achieved through subjective pleasures---its preservation should be an a priori goal

Amien Kacou 8 WHY EVEN MIND? On The A Priori Value Of “Life”, Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, Vol 4, No 1-2 (2008)

[cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184](http://cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184" \t "_blank)

Furthermore, that manner of finding things good that is in pleasure can certainly not exist in any world without consciousness (i.e., without “life,” as we now understand the word)—slight analogies put aside. In fact, we can begin to develop a more sophisticated definition of the concept of “pleasure,” in the broadest possible sense of the word, as follows: it is the common psychological element in all psychological experience of goodness (be it in joy, admiration, or whatever else). In this sense, pleasure can always be pictured to “mediate” all awareness or perception or judgment of goodness: **there is pleasure in all consciousness** of things good; pleasure is the common element of all conscious satisfaction. In short, **it is simply the very experience of liking things**, or the liking of experience, in general. In this sense, pleasure is, not only uniquely characteristic of life but also, the core expression of goodness in life—the most general sign or phenomenon for favorable conscious valuation, in other words. This does not mean that “good” is absolutely synonymous with “pleasant”—what we value may well go beyond pleasure. (The fact that we value things needs not be reduced to the experience of liking things.) However, what we value beyond pleasure remains a matter of speculation or theory. Moreover, we note that a variety of things that may seem otherwise unrelated are correlated with pleasure—some more strongly than others. In other words, **there are many things the experience of which we like**. For example: the admiration of others; sex; or rock-paper-scissors. But, again, what they are is irrelevant in an inquiry on a priori value—what gives us pleasure is a matter for empirical investigation. Thus, we can see now that, in general, something primitively valuable is attainable in living—that is, pleasure itself. And it seems equally clear that we have a priori logical reason to pay attention to the world in any world where pleasure exists. Moreover, we can now also articulate a foundation for a security interest in our life: since the good of pleasure can be found in living (to the extent pleasure remains attainable),[17] and only in living, therefore, a priori, life ought to be continuously (and indefinitely) pursued at least for the sake of preserving the possibility of finding that good. However, this platitude about the value that can be found in life turns out to be, at this point, insufficient for our purposes. It seems to amount to very little more than recognizing that our subjective desire for life in and of itself shows that **life has some** objective value. For what difference is there between saying, “living is unique in benefiting something I value (namely, my pleasure); therefore, I should desire to go on living,” and saying, “I have a unique desire to go on living; therefore I should have a desire to go on living,” whereas the latter proposition immediately seems senseless? In other words, “life gives me pleasure,” says little more than, “I like life.” Thus, we seem to have arrived at the conclusion that the fact that we already have some (subjective) desire for life shows life to have some (objective) value. But, if that is the most we can say, then it seems our enterprise of justification was quite superficial, and the subjective/objective distinction was useless—for all we have really done is highlight the correspondence between value and desire. Perhaps, our inquiry should be a bit more complex.

#### We must default to the preservation of human value over non- life – our creation of value is the most ethical judgment

Erin Moore Daly and Robert Frodeman, professor @ UNT Spring 2008 Ethics & the Environment, Vol 13, No 1, Spring, pp. 135-151, “Separated at Birth, Signs of Rapprochement Environmental Ethics and Space Exploration,”

Of course, the issue of terraforming is not exclusively a scientific or technological one. Indeed, a number of talented scientists have noted that terraforming must be dealt with by those qualified to address ontological and theological questions about the nature of life (e.g., Haynes 1990).12 Few philosophers have approached the question—the majority of literature considering the ethics of such a project has been written by scientists. Those who have written about the ethical implications of terraforming (both scientists and philosophers) have tended to appeal to the intrinsic value issues involved in introducing terrestrial life to Mars. The questions usually take the following forms: Is life better than non-life? Is there value in nature absent the presence of life? Should we preserve the natural state of the red planet, or might we have an ethical obligation to populate the universe? The answer to the last question is often a qualified yes. David Grinspoon likens the issue to that of planting a garden in a vacant lot—if no life exists on Mars, then we have a duty to bring life to it: “Mars belongs to us [life] because this universe belongs to life” (Grinspoon 2004). Of course, a vacant lot is a human creation, and thus is a questionable analogy to a planet which happens to be naturally abiotic. Christopher McKay voices a similar position: “Life has precedence over non-life,” he states; “life has value. A planet Mars with a natural global-scale biota has value vis-à-vis a planet with only sparse life or none at all” (McKay 1990). Robert Zubrin, one of the most energetic and unequivocal spokesman of the case for bringing life to Mars, claims that the act of terraforming the Red Planet will prove that “the worlds of the heavens themselves are subject to the human intelligent will” (Zubrin 2002). Zubrin has called the argument that we should forgo the terraforming project if native life is found on Mars “immoral and insane,” because humans are more important than bacteria. “In securing the Red Planet on behalf of life, humans will perform an act of improving creation so dramatic that it will affirm the value of the human race, and every member of it. There could be no activity more ethical” (Zubrin 2002, 179–80). The terraforming project does not receive universal approval. An advocate of the ‘hands-off’ approach, or what has come to be called cosmic preservationism, is Rolston, who assigns value to the “creative projects” of nature, regardless of the existence of life or consciousness. “Humans ought to preserve projects of formed integrity, wherever found….” [We should] “banish soon and forever the bias that only habitable places are good ones, and all uninhabitable places empty wastes, piles of dull stones, dreary, desolate swirls of gases” (Rolston 1986, 170–71). Alan Marshall, another preservationist, advocates strict enforcement measures to ensure that the planet continues to exist in its natural state. For Marshall, all of nature should receive respect; rocks, for instance, exist in “a blissful state of satori only afforded to non-living entities” (Marshall 1993). MartynFogg, on the other hand, notes that efforts to protect a barren environment are often misanthropic critiques of human nature emphasizing our capacity for evil, or sentimental illusions based on outofdate ecology. He offers as an example the ecocentrist notion of ecological harmony—“that there exists an ideal balancein nature that is perfect, unchanging, and which nurtures and sustains” (Fogg 2000a, 209). Such a state is a cozy sentimentality, he claims. “Nature is…better regarded as a continuous state of flux dominated by chaos and disharmony” (ibid.). Fogg counters Alan Marshall’s argument that rocks exist in a state of ‘blissful satori’ by stating, “rocks don’t think, don’t act and don’t care. They cannot have values of their own” (ibid., 210).

Nietzsche

1. The K links to itself – to claim that we can’t take any positive action because that might be securitizing is to adopt passivity and fear, which is exactly what Nietzsche criticizes. We should be willing to take a leap of faith and indulge a creative act like the plan no matter what the risks.

#### 2. The perm solves best – seeking new ways to reshape the world is a form of life-affirmation – we create new ways of being. Suffering is a contingent fact – to say “it’s inevitable” is willful blindness and that blocks off the best path to celebration of life.

**May 5**—PhD from Penn State University in 1989, and has been at Clemson since 1991.

(Todd May, “To change the world, to celebrate life,” Philosophy & Social Criticism 2005 Vol 31 nos 5–6 pp. 517–531nex)

For those among us who seek in philosophy a way to grapple with our lives rather than to solve logical puzzles; for those whose reading and whose writing are not merely appropriate steps toward academic advancement but a struggle to see ourselves and our world in a fresher, clearer light; for those who ﬁnd nourishment among impassioned ideas and go hungry among empty truths: there is a struggle that is often waged within us. It is a struggle that will be familiar to anyone who has heard in Foucault’s sentences the stammering of a fellow human being struggling to speak in words worth hearing. Why else would we read Foucault? We seek to conceive what is wrong in the world, to grasp it in a way that offers us the possibility for change. We know that there is much that is, to use Foucault’s word, ‘intolerable’. There is much that binds us to social and political arrangements that are oppressive, domineering, patronizing, and exploitative. We would like to understand why this is and how it happens, in order that we may prevent its continuance. In short, we want our theories to be tools for changing the world, for offering it a new face, or at least a new expression. There is struggle in this, struggle against ideas and ways of thinking that present themselves to us as inescapable. We know this struggle from Foucault’s writings. It is not clear that he ever wrote about anything else. But this is not the struggle I want to address here. For there is, on the other hand, another search and another goal. They lie not so much in the revisioning of this world as in the embrace of it. There is much to be celebrated in the lives we lead, or in those led by others, or in the unfolding of the world as it is, a world resonant with the rhythms of our voices and our movements. We would like to understand this, too, to grasp in thought the elusive beauty of our world. There is, after all, no other world, except, as Nietzsche taught, for those who would have created another one with which to denigrate our own. In short, we would like our thought to celebrate our lives. To change the world and to celebrate life. This, as the theologian Harvey Cox saw, is the struggle within us. 1 It is a struggle in which one cannot choose sides; or better, a struggle in which one must choose both sides. The abandonment of one for the sake of the other can lead only to disaster or callousness. Forsaking the celebration of life for the sake of changing the world is the path of the sad revolutionary. In his preface to Anti-Oedipus, Foucault writes that one does not have to be sad in order to be revolutionary. The matter is more urgent than that, however. One cannot be both sad and revolutionary. Lacking a sense of the wondrous that is already here, among us, one who is bent upon changing the world can only become solemn or bitter. He or she is focused only on the future; the present is what is to be overcome. The vision of what is not but must come to be overwhelms all else, and the point of change itself becomes lost. The history of the left in the 20th century offers numerous examples of this, and the disaster that attends to it should be evident to all of us by now. The alternative is surely not to shift one’s allegiance to the pure celebration of life, although there are many who have chosen this path. It is at best blindness not to see the misery that envelops so many of our fellow humans, to say nothing of what happens to sentient nonhuman creatures. The attempt to jettison world-changing for an uncritical assent to the world as it is requires a self-deception that I assume would be anathema for those of us who have studied Foucault. Indeed, it is anathema for all of us who awaken each day to an America whose expansive boldness is matched only by an equally expansive disregard for those we place in harm’s way. This is the struggle, then.. The one between the desire for life celebration and the desire for world-changing. The struggle between reveling in the contingent and fragile joys that constitute our world and wresting it from its intolerability. I am sure it is a struggle that is not foreign to anyone who is reading this. I am sure as well that the stakes for choosing one side over another that I have recalled here are obvious to everyone. The question then becomes one of how to choose both sides at once. III Maybe it happens this way. You walk into a small meeting room at the back of a local bookstore. There are eight or ten people milling about. They’re dressed in dark clothes, nothing fancy, and one or two of them have earrings or dreadlocks. They vary in age. You don’t know any of them. You’ve never seen them before. Several of them seem to know one another. They are affectionate, hugging, letting a hand linger on a shoulder or an elbow. A younger man, tall and thin, with an open face and a blue baseball cap bearing no logo, glides into the room. Two others, a man and a woman, shout, ‘Tim!’ and he glides over to them and hugs them, one at a time. They tell him how glad they are that he could make it, and he says that he just got back into town and heard about the meeting. You stand a little off to the side. Nobody has taken a seat at the rectangle of folding tables yet. You don’t want to be the ﬁrst to sit down. Tim looks around the room and smiles. Several other people ﬁlter in. You’re not quite sure where to put your hands so you slide them into your jean pockets. You hunch your shoulders. Tim’s arrival has made you feel more of an outsider. But then he sees you. He edges his way around several others and walks up to you and introduces himself. You respond. Tim asks and you tell him that this is your ﬁrst time at a meeting like this. He doesn’t ask about politics but about where you’re from. He tells you he has a friend in that neighborhood and do you know . . . ? Then several things happen that you only vaguely notice because you’re talking with Tim. People start to sit down at the rectangle of tables. One of them pulls out a legal pad with notes on it. She sits at the head of the rectangle; or rather, when she sits down there, it becomes the head. And there’s something you don’t notice at all. You are more relaxed, your shoulders have stopped hunching, and when you sit down the seat feels familiar. The woman at the head of the table looks around. She smiles; her eyes linger over you and a couple of others that you take to be new faces, like yours. She says, ‘Maybe we should begin.’ IV I can offer only a suggestion of an answer here today. It is a suggestion that brings together some thoughts from the late writings of

Maurice Merleau-Ponty with those of Foucault, in order to sketch not even a framework for thought, but the mere outlines of a framework. It is not a framework that would seek to ﬁnd the unconscious of each in the writings of the other. Neither thinker ﬁnishes or accomplishes the other. (Often, for example regarding methodology, they do not even agree.) Rather, it is a framework that requires both of them, from their very different angles, in order to be able to think it. My goal in constructing the outlines of this framework is largely philosophical. That is to say, the suggestion I would like to make here is not one for resolving for each of us the struggle of life-celebration and world-changing, but of offering a way to conceive ourselves that allows us to embrace both sides of this battle at the same time. There are many ways to conceive the bond between world-changing and life-celebrating. Let me isolate two: one that runs from Merleau-Ponty to Foucault, from the body’s chiasmic relation with the world to the politics of its practices; and the other one running back in the opposite direction. The ontology Merleau-Ponty offers in his late work is one of wonder. Abandoning the sterile philosophical debates about the relation of mind and body, subject and object, about the relation of reason to that which is not reason, or the problem of other minds, his ontology forges a unity of body and world that puts us in immediate contact with all of its aspects. No longer are we to be thought the self-enclosed creatures of the philosophical tradition. We are now in touch with the world, because we are of it. Art, for example, does not appeal solely to our minds; its beauty is not merely a matter of the convergence of our faculties. We are moved by art, often literally moved, because our bodies and the work of art share the same world. As Merleau-Ponty says, ‘I would be at great pains to say where is the painting I am looking at. For I do not look at it as I do a thing; I do not ﬁx it in its place. My gaze wanders in it as in the halos of Being. It is more accurate to say that I see according to it, or with it, than that I see it.’ 7 It is only because my body is a fold of this world that art can affect me so. But this affection is also a vulnerability. As my look can happen according to a work of art, so it can happen according to a social practice. And even more so in proportion as that social practice and its effects are suffused through the world in which I carry on my life, the world my body navigates throughout the day, every day. I do not have a chance to look according to a painting by Cezanne very often; but I do encounter the effects of normalization as it has ﬁltered through the practices of my employment, of my students’ upbringing, and of my family’s expectations of themselves and one another. The vulnerability of the body, then, is at once its exposure to beauty and its opening to what is intolerable. We might also see things from the other end, starting from politics and ending at the body. I take it that this is what Foucault suggests when he talks about bodies and pleasures at the end of the ﬁrst volume of the History of Sexuality. If we are a product of our practices and the conception of ourselves and the world that those practices have fostered, so to change our practices is to experiment in new possibilities both for living and, inseparably, for conceiving the world. To experiment in sexuality is not to see where the desire that lies at the core of our being may lead us; that is simply the continuation of our oppression by other means. Rather, it is to construct practices where what is at issue is no longer desire but something else, something that might go by the name of bodies and pleasures. In doing so, we not only act differently, we think differently, both about ourselves and about the world those selves are inseparable from. And because these experiments are practices of our bodies, and because our bodies are encrusted in the world, these experiments become not merely acts of political resistance but new folds in the body/ world nexus. To construct new practices is to appeal to aspects or possibilities of the world that have been previously closed to us*. It* is to offer novel, and perhaps more tolerable, engagements in the chiasm of body and world. Thus we might say of politics what Merleau-Ponty has said of painting, that we see according to it. Here, I take it, is where the idea of freedom in Foucault lies. For Foucault, freedom is not a metaphysical condition. It does not lie in the nature of being human, nor is it a warping, an atomic swerve, in the web of causal relations in which we ﬁnd ourselves. To seek our freedom in a space apart from our encrustation in the world is not so much to liberate ourselves from its inﬂuence as to build our own private prison. Foucault once said: There’s an optimism that consists in saying that things couldn’t be better. My optimism would consist rather in saying that so many things can be changed, fragile as they are, bound up more with circumstances than with necessities, more arbitrary than self-evident, more a matter of complex, but temporary, historical circumstances than with inevitable anthropological constraints . . . 8 That is where to discover our freedom

3. Go to the alt – turn – naturalism

**(A) Inverting morality leads to naturalistic values**

**Comte-Sponville**, professor of Philosophy at the Sorbonne and author of numerous books, **‘91**

[Andre, *The Brute, the Sophist, and the Aesthete: Art in the Service of Illusion*, Why We Are Not Nietzscheans, edited by Luc Ferry and Alain Renaut, p. 33-36]

This is what Nietzsche calls his "Fundamental Innovations: In place of 'moral values,' purely naturalistic values. Naturalization of morality" *(WP,* 462.).These "naturalistic values" are, of course, of vi­talist inspiration: Every naturalism in morality—that is, every healthy morality—is dominated by an instinct of life . . . *Anti-natural* morality—that is, almost every morality which has so far been taught, revered, and preached—turns, conversely, *against* the instincts of life. *(TI,* "Morality as Anti-Nature," 4) We can see here that Nietzsche was right to feel himself singular: all phi­losophers, more or less, have affirmed that morality should conquer the instincts or, at the very least, dominate them; Nietzsche teaches that the instincts should conquer morality. Spinoza would have said: *Ultimi bar­barorum!*

**(B) Turns and outweighs their impact – naturalism leads to the worst forms of moral calculation and oppression**

MacSaorsa, ‘7

[Iain, “The Myth of Natural Law,” [www.spunk.com](http://www.spunk.com), <http://www.spunk.org/texts/otherpol/critique/sp001283.txt>]

Rights, far from being fixed, are the product of social evolution and human action, thought and emotions. What is acceptable now may become unacceptable in the future. Slavery, for example, was long considered "natural". In fact, John Locke, the "father" of "Natural Rights" was heavily involved in the slave trade. He made a fortune in violating a "natural law". Many claimed slavery was a "Natural Law". Few would say so now. The "Natural Law" cult desires to stop this evolutionary process and fix social life into what \*they\* think is good and right and use a form of argument which tries to raise their ideology above critique or thought. This denies the fundamental nature of liberty, the ability to think for yourself. Michael Bakunin writes "the liberty of man consists solely in this: that he obeys natural laws because he has \*himself\* recognised them as such, and not because they have been externally imposed upon him by any extrinsic will whatever, divine or human, collective or individual" [Bakunin on Anarchism, page 227]. The case for liberty and a free society is that every individual is unique, that all can contribute something which no other individual has noticed or thought about. It is this interaction of individuals which allows individuals, society, social customs and rights to evolve, change and develop. "Natural Law", like the state, tries to arrest this evolution. It replaces individuality with cold dogma, **placing the individual under yet another God,** destroying critical thought with a new rule book. In addition, as these "Natural Laws" are the product of human as humans, they \*must\* be applicable to \*all\* humanity. Hence the "Natural Law" cult desires to see \*one\* moral code dominate society, all other codes \*must be\* (by definition) "against nature". That the Dogma of Natural Law was only invented a few hundred years ago, in one part of the planet, does not seem to bother them. Nor the fact that for the vast majority of human existence people have lived in societies which violated almost \*all\* aspects of their "Natural Law". If "Natural Law" did exist, then all people would have discovered this "true" law years ago. As it is, the debate is still going on, with (for example) fascists and "Libertarians" each claiming "the laws of nature" (and sociobiology) as their own.

4. Perm – do the plan and then the alt. The perm is uniquely net-beneficial – it resolves the alternative’s moral relativism towards inclusion and respect for the Other

**Hatab,** Professor and Chair of Philosophy and Religious Studies Old Dominion, **‘2**

[Lawrence, Prospects for a Democratic Agon: Why We can still be Nietzscheans, Journal of Nietzsche Studies, issue 24, p. Project Muse]

Democratic respect forbids exclusion, it demands inclusion; but respect for the Other as other can avoid a vapid sense of " tolerance," a sloppy "relativism," or a misplaced spirit of "neutrality." Agonistic respect allows us to simultaneously affirm our beliefs and affirm our opponents as worthy competitors [End Page 142] in public discourse. Here we can speak of respect without ignoring the fact that politics involves perpetual disagreement, and we have an adequate answer to the question "Why should I respect a view that I do not agree with?" In this way beliefs about what is best (aristos) can be coordinated with an openness to other beliefs and a willingness to accept the outcome of an open competition among the full citizenry (demos). Democratic respect, therefore, is a dialogical mixture of affirmation and negation, a political bearing that entails giving all beliefs a hearing, refusing any belief an ultimate warrant, and perceiving one's own viewpoint as agonistically implicated with opposing viewpoints. In sum, we can combine 1) the historical tendency of democratic movements to promote free expression, pluralism, and liberation from traditional constraints, and 2) a Nietzschean perspectivism and agonistic respect, to arrive at a postmodern model of democracy that provides both a nonfoundational openness and an atmosphere of civil political discourse. [26](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_nietzsche_studies/v024/24.1hatab.html" \l "FOOT26#FOOT26) An agonistic politics construed as competitive fairness can sustain a robust conception of political rights, not as something "natural" possessed by an original self, but as an epiphenomenal, procedural notion conferred upon citizens in order to sustain viable political practice. Constraints on speech, association, access, and so on, simply insure lopsided political contests. We can avoid metaphysical models of rights and construe them as simply social and political phenomena: social in the sense of entailing reciprocal recognition and obligation; political in the sense of being guaranteed and enforced by the state. We can even defend so-called positive rights, such as a right to an adequate education, as requisite for fair competition in political discourse. Rights themselves can be understood as agonistic in that a right-holder has a claim against some treatment by others or for some provision that might be denied by others. In this way rights can be construed as balancing power relations in social milieus, as a partial recession of one's own power on behalf of the power of others—which in fact is precisely how Nietzsche in an early work described fairness and rights (D 112). And, as is well known, the array of rights often issues conflicts of different and differing rights, and political life must engage in the ongoing balancing act of negotiating these tensions, a negotiation facilitated by precisely not defining rights as discrete entities inviolably possessed by an originating self.

#### 5. Turn: Ignore their value to life claims – failure to focus on the sanctity of life produces genocidal atrocity

Federer, President @ Amerisearch Inc, ‘3 (WILLIAM, 10/18, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\_ID=35138)

Even before the rise of Adolf Hitler's Third Reich, the way for the gruesome Nazi Holocaust of human extermination and cruel butchery was being prepared in the 1930 German Weimar Republic through the medical establishment and philosophical elite's adoption of the "quality of life" concept in place of the "sanctity of life." The Nuremberg trials, exposing the horrible Nazi war crimes, revealed that Germany's trend toward atrocity began with their progressive embrace of the Hegelian doctrine of "rational utility," where an individual's worth is in relation to their contribution to the state, rather than determined in light of traditional moral, ethical and religious values. This gradual transformation of national public opinion, promulgated through media and education, was described in an article written by the British commentator Malcolm Muggeridge entitled "The Humane Holocaust" and in an article written by former United States Surgeon General, C. Everett Koop, M.D., entitled "The Slide to Auschwitz," both published in The Human Life Review, 1977 and 1980 respectively. Muggeridge stated: "Near at hand, we have been accorded, for those that have eyes to see, an object lesson in what the quest for 'quality of life' without reference to 'sanctity of life' can involve ... [namely] the great Nazi Holocaust, whose TV presentation has lately been harrowing viewers throughout the Western world. In this televised version, an essential consideration has been left out – namely, that the origins of the Holocaust lay, not in Nazi terrorism and anti-Semitism, but in pre-Nazi Weimar Germany's acceptance of euthanasia and mercy-killing as humane and estimable. ... "It took no more than three decades to transform a war crime into an act of compassion, thereby enabling the victors in the war against Nazism to adopt the very practices for which the Nazis had been solemnly condemned at Nuremberg." The transformation followed thus: The concept that the elderly and terminally ill should have the right to die was promoted in books, newspapers, literature and even entertainment films, the most popular of which were entitled "Ich klage an (I accuse)" and "Mentally Ill." One euthanasia movie, based on a novel by a National Socialist doctor, actually won a prize at the world-famous Venice Film Festival! Extreme hardship cases were cited, which increasingly convinced the public to morally approve of euthanasia. The medical profession gradually grew accustomed to administering death to patients who, for whatever reasons, felt their low "quality of life" rendered their lives not worth living, or as it was put, lebensunwerten Lebens, (life unworthy of life). In an Associated Press release published in the New York Times Oct. 10, 1933, entitled "Nazi Plan to Kill Incurables to End Pain; German Religious Groups Oppose Move," it was stated: "The Ministry of Justice, in a detailed memorandum explaining the Nazi aims regarding the German penal code, today announced its intentions to authorize physicians to end the sufferings of the incurable patient. The memorandum ... proposed that it shall be possible for physicians to end the tortures of incurable patients, upon request, in the interest of true humanity. "This proposed legal recognition of euthanasia – the act of providing a painless and peaceful death – raised a number of fundamental problems of a religious, scientific and legal nature. The Catholic newspaper Germania hastened to observe: 'The Catholic faith binds the conscience of its followers not to accept this method.' ... In Lutheran circles, too, life is regarded as something that God alone can take. ... Euthanasia ... has become a widely discussed word in the Reich. ... No life still valuable to the State will be wantonly destroyed." Nationalized health care and government involvement in medical care promised to improve the public's "quality of life." Unfortunately, the cost of maintaining government medical care was a contributing factor to the growth of the national debt, which reached astronomical proportions. Double and triple digit inflation crippled the economy, resulting in the public demanding that government cut expenses. This precipitated the 1939 order to cut federal expenses. The national socialist government decided to remove "useless" expenses from the budget, which included the support and medical costs required to maintain the lives of the retarded, insane, senile, epileptic, psychiatric patients, handicapped, deaf, blind, the non-rehabilitatable ill and those who had been diseased or chronically ill for five years or more. It was labeled an "act of mercy" to "liberate them through death," as they were viewed as having an extremely low "quality of life," as well as being a tax burden on the public. The public psyche was conditioned for this, as even school math problems compared distorted medical costs incurred by the taxpayer of caring for and rehabilitating the chronically sick with the cost of loans to newly married couples for new housing units. The next whose lives were terminated by the state were the institutionalized elderly who had no relatives and no financial resources. These lonely, forsaken individuals were needed by no one and would be missed by no one. Their "quality of life" was considered low by everyone's standards, and they were a tremendous tax burden on the economically distressed state. The next to be eliminated were the parasites on the state: the street people, bums, beggars, hopelessly poor, gypsies, prisoners, inmates and convicts. These were socially disturbing individuals incapable of providing for themselves whose "quality of life" was considered by the public as irreversibly below standard, in addition to the fact that they were a nuisance to society and a seed-bed for crime. The liquidation grew to include those who had been unable to work, the socially unproductive and those living on welfare or government pensions. They drew financial support from the state, but contributed nothing financially back. They were looked upon as "useless eaters," leeches, stealing from those who worked hard to pay the taxes to support them. Their unproductive lives were a burden on the "quality of life" of those who had to pay the taxes. The next to be eradicated were the ideologically unwanted, the political enemies of the state, religious extremists and those "disloyal" individuals considered to be holding the government back from producing a society which functions well and provides everyone a better "quality of life." The moving biography of the imprisoned Dietrich Bonhoffer chronicled the injustices. These individuals also were a source of "human experimental material," allowing military medical research to be carried on with human tissue, thus providing valuable information that promised to improve the nation's health. Finally, justifying their actions on the purported theory of evolution, the Nazis considered the German, or "Aryan," race as "ubermenschen," supermen, being more advanced in the supposed progress of human evolution. This resulted in the twisted conclusion that all other races, and in particular the Jewish race, were less evolved and needed to be eliminated from the so-called "human gene pool," ensuring that future generations of humans would have a higher "quality of life." Dr. Koop stated: "The first step is followed by the second step. You can say that if the first step is moral then whatever follows must be moral. The important thing, however, is this: Whether you diagnose the first step as being one worth taking or being one that is precarious rests entirely on what the second step is likely to be. ... I am concerned about this because when the first 273,000 German aged, infirm and retarded were killed in gas chambers there was no outcry from that medical profession either, and it was not far from there to Auschwitz." Can this holocaust happen in America? Indeed, it has already begun. The idea of killing a person and calling it "death with dignity" is an oxymoron. The "mercy-killing" movement puts us on the same path as pre-Nazi Germany. The "quality of life" concept, which eventually results in the Hegelian utilitarian attitude of a person's worth being based on their contribution toward perpetuating big government, is in stark contrast to America's founding principles. This philosophy which lowers the value of human life, shocked attendees at the Governor's Commission on Disability, in Concord, N.H., Oct. 5, 2001, as they heard the absurd comments of Princeton University professor Peter Singer. The Associated Press reported Singer's comments: "I do think that it is sometimes appropriate to kill a human infant," he said, adding that he does not believe a newborn has a right to life until it reaches some minimum level of consciousness. "For me, the relevant question is, what makes it so seriously wrong to take a life?" Singer asked. "Those of you who are not vegetarians are responsible for taking a life every time you eat. Species is no more relevant than race in making these judgments." Singer's views, if left unchecked, could easily lead to a repeat of the atrocities of Nazi Germany, if not something worse.

6. Nietzsche justifies treating human beings as disposable, which is exactly what our 1AC criticizes. The will to power simply becomes the will to control and removes all meaning to life – turns the K.

Hicks 03 Prof and Chair of Philosophy @ Queens College of the CUNY

(Steven V., “Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Foucault: Nihilism and Beyond,” *Foucault and Heidegger: Critical Encounters*, Ed. Alan Milchman and Alan Rosenberg, P. 109, Questia)

Here again, one might raise objections to Heidegger's equating of Nietzsche's doctrine of will to power with the metaphysics of subjectivity. After all, Nietzsche often attacked Descartes's “ego cogito” as a logical or linguistic fiction (cf. BGE, §§ 16, 54). Yet according to Heidegger, Nietzsche still follows Descartes's lead in making human beings the subject or foundation of things. Unlike Descartes, however, Nietzsche's subject is not a fixed mental substance, but the body interpreted as a center of instincts, drives, affects, and sublimations, i.e., as will to power. Heidegger claims that this “body as given” idea still involves Nietzsche in a “fixity” that brings him into the philosophy of presence: “Nietzsche argues that being is as fixated, as permanent” (N, 2:200). And this forced sense of presence, Heidegger thinks, leads to the dangers of “radical objectifiability” and to the “disposability of beings, ” i.e., treating beings as nothing but objects of use, control, and management. 32 Moreover, like its Cartesian counterpart, the Nietzschean subject reins supreme over the whole of beings and posits “the measure for the beingness of every … being” (N, 4:121). 33 In claiming that “truths are illusions” and that “Being is an empty fiction, ” Nietzsche “fashions for the subject an absolute power to enjoin what is true and what is false” and hence to define what it means “to be” or “not to be” a being (N, 4:145). According to Nietzsche, what is true—what has being—is that which serves the interest of the subject whose essence is will to power (in the mode of existence of eternal recurrence; cf. N, 2:203). Being is thus reduced to the status of a value or a “condition of the preservation and enhancement of the will to power” (N, 4:176). This is why Heidegger considers Nietzsche the “consummation, ” and not the overcoming, of Western metaphysics: by reducing Being to a value, the doctrine of will to power makes the nihilism of the metaphysical tradition (the assumption that Being itself is nothing and the human will everything) a matter of philosophical principle. 34 Thus Nietzsche's “counter-ideals” of will to power and eternal recurrence, far from overcoming nihilism, actually express or exemplify the loss of any sense of Being, or the withdrawal of Being itself, in favor of beings (i.e., products of human will). As Heidegger reads him, Nietzsche understands Being in terms of value (or what is useful for enhancing the human will) because Being itself has totally withdrawn in default. And this brings to completion traditional metaphysics, which, according to Heidegger, is the history of Being in its withdrawal. As Heidegger sees it, Nietzsche's metaphysics of will to power is “the most extreme withdrawal of Being” and thus “the fulfillment of nihilism proper” (N, 4:204, 232). So Nietzsche brings to completion, in his **denial of Being**, the very nihilism he wanted to overcome. Far from twisting free of the ascetic ideal, Heidegger claims, Nietzsche 's doctrine of will to power actually provides the basis for its most complete expression in the modern “secularized” ascetic “will-tocontrol” everything. In other words, instead of seeking salvation in a transcendent world by means of ascetic self-denial—the aspect of metaphysics that Nietzsche most obviously rejects—salvation is now, Heidegger claims, sought “exclusively in the free self-development of all the creative powers of man” (N, 4:89). This unlimited expanding of power for power's sake parallels in many ways what Nietzsche characterized as the most terrifying aspect of the ascetic ideal: the pursuit of “truth for truth's sake.” It is, according to Heidegger, the “hidden thorn” in the side of modern humanity (cf. N, 4:99). This “hidden thorn” expresses itself variously in the Protestant “work ethic” and in the “iron cage” of bureaucratic-technological rationality (discussed in the works of Max Weber); it also expresses itself in the various power aims of modern scientific/technological culture as well as in the frenzied impulse to produce and consume things at ever faster rates. Heidegger even suggests that Nietzsche's own figure of the Overman (Ubermensch) foreshadows the calculating, technological attitude of modern secularized asceticism: “His Overman [stands] for the technological worker-soldier who would disclose all entities as standingreserve necessary for **enhancing the ultimately aimless quest for power** for its own sake.”35 This emerging technological human, grounded in a control-oriented anthropocentrism, compels entities to reveal only those one-dimensional aspects of themselves that are consistent with the power aims of a technological/productionist culture. Instead of dwelling and thinking in a world unified by what Heidegger metaphorically terms the “fourfold of earth and sky, gods and mortals, ” impoverished modern technocrats occupy a world “bereft of gods” in which thinking becomes calculating, and dwelling becomes tantamount to the “technological domination of nature” and what Nietzsche calls “the common economic management of the earth” in which “mankind will be able to find its best meaning as a machine in the service of this economy” (WP, § 866). Thus citizens come to be viewed primarily as consumers, wilderness is looked upon in terms of “wildlife management areas, ” and genuine human freedom is “replaced by the organized global conquest of the earth, and the thrust into outer space” (N, 4:248). As Heidegger sees it, “our era entertains the illusion that man, having become free for his humanity, has freely taken the universe into his power and disposition” (N, 4:248). In summary, Nietzsche tried to combat the nihilism of the ascetic ideal (e.g., the collapse of the Christian table of values) by bringing forth new nonascetic values that would enhance rather than devalue humanity's will to power. According to Heidegger, however, instead of overcoming nihilism, Nietzsche simply **reinforced it.** By characterizing Being as an “empty fiction” and “the last smoke of a vaporized reality ” (TI, 2:2, 481), and by degrading it to the status of a value for enhancing the subject's will to power, Nietzsche **loses any sense of Being as such**. For him it is a mere nothing, a “nihil.” And this brings to completion the “fundamental movement” of history in the West, which is nihilism: the withdrawal of Being itself and the consequent focus on beings as objects for “consolidating the power of Will and for expanding it out beyond itself” in an ever-increasing spiral. 36 As Heidegger sees it, this “eternally recurring” will to power, or “will to will, ” is a will-to-control that only **reinforces the nihilism** Nietzsche feared: the **loss of meaning or direction, the devaluation of the highest values, the “constructs of domination, ” and the devotion to frenzied consumption and production**.

Bataille

#### 1. Perm do both

#### 2. Growth is sustainable, inevitable and self correcting

Zey 98 (Michael, founder of the Expansionary Institute, Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era, pg. 36-37)J

Third, growth itself contains the solutions to the problems it produces. Supporting this principle is the World Bank's 1992 report "Development and the Environment," which blatantly starts that growth is a powerful antidote to a number of ills plaguing Third World countries, including the pollution that growth supposedly generates. The report thus contends that eliminating poverty should remain the top goal of world policymakers. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, the resulting prosperity also facilitates the developments of technologies that lead to cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation's per capita income rises to about $4000 in 1993 dollars, it produces less of some pollutants per capita, mainly due to the fact that it can afford technology like catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, "We consider any kind of environment damage to result from mismanagement of the economy." He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as Eastern Europe can be traced to their economic woes. Hence, he concludes that in order to ensure environmental safety "we need a sound economy on a global basis."

#### 3. Case O/W – we prevent the deaths of millions of people and the root cause of these impacts is not the K

#### 4. Life has intrinsic and objective value achieved through subjective pleasures---its preservation should be an a priori goal

Amien Kacou 8 WHY EVEN MIND? On The A Priori Value Of “Life”, Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, Vol 4, No 1-2 (2008) cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184

Furthermore, that manner of finding things good that is in pleasure can certainly not exist in any world without consciousness (i.e., without “life,” as we now understand the word)—slight analogies put aside. In fact, we can begin to develop a more sophisticated definition of the concept of “pleasure,” in the broadest possible sense of the word, as follows: it is the common psychological element in all psychological experience of goodness (be it in joy, admiration, or whatever else). In this sense, pleasure can always be pictured to “mediate” all awareness or perception or judgment of goodness: **there is pleasure in all consciousness** of things good; pleasure is the common element of all conscious satisfaction. In short, **it is simply the very experience of liking things**, or the liking of experience, in general. In this sense, pleasure is, not only uniquely characteristic of life but also, the core expression of goodness in life—the most general sign or phenomenon for favorable conscious valuation, in other words. This does not mean that “good” is absolutely synonymous with “pleasant”—what we value may well go beyond pleasure. (The fact that we value things needs not be reduced to the experience of liking things.) However, what we value beyond pleasure remains a matter of speculation or theory. Moreover, we note that a variety of things that may seem otherwise unrelated are correlated with pleasure—some more strongly than others. In other words, **there are many things the experience of which we like**. For example: the admiration of others; sex; or rock-paper-scissors. But, again, what they are is irrelevant in an inquiry on a priori value—what gives us pleasure is a matter for empirical investigation. Thus, we can see now that, in general, something primitively valuable is attainable in living—that is, pleasure itself. And it seems equally clear that we have a priori logical reason to pay attention to the world in any world where pleasure exists. Moreover, we can now also articulate a foundation for a security interest in our life: since the good of pleasure can be found in living (to the extent pleasure remains attainable),[17] and only in living, therefore, a priori, life ought to be continuously (and indefinitely) pursued at least for the sake of preserving the possibility of finding that good. However, this platitude about the value that can be found in life turns out to be, at this point, insufficient for our purposes. It seems to amount to very little more than recognizing that our subjective desire for life in and of itself shows that **life has some** objective value. For what difference is there between saying, “living is unique in benefiting something I value (namely, my pleasure); therefore, I should desire to go on living,” and saying, “I have a unique desire to go on living; therefore I should have a desire to go on living,” whereas the latter proposition immediately seems senseless? In other words, “life gives me pleasure,” says little more than, “I like life.” Thus, we seem to have arrived at the conclusion that the fact that we already have some (subjective) desire for life shows life to have some (objective) value. But, if that is the most we can say, then it seems our enterprise of justification was quite superficial, and the subjective/objective distinction was useless—for all we have really done is highlight the correspondence between value and desire. Perhaps, our inquiry should be a bit more complex.

5. Fear of death turns the kritik—incentivizes individuals to find their own value

Gyatso 2003 [Geshe Kelsang, fully accomplished meditation master, internationally renowned spiritual teacher who can show us from his experience how to begin our spiritual paths, author, “Fear of Death,” Tharpa Publications, www.tharpa.com/background/fear-of-death.htm, acc 10-26-04//uwyo-ajl]

Generally, our fear of death is an unhealthy and unrealistic fear-we don't want to die, so we ignore the subject, deny it, or get morbidly obsessed by it and think that life is meaningless. However, right now we cannot do anything about dying, so there is no point fearing death itself. What kind of fear is useful? A healthy fear of death would be the fear of dying unprepared, as this is a fear we can do something about, a danger we can avert. If we have this realistic fear, this sense of danger, we are encouraged to prepare for a peaceful and successful death and are also inspired to make the most of our very precious human life instead of wasting it. This "sense of danger" inspires us to make preparations so that we are no longer in the danger we are in now, for example by practicing moral discipline, purifying our negative karma, and accumulating as much merit, or good karma, as possible. We put on a seat belt out of a sense of danger of the unseen dangers of traffic on the road, and that seat belt protects us from going through the windshield. We can do nothing about other traffic, but we can do something about whether or not we go through the windscreen if someone crashes into us. Similarly, we can do nothing about the fact of death, but we can seize control over how we prepare for death and how we die. Eventually, through Tantric spiritual practice, we can even attain a deathless body.

#### **6. To refuse to solve suffering is also to abandon the celebration of life.**

May 5—PhD from Penn State University in 1989, and has been at Clemson since 1991

(Todd May, “To change the world, to celebrate life,” Philosophy & Social Criticism 2005 Vol 31 nos 5–6 pp. 517–531nex)

. IX And what happens from there? From the meetings, from the rallies, from the petitions and the teach-ins? What happens next? There is, after all, always a next. If you win this time – end aid to the contras, divest from apartheid South Africa, force debt-forgiveness by technologically advanced countries – there is always more to do. There is the de-unionization of workers, there are gay rights, there is Burma, there are the Palestinians, the Tibetans. There will always be Tibetans, even if they aren’t in Tibet, even if they aren’t Asian. But is that the only question: Next? Or is that just the question we focus on? What’s the next move in this campaign, what’s the next campaign? Isn’t there more going on than that? After all, engaging in political organizing is a practice, or a group of practices. It contributes to making you who you are. It’s where the power is, and where your life is, and where the intersection of your life and those of others (many of whom you will never meet, even if it’s for their sake that you’re involved) and the buildings and streets of your town is. This moment when you are seeking to change the world, whether by making a suggestion in a meeting or singing at a rally or marching in silence or asking for a signature on a petition, is not a moment in which you don’t exist. It’s not a moment of yours that you sacriﬁce for others so that it no longer belongs to you. It remains a moment of your life, sedimenting in you to make you what you will become, emerging out of a past that is yours as well. What will you make of it, this moment? How will you be with others, those others around you who also do not cease to exist when they begin to organize or to protest or to resist? The illusion is to think that this has nothing to do with you. You’ve made a decision to participate in world-changing. Will that be all there is to it? Will it seem to you a simple sacriﬁce, for this small period of time, of who you are for the sake of others? Are you, for this moment, a political ascetic? Asceticism like that is dangerous. X Freedom lies not in our distance from the world but in the historically fragile and contingent ways we are folded into it, just as we ourselves are folds of it. If we take Merleau-Ponty’s Being not as a rigid foundation or a truth behind appearances but as the historical folding and refolding of a univocity, then our freedom lies in the possibility of other foldings. Merleau-Ponty is not insensitive to this point. His elusive concept of the invisible seems to gesture in this direction. Of painting, he writes: the proper essence of the visible is to have a layer of invisibility in the strict sense, which it makes present as a certain absence . . . There is that which reaches the eye directly, the frontal properties of the visible; but there is also that which reaches it from below . . . and that which reaches it from above . . . where it no longer participates in the heaviness of origins but in free accomplishments. 9 Elsewhere, in The Visible and the Invisible, he says: if . . . the surface of the visible, is doubled up over its whole extension with an invisible reserve; and if, ﬁnally, in our ﬂesh as the ﬂesh of things, the actual, empirical, ontic visible, by a sort of folding back, invagination, or padding, exhibits a visibility, a possibility that is not the shadow of the actual but its principle . . . an interior horizon and an exterior horizon between which the actual visible is a partitioning and which, nonetheless, open indeﬁnitely only upon other visibles . . . 10 What are we to make of these references? We can, to be sure, see the hand of Heidegger in them. But we may also, and for present purposes more relevantly, see an intersection with Foucault’s work on freedom. There is an ontology of freedom at work here, one that situates freedom not in the private reserve of an individual but in the unﬁnished character of any historical situation. There is more to our historical juncture, as there is to a painting, than appears to us on the surface of its visibility. The trick is to recognize this, and to take advantage of it, not only with our thoughts but with our lives. And that is why, in the end, there can be no such thing as a sad revolutionary. **To seek to change the world is to offer a new form of life-celebration**. It is to articulate a fresh way of being, which is at once a way of seeing, thinking, acting, and being acted upon. It is to fold Being once again upon itself, this time at a new point, to see what that might yield. There is, as Foucault often reminds us, no guarantee that this fold will not itself turn out to contain the intolerable. In a complex world with which we are inescapably entwined, a world we cannot view from above or outside, there is no certainty about the results of our experiments. Our politics are constructed from the same vulnerability that is the stuff of our art and our daily practices. But to refuse to experiment is to resign oneself to the intolerable; it is to abandon both the struggle to change the world and the opportunity to celebrate living within it. And to seek one aspect without the other – life-celebration without world-changing, world-changing without life-celebration – is to refuse to acknowledge the chiasm of body and world that is the wellspring of both. If we are to celebrate our lives, if we are to change our world, then perhaps the best place to begin to think is our bodies, which are the openings to celebration and to change, and perhaps the point at which the war within us that I spoke of earlier can be both waged and resolved. That is the fragile beauty that, in their different ways, both MerleauPonty and Foucault have placed before us. The question before us is whether, in our lives and in our politics, we can be worthy of it.

#### 7. VTL is subjective and we shouldn’t decide it for others – turns the aff

Schwartz et al, ‘2 [Lisa, Lecturer in Philosophy of Medicine, Department of General Practice, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK; Paul Preece, Theme Coordinator of Medical Ethics, Dundee Medical School, Ninewells, Dundee, UK; and Rob Hendry, Medical Advisor, Medical & Dental Defense Union of Scotland, Mackintosh House, Glasgow, UK, Medical Ethics: A Case-Based Approach, p. 112, November]

The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients' judgement in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

#### 8. Their ideology causes war and the end of human aspiration

Hall, 95 (T.D., Ph.D and contributor—Trufax”; “Influence of Malthus and Darwin on the European Elite”)

After 1859, the Darwinian "vision" of existence as purposeless struggle and of evolution as a haphazard process quickly replaced the Judeo-Christian vision of human life as a purposeful, divinely guided moral struggle. The Darwinian revolution deposed God as Source, and indeed exiled from the realm of "true science" all teleological considerations (considerations as to the purpose and ends of life). "Instead of endorsing the eighteenth-century concept of a drive toward perfection," writes Ernst Mayr, "Darwin merely postulated change.... By chance this process of adaptation sometimes results in changes that can be interpreted as progress, but there is no intrinsic mechanism generating inevitable advance." "Darwin's new and revolutionary [reactionary] view," writes Australian scientist Michael Denton, "implied that all the diversity of life on Earth had resulted from natural and random processes and not, as previously believed, from the creative activity of God. The acceptance of this great claim and the consequent elimination of God from nature was to play a decisive role in the secularization of western society...." Further, the "idea of life as meaningless struggle" played a decisive role in the brutalization of the western world. Guided by the "scientific" ideas that "war is the health of the nation" and that the great threat to the state is over-population, the rulers of late nineteenth century Europe precipitated the Age of Imperialism. After Darwin, the nations of Europe found themselves with "surplus populations." Nation after nation entered the race to acquire foreign lands. The motive was not greed, it was "survival." The nations that would survive into the future, it was believed, would be those in possession of vast tracts of land for the dumping of surplus population. In a very short time, all of Africa was carved up by the European powers. Aboriginal peoples of that continent who objected to slavery were destroyed. Many great tribes, tribes that for thousands of years existed in balance with the environment, were eradicated. It was the "African Holocaust." Today, the holocaust continues. Competition for empire (i.e. the possession of colonies for the dumping of surplus population) was a major cause of World War I. In 1901, Arthur Dix, the editor of two Berlin journals, wrote: "A timorous people, which knows not how to use its elbows, may of course put a stop to the increase of population--it might find things too narrow at home. The superfluity of population might find no economic existence. A people happy in its future, however, knows nothing of artificial limitation; its only care can be to find room on the globe for a livelihood for other members of its own race." In Britain as Germany's Vassal (1912), Social Darwinist (and retired German general) F. von Bernhardi writes, "In the interest of the world's civilization it is our duty to enlarge Germany's colonial empire. Thus alone can we politically, or at least nationally, unite the German civilization throughout the world, for only then will they recognize that German civilization is the most necessary factor in human progress. We must endeavor to acquire new territories throughout the world by all means in our power, because we must preserve to Germany the millions of Germans who will be born in the future, and we must provide for them food and employment. They ought to be enabled to live under a German sky, and to lead a German life." Given such attitudes (not only in Germany, but throughout Europe), war became inevitable. It became inevitable for another reason as well: War was viewed by Bernhardi and other influential hard-core Social Darwinists as an "indispensable regulator" of populations. "If it were not for war," Bernhardi writes, "we should probably find that inferior and degenerate races would overcome healthy and youthful ones by their wealth and their numbers. The generative importance of war lies in this, that it causes selection, and thus war becomes a biological necessity." In the twentieth century, the Malthus-Darwin doctrine conditioned a struggle for power on an unprecedented scale. The twentieth century is the most bloody, the most brutal on record. For the first time, the principal targets of war became populations. The Concept of Mutual Aid and Cooperation One who had attempted to stop the carnage was the Russian naturalist and evolutionist Petr Kropotkin. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, Kropotkin argued the view that the key to evolutionary progress is not conflict, but cooperation. In his years of research in Siberian and elsewhere, Kropotkin maintained, he failed to find "that bitter struggle for existence, among animals belonging to the same species, which was considered by most Darwinists (though not always by Darwin himself) as the dominant characteristic of the struggle for life, and the main factor of evolution. "If we ask Nature," Kropotkin writes, "Who are the fittest: those who are continually at war with each other, or those who support one another?" we at once see that those animals which acquire habits of mutual aid are undoubtedly the fittest. They have more chances to survive, and they attain, in their respective classes, the highest development of the intelligence and bodily organization...." In 1902, Kropotkin published Mutual Aid--A Factor of Evolution, a thorough, scientific refutation of the idea that struggle for survival is the source of evolutionary progress. It was too late. The Social Darwinists were in command of the field, and they were demanding war. In 1914, the despairing Kropotkin wrote: "When the present war began, involving nearly all Europe in a terrible struggle, and this struggle assumed ... a never yet known character of wholesale destruction of life among the non-combatants and pillage of the means of subsistence of the civil population, 'struggle for existence' became the favorite explanation with those who tried to find an excuse for these horrors." Applied Darwinism and the Nazi Reich As we all know, the First World War was only the beginning of the horrors. For many twentieth century leaders, "genocide" was regarded as a legitimate tool of state policy. "National Socialism," said Nazi Deputy Party leader Rudolf Hess in 1934, is nothing but applied biology." The third premise of classical Darwinism became the foundation of the Third Reich. "The entire Nazi regime," writes Robert Jay Lifton, "was built on a biomedical vision that required the kind of racial purification that would progress from sterilization to extensive killing." As early as the publication of Mein Kampf (1924-26), Lifton indicates, "Hitler had declared the sacred racial mission of the German people to be 'assembling and preserving the most valuable stocks of basic racial elements [and].... slowly and severely raising them to a dominant position.'..." For Hitler, the most famous of the twentieth century Social Darwinist politicos, the stakes were absolute: "If the power to fight for one's own health is no longer present, the right to live in this world of struggle ends." Annihilation "In the Name of Survival" By the middle of our Malthusian century, the great "Superpowers"--the winners of the struggle for dominance--were threatening the annihilation of the entire planet ... in the name of survival."The twentieth century would be incomprehensible without the Darwinian revolution," writes Michael Denton. "The social and political currents which have swept the world in the past eighty years would not have been possible without its intellectual sanction... ."49 Among the "currents which have swept the world," we may list ... Imperialism, the mad rush for empire in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth; the rise in the twentieth century of various forms of socialism premised on the idea that the first responsibility of the state is population control, a responsibility inevitably involving emphasis on the elimination of supposedly defective peoples; the First and Second World Wars; the so-called Cold War; and the numerous late twentieth century "hot" wars.

#### 9. Sacrificial rituals make it impossible to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate forms of destruction.

Hamblet 4

**Wendy** Hamblet, **Asst Prof Philosophy at Adelphi University, 200**4 **[*Sacred Monstrous: A Reflection on Violence in Human Communities* p. 31-35]**

Violent rituals legitimated violence on the (sometimes implicit, sometimes explicit) argument that existence is naturally chaotic and requires its ordering force. Where violence is configured as a manifestation of the sacred, both a symbol of divine presence among people and a gift from beneficent gods, it is difficult to see how any act of brutality, however extreme, however unwar‑ranted, however destructive, could fail to be seen as legitimate, sanctified, necessary and desirable, if committed by the "rightful" authorities. Ritual violences, with their alternating episodes of insult, injury and murder, dramatically confirmed in the participants, through the pain inflicted upon their bodies and the terrors inflicted upon their psyches, a view of earthly existence as a dialectic of victimization and empowerment. They also initiated the participants into "pathologies of defense" that configured difference as exaggerated in power and malice and that counseled violent rejection of the alien for the sake of the purity and security of the homespace. The participants, themselves "purified" by ritual violence, often returned to the mundane with an "elevated" view of themselves. Having suffered and survived the torment of the demon or the malevolence of the spirit ancestors or gods, the initiated understood themselves as "chosen ones," ordained to protect the interests of the gods on earth and licensed to employ "good violence" to this end. Obsessions with assertive identity need not be overly defensive and defensiveness need not be pathological. But where identity has been determined and the wisdom of defense has been taught through excruciating pain and tenor, pathology is a likely result. The fact that defensive obsessions can readily "rebound" into offensive obsessions (as Bloch has indicated) illuminates the risk of obsessions per se. Obsessiveness, the definitive feature of ritual, signifies an over‑seriousness with oneself and one's traditions, and an inflexibility that does not prepare people for the inevitable changes that life brings. Nor do obsessions with identity and defense prepare people for peaceful co‑dwelling in a multicultural, multi‑racial, multi‑religioned world. Many of the experts rallied here conclude with an ominous warning that, since violent rituals are primal and archaic (in the original multivocity of that Greek word 3), dating back to the earliest human communities, it may be bloody [p. 34] murder, rather than lofty ideals and political astuteness, that underpin and configure the "civilizing processes" to which we so proudly credit the moral progress of the species. This paradox is concomitant to the paradox that motivates this inquiry: the coexistent yet morally irreconcilable facts of people's ideals of peaceful community and the bloody terrain of their actual engagement in the world. Polar characterizations that rest upon clear and distinct definitions are the legacy of a violent human past of bloody sacrifice, physical torture, humiliation and mutilation. A "logic of domination" and an "idiom of conquest" may manifest a presence today in the rigidity of our "ordered" systems, their obsessive prescriptions and prohibitions of appropriate behaviors, in the seriousness with which we carve out inflexible self‑definitions, in the sacredness that we attribute to our homespaces, and in the disgust and fear that we experience in the face of the alien. Pathologies of defense, scapegoat mechanisms, the humiliation of the outcast, the tenor of the tormented, and the rage of the oppressed linger on in the founding logic and mechanisms of "order" that keep intact our systems, poising us aggressively in favour of "rebounding vinlences." Violence remains an ineluctable element of orders per se. It is not difficult to see that the more "ordered" a society is, the more it conforms to the original structure established in ancient rituals of violence. The "order" of systems, however, is entirely illusional, grounded in perceived commonalities that deny individual differencing. This indicates that what matters is not so much commonality as consciousness of commonality. Perceived eommonalities will always have a component of shared histories‑shared memories of past triumphs or persecutions. To the degree that past victories or degradations become the focus of identity work, the group will be identity‑obsessed and pathological. The more pathological the coalition, the greater the likelihood that stable identity will he sought through mechanisms of rejection that demonize the differences within and outside the group. Thus we can say, as a general observation of their structure, that "ordered" worlds are metaphysically rapacious worlds that feed upon the marginal, the different, the alienated and the non‑belonging. Ordering systems not only suppress and regulate violence; they comprise it and they compose it. Mechanisms of control and order and organization not only define the belonging and distinguish it from the marginal; they produce the alien through their alienating definitions. Prohibitions and prescriptions not only keep the differences within the system suppressed so as to produce an illusion of integrity and consonance; they increase the fear and sense of powerlessness from which burgeon hysterias for cleanliness. The different come to serve as horrifying objects of dread. They function as extreme derivatives that give boundaries and definition to a "human" world. Extremes of human difference serve to reconfirm the system and to reinstate the legitimacy of those who belong. Thus the non‑belonging serve well in the identity work of the system, even as, paradoxically, they serve the selfdefeating purpose of reconfirming as "rightful" the violenees visited upon them

10. The alt is untestable and unverifiable

Boldt-Irons 95 (Leslie Anne “On Bataille: Critical Essays” pg.4)

A second early and noteworthy response may be found in Sartre’s article "Un Nouveau mystique." In the first section of this text, Sartre accuses Bataille of putting forward a "totalitarian thought," one that is "syncretic" in approach. Sartre writes: "In contrast to the analytic processes of philosophers, one might say that Bataille's book presents itself as the result of **a totalitarian thought**" (149). According to Sartre, Bataille's thought "does not construct itself, does not progressively enrich itself, but, indivisible and almost ineffable, it is level with the surface of each aphorism, such that each one of them presents us with the same complex and formidable meaning seen from a particular light" (149). Sartre seems to be accusing Bataille of not being systematic, of not elaborating a system beginning from founding principles. He appears to be dissatisfied with the exposition of Bataille's thought because it **refuses to be linear**. One can suppose that Bataille's response to this accusation would, in itself, issue from various points of departure, thus once again refusing linearity and system.

11. The K internally link turns itself – doesn’t account for the privileging of expenditure

Boldt-Irons 95 (Leslie Anne “On Bataille: Critical Essays

Arkady Plotnitsky takes as his point of departure Bataille's notion of expenditure when he asks whether or not Bataille avoids idealizing waste which he opposes to consumption for productive purposes. While Plotnitsky points to Bataille's tendency at times to "subordinate the effect of exchange and consumption" (to a somewhat idealized insistence on the primordiality of waste), he also underlines Bataille's awareness that **to privilege expenditure unconditionally is just as untenable as to not account for its loss.** Plotnitsky argues that Bataille's "insistence on waste is saved by his labyrinthine complexity of inscription of these theories." In writing of an exchange of expenditures, Bataille avoids reducing his view of economy to either an exchange economy or to one that is entirely free of exchange, the exuberance of the sovereign operations which he describes always involve more than mere waste or expenditure.

12. We are running out of energy resources—there is no excess energy—failure to grow results in:

#### a. Famine

Pimentel, Ecology @ Cornell, 98

(<http://dieoff.org/page57.htm>)

As the world population continues to grow geometrically, great pressure is being placed on arable land, water, energy, and biological resources to provide an adequate supply of food while maintaining the integrity of our ecosystem. According to the World Bank and the United Nations, from 1 to 2 billion humans are now malnourished, indicating a combination of insufficient food, low incomes, and inadequate distribution of food. This is the largest number of hungry humans ever recorded in history. In China about 80 million are now malnourished and hungry. Based on current rates of increase, the world population is projected to double from roughly 6 billion to more than 12 billion in less than 50 years (Pimentel et al., 1994). As the world population expands, the food problem will become increasingly severe, conceivably with the numbers of malnourished reaching 3 billion.

b. Resource wars

New Statesman, 9/8/2003

The unprecedented power failures of the past few weeks reveal a deeper truth. Human ambitions may be limitless, but the earth's resources are irrevocably finite. Our present way of life cannot renew itself without cheap energy; but the resources from which energy is extracted are becoming inexorably scarcer and more expensive. At the same time, they are becoming a focus of conflict between states. As countries such as Britain and the US become ever more dependent on energy originating in faraway regions, they are drawn increasingly into trying to secure control of them by military means. Conflict in the Middle East has an extremely complex history, but anyone who tells you that western intervention in the region has nothing to do with oil is a fool or a liar. In central Asia, the Great Game has been resumed, with the major powers vying for access to the region's reserves of oil and natural gas. Behind all the rhetoric about humanitarian intervention, the hard realities of classical geopolitics have returned.

c. US global militarization

Renner, 4 (Michael Renner, Senior Researcher at the Worldwatch Institute, January 2004, <http://www.fpif.org/papers/03petropol/war.html>)

Corporate interests are only part of the picture. Demand has prompted governments of major oil importing countries to apply increasing pressure for access to oil in the Middle East and elsewhere. Only the European nations have managed to keep the growth of their oil consumption in check. With the help of North Sea oil, the continent has reduced net imports by about 8% to a little more than 8 million barrels per day. Runaway consumption in the United States caused it to surpass Europe in net oil imports in the early 1990s. The United States, for the first time, imported more oil from the Persian Gulf region than Europe did in 2001. U.S. oil imports have increased by a whopping 65% over the last decade. Meanwhile, China is entering the skirmish. As its economy surges, domestic supplies are incapable of satisfying the rapidly rising demand, and it is becoming more and more import dependent. The Middle East is of growing interest to Beijing, and China’s state oil companies recently took steps toward securing a stake in oil from Central Asia’s Caspian Sea basin. Outside the Middle East, major industrial powers and leading international oil companies are vying for access to oil in the West African countries of Nigeria, Angola, and Chad, as well as in the Caspian region. As the industrial powers increasingly rely on imported oil, the rivalry could lead to confrontations and interventions to ensure compliant regimes in exporting countries. Both in the Middle East and in other regions, securing access to oil, pipelines, and shipping lanes go hand-in-hand with a fast-expanding U.S. military presence. From Pakistan to Central Asia to the Caucasus, and from the eastern Mediterranean to the Horn of Africa, a dense network of U.S. military facilities has emerged, with many bases established in the name of the war on terror. In South America, the United States is getting more and more drawn into the civil war in Colombia. The Bush administration decided to provide training and equipment for Colombian troops protecting an oil export pipeline against frequent bombings by rebel forces.

d. Nuclear war in the Persian gulf

Ehrlich, Population Studies @ Stanford, 91

(The Population Explosion, p.45)

Instead, each nation seems bent on competing for and quarreling over the pieces of the shrinking resource pie-even diverting large portions of it into dangerous and wasteful arms races. One need only contrast the great efforts expended to find and defend access to petroleum reserves in the 1980s with the negligible efforts to increase energy efficiency and control population growth. The world might yet be plunged into nuclear war over the Persian Gulf, and the petroleum situation is often discussed in the media.

13. Valuing life is inevitable—humans can never truly accept the eclipse of the ego, the individual will always have a will to live for its own sake

Crosby in 88 (Donald A., Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State University, The specter of the absurd : sources and criticisms of modern nihilism)

Finally, we need to recognize that there is a sense in which it is pointless to argue for or against the meaning of life in the presence of death. Most of us simply cannot help wanting to live, despite the uncertainties, perplexities, sorrows, and tragedies that confront us in life, including the ever-present fact and threat of unexpected deaths. The will to live is in the final analysis a wondrous gift. It cannot be created or destroyed by even the most sophisticated intellectual arguments. Something akin to this is true for all living creatures in whom, as Boethius remarks, "the desire to live comes not from the wishes of the will but from the principles of nature" (1962:68).

### Gender K

#### Case comes first - Patriarchy is not the root cause–

#### Framework – we get to weigh our impacts – allowing the neg to turn the debate to a question purely of ontology moots the 1AC and allows them to set up an infinite number of unpredictable frameworks – our interp best preserves both policy and kritikal education

#### No link – their card is talking about transportation that’s built with the assumption of male rush-hour commuters – make them prove how this applies to our aff

#### Perm – do the plan under a framework of feminist geography – combining feminist geography with concrete transportation policies is the best way to address oppression

Porter and Fernando '02 Gina and Priyantha ("Bridging the gap between gender and transport",Balancing the Load. Women, Gender and Transport, IFRTD Publications, 2002, Chapter 1)

Gender, however, has not been fully mainstreamed into either the infrastructure debate or the debate on rural transport services and IMTs. Agencies promoting labour based road construction and maintenance as a means of creating employment and incomes have made an effort to increase women’s participation in labour based activities. There are a number of ‘pilot projects’ and several guidelines, toolkits and the like that encourage transport sector professionals to develop more gender sensitive transport interventions (Booth et al, 2000). But, despite evidence (mostly from sub-Saharan Africa) that women and men in rural households have responsibility for different transport tasks; that women often carry a heavier burden in terms of time and effort spent on transport, and that with less access and control over resources, they have less opportunities than men to use transport technologies that could alleviate their ‘burden’, gender issues are still peripheral to much of rural transport policy and practice (Sibanda, 2001). While transport professionals have taken little account of gender, issues of access and mobility have been *marginalised* in much of the discourse on gender and development. Gender analysts, focusing on gender roles, resources and relations, have rarely considered in detail the role that improved transport plays in providing women with the resources to meet their practical needs (for example, enabling them to fulfil their responsibilities for water and firewood collection). Few have looked at how improving access and increasing mobility can address more strategic gender issues. Women’s transport burden contributes to women’s time poverty. Lack of time is a key constraint to women building up their assets and reducing their vulnerability. By reducing women’s transport burden, development interventions can increase their productivity and incomes and enhance their assets; they can also have more time to rest, to enjoy social life, to participate in community activities. Increasing women’s mobility can empower women to take greater control of their lives by increasing their access to markets and their exposure to education, training and information, and by providing more opportunities for their political participation.

1. Alt can’t solve – feminism reproduces racial hierarchies

Goetz, 91research fellow in Development studies at U of Sussex, (Anne Goetz, “Gender and International Relations,” Harper and Row, 1991, J)

Third world women have accused first world and western-trained feminists of exercising a certain cultural colonialism, of misrepresenting different women by homogenizing the experiences and conditions of western women across time and culture. Chakravorty Spivak has shown that western women are “complicitous” in contributing to the continued ‘degredation’ of third world women whose micrology they interpret without having access to it. Monica Lazreg, exploring the ‘perils of writing as a woman on women in Algeria’ suggests that third world women have been produced as a field of knowledge, essentializing their difference in a process that represents a ‘caricature of the feminist project’. Black feminists have accused white feminists of adding on difference at the margin ‘without leaving the comforts of home’ so as to support ‘the seeming homogeneity, stability, and self-evidence of its experience based epistemology’. Trinh T. Minh-ha identifies this neutralized difference as ‘the very kind of colonized anthropologised difference the master has always granted his subordinates’. Audre Lorde’s response to the universalized picture of oppression in Mary Dali’s Gym/Ecology reproaches her for failing: “to recognize that, as women… differences expose all women to various forms and degrees of patriarchal oppression, some of which we share, some of which we do not… The oppression of women knows no ethnic nor racial boundaries, true, but that does not mean that it is identical within those boundaries… to imply… that all women suffer the same oppression simply because we are women is to lose sight of the many varied tools of patriarchy. It is to ignore how these tools are used by women without awareness against each other.” These statements amount to descriptions of an epistemologically totalizing and culturally disruptive feminist. And to the extent that feminist theory’s claim to relevance is based upon its claim to represent the meaning of women’s social experience in all its heterogeneity, these critiques point to some fundamental problems. The original consciousness raising approach of traditional feminist – what Catherine MacKinnon has called its critical method – involved a project of theorizing the collective expression of the social constitution of sexed identities. This was informed by a political understanding that gender was not an inalienable description of human reality; an understanding derived from the insights of a traditional feminist ideology whose analysis of the political meaning of experience was concerned with deconstructing the legitimating surface of women’s oppression. Theorizing the social construction of subjectivity produced an understanding of the mechanisms of sexist oppression. In practice, and as seen above, particularly in the context of WID practice, that collective critical reconstitution of women’s experiences in traditional feminist movements has tended to reproduce the situational consciousness of the white, bourgeois, heterosexual feminist, developing a set of certainties structured around that specific subjectivity. Such certainties in liberal or Marxist feminist ideologies tended to inform the cross-cultural investigations of sexual subordination, producing a certain myopia with respect to the details of sexual subordination in different societies. The failure to guide practice with reference to the processes that shape human perceptions and norms promoted the disintegration of feminist pronouncements on women in development into a norm setting activity by a counter-elite.

#### Policy analysis should precede ontology – most effective way to challenge power

Jill Taft-Kaufman, Speech prof @ CMU, 1995, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, “Other Ways”, p pq

**The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire**. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, **despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice**. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries **this** situation as one which **leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism**. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: **Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has [have] become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities** of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the **postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend**. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies:  **I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror** (what else do we do but speak?), **but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous**....(pp. 2-27) **The** realm of the **discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols**.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. **Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals** (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "**the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual**" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "**the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation**" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. **People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. (????)**

#### Turn: Designating patriarchy as the sole cause of oppression denies privileged women’s participation in systems of domination like racism and classism – this abdicates responsibility and reinforces oppression.

**Crenshaw**, director of debate @ university of alabama, **2** (carrie, dominant form and marginalized voices: argumentation about feminism(s), ceda yearbook, 14, p. 76-77)

Debate arguments that assume a singular conception of feminism include and empower the voices of race- and class-privileged women while excluding and silencing the voices of feminists marginalized by race and class status. This position becomes clearer when we examine the second assumption of arguments about feminism in intercollegiate debate – patriarchy is the *sole* cause of oppression. Important feminist thought has resisted this assumption for good reason. Designating patriarchy as the sole cause of oppression allows the subjugation of resistance to other forms of oppression like racism and classism to the struggle against sexism. Such subjugation has the effect of denigrating the legitimacy of resistance to racism and classism as struggles of equal importance. “Within feminist movement in the West, this has lead to the assumption that resisting patriarchal domination is a more legitimate feminist action that resisting racism and other forms of domination” (hooks, *Talking Back* 19). The relegation of struggles against racism and class exploitation to offspring status is not the only implication of the “sole cause” argument. In addition, identifying patriarchy as the single source of oppression obscures women’s perpetration of other forms of subjugation and domination. bell hooks argues that we “should not obscure the reality that women can and do participate in politics of domination, as perpetrators as well as victims – that we dominate, that we are dominated. If focus on patriarchal domination masks this reality or becomes the means by which women deflect attention from the real conditions and circumstances of our lives, the women cooperate in suppressing and promoting false consciousness, inhibiting our capacity to assume responsibility for transforming ourselves and society (hooks, *Talking Back* 20). Characterizing patriarchy as the sole cause of oppression allows mainstream feminists to abdicate responsibility for the exercise of class and race privilege. It casts the struggle against class exploitation and racism as secondary concerns.

#### Perm do the plan and the alt in all other instances – either the alt is strong enough to overcome the residual link to the plan or it can’t overcome the massive link to the status quo

#### Alt doesn’t solve – can’t challenge hegemonic practices

**Saloom JD UGA, 6**

Rachel, JD Univ of Georgia School of Law and M.A. in Middle Eastern Studies from U of Chicago, Fall 2006, A Feminist Inquiry into International Law and International Relations, 12 Roger Williams U. L. Rev. 159, Lexis

Because patriarchy is embedded within society, it is no surprise that the theory and practice of both international law and international relations is also patriarchal. [98](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53" \l "n98#n98" \t "_self) **Total critique**, however, **presents no method by which to challenge current hegemonic practices. Feminist scholars have yet to provide a coherent way in which total critique can be applied to change the nature of international law and international relations**. Some  [\*178]  feminist scholars are optimistic for the possibility of changing the way the current system is structured. For example, Whitworth believes that "sites of resistance are always available to those who oppose the status quo." [99](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53" \l "n99#n99" \t "_self) Enloe suggests that since the world of international politics has been made it can also be remade. [100](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53" \l "n100#n100" \t "_self) She posits that every time a woman speaks out about how the government controls her, new theories are being made. [101](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53" \l "n101#n101" \t "_self) **All of these theorists highlight the manner in which gender criticisms can destabilize traditional theories. They provide no mechanism**, however, **for the actual implementation of their theories into practice**. While in the abstract, resistance to hegemonic paradigms seems like a promising concept, gender theorists have made no attempt to make their resistance culminate in meaningful change. **The notion of rethinking traditional approaches to** international law and **international relations does not go far enough in prescribing an alternative theoretical basis for understanding the international arena. Enloe's plea for women to speak out about international politics does not go nearly far enough in explaining how those acts could have the potential to actually change the practice of international relations. Either women are already speaking out now, and their voices alone are not an effective mechanism to challenge the system**, or women are not even speaking out about world politics currently. Obviously it is absurd to assume that women remain silent about world politics. If that is the case, then one must question women's ability to speak up, challenge, and change the system.

**Rejecting gendered politics while still engaging in realism can still solve**

**Lind 5** (Michael, Executive Editor of the National Interest, “Of Arms and the Woman,” Jan 20,http://feminism.eserver.org/of-arms-and-the-woman.txt) AK

The first thing that must be said about the feminist critique of realism is that it is by no means incompatible with realism, properly understood. In fact, realist theory can hardly be recognized in the feminist caricature of it. Take the idea of the innate human propensity for conflict. Although some realist thinkers such as Hans Morgenthau have confused the matter (often under the influence of Reinhold Niebuhr) with misleading talk of "original sin," the controlling idea of realism is that there is an ineradicable potential for conflict between human beings--"men" in the inclusive, gender-neutral sense-- when they are organized in groups. Realism is not about conflict between individual men, that is, males; if it were, it would be a theory of barroom brawls or adolescent male crime. It is about conflict between rival communities, and those communities include women and men alike. Feminist critics of realism, then, begin by attacking a straw man, or a straw male. Even worse, they tend to indulge in the stereotypes that they otherwise abhor: aggression is "male," conciliation is "female." To their credit, most feminist theorists are aware of this danger, ever mindful of their dogma that all sexual identity is socially constructed, ever fearful that they will hear the cry of "Essentialist!" raised against them. Thus Enloe, in an earlier book called Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics, struggles with how to answer what she calls "the `What about Margaret Thatcher?' taunt." Her answer is that women like Margaret Thatcher and Jeane Kirkpatrick reinforce the patriarchy by making international conflict look "less man-made, more people-made and thus more legitimate and harder to reverse." Enloe applies this analysis consistently--right-wing women like Phyllis Schlafly are pawns of the patriarchal-militarist power structure, while left-wing women like the Greenham Common Women are disinterested proponents of the good of humanity. Still, Enloe is troubled enough to return to the question: "some women's class aspirations and their racist fears lured them into the role of controlling other women for the sake of imperial rule." Admit that, however, and you are close to conceding the point about collective human behavior made by realists. Then there is "the state." Here, too, there is nothing in realism that cannot accommodate many feminine observations about the particular patriarchal features of particular historic states. The realist definition of "the state" as a sovereign entity with an existence and a strategy distinct from that of individuals is very broad, including medieval duchies and ancient empires-- and, perhaps, female biker gangs. Realist theory holds no preference for the modern nation-state, though a word might be spoken in its defense. Again and again in feminist writings one encounters the claim that the modern nation- state is inherently "gendered," as though its predecessors--feudal dynastic regimes, theocratic empires, city-states, tribal amphictyonies--were not even more rigidly patriarchal.

**The criticism’s focus on identity creates a politics of exclusion that prevents meaningful critiques and turns the very superior identification they try to solve**

Jarvis – 2000[DSL, ‘International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism’, February, *University of South Carolina Publishing*, pg. 160-162]

Critical research agendas of this type, however, are not found easily in International Relations. Critics of feminist perspectives run the risk of denouncement as either a misogynist malcontent or an androcentric keeper of the gate. At work in much of this discourse is an unstated political correctness, where the historical marginalization of women bestows intellectual autonomy, excluding those outside the identity group from legitimate participation in its discourse. Only feminist women can do real, legitimate, feminist theory since, in the mantra of identity politics, discourse must emanate from a positional (personal) ontology. Those sensitive or sympathetic to the identity politics of par­ticular groups are, of course, welcome to lend support and encourage­ment, but only on terms delineated by the groups themselves. In this way, they enjoy an uncontested sovereign hegemony oyer their own self-identification, insuring the group discourse is self constituted and that its parameters, operative methodology, *,uu\* standards of argument, appraisal, and evidentiary provisions are self defined. Thus, for example, when Sylvester calls lor a "home.steading" does so "by [a] repetitive feminist insistence that *we be included on our terms"* (my emphasis). Rather than an invitation to engage in dialogue, this is an ultimatum that a sovereign intellectual space be provided and insulated from critics who question the merits of identity-based political discourse. Instead, Sylvester calls upon International Relations to "share space, respect, and trust in a re-formed endeavor," but one otherwise proscribed as committed to demonstrating not only "that the secure homes constructed by IR's many debaters are chimerical," but, as a con­sequence, to ending International Relations and remaking it along lines grounded in feminist postmodernism.93 Such stipulative provisions might be likened to a form of negotiated sovereign territoriality where, as part of the settlement for the historically aggrieved, border incursions are to be allowed but may not be met with resistance or reciprocity. Demands for entry to the discipline are thus predicated on conditions that insure two sets of rules, cocooning postmodern feminist spaces from systematic analyses while "respecting" this discourse as it hastens about the project of deconstructing International Relations as a "male space." Sylvester's impassioned plea for tolerance and "emphatic cooperation" is thus confined to like-minded individuals, those who do not challenge feminist epistemologies but accept them as a necessary means of rein­venting the discipline as a discourse between postmodern identities—the most important of which is gender.94 Intolerance or misogyny thus become the ironic epithets attached to those who question the wisdom of this reinvention or the merits of the return of identity in international theory.'"' Most strategic of all, however, demands for entry to the disci­pline and calls for intellectual spaces betray a self-imposed, politically motivated marginality. After all, where are such calls issued from other than the discipline and the intellectual—and well established—spaces of feminist International Relations? Much like the strategies employed by male dissidents, then, feminist postmodernists too deflect as illegitimate any criticism that derives from skeptics whose vantage points are labeled privileged. And privilege is vari­ously interpreted historically, especially along lines of race, color, and sex where the denotations white and male, to name but two, serve as generational mediums to assess the injustices of past histories. White males, for example, become generic signifiers for historical oppression, indicating anontologicallv privileged group by which the historical experiences of the "other" can then be reclaimed in the context of their related oppression, exploitation, and exclusion. Legitimacy, in this context, can then be claimed in terms of one's group identity and the extent to which the history of that particular group has been "silenced." In this same way, self-identification or "self-situation" establishes one's credentials, allowing admittance to the group and legitimating the "authoritative" vantage point from which one speaks and writes. Thus, for example, Jan Jindy Pettman includes among the introductory pages to her most recent book, *Worldinjj Women,* a section titled "A (personal) politics of location," in which her identity as a woman, a feminist, and an academic, makes appar­ent her particular (marginal) identities and group loyalties.96 Similarly, Christine Sylvester, in the introduction to her book, insists, "It is impor­tant to provide a context for one's work in the often-denied politics of the personal." Accordingly, self-declaration reveals to the reader that she is a feminist, went to a Catholic girls school where she was schooled to "develop your brains and confess something called 'sins' to always male forever priests," and that these provide some pieces to her dynamic objec­tivity.97 Like territorial markers, self-identification permits entry to intel­lectual spaces whose sovereign authority is "policed" as much by marginal subjectivities as they allege of the oppressors who "police" the discourse of realism, or who are said to walk the corridors of the discipline insuring the replication of patriarchy, hierarchical agendas, and "malestream" theory. If Sylvester's version of feminist postmodernism is projected as tolerant, per-spectivist, and encompassing of a multiplicity of approaches, in reality it is as selective, exclusionary, and dismissive of alternative perspectives as mainstream approaches are accused of being.

**IR feminists vastly over simplify the diverse field of international relations literature—they need a specific link our aff.**

**Caprioli, 04** (“Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis” Mary Caprioli, Dept. of Political Science, University of Tennessee. International Studies Review. Volume 42 Issue 1 Page 193-197, March 2004. http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/0020-8833.00076).

Conventional feminist IR scholars misrepresent the field of international relations in arguing that IR scholarship as popularly accepted excludes alternative explanations of state behavior, including feminist inquiry, that go beyond structural, state-focused models. Feminist IR theorists, among others, critique the IR field for its state-centric approach and argue that ‘‘a world of states situated in an anarchical international system leaves little room for analyses of social relations, including gender relations’’ (Tickner 2001:146). As a result, they appear to set up a straw man by refusing to recognize the variety within ‘‘conventional’’ IR research. Indeed, as Jack Levy (2000) has observed, a significant shift to societal-level variables has occurred, partly in response to the decline in the systemic imperatives of the bipolar era. Certainly the democratic peace literature, particularly its normative explanation (Maoz and Russett 1993; Dixon 1994), among other lines of inquiry, recognizes the role of social relations in explaining state behavior. The normative explanation for the democratic peace thesis emphasizes the societal level values of human rights, support for the rule of law, and peaceful conflict resolution in explaining the likelihood of interstate conflict. Furthermore, dyadic tests of the democratic peace thesis rely ‘‘on an emerging theoretical framework that may prove capable of incorporating the strengths of the currently predominant realist or neorealist research program, and moving beyond it’’ (Ray 2000:311). In addition, theorizing and research in the field of ethnonationalism has highlighted connections that domestic ethnic discrimination and violence have with state behavior at the international level (Gurr and Harff 1994; Van Evera 1997; Caprioli and Trumbore 2003a, 2003b).

### Transportation Rationality K

#### 1. Perm do the plan and adopt a outlook of communicative rationality with instrumental rationality. Also, Instrumental rationality is not categorically bad – perm is best option.

**Mohammadi ‘10**

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – Page 23-25

It seems that at least part of reasons to formation of theory of communicative rationality refers to this "difference\* and 'language relativity\*. This theory helps consensus among individuals and group members and Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger's critique of the theory regarding difference and language relativity has no strong logic. On the contrary, using the critics' reasons, the bases of Habermas's theory will be supported and reinforced. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) in another critique of the theory stated: "there **is** the question raised by Rorty regarding **instrumental rationality**—**the bogeyman of communicative rationality**. Is it **all bad? Of course not."** They referred to the benefits of modernism and instrumental rationality and asked: "Although we must not forget that not everyone has benefited from this in equal measures and huge disparities exist, **can we really say that instrumental rationality has** (I) been crucial to people's 'voice', and (2) **made a** significant **detrimental difference** **to** their **ability to express** that **voice** when other avenues are open to them **? We think not.** I believe that Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger are right when they stated that in scientific and instrumental rationality, the situation was not too bad to hear the people's voice and there were no other methods open to them, but the important question is that do the opponents of communicative planning and rationality theories deny the whole scientific and instrumental rationality'1 And do they question all the aspects of scientific rationality and introduce it as a bogeyman'1 According to the writings of opponents of communicative rationality, the answer is 'No'. At least I do not think so. In most writings about communicative rationality and planning, the opponents have clearly mentioned the **scientific and instrumental rationality is a way that should help the communicative planning.** Where Healey (1993) describing essential components of communicative theory stated: "Planning is an interactive and interpretive process, focusing on "deciding and acting" within a range of specialized allocative and authoritative systems but drawing on the multi-dimensionality of "life-worlds" or "practical sense," rather than a single formalized dimention (for example, urban morphology- or scientific rationalism). Formal techniques of analysis and design in planning processes are but one form of discourse. Planning processes should be enriched by discussion of moral dilemmas and aesthetic experience, using a range of presentational tonus, from telling stones to aesthetic illustrations or experiences. Therefore, it can be seen that the opponents of communicative theory' have not rejected and denied the whole scientific and instrumental rationality.

#### 2. Willson’s transportation paradigm will fail and can’t explain change.

TALVITIE ‘1

(Antti Talvitie, Professor at Aalto University School of Science and Technology and formerly with the World Bank – “Comment on Richard Willson’s paper: Assessing communicative rationality as a transportation planning paradigm” – Transportation 28: 207–210, 2001 – via EBSCO database)

Willson addresses in his paper a wide range of planning issues: better communication, honesty, re-education of planners, public participation, planning process, and so on, and aims at creating a new paradigm for transport planning. The paper has much content to recommend it to planners, decisionmakers and the public. Dr. Willson deserves credit – as does Transportation – for bringing up these issues. Dr. Willson is also right in pointing out that technical expertise and methods that have been built over the past 30 years continue to be needed. Is Prof. Willson’s case for Communicative Rationality as the new paradigm for transport planning valid? I am not persuaded. I agree with many elements of his argument enumerated above, but not the paradigm. If it is not the right paradigm, what is? I argue below that analysis and emotional communication are. This is puzzling when talking is involved in both, and a prominent econometrist friend once complained to me that “these planners like to talk rather than analyze the problems.” Willson’s core inspiration is Habermas’ concept of communicative rationality. Habermas crafted communicative rationality as postmodernist method to counter the instrumental rationality of industrial revolution. Two constructs, lifeworld and system, are central to his argument. Lifeworld comprises the social life with symbolic meanings – religion, self-concepts, social norms, stories, art – and form the cultural basis for communication, social interaction, consensus and conflict resolution. System is the material knowledge in society, such as agriculture or engineering. Prior to the modern era system and lifeworld had an experiential relation. Symbolically, Habermas argued, in the good old days people related to each other in human ways – Oktoberfest brought people together to celebrate the hard work of harvest. Industrial revolution uncoupled system and lifeworld, mechanized harvest and commercialized Oktoberfest. Other than issues of money, there is now little human satisfaction in either. For Willson communicative rationality is an expansion of knowledge-based logical thinking to counter similar uncoupling as Habermas observed in society. He contends that knowledge and thinking – the traditional means of interpretation – are insufficient instruments. Rational communication, argumentation and debate, as distinct from knowledge and thinking, will lead to experiences of understanding and consensus, and will help construct, rationally, ends and means for a democratic society. It does this that by interpersonal discourse and interpretation of “facts” which, through public participation, result in social learning and consensus for change – ultimately, in desirable actions. Further, rational communication enriches public and political discourse, and integrates “traditional notions of science and communicative rationality’s critical social theory origins” (Willson, p. 12). Does rational communication facilitate or cause desirable change? Evidence answers in the negative. When rational communication is a factor in change, it occurs toward the end of a process when the battle has already been won. That is the problem with Willson’s paradigm. It does not answer what makes changes happen, in planning or in peoples’ lives, or in peoples themselves.

#### 3. Alt fails – their ideology is flawed as it encourages anarchy through direct democracy. The world of the alternative shows power struggle, racism and endless war. Further more, this TURNS the K because in a world of anarchy there is no communicative rationality because decision-making and planning comes from the majority in power excluding the minorities. The Perm avoids this while there is still federal control.

**4. Social justice impact not 1st – consequentialism’s always a better option**

**Issac, ‘2**

(Jeffery, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, Dissent, Vol. 49 No. 2, Spring)

Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, Hannah Arendt have taught, an **unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility**. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) **It fails to see that the purity of one’s intentions does not ensure the achievement of what one intends.** Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally comprised parties may seem like the right thing, but **if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity** is not simply a form of powerlessness, it **is often a form of complicity in injustice.** This is why, from the standpoint of politics-as opposed to religion-pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3**) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is** the **effects of action, rather than the motives** of action, **that is most significant**. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, **it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic** and historically contextualized **ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment.** It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. **And it undermines political effectiveness.**

**5. Alt won’t boost democracy – not everyone can participate and stakeholders will jack democratic ethic.**

**Mohammadi ‘10**

Dr. Hamid Mohammadi, Assistant Professor at Yazd University and also holds an Urban Planning PhD from Kassel University – from the Book Citizen Participation in Urban Planning and Management: The Case of Iran, Shiraz City, Saadi Community – Page 27

Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) criticized other aspects of **the communicative planning** theory in practice. They question, above all, some assumptions of the theory. They believe: "The **assumption that** all **stakeholders within** **the communicative** discourse **arena are striving for** **enhanced democracy** for communities **is** a value judgment and **one that does not hold water**; the stakeholders present within the arena of discourse will possess different aims and values and professional agendas There is also difficulty in questioning how far values are held in common, and what assumptions can be made about this. **The ethic assumes that** all **those who present themselves into the discourse arena would share** the same **desire to make sense together**. This assumption does not relate to the nature of the human psyche: why should consensus among all those attending be regarded as a positive attribute when clearly different agendas and different objectives form the very essence of the planning argumentation process?" Citing a sentence from John Forester (1989) "making sense together while living differently"; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger stated "It does not suggest that the purpose of communicative planning is to ensure that everyone agrees, or that everyone will accept a shared understanding of multifarious position on the same contentious issue". Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger added **communicative rationality assumes that all sections of the community *can* participate in the process of collaborative planning** discourse, however, this theory has not enough answers to the questions like **how should this be achieved?** How the stakeholders can be identified and by whom?

**6. Communicative planning alt fails – won’t tackle power.**

**Flyvbjerg ‘2**

(et al, Bent Flyvbjerg is founding chair of the Geography Program at Aalborg University, Department of Development and Planning – In Philip Allmendinger and Mark Tewdwr-Jones, eds., Planning Futures: New Directions for

Planning Theory. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, pp. 44-62. Also available at: http://flyvbjerg.plan.aau.dk/DarkSide2.pdf)

The position we are attempting to establish is that **communicative planning theory fails to capture the role of power in planning.** As a result, **it is a theory which is weak in its capacity to help us understand what happens in the real world;** **and weak in serving as a basis for effective action and change.** Because of these weaknesses, we believe that **this approach to theory** building **is highly problematic for planning.**

### Psychoanalysis

#### 1. Our interpretation is that the negative gets to defend a competitive policy alternative

#### Predictability – there are millions of representations that we can’t predict – the resolution says USFG so we should debate that – predictability is key to fairness

#### Education – policy discussions foster better informed debate that can be adapted to the real world

Stefano **Guzzini**, Assistant Professor at Central European University, “The enduring dilemmas of realism in International Relations,” Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, December 2001, http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/gus02/gus02.pdf, accessed 8/13/02

Contrary to Waltz, Gunther Hellmann does not leave the debate at this unfinished stage. Starting from the same Friedmanian pragmatist grounding that a theory is good as long as it works or functions, he wants a return to the common language of academia and practice by pushing academia back to the language of the practitioner, yet by keeping the advantage of the outside observer. More openly than Waltz, he plays down the need for scientific respectability, but by offering a more philosophically grounded argument. The grounding is provided by the recourse to the philosophy of science, more particularly to modern versions of “pragmatism”, represented in particular, but not only, by Richard Rorty. For Hellmann, pragmatism has done the job in undermining the credentials of positivism and all what comes with it. This move takes the ground away for the need of any of the classical justifications in IR theory. Any version of the correspondence theory of truth, any version of scientific realism, any version of falsification is wrong-headed, if understood in a logical theoretical way. Such devices are just this: scholarly habits devised through the tradition of a scientific community. But pragmatism is also not succumbing to the sirens of poststructuralism whose theorising, according to him, is purely de-constructing and has lost any major connection with real problems.

#### Perm do both - State action is key- only by creating concrete policies can we begin to break down the psychological forces

Mack 86 (John; MD, psychiatry professor at Harvard; “Epilogue: Aggression and Its Alternatives in the Conduct of International Relations”, 1986; http://johnemackinstitute.org/1986/01/epilogueaggression-and-its-alternatives-in-the-conduct-of-international-relations/)

Freud and those who have followed him, working with individual patients, have identified the unconscious psychological forces that limit the possibilities of human well-being and fulfillment. Collective human phenomena, such as international conflict, represent a different kind of challenge, one to which psychoanalysts can contribute usefully only if they collaborate with colleagues who bear a more direct responsibility for the policies and decisions of political life. It is important, however, that we do make this a central professional concern and bring what new approaches we can to the understanding and better management of the destructive forces that often dominate the relations between nations. If we fail to do so, it may come about that the dark elements in the human soul will, before long, lead to the extinction of life altogether.

#### Psychoanalysis as social theory annihilates politics – their link argument is so overbroad it can be used to prevent ALL social action

**Gordon**, psychotherapist living and working in London, **01** (Paul, Psychoanalysis and racism: the politics of defeat, Race & Class, April)

<The postmodernists' problem is that they cannot live with dis- appointment. All the tragedies of the political project of emancipation ± the evils of Stalinism in particular ± are seen as the inevitable product of men and women trying to create a better society. But, rather than engage in a critical assessment of how, for instance, radical political movements go wrong, they discard the emancipatory project and impulse itself. The postmodernists, as Sivanandan puts it, blame modernity for having failed them: `the intellectuals and academics have ̄ed into discourse and deconstruction and representation ± as though to interpret the world is more important than to change it, as though changing the interpretation is all we could do in a changing world'.58 To justify their ̄ight from a politics holding out the prospect of radical change through self-activity, the disappointed intellectuals ®nd abundant intellectual alibis for themselves in the very work they champion, including, in Cohen's case, psychoanalysis. What Marshall Berman says of Foucault seems true also of **psychoanalysis**; that it **offers `a world-historical alibi' for** the **passivity and helplessness** felt by many in the 1970s, and that it has nothing but contempt for those naive enough to imagine that it might be possible for modern humankind to be free. At every turn for such theorists, as Berman argues, whether in sexuality, politics, even our imagination, we are nothing but prisoners: there is no freedom in Foucault's world, because his language forms a seamless web, a cage far more airtight than anything Weber ever dreamed of, into which no life can break . . . There is no point in trying to resist the oppressions and injustices of modern life, since even our dreams of freedom only add more links to our chains; how- ever, once we grasp the futility of it all, at least we can relax.59 Cohen's political defeatism and his conviction in the explanatory power of his new faith of psychoanalysis lead him to be contemptuous and dismissive of any attempt at political solidarity or collective action. For him, `communities' are always `imagined', which, in his view, means based on fantasy, while different forms of working-class organisation, from the craft fraternity to the revolutionary group, are dismissed as `fantasies of self-suf®cient combination'.60 In this scenario, **the idea that people might** come together, **think together**, analyse together **and act together as rational beings is impossible**. The idea of a genuine community of equals becomes a pure fantasy, a `symbolic retrieval' of something that never existed in the ®rst place: `Community is a magical device for conjuring something apparently solidary out of the thin air of modern times, a mechanism of re-enchantment.' **As for history, it is always false, since `We are always dealing with invented traditions.'**61 Now, **this is** not only non- sense, but **dangerous nonsense** at that. Is history `always false'? **Did the Judeocide happen or did it not?** And did not some people even try to resist it? **Did slavery exist or did it not, and did not people resist that too and, ultimately, bring it to an end?** And are communities always `imagined'? Or, as Sivanandan states, are they beaten out on the smithy of a people's collective struggle? Furthermore, all attempts to legislate against ideology are bound to fail because they have to adopt `technologies of surveillance and control identical to those used by the state'. Note here the Foucauldian language to set up the notion that all `surveillance' is bad. But is it? No society can function without surveillance of some kind. The point, surely, is that there should be a public conversation about such moves and that those responsible for implementing them be at all times accountable. To equate, as Cohen does, a council poster about `Stamping out racism' with Orwell's horrendous prophecy in 1984 of a boot stamping on a human face is ludicrous and insulting. (Orwell's image was intensely personal and destructive; the other is about the need to challenge not individuals, but a collective evil.) Cohen reveals himself to be deeply ambivalent about punitive action against racists, as though punishment or other ®rm action against them (or anyone else transgressing agreed social or legal norms) precluded `understand- ing' or even help through psychotherapy. It is indeed a strange kind of `anti-racism' that portrays active racists as the `victims', those who are in need of `help'. But this is where Cohen's argument ends up. In their move from politics to the academy and the world of `discourse', the postmodernists may have simply exchanged one grand narrative, historical materialism, for another, psychoanalysis.62 For **psychoanalysis is a grand narrative, par excellence**. **It is a theory that seeks to account for the world and which recognises few limits on its explanatory potential**. And **the claimed radicalism of psychoanalysis**, in the hands of the postmodernists at least, **is not a radicalism at all but a prescription for a politics of quietism, fatalism and defeat**. Those wanting to change the world, not just to interpret it, need to look elsewhere.>

#### Perm do the plan than the alt – double bind either the K can overcome the one small link to the aff or can’t overcome years of psychoanalysis

#### No verifiable support for psychoanalysis outside of the clinical setting

**Gordon**, psychotherapist living and working in London, **01** (Paul, Psychoanalysis and racism: the politics of defeat, Race & Class, April)

<The question of method Cohen's work unavoidably raises the question of the status of psychoanalysis as a social or political theory, as distinct from a clinical one. Can psychoanalysis, in other words, apply to the social world of groups, institutions, nations, states and cultures in the way that it does, or at least may do, to individuals? Certainly there is now a considerable body of literature and a plethora of academic courses, and so on, claim- ing that psychoanalysis is a social theory. And, of course, in popular discourse, it is now a commonplace to hear of nations and societies spoken of in personalised ways. Thus `truth commissions' and the like, which have become so common in the past decade in countries which have undergone turbulent change, are seen as forms of national therapy or catharsis, even if this is far from being their purpose. Never- theless, the question remains: **does it make sense**, as Michael Ignatieff puts it, **to speak of nations having psyches the way that individuals do?** `Can a nation's past make people ill as we know repressed memories sometimes make individuals ill? . . . Can we speak of nations ``working through'' a civil war or an atrocity as we speak of individuals working through a traumatic memory or event?'47 **The problem with the application of psychoanalysis to social institutions is that there can be no testing of the claims made**. If someone says, for instance, that nationalism is a form of looking for and seeking to replace the body of the mother one has lost, or that the popular appeal of a particular kind of story echoes the pattern of our earliest relationship to the maternal breast, how can this be proved? **The pioneers of psychoanalysis**, from Freud onwards, **all derived their ideas in the context of** their work with **individual patients** and their ideas can be examined in the everyday laboratory of the therapeutic encounter where the validity of an interpretation, for example, is a matter for dialogue between therapist and patient. Outside of the consulting room, there can be no such verification process, and **the further one moves from the individual patient, the less purchase psychoanalytic ideas can have**. **Outside the therapeutic encounter, anything** and everything **can be true, psychoanalytically speaking**. **But if everything is true, then nothing can be false and therefore nothing can be true**.>

#### No offense—friend/enemy distinctions are inevitable; it is only a question of how we orient ourselves toward it

Norman, 09 (Emma R. Norman, University of the Americas Puebla, Mexico, Department of International Relations and Political Science, " Applying Carl Schmitt to Global Puzzles: Identity, Conflict and the Friend/Enemy Antithesis", <http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=emma_norman>, September 4, 2009)

The emphasis on the exclusive nature of identity construction leads to the conclusion that an¶ inter-national (or other plurality of identities) context is required to provide the contrast necessary¶ for the clear definition of a collective identity. But this theory does not stipulate that just any form¶ of “other” is needed—neutral toleration of others, or half-hearted partnerships to foster security¶ or prosperity fail on this model to provide the required clear definition. At some point, the¶ intensification to the friend-enemy status on at least one front is, for Schmitt, required. But it is¶ also inevitable. On this model, if one enemy disappears (as a direct result of enemy actions or for¶ other systemic reasons) a vacuum is created that at some point needs to be filled. ¶ 11PSA 2009 PSO Panel 1 Friday September 4, 10.15am ¶ Norman ¶ An obvious illustration of this concerns the transition to a unipolar international order after¶ the collapse of the Soviet Union. The effects of losing such a starkly defined “enemy” placed the¶ collective identity and global role of the United States in serious question, both internally and¶ externally. This blurring of a solid sense of national identity was reflected in U.S. foreign policy¶ during the 1990s and thereafter, which has lacked a clearly defined geopolitical strategy.¶ 24¶ This¶ was reflected in the continuous wavering over whether and how to intervene in some admittedly¶ daunting international crises. Joint peace operations in Bosnia and Kosovo in the face of ethnic¶ cleansing and atrocious human rights abuses did succeed, though they were entered into in a way¶ that Schmitt would not have seen as wholehearted expressions of either “friendship” or enmity.¶ However, U.S. stances toward Rwanda and Somalia were abysmal failures. ¶ One interpretation of these occurrences, from a Schmittian perspective, is that ‘another other’¶ subsequently had to be found (or invented) to balance the inescapable tension that loss of U.S.¶ national identity has entailed. One interpretation is that the reaction to the attacks of September¶ 11, 2001, reflected this. And though while a concrete enemy clearly existed, much effort was¶ made to embellish an account of its “evil” origins and purpose.¶ 25¶ As Kelanic observes, “[t]he¶ seemingly infinite and recurring supply of existential enemies suggests that the real action stems¶ less from the presence of any finite, essentialist differences between peoples, leading to the¶ recognition of “Other” as “enemy,” and more from the inclination of peoples to reinvent each¶ other as existential enemies.”¶ 26¶ G.W. Bush’s comment in 2006 illustrates the wider implications¶ 24¶ 2¶ Fareed Zakaria, The Post-American World (New York: New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008).¶ Kelanic, “Carl Schmitt,” 17-18. While this does not contradict widely shared perception that anarchy is endemic it certainly¶ undermines the grounds that both liberals and realists deploy to expect international cooperation.¶ Norman ¶ of Kelanic’s point here: "[y]ou know, one of the hardest parts of my job is to connect Iraq to the¶ war on terror."

#### Alternative can’t solve---psychoanalysis can’t change anything

**Hutchens 4** Assistant Professor at James Madison University “The Senselessness of a Curable World: Jean-Luc Nancy on Freudian Massenpsychologie,” theory @ Buffalo 9, http://wings.buffalo.edu/theory/archive/archive.html, 115-116

Yet Nancy does have a viable objection that the very distinction between curable and incurable already implies the linkages that enable socialization amongst narcissistic egos. In other words, this vacillation of commitment is the result of indebtedness to biological and metaphysical presumptions concerning the ego. Insofar as the egos of this scheme neither compose nor have access to social reality, they lack the very ‘world’ which singular beings, someones, must compose. There is thus a lacuna of sense in the play of signifyingness around narcissistic egos. Psychoanalytic theory offers only a “severe punctuation of truth, that is, a pure privation of sense” that might ultimately demand an excessive sense. The inaugural thought of psychoanalysis merely “dissolves all sense”, renders it “destitute” by reducing it to a “mere demand of sense” and by “exposing truth as the disappointment of that demand” (The Sense of the World 46). It lacks world and access to the sense with which the world is coextensive. It therefore offers only a description of an unrequited demand for sense that is confused with sense itself. It is precisely this “disappointment” of the psycho-analytics of culture that provides it with the mission to cure a world; yet, paradoxically, the analyst would never settle for such a disappointment if it were not already striving to endow itself with authority over a “curable” world it feared might prove incurable. I concur with Nancy that psychoanalysis endeavors to lead politics to its truth, yet achieves only the annihilation of the political truth it needs for the purpose of resolving the difficulties engendered by the espousal of the metaphysical egology. Scanning political truth in a lapidary fashion, without arche, possessing no end or ground by which its success could be determined, psychoanalysis fails either to resolve the political deficiencies it identifies or to offer a purview of its own conceptual capacity to do so. In more general terms, one might propose that the effort to appropriate political truth into a tenable psychoanalysis of culture serves only to depropriate the very subject of culture. Perhaps there is a sickness, a collective neurosis that leaves all non-relating narcissistic egos in a state of panic. Yet, psychoanalysis has neither devolved its actual sense nor provided therapeutic means by which to address it. Sense, anterior to sanity and insanity, is not indicative of the sickness that psychoanalysis construes. In its infinite reticulations of singularity, sense is ‘mad’ and thus cannot be produced by any theory whose intended praxis is therapy (The Sense of the World 49) Psychoanalysis composes its own neurotic fantasy of social illusion. It does not confront the manner in which there might be ‘sickness’ in the very groundless insubstantiality of social relations, or perhaps no such sickness of that kind at all.

**Positing the role of the ballot as solely an intellectual rejection reflects a paranoid detachment from reality**

**Bird**, prof @ univ of west of England, Bristol, uk, **06** (John, On the Poverty of Theory, Psychoanalysis, Culture, & Society, December)

<**There is no inherent reason why we should not discuss representations** of racism, especially where these discussions illuminate our understanding of the structural bases of racism, **but** there is a danger that the pain of real racism and the **structural conditions underlying those representations can be** occluded and **obscured by a too great emphasis on theory** and theorizing. I would argue that what is sometimes an over-concern with representations, images and texts, and with what theory has to offer for an understanding of those representations, has to do with more than the well-recognized linguistic and cultural turn in the humanities and social sciences. It also tells us something about our individual and social attachment to theory, an attachment which has a psychodynamic component. Theory may not simply be a matter of understanding something, of rationally explaining something, although, of course, good enough theory enables this engagement to happen. There may, in addition, be a powerful emotional attachment to theory and some relationships between the sort of person we are, what we might term our characterology, and the theories we espouse. We can begin to explore the psychodynamics and characterology of theory by focusing on three possible approaches. First, using Steiner’s analysis of psychic retreats (1993), I will discuss how **theory can become a means to avoid engagement with reality**. Second, using Winnicott’s ideas concerning the false self (Winnicott, 1965; Belger, 2002), I will argue that theory might encourage us to flee into over-intellectualization. Third, I will discuss how our attachment to theory relates to hysterical, obsessional and narcissistic character structures (Freud, 1931, 1966; Young-Bruehl, 1996, 2003). Subsequently, I will discuss the idea that we develop forms of attachment to the methods of research we use and will then try to indicate how our attachments to theory and methods might become less defensive. A psychosocial approach to theory Theories as psychic retreats [Psychic retreats] function to help the patient to avoid anxiety by avoiding contact with other people and with reality. (Steiner, 1993, p 2) Steiner’s analysis of psychic retreats occurs in the context of a series of clinical studies of patients in analysis and is primarily oriented to understanding those patients’ resistance to analysis. Steiner’s is an approach that has links, for example, with Reich’s analysis of character armour and with Abraham’s discussions of narcissistic resistance. Steiner suggests that there may be psychic retreats at the social level, which facilitate similar forms of avoidance of anxiety. In what follows, I will suggest that **theory can form** such **a psychic retreat for anxieties generated**, in part, **by the social and political role of the intellectual**. Steiner’s description and analysis of psychic retreats are clear and concise. Faced with anxiety, the retreat becomes a way of managing and/or neutralizing that anxiety by avoiding contact with reality and with other people. Although Steiner sees psychic retreats as a third position in addition to Klein’s identification of paranoid-schizoid and depressive positions, the defences mobilized in those positions are crucial. In the former, the defences include splitting, paranoia and forms of pathological projective identification; in the latter, omnipotence, denial of inner and outer reality, and reparation, the latter of which can be manic, obsessional and, we might say, real. Contained in this idea of psychic retreats are forms of interpersonal retreat – cults, business organizations, total institutions and the like which can become places where internal and innate destructiveness and external trauma are managed. Theories themselves can, under certain conditions, become interpersonal and social psychic retreats. The retreat is idealized and admired but the cost of this is that phantasy and omnipotence work in a way unchecked by reality. **The retreat may be** normal or **pathological**, but whichever it is, it can become **addictive and masochistic**. As Steiner sums it up: Psychic retreats vary, as we have seen, both in their structure and in the anxiety they defend against. Some function predominantly as a retreat from paranoid-schizoid anxieties of fragmentation and persecution, while others are deployed primarily to deal with depressive affects such as guilt and despair. All, to varying degrees, serve as a retreat from reality, and in most, if not all, perverse mechanisms can be observed. (Steiner, 1993, p 99) As Armstrong suggests (1998), the retreat comes to act as a container for anxiety, and that container often takes the form of a social organization: The organisation becomes personified: controlling, sanctioning and protect- ing as long as it remains unchallenged. Correspondingly, the individual becomes locked into the organisation and in a way that makes it difficult to regain, reassemble and move beyond the fragmentation of the self. (Armstrong, 1998, p 6) We could now think about theory and the **attachment to theory** as a form of psychic retreat, especially where this attachment **avoids contact with reality and gives us a feeling of being locked in**, such that **theory becomes an end-in-itself**. This allows the free flow of phantasy and omnipotence in which the community of theorists avidly colludes. Theory allows protection – from external and internal anxieties, ‘‘[but] at the expense of [the] development and evolution of meaning’’ (Armstrong, 1998, p 7). Thus, Lacan and Zˇ izˇek have the answer for everything – even the answer to which is the real Freud – and the community of Lacanians and Zˇ izˇekians colludes with this and excludes those who are not in the community. If theory is a form of psychic retreat then what are the anxieties that this retreat is addressing? With reference to depressive affects, **the helplessness and despair of the theorist in the face of terrible social and political events** – 9/11, global warming, famine, the Asian Tsunami, 7/7 in London – **make theory an attractive retreat, an alternative to engagement with the realities of despair**. With reference to paranoid-schizoid anxieties, the persecution of the theorist when faced with the call to certainty and a return to fundamental truths may lead to a paranoid attachment to theory through retreat from both a real and a phantasied persecution. **These forms of retreat may be exacerbated** in three ways: first, **through the paranoid style in much contemporary political** and social action and **thought**, a paranoid style exacerbated by the fear engendered by the war on terror; second, through the peculiar and particular conditions of the social production of knowledge in the academy (Sibley, 2004), with its attachment to systems of quality control and assessment, of tenure and promotion, of user engagement and so on; and third, through what seem to be the structural conditions of post-modernity, in which the fragmentation of the self and of identity become, as it were, normal conditions. The structural insecurities of flexible labour markets, and the constant pressure to change and cultivate identities, feed into forms of defensive attachment to theory (Bauman, 2005). False self-relationships to theories The idea that theory may be a form of psychic retreat implies that we often use theory for defensive purposes, both as individuals and as members of social organizations. As Belger suggests (2002), we can approach the difficulties and dangers of theory in another, but related way, that is, with reference to Winnicott’s idea of the False Self: this False Self functions as the reactive protector of the true core of the individual in an environmental context in which impingements [infantile and contemporary] and neglect, rather than attunements, have dominated the developmental fieldy . The False Self is reactive instead of proactive. (Belger, 2002, p 51) In the context of theory – in this case, the role of theory in the training of analysts – Belger postulates false self-relationships to theory which ‘‘foreclose potential space and inhibit the healthy development of the therapist-as-subject’’ (Belger, 2002, p 51). As such, there is ‘‘an elaboration of the intellectual at the expense of the real’’ (p 55). These defensive, false self-relationships to theory are further analysed by Ogden: The illusion of knowing is achieved through the creation of a wide range of substitute formations that fill the ‘‘potential space’’ in which desire and fear, appetite and fullness, love and hate might otherwise come into being. In the absence of the capacity to generate potential space, one relies on defensive substitutes for the experience of being alive . (Ogden, 1989, cited in Belger, 2002, p 55). **Theory becomes defensive and delusional and provides us with a phantasy of being all-knowing and omnipotent**. For Belger and Ogden, the problem becomes one of releasing omnipotent control in much the same way that the infant may find it difficult to release its control in its relationships with carers. As Belger suggests, following Wheelis (1958), theory becomes a way in which we foreclose creativity, such that it is not experience which dictates what might be called truth, but dogma. As we will see later, this release of control and this withdrawal from theoretical dogma is part of the development of what could be called a healthy relationship to theory.>