#### Management solves extinction—letting nature “be” cements existing destruction

**Levy 99** – Research Fellow, Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics (Neil, Discourses of the Environment, p 215, AG)

If the 'technological fix' is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our use of resources, we are nevertheless unable simply to leave the environment as it is. There is a real and pressing need for more, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have already set in train will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us, for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to develop real, concrete proposals for action, to reverse, or at least limit, the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behaviour towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207). In fact, we risk exacerbating these inequalities. It is not us, but the poor of Brazil, who will hear the brunt of the misery which would result from a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternatives which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current greenhouse gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals for concrete action must be formulated by ecologists, environmentalists, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impacts which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, very much the province of Foucault's specific intellectual, the one who works 'within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them' (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as 'the strategists of life and death' than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man's 'politics places his existence as a living being in question' (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the fate of our species, and of those with whom we share this planet, will be decided.

#### Implementation before ontology

**Jarvis 2k** – IR lecturer, Sydney (Darryl, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p 128-9, AG)

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

**Even if relations are low it wouldn’t trigger nuclear conflict**

**Podvig 11** [Pavel Podvig – “INSTRUMENTAL INFLUENCES Russia and the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review”, Nonproliferation Review, Vol. 18, No. 1, March 2011, Chetan]

Indeed, **the 2010 Russian military doctrine substantially narrowed the role of nuclear weapons;** the 2000 version treated nuclear weapons as instruments to support the military security of Russia and its allies as well as to support international stability **and** peace. The 2010 doctrine preserved the deterrence role of nuclear weapons, but maintaining the nuclear arsenal is seen as just one of a range of measures that aim at preventing a nuclear war, along with diplomatic and other non-military measures. The new Russian military doctrine also substantially narrowed **the range of circumstances in which Moscow would consider using nuclear weapons**. In the 2000 version of the doctrine, Russia reserved the right to use nuclear weapons in response to an aggression against it or its allies that used nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Russia also reserved the right to use nuclear weapons in response to a conventional aggression ‘‘in situations critical to national security of the Russian Federation.’’ 33 The 2010 doctrine also lists nuclear (or other WMD) aggression against Russia or its allies as a situation that would justify a nuclear response; however, it states that the conventional **aggression that would trigger a nuclear response would have to be directed against Russia and would have to ‘‘threaten the very existence of the state’’**\*a much more limited set of circumstances. 34

#### Romney will be moderate on Russia. The Afghan transit line creates self-interest.

**Trenin**, 8/31/**2012** (Dmitri- director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, Republican’s Russia Approach Wide Open, p. <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/2012/08/31/republicans-russia-approach-wide-open/dr5j>)

Everything said on the campaign trail should usually be treated with a grain of salt, and with reason. For Romney, the principal battleground has been within his own party until now. He had to reach out to various Republican groups to get their support, including what the New York Times columnist Tom Friedman calls “the Dick Cheney wing” of the party. This can be seen to account for Romney’s vow to formally brand China a “currency manipulator” on the first day in office, and his referring to Russia as if it were still the Soviet Union. If elected, Romney, like any chief executive in the United States, will have to reason and act differently, and probably “pivot to the center” as a result. Practical economic and financial considerations make full-scale confrontation with China extremely unlikely, and while Romney will probably not warm to President Putin, the importance of the Afghan transit across Russia will moderate his behavior vis-à-vis Moscow. There may be more rhetoric going the Moscow way, and symbolic actions of the kind exemplified by the Magnitsky Bill, going to become law next year. Relations may become frayed, but Russia will not be Romney’s priority—for good or for bad.

### 1AR – Ince

#### More evidence - Romney will win – electoral college projections, hard party ID numbers

Stevens 10/26/12 (Neil, "Swingometer: Gallup Party ID figures predict solid Romney win," RedState, <http://www.redstate.com/2012/10/26/swingometer-gallup-party-id-figures-predict-solid-romney-win/>)

We always talk about the independent, swing vote in elections because those tend to be the persuadables. But party ID numbers matter as well, because those partisan voters tend to split better than 90/10 for their party.¶ It is for that reason that Gallup’s new partisan ID split, one that mimics what Rasmussen has been saying all along, predicts nothing less than doom for the Democrats, and a solid, national win for Mitt Romney this year.¶ Ignore Gallup’s headline. They’ve buried the lede so far deep, they’ll be fracking in Australia to bring it to the surface. Demographically the country hasn’t changed in a few years, naturally, but the difference between 2008 and 2012 is in the TEA party. The TEA party happened, dictated the 2010 elections, and has now resulted in a large partisan ID and registration shift in this country since.¶ When Rasmussen Reports noted this, and showed it in polling, Nate Silver and his followers scoffed. Just as they did in [2010] when Rasmussen was first to predict the TEA party driven Republican wave, they criticized and insulted the firm that was first to what turned out to be the facts.¶ Now Gallup is in the game, and the numbers are brutal. In 2008, the Democrats had a 39-29 (D+10) advantage in hard party ID, and a 54-42 (D+12) advantage with leaners. In 2012 though, we’re in the post-TEA party era. Republicans now show a 36-35 (R+1) hard party ID advantage, and a 49-46 (R+3) lead with leaners. This gives us a range of party ID swings from 2008, from R+11 to R+15.¶ That Gallup is giving us a range is not new. They did the same in 2010, when the late Generic Ballot polls offered two different voter models. First there was the high turnout model, one that proved too pessimistic for Republicans, and the low turnout model that was too optimistic. The truth was, as they surely intended, somewhere in the middle.¶ But let’s look at where this range takes us. Asking Swingometer what an R+11 swing means, it’s bad for Democrats. This is a crude measure as Swingometer is meant to deal with the two party vote and not raw party ID, but again, with the 90/10 split that partisans show in their candidate support, this isn’t going to be that far off.¶ This low end swing gives Romney the election handily. We get taken back to the 2000 election map, but with Romney trading Nevada in exchange for Iowa, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania. It’s a solid 315-223 Electoral College victory. Not a blowout, but roughly as meaningful as Obama’s 2008 victory.¶ But then we come to the high end, R+15 swing:¶ Again, not a blowout. The nation is more polarized than it was in the past, so elections like 1984 or 1964 just don’t happen these days. but gaining the straight 2000 map plus Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Pennsylvania, and Maine’s second district would give Romney a 332-206 victory.¶ The takeaway here is that Mitt Romney has many paths to victory. He’s solidified enough states (Florida, North Carolina, Virginia, Indiana, and probably Colorado) that he has his chances elsewhere (Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin + Iowa or New Hampshire, Nevada + New Hampshire + Maine 2).¶ This election is winnable for Mitt Romney as long as his people vote and get out the vote on election day.

#### Our links matter more than uniqueness --- polls will constantly fluctuate but the link shapes the outcome.

Chicago Tribune, 9/20/2012 (How to read polling data, p. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-09-20/news/ct-nw-presidential-polls-sidebar-20120919\_1\_national-polls-public-polls-battleground-states)

Don't obsess about small shifts in those horse race numbers. Right now, Obama vs. Romney is a close election, and it's likely to be so till Election Day. The numbers will bounce around from week to week, and "analysts" will come up with reasons to explain the "movement," much of which is caused by nothing more than the natural variations of any statistical sample. Instead, pay attention to the "internals." What issues are moving voters? Which subgroups are favoring one candidate or another? That's data that actually mean something.

#### Polls prove nuclear is popular

The Hill 11 [Poll: 71 percent in U.S. support nuclear power”, February 23rd, 2011, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/145675-poll-71-percent-of-americans-support-nuclear-energy>, Chetan]

A new poll commissioned by the nuclear industry shows that 71 percent of people in the United States support including nuclear power in the country’s energy portfolio. The poll, commissioned by the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), comes as President Obama has called for expanding the country’s reliance on nuclear power as part of a broad strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The president’s fiscal 2012 budget request set aside more than $800 million for nuclear energy research and tripled the amount of money authorized for nuclear loan guarantees. About 71 percent of respondents said they support “the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the United States,” while 26 percent are opposed, NEI said. At the same time, the poll shows broad public support for a proposal floated by Obama to get large amounts of the country’s electricity from low-carbon sources. The poll finds that 89 percent of Americans think, “We should take advantage of all low-carbon energy sources, including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy, to produce the electricity we need while limiting greenhouse gas emissions.” Obama laid out a proposal in last month's State of the Union address to get 80 percent of the country’s electricity from low-carbon sources like nuclear, wind, solar and natural gas by 2035. Obama is working closely with Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.) to hash out the details of the proposal. Meanwhile, 79 percent of Americans say they support the government providing loan guarantees for a range of low-carbon energy technologies like nuclear, wind and solar. Obama’s 2012 budget request calls for adding $36 billion in loan guarantee authority for nuclear power plants. The proposal is already coming under fire from anti-nuclear activists, who argue that nuclear power plants are far too expensive to receive government support.