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### **T**

#### Interpretation – “financial incentives” are funding for investors to develop a project – that excludes nonfinancial incentives like procurement

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

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

#### Violation – procurements are purchases that don’t motivate action – they just buy a technology that already exists

#### Prefer our interpretation – for Limits – they allow any aff that makes some technology more economically viable. Procurement can be applied to every technology and every industry – that explodes neg burden.

### 1NC – CP

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially increase investment in smart microgrid technology for its military bases in the United States via a diverse portfolio tailored to individual installation circumstances, including non-nuclear renewable energies for on-site generation, increased backup generation capacity, improvements in energy efficiency and energy storage, intelligent local energy management, and accelerated implementation of the SPIDERS project.

#### Solves the grid

Hallett 12 (Michael, US Strategic Engagement Staff Officer at NATO, Allied Command Transformation, “Microgrids: A Smart Defense Based NATO Contribution to Energy Security,” Journal of Energy Security, November, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=390:microgrids-a-smart-defense-based-nato-contribution-to-energy-security&catid=130:issue-content&Itemid=405>)

Microgrids: an energy system resilience increasing tool Microgrids provide a useful focal point through which we can examine the utility of NATO’s contribution to energy security. A microgrid can be defined, according to Peter Asmus as “an integrated energy system consisting of distributed energy resources and multiple electrical loads operating as a single, autonomous grid either in parallel to or ‘islanded’ from the existing utility power grid.” Microgrids have two important overlapping capabilities from the military perspective: increased multi-source (natural gas, diesel, oil, wind, solar, methane, etc.) power generation capability for bases (both in home countries and in expeditionary operations in austere environments) and in providing continuity of service separate from the main power grid.
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#### Hagel will get confirmed now, but it’s close – new controversy derails passage

Reuters 1-15 (“Chuck Hagel's Chances of Confirmation Improve,” Jewish Daily Forward, 2013, <http://forward.com/articles/169341/chuck-hagels-chances-of-confirmation-improve/>)

Former Republican Senator Chuck Hagel appears increasingly likely to be confirmed as U.S. defense secretary, thanks to support from two key senators and the lack of an overt campaign against him by mainstream pro-Israel groups. Hagel, whose comments on Israel, Iran and gay rights have sparked opposition to his candidacy, on Tuesday won the backing of Senator Charles Schumer, the Senate’s No. 3 Democrat, who had been conspicuously on the fence. Sen. Barbara Boxer, a California Democrat, also weighed in with support. Schumer’s support was seen as pivotal given his record as a strong supporter of Israel. Both he and Boxer are Jewish. Neoconservative activists have vociferously attacked Hagel, a decorated Vietnam veteran, over past statements questioning the wisdom of using military force to stop Iran’s nuclear program and complaining about what he called the intimidating influence of the “Jewish lobby” in Washington. Larger, more mainstream organizations have not mounted a concerted public effort to derail Hagel’s nomination to replace Leon Panetta as President Barack Obama’s Pentagon chief. Kenneth Bandler, a spokesman for the American Jewish Committee, said his group was “in the concerned camp, not the opposition camp” and would decide whether to oppose or support the nomination depending upon what emerges during the Senate confirmation process. That process is likely to be messy. Mississippi Republican Roger Wicker, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which will hold confirmation hearings, issued a tweet calling him “a divisive and disastrous nominee.” But those views are unlikely to gain more traction, aides say, unless Hagel mishandles his confirmation hearing or additional controversial statements from the past emerge. “I’ve had a few conversations with Republicans on the Hill who admittedly don’t like Hagel for his ‘malleability,’” said one well-connected former Republican congressional and Bush administration aide. Hagel will get “raked over the coals” for some of his statements on Israel and Iran and grilled on his willingness to send troops into battle, the aide said. “But in the end he will be confirmed,” the former official said. Democratic officials offered a similar assessment. One close to the Armed Services Committee said, “There is no groundswell on Capitol Hill” against Hagel. “Have I seen anything that looks truly disqualifying? No.” Hagel will garner votes from all 53 Senate Democrats and between 10 and 15 Republicans, predicted one observer who has been counting votes. Should Hagel’s nomination come to a vote in the full Senate, he would need a simple majority of its 100 members to win confirmation.

#### Capital is key to get the confirmation through.

**Politico**, **1/6**/2013 (Chuck Hagel takes fire from Capitol Hill, p. <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/chuck-hagel-takes-fire-from-capitol-hill-85805.html>)

Senate Democrats and Republicans are far from sold on President Barack Obama’s expected nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense. In fact, Obama’s decision to tap the Vietnam veteran and outspoken former Republican senator is likely to spark another nasty fight with Congress right on the heels of the fiscal cliff showdown and just before another likely battle royal over the debt ceiling. Republicans on Sunday unleashed a fresh barrage of attacks amid reports Obama would nominate Hagel on Monday for the top job at the Pentagon. The new Senate minority whip, Texas Republican John Cornyn, said he’s firmly against Hagel’s nomination. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), an Air Force reservist who serves on the Armed Services Committee that will consider the nod, said Hagel would hold the “most antagonistic” views toward Israel of any defense secretary in U.S. history. And despite heaping praise on Hagel when he retired from the Senate after the 2008 elections, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Sunday failed to extend an olive branch to the Nebraska Republican, instead suggesting there would be “tough questions” ahead. Even Senate Democrats are privately signaling they‘re not yet on board with the Hagel pick, and that the White House has a lot of work to do to get him across the finish line. The nomination comes at a tricky time for the administration — just as the fights over raising the debt ceiling and government appropriations are set to begin. And it could put a number of at-risk or pro-Israel Democrats in tough political spots — especially if the nomination fight grows even more contentious. Democrats are also scratching their heads over why Obama appears willing to go to the mat for Hagel, while abandoning his push for a close friend and member of his inner circle, U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, to become secretary of state. Rice, an unabashed Democrat, abandoned her bid after withering GOP criticism over the deadly attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Libya. Though different in substance, the controversy over Rice’s remarks is not unlike the current pushback over Hagel’s past foreign policy positions and controversial remarks. But Hagel lacks a natural constituency in the Senate, given that he’s grown alienated from the GOP, yet Democrats are suspicious of his record. “It is a strange signal for the White House to send that they are willing to fight for Hagel but not Rice,” one Senate Democratic aide said Sunday. “Democrats are not currently unified behind Hagel, and it will take some real work by the administration to get them there, if it’s even possible.” Senior Republicans agreed, noting that after Hagel infuriated Republicans and Democrats alike over the years, there isn’t a natural base for him. “I can’t imagine why [Obama] would choose to burn his political capital on this nomination. For what? There is no constituency for Chuck Hagel,” one senior GOP aide said. “Obama will expend every ounce of political capital he has to get him across the finish line. Dems will hate this.”

#### DoD energy projects are unpopular

Sorenson 12 [Lt. Gen Jeff Sorenson, 9/28/12, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/259163-saving-energy-saving-soldiers-lives>]

From biofuels that could propel the Navy’s Great Green Fleet to spending billions of dollars on renewable energy, the Pentagon’s green energy initiatives have emerged as a contentious topic in Washington. Recent Congressional budget proposals could curtail military efforts to produce alternative fuels because they are currently more expensive than fossil fuels. Yet Pentagon officials insist its focus on energy conservation and renewable energy is essential for national security and improved military capability. Who’s right? Is the Pentagon’s pursuit of green energy an outrageously expensive endeavor or an operational necessity? Yes, the impending concerns about a potential $259 billion budget reduction for the Defense Department over the next five years **might make one question the fiscal sense of investing billions on renewable energy projects.**

#### Hagel confirmation prevents Iran war --- leads to peaceful negotiations.

**Barnes**, **1/8**/2013 (Diana, Hagel Pick Could Signal U.S. Policy Shift on Iran, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/hagel-pick-could-signal-u-s-policy-shift-on-iran-20130108)

Washington and Tehran have been "inching towards a confrontation" as the United States has sought to pressure Iran through isolation and covert action, said Hossein Mousavian, a one-time spokesman for Iran's nuclear negotiating team. However, the nomination of former Republican Senator Chuck Hagel (Neb.) could create "an opportunity to bring a peaceful solution to the Iranian nuclear dilemma" if the Senate confirms his nomination to the top Pentagon post and the designation of Senator John Kerry (D-Mass.) to become the next secretary of State, the former envoy told Global Security Newswire.

#### Iran strikes escalates to a nuclear world war

**Chossudovsky**, 12/26/**2011** (Michel, Preparing to attack Iran with Nuclear Weapons, Global Research, p. <http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28355>)

An attack on Iran would have devastating consequences, It would unleash an all out regional war from the Eastern Mediterranean to Central Asia, potentially leading humanity into a World War III Scenario. The Obama Administration constitutes a nuclear threat. NATO constitutes a nuclear threat Five European "non-nuclear states" (Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey) with tactical nuclear weapons deployed under national command, to be used against Iran constitute a nuclear threat. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu not only constitutes a nuclear threat, but also a threat to the security of people of Israel, who are misled regarding the implications of an US-Israeli attack on Iran. The complacency of Western public opinion --including segments of the US anti-war movement-- is disturbing. No concern has been expressed at the political level as to the likely consequences of a US-NATO-Israel attack on Iran, using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state. Such an action would result in "the unthinkable": a nuclear holocaust [catastrophe] over a large part of the Middle East.
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#### Electricity prices are declining

**Burtraw 12** (one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom” http://common–resources.org/2012/falling–emissions–and–falling–prices–expectations–for–the–domestic–natural–gas–boom/)

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow–growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency.For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt–hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

Cooper 9 (Mark, SENIOR FELLOW FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT VERMONT LAW SCHOOL, "THE ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS: RENAISSANCE OR RELAPSE http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Cooper%20Report%20on%20Nuclear%20Economics%20FINAL%5B1%5D.pdf)

Within the past year, estimates of the cost of nuclear power from a new generation of reactors have ranged from a low of 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) to a high of 30 cents. This paper tackles the debate over the cost of building new nuclear reactors, with the key findings as follows: • The initial cost projections put out early in today’s so–called “nuclear renaissance” were about one–third of what one would have expected, based on the nuclear reactors completed in the 1990s. • The most recent cost projections for new nuclear reactors are, on average, over four times as high as the initial “nuclear renaissance” projections. • There are numerous options available to meet the need for electricity in a carbon–constrained environment that are superior to building nuclear reactors. Indeed, nuclear reactors are the worst option from the point of view of the consumer and society. • The low carbon sources that are less costly than nuclear include efficiency, cogeneration, biomass, geothermal, wind, solar thermal and natural gas. Solar photovoltaics that are presently more costly than nuclear reactors are projected to decline dramatically in price in the next decade. Fossil fuels with carbon capture and storage, which are not presently available, are projected to be somewhat more costly than nuclear reactors. • Numerous studies by Wall Street and independent energy analysts estimate efficiency and renewable costs at an average of 6 cents per kilowatt hour, while the cost of electricity from nuclear reactors is estimated in the range of 12 to 20 cents per kWh. • The additional cost of building 100 new nuclear reactors, instead of pursuing a least cost efficiency–renewable strategy, would be in the range of $1.9–$4.4 trillion over the life the reactors. Whether the burden falls on ratepayers (in electricity bills) or taxpayers (in large subsidies), incurring excess costs of that magnitude would be a substantial burden on the national economy and add immensely to the cost of electricity and the cost of reducing carbon emissions.

#### Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring" and sparks US economic growth via consumer spending and investment

Perry 12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas–energy–jackpot–industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike. After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low–priced natural gas. Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025. MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale–based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well–paying, shovel–ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity–generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy–based stimulus to the economy. Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low–cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy–intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer–funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### Econ decline risks extinction

Auslin 9 (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3–6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free–market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide–scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one–third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.
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#### The nuclear arsenal will be modernized now – but risks cuts from the defense budget

Washington Post, 9/15/12 (Dana Priest, “Aging U.S. nuclear arsenal slated for costly and long-delayed modernization,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-nuclear-arsenal-is-ready-for-overhaul/2012/09/15/428237de-f830-11e1-8253-3f495ae70650_story.html>)

The U.S. nuclear arsenal, the most powerful but indiscriminate class of weapons ever created, is set to undergo the costliest overhaul in its history, even as the military faces spending cuts to its conventional arms programs at a time of fiscal crisis.¶ For two decades, U.S. administrations have confronted the decrepit, neglected state of the aging nuclear weapons complex. Yet officials have repeatedly put off sinking huge sums into projects that receive little public recognition, driving up the costs even further.¶ Now, as the nation struggles to emerge from the worst recession of the postwar era and Congress faces an end-of-year deadline to avoid $1.2 trillion in automatic cuts to the federal budget over 10 years, the Obama administration is overseeing the gargantuan task of modernizing the nuclear arsenal to keep it safe and reliable.

#### The aff causes DoD budget tradeoffs

Snider 12 – reporter for E&E (Annie, 2/23, “Military’s alt energy programs draw Republicans’ ire,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/02/23/2>)

The idea that the administration is using DOD as a more politically palatable vehicle for renewable energy investments is now reverberating across Capitol Hill, even as Pentagon officials flatly deny the allegations.¶ At a budget hearing last week, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, the department's most high-profile alternative energy advocate, took volley after volley from Republicans on the House Armed Services Committee. They said that his priorities were misplaced, argued that spending on clean energy was taking money out of more important missions and hinted at a link between the Pentagon's green efforts and the prominence of former Silicon Valley clean-tech investors within the Obama administration.¶ "You're not the secretary of the energy, you're the secretary of the Navy," said Rep. Randy Forbes (R-Va.), who leads the subcommittee with jurisdiction over military energy and environment issues.¶ Prime among the lawmakers' complaints was that the military is paying a higher price for some forms of alternative energy at a time when DOD proposes cutting weapons programs and reducing forces in order to meet budget mandates.

#### Nuclear modernization will be the first to be cut – it’s on the chopping block – that destroys deterrence

Trachtenberg, 11 – president and CEO of Shortwaver Consulting, LLC, former principal deputy assistant secretary of defense (international security policy), acting deputy assistant secretary of defense (forces policy), and head of the policy staff of the House Armed Services Committee (David J, 10/1. “Nuclear Fallback.” ,” [http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/279610/nuclear-fallback-david-j-trachtenberg#](http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/279610/nuclear-fallback-david-j-trachtenberg))

Political turmoil in the Middle East, Iran’s drive for nuclear weapons, and the buildup of China’s military are only a few of the worrisome trends that point to a prolonged period of global instability. Against this backdrop, the U.S. defense budget and the military capabilities it buys are being dramatically reduced in ways that will hinder our ability to shape or respond to these developments.¶ Over the next decade, defense spending will drop by anywhere from $450 billion to more than $1 trillion. The full extent of the cuts, and the national-security implications they foreshadow, are now in the hands of a congressional “supercommittee” charged with slashing overall federal spending. But cuts of this magnitude will translate into less military capability, a likely “dumbing down” of U.S. military strategy, a more problematic margin of military advantage over potential adversaries, and greater strategic risk. They are also likely to diminish America’s ability to advance U.S. policy objectives and secure a stable world order.¶ Not surprisingly, long-overdue investments in our aging and deteriorating nuclear capabilities and infrastructure — essential to maintaining a reliable and effective nuclear deterrent — are now on the chopping block as the military services seek to protect “usable” non-nuclear systems at the expense of “unusable” nuclear ones.¶ But the world remains a dangerous place, with nations and groups seeking nuclear weapons as a counter to U.S. military preponderance, a deterrent to U.S. action in regions vital to American national-security interests, a bargaining chip for political leverage, or a counter to regional threats. Nuclear weapons remain the great equalizer in world affairs, granting those that possess them greater influence over American policies and actions. Consequently, an effective and robust U.S. nuclear deterrent remains as important as ever.

#### Nuclear deterrence is vital to prevent WMD attacks and preserve global stability

Mark **Schneider**, July **2008**. Senior Analyst with the National Institute for Public Policy, Ph.D in history at the University of Southern California and JD from George Washington University, former senior officer in the DoD in positions relating to arms control and nuclear weapons policy. “The Future of the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent,” Comparative Strategy 27.4, Ebsco.

Today, the United States, the world's only superpower with global responsibilities, is the only nuclear weapons state that is seriously debating (admittedly largely inside the beltway) about whether the United States should retain a nuclear deterrent. By contrast, the British Labour Government has decided to retain and modernize its nuclear deterrent. In every other nuclear weapons state—Russia, China, France, India, Pakistan, and allegedly Israel—there is general acceptance of the need for a nuclear deterrent and its modernization. Amazingly, the United States is the only nuclear-armed nation that is not modernizing its nuclear deterrent. Distinguished former leaders such a George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger, and Sam Nunn, despite the manifest failure of arms control to constrain the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) threat, call for “A world free of Nuclear Weapons” because “… the United States can address almost all of its military objectives by non-nuclear means.”1 This view ignores the monumental verification problems involved and the military implication of different types of WMD—chemical and biological (CBW) attack, including the advanced agents now available to potential enemies of the United States and our allies. A U.S. nuclear deterrent is necessary to address existing threats to the very survival of the U.S., its allies, and its armed forces if they are subject to an attack using WMD. As former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and former Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch wrote in The Wall Street Journal, “However, the goal, even the aspirational goal, of eliminating all nuclear weapons is counterproductive. It will not advance substantive progress on nonproliferation; and it risks compromising the value that nuclear weapons continue to contribute, through deterrence, to U.S. security and international stability.”2 Why can't the United States deter WMD (nuclear, chemical, biological) attack with conventional weapons? The short answer is that conventional weapons can't deter a WMD attack because of their minuscule destructiveness compared with WMD, which are thousands to millions of times as lethal as conventional weapons. Existing WMD can kill millions to hundreds of millions of people in an hour, and there are national leaders who would use them against us if all they had to fear was a conventional response. The threat of nuclear electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attack, as assessed by a Congressional Commission in 2004, is so severe that one or at most a handful of EMP attacks could demolish industrial civilization in the United States.3 The view that conventional weapons can replace nuclear weapons in deterrence or warfighting against a state using WMD is not technically supportable. Precision-guided conventional weapons are fine substitutes for non-precision weapons, but they do not remotely possess the lethality of WMD warheads. Moreover, their effectiveness in some cases can be seriously degraded by counter-measures and they clearly are not effective against most hard and deeply buried facilities that are associated with WMD threats and national leadership protection. If deterrence of WMD attack fails, conventional weapons are unlikely to terminate adversary WMD attacks upon us and our allies or to deter escalation. Are there actual existing threats to the survival of the United States? The answer is unquestionably “yes.” Both Russia and China have the nuclear potential to destroy the United States (and our allies) and are modernizing their forces with the objective of targeting the United States.4 China is also increasing the number of its nuclear weapons.5 Russia is moving away from democracy, and China remains a Communist dictatorship. A number of hostile dictatorships—North Korea, Iran, and possibly Syria—have or are developing longer-range missiles, as well as chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.6 They already have the ability to launch devastating WMD attacks against our allies and our forward deployed forces, and in time may acquire capabilities against the United States. Iran will probably have nuclear weapons within approximately 2 to 5 years.7 The United States already faces a chemical and biological weapons threat despite arms control prohibitions. Due to arms control, we do not have an in-kind deterrent. Both Iranian and Syria acquisition of nuclear weapons could be affected by sales from North Korea, which have been reported in the press.8
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#### Backup capacity solves blackouts

Aimone 9-12 (Dr. Michael, Director of Business Enterprise Integration – Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), “Statement Before the House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies,” 2012, <http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony%20-%20Aimone.pdf>)

DoD’s facility energy strategy is also focused heavily on grid security in the name of mission assurance. Although the Department’s fixed installations traditionally served largely as a platform for training and deployment of forces, in recent years they have begun to provide direct support for combat operations, such as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) flown in Afghanistan from fixed installations here in the United States. Our fixed installations also serve as staging platforms for humanitarian and homeland defense missions. These installations are largely dependent on a commercial power grid that is vulnerable to disruption due to aging infrastructure, weather-related events, and potential kinetic, cyber attack. In 2008, the Defense Science Board warned that DoD’s reliance on a fragile power grid to deliver electricity to its bases places critical missions at risk. 1 Standby Power Generation Currently, DoD ensures that it can continue mission critical activities on base largely through its fleet of on-site power generation equipment. This equipment is connected to essential mission systems and automatically operates in the event of a commercial grid outage. In addition, each installation has standby generators in storage for repositioning as required. Facility power production specialists ensure that the generators are primed and ready to work, and that they are maintained and fueled during an emergency. With careful maintenance these generators can bridge the gap for even a lengthy outage. As further back up to this installed equipment, DoD maintains a strategic stockpile of electrical power generators and support equipment that is kept in operational readiness. For example, during Hurricane Katrina, the Air Force transported more than 2 megawatts of specialized diesel generators from Florida, where they were stored, to Keesler Air Force Base in Mississippi, to support base recovery.

#### No risk of cyberattack and no impact

Birch, 10/1/12 – former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy (Douglas, “Forget Revolution.” Foreign Policy. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget\_revolution?page=full)

"That's a good example of what some kind of attacks would be like," he said. "You don't want to overestimate the risks. You don't want somebody to be able to do this whenever they felt like it, which is the situation now. But this is not the end of the world." The question of how seriously to take the threat of a cyber attack on critical infrastructure surfaced recently, after Congress rejected a White House measure to require businesses to adopt stringent­ new regulations to protect their computer networks from intrusions. The bill would have required industries to report cyber security breaches, toughen criminal penalties against hacking and granted legal immunity to companies cooperating with government investigations. Critics worried about regulatory overreach. But the potential cost to industry also seems to be a major factor in the bill's rejection. A January study by Bloomberg reported that banks, utilities, and phone carriers would have to increase their spending on cyber security by a factor of nine, to $45.3 billion a year, in order to protect themselves against 95 percent of cyber intrusions. Likewise, some of the bill's advocates suspect that in the aftermath of a truly successful cyber attack, the government would have to bail the utilities out anyway. Joe Weiss, a cyber security professional and an authority on industrial control systems like those used in the electric grid, argued that a well-prepared, sophisticated cyber attack could have far more serious consequences than this summer's blackouts. "The reason we are so concerned is that cyber could take out the grid for nine to 18 months," he said. "This isn't a one to five day outage. We're prepared for that. We can handle that." But pulling off a cyber assault on that scale is no easy feat. Weiss agreed that hackers intent on inflicting this kind of long-term interruption of power would need to use a tool capable of inflicting physical damage. And so far, the world has seen only one such weapon: Stuxnet, which is believed to have been a joint military project of Israel and the United States. Ralph Langner, a German expert on industrial-control system security, was among the first to discover that Stuxnet was specifically designed to attack the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system (SCADA) at a single site: Iran's Natanz uranium-enrichment plant. The computer worm's sophisticated programs, which infected the plant in 2009, caused about 1,000 of Natanz's 5,000 uranium-enrichment centrifuges to self-destruct by accelerating their precision rotors beyond the speeds at which they were designed to operate. Professionals like Weiss and others warned that Stuxnet was opening a Pandora's Box: Once it was unleashed on the world, they feared, it would become available to hostile states, criminals, and terrorists who could adapt the code for their own nefarious purposes. But two years after the discovery of Stuxnet, there are no reports of similar attacks against the United States. What has prevented the emergence of such copycat viruses? A 2009 paper published by the University of California, Berkeley, may offer the answer. The report, which was released a year before Stuxnet surfaced, found that in order to create a cyber weapon capable of crippling a specific control system ­­-- like the ones operating the U.S. electric grid -- six coders might have to work for up to six months to reverse engineer the targeted center's SCADA system. Even then, the report says, hackers likely would need the help of someone with inside knowledge of how the network's machines were wired together to plan an effective attack. "Every SCADA control center is configured differently, with different devices, running different software/protocols," wrote Rose Tsang, the report's author. Professional hackers are in it for the money -- and it's a lot more cost-efficient to search out vulnerabilities in widely-used computer programs like the Windows operating system, used by banks and other affluent targets, than in one-of-a-kind SCADA systems linked to generators and switches. According to Pollard, only the world's industrial nations have the means to use the Internet to attack utilities and major industries. But given the integrated global economy, there is little incentive, short of armed conflict, for them to do so. "If you're a state that has a number of U.S. T-bills in your treasury, you have an economic interest in the United States," he said. "You're not going to have an interest in mucking about with our infrastructure." There is also the threat of retaliation. Last year, the U.S. government reportedly issued a classified report on cyber strategy that said it could respond to a devastating digital assault with traditional military force. The idea was that if a cyber attack caused death and destruction on the scale of a military assault, the United States would reserve the right to respond with what the Pentagon likes to call "kinetic" weapons: missiles, bombs, and bullets. An unnamed Pentagon official, speaking to the Wall Street Journal, summed up the policy in less diplomatic terms: "If you shut down our power grid, maybe we will put a missile down one of your smokestacks." Deterrence is sometimes dismissed as a toothless strategy against cyber attacks because hackers have such an easy time hiding in the anonymity of the Web. But investigators typically come up with key suspects, if not smoking guns, following cyber intrusions and assaults -- the way suspicions quickly focused on the United States and Israel after Stuxnet was discovered. And with the U.S. military's global reach, even terror groups have to factor in potential retaliation when planning their operations.

#### No escalation of accidental launch

Kislov 93 (Alexander K., Professor and Director of Peace and Research Institute, Inadvertent Nuclear War, p. 239-240)

A deliberate nuclear war between East and West is out of the question; but what about a war caused by chance factors? An accidental or unauthorized launching of a missile or even of several missiles (in itself highly improbable) is unlikely to bring about a full-scale nuclear war when neither side has any incentive for it. We assume a very small probability of a very limited (“automatic” or unauthorized) reaction and a close-to-zero probability of a very limited authorized ‘retaliation’; this is the maximal assumption that is possible if we want to remain realistic.

#### Hegemony doesn’t solve war and there’s no transition wars

**Fettweis 10** (Christopher J. Professor of Political Science at Tulane, Dangerous Times-The International Politics of Great Power Peace, pg. 175-6)

If the only thing standing between the world and chaos is the US military presence, then an adjustment in grand strategy would be exceptionally counter-productive. But it is worth recalling that none of the other explanations for the decline of war – nuclear weapons, complex economic interdependence, international and domestic political institutions, evolution in ideas and norms – necessitate an activist America to maintain their validity. Were American to become more restrained, nuclear weapons would still affect the calculations of the would be aggressor; the process of globalization would continue, deepening the complexity of economic interdependence; the United Nations could still deploy peacekeepers where necessary; and democracy would not shrivel where it currently exists. More importantly,the idea that war is a worthwhile way to resolve conflict would have no reason to return. As was argued in chapter 2, normative evolution is typically unidirectional. Strategic restraint in such a world be virtually risk free.

#### US hegemony will guarantee US-Sino conflict with flashpoints across Asia

Layne 12 [Christopher Layne is the Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University and Research Fellow with the Center on Peace and Liberty at The Independent Institute, “The Global Power Shift from West to East”, April 25th, 2012, <http://nationalinterest.org/article/the-global-power-shift-west-east-6796>, Chetan]

Certainly, the Chinese have not forgotten. Now **Beijing aims to dominate its own** East and Southeast Asian **backyard,** just as a rising America sought to dominate the Western Hemisphere a century and a half ago. **The United States and China now are competing for supremacy in East and Southeast Asia**. Washington has been the incumbent hegemon there since World War II, and many in the American foreign-policy establishment view China’s quest for regional hegemony as a threat that must be resisted. **This contest for regional dominance is fueling escalating tensions and possibly could lead to war**. In geopolitics, **two great powers cannot simultaneously be hegemonic in the same region. Unless one of them abandons its aspirations, there is a high probability of hostilities. Flashpoints that could spark a Sino-American conflict include the** **unstable Korean Peninsula; the disputed status of Taiwan; competition for control of oil and other natural resources; and the burgeoning naval rivalry between the two powers.**

#### Extinction

Straits Times – 2k [“Regional Fallout: No one gains in war over Taiwan,” June 25, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis]

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

#### Military SMRs rely on foreign grids that are fragile – takes out solvency

Smith 11 (Terrence P., Program Coordinator and Research Assistant with the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy – CSIS, “An Idea I Can Do Without: “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations”,” Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2-16, http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations)

Nowhere in these key points is there even a hint of, “Hey this is not necessarily the best thing since sliced bread.” My initial response to each of these “key points”: (1) Takes the assumption it is a good idea and pushes a pursuit of the capability soon and hard to maintain a competitive technological edge, before examining the wisdom of the idea to begin with; (2) Just because DoD is interested in it, does not make it a good idea; (3) Arguing that they are better than larger reactors is not an argument for them being a good idea; (4) See my first point, but add in military advantage. The report describes DoD’s interest in the reactors as stemming from two “critical vulnerabilities”: 1) “the dependence of U.S. military bases on the fragile civilian electrical grid,” and 2) “the challenge of safely and reliably supplying energy to troops in forward operating locations.” The proposed solution: small nuclear reactors that (in many of the proposed plans) are “self-contained and highly mobile.” This would allow the military to use them in forward bases and pack ‘em up and move ‘em out when we are done. But in an era where the U.S. is engaged in global fights with our bases often placed in unfriendly neighborhoods, the idea of driving around nuclear reactors and material (particularly through areas that have “ a fragile civilian electrical grid”) hardly seems like the idea of the century to me. The report counters that “some” designs promise to be “virtually impervious to accidents” and have design characteristics that “might” allow them to be proliferation-resistant. The plans that use low-enriched uranium, sealed reactor cores, ect., do make them a safer option that some current designs of larger nuclear reactors, but, again, if we are going to be trucking these things around the world, when it comes to nuclear material a “might” doesn’t sit well with me.

#### Statisically unipolarity is THE most conflict prone system

Montiero 12 [Nuno P. Monteiro is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity is Not Peaceful”, International Security, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Winter 2011/12), pp. 9–40, Chetan]

**Wohlforth claims not only that the unipole can stave off challenges and preclude major power rivalries, but also that it is able to prevent conflicts among other states** and create incentives for them to side with it. 39 The unipole’s advantage is so great that it can settle any quarrel in which it intervenes. **As Wohlforth writes, “For as long as unipolarity obtains....second-tier states are less likely to engage in conflict-prone rivalries** for security or prestige. Once the sole pole takes sides, there can be little doubt about which party will prevail.” 40 This is the core logic of Wohlforth’s argument that unipolarity is peaceful. But what specifically does his argument say about each of the six possible kinds of war I identified in the previous section? Clearly, great power war is impossible in a unipolar world. In Wohlforth’s famous formulation: “Two states measured up in 1990. One is gone. No new pole has appeared: 2 1 1.” 41 Furthermore, by arguing that unipolarity precludes hegemonic rivalries, Wohlforth makes no room for wars between the sole great power and major powers. These are, according to him, the two main reasons why a unipolar world is peaceful. Unipolarity, he writes, “means the absence of two big problems that bedeviled the statesmen of past epochs: hegemonic rivalry and balance-of-power politics among major powers.” 42 I agree with Wohlforth on these two points, but they are only part of the picture. Granted, the absence of great power wars is an important contribution toward peace, but great power competition—and the conflict it might engender—would signal the emergence of one or more peer competitors to the unipole, and thus indicate that a transition to a bipolar or multipolar system was already under way. In this sense, great power conflict should be discussed within the context of unipolar durability, not unipolar peace. Indeed, including this subject in discussions of unipolar peacefulness parallels the mistakes made in the debate about the Cold War bipolar system. Then, arguments about how the two superpowers were unlikely to fight each other were often taken to mean that the system was peaceful. This thinking ignored the possibility of wars between a superpower and a lesser state, as well as armed conflicts among two or more lesser states, often acting as great power proxies. 43 In addition, **Wohlforth claims that wars among major powers are unlikely**, because the unipole will prevent conflict from erupting among important states. He writes, “The sole pole’s power advantages matter only to the degree that it is engaged, and it is most likely to be engaged in politics among the other major powers. 44 I agree that if the unipole were to pursue a strategy of defensive dominance, major power wars would be unlikely. Yet, there is no compelling reason to expect that it will always follow such a course. Should the unipole decide to disengage, as Wohlforth implies, major power wars would be possible. At the same time, Wohlforth argues that the unipole’s power preponderance makes the expected costs of balancing prohibitive, leading minor powers to bandwagon. This is his explanation for the absence of wars between the sole great power and minor powers. But, as I show, the costs of balancing relative to bandwagoning vary among minor powers. So Wohlforth’s argument underplays the likelihood of this type of war. Finally, Wohlforth’s argument does not exclude all kinds of war. **Although power preponderance allows the unipole to manage conflicts globally, this argument is not meant to apply to relations between major and minor powers,** or among the latter. As Wohlforth explains, his argument “applies with less force to potential security competition between regional powers, or between a second-tier state and a lesser power with which the system leader lacks close ties.” 45 Despite this caveat, Wohlforth does not fully explore the consequences of potential conflict between major and minor powers or among the latter for his view that unipolarity leads to peace. **How well**, then, **does the argument that unipolar systems are peaceful account for the first two decades of unipolarity** since the end of the Cold War? Table 1 presents a list of great powers divided into three periods: 1816 to 1945, multipolarity; 1946 to 1989, bipolarity; and since 1990, unipolarity. 46 Table 2 presents summary data about the incidence of war during each of these periods. **Unipolarity is the most conflict prone of all the systems, according to** at least **two important criteria: the percentage of years that great powers spend at war and the incidence of war involving great powers**. In multipolarity, 18 percent of great power years were spent at war. In bipolarity, the ratio is 16 percent. **In unipolarity**, however, **a remarkable 59 percent of great power years** until now **were spent at war**. This is by far the highest percentage in all three systems. Furthermore, **during** periods of **multipolarity and bipolarity, the probability that war** involving a great power **would break out in any given year was, respectively, 4.2 percent and 3.4 percent. Under unipolarity, it is 18.2 percent**—or more than four times higher. 47 **These figures provide no evidence that unipolarity is peaceful**. 48 In sum, the argument that unipolarity makes for peace is heavily weighted toward interactions among the most powerful states in the system. This should come as no surprise given that Wohlforth makes a structural argument: peace flows from the unipolar structure of international politics, not from any particular characteristic of the unipole. 49 Structural **analyses of the international system are usually centered on interactions between great powers**. 50 As Waltz writes, “The theory, like the story, of international politics is written in terms of the great powers of an era.” 51 In the sections that follow, however, I show that **in the case of unipolarity, an investigation of its peacefulness must consider** potential **causes of conflict beyond interactions between the most important states in the system.**

### 1NC – Prolif

#### No global nuclear tech – the net trend is nuclear declining

Dyer, 11/23/12 – commentator on international affairs, syndicated columnist and military historian (Gwynne, “Anti-nuclear madness grips developed world.” http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/nuclear-378571-power-energy.html)

Oh, wait a minute. Nobody died in the Three-Mile Island calamity, 28 plant workers were killed, and 15 other people subsequently died of thyroid cancer in the Chernobyl holocaust, and nobody died in the Fukushima catastrophe. In fact, northern Japan has not been evacuated after all. But never mind all that. Governments really are shutting down their nuclear plants. They have already shut them down in Japan. All of the country's 50 nuclear reactors were closed for safety checks after the tsunami damaged the Fukushima plant, and only two have reopened. The government has promised to close every nuclear power plant in Japan permanently by 2040. The new Japanese plan says that the country will replace the missing nuclear energy with an eightfold increase in renewable energy (wind, solar, etc.), and "the development of sustainable ways to use fossil fuels." But going from 4 percent to 30 percent renewables in the energy mix will take decades, and nobody has yet found an economically sustainable way to sequester the greenhouse gas emissions from burning fossil fuels. In Germany, where the Greens have been campaigning against nuclear power for decades, Chancellor Angela Merkel has done a U-turn and promised to close all the country's nuclear reactors by 2022. She also promised to replace them with renewable power sources, of course, but the reality will be that the country also burns more fossil fuels. Belgium is also shutting down its nuclear plants, and Italy has abandoned its plans to build some. Even France, which has taken 80 percent of its power from nuclear power plants for decades without the slightest problem, is joining the panic. President Francois Hollande's new government has promised to lower the country's dependence on nuclear energy to 50 percent of the national energy mix. But you can see why he and his colleagues had to do it. After all, nuclear energy is a kind of witchcraft, and the public is frightened. The tireless campaign against nuclear energy that the Greens have waged for decades is finally achieving its goal, at least in the developed countries. Their behavior cannot be logically reconciled with their concern for the environment, given that abandoning nuclear will lead to a big rise in fossil fuel use. The Greens prattle about replacing nuclear power with renewables, which might happen in the distant future. But the brutal truth for now is that closing down the nuclear plants will lead to a sharp rise in greenhouse gas emissions. Fortunately, their superstitious fears are largely absent in more sophisticated parts of the world. Only four new nuclear reactors are under construction in the European Union, and only one in the United States, but there are 61 being built elsewhere. Over two-thirds of them are being built in the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India and China), where economies are growing fast. But it's **not enough to outweigh the closure of so many nuclear plants in the developed world**, at least in the short run. India may be aiming at getting 50 percent of its energy from nuclear power by 2050, for example, but the fact is that only 3.7 percent of its electricity is nuclear right now. So the price of nuclear fuel has collapsed in the past four years, and uranium mine openings and expansions have been cancelled.

#### No widespread proliferation

Hymans 12 (Jacques, Associate Professor of International Relations – USC, North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb, Foreign Affairs, 4-16, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show)

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. **Such warnings have routinely proved wrong** - for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq - but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground - and their failure rate is much higher - than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age. As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. **These problems are debilitating**, and **they cannot be fixed** simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### No nuclear terror – operation, cohesion and coordination

Mueller and Stewart 12 [John Mueller is Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C. Mark G. Stewart is Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “The Terrorism Delusion”, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Summer 2012), pp. 81–110, Chetan]

In the eleven years since the September 11 attacks, no terrorist has been able to detonate even a primitive bomb in the United States, and except for the four explosions in the London transportation system in 2005, neither has any in the United Kingdom. Indeed, the only method by which Islamist terrorists have managed to kill anyone in the United States since September 11 has been with gunfire—inflicting a total of perhaps sixteen deaths over the period (cases 4, 26, 32).11 This limited capacity is impressive because, at one time, small-scale terrorists in the United States were quite successful in setting off bombs. Noting that the scale of the September 11 attacks has “tended to obliterate America’s memory of pre-9/11 terrorism,” Brian Jenkins reminds us (and we clearly do need reminding) that the 1970s witnessed sixty to seventy terrorist incidents, mostly bombings, on U.S. soil every year.12 The situation seems scarcely different in Europe and other Western locales. Michael Kenney, who has interviewed dozens of government officials and intelligence agents and analyzed court documents, has found that, in sharp contrast with the boilerplate characterizations favored by the DHS and with the imperatives listed by Dalmia, Islamist militants in those locations are operationally unsophisticated, short on know-how, prone to making mistakes, poor at planning, and limited in their capacity to learn.13 Another study documents the difficulties of network coordination that continually threaten the terrorists’ operational unity, trust, cohesion, and ability to act collectively.14 In addition, although some of the plotters in the cases targeting the United States harbored visions of toppling large buildings, destroying airports, setting off dirty bombs, or bringing down the Brooklyn Bridge (cases 2, 8, 12, 19, 23, 30, 42), all were nothing more than wild fantasies, far beyond the plotters’ capacities however much they may have been encouraged in some instances by FBI operatives. Indeed, in many of the cases, target selection is effectively a random process, lacking guile and careful planning. Often, it seems, targets have been chosen almost capriciously and simply for their convenience. For example, a would-be bomber targeted a mall in Rockford, Illinois, because it was nearby (case 21). Terrorist plotters in Los Angeles in 2005 drew up a list of targets that were all within a 20-mile radius of their shared apartment, some of which did not even exist (case 15). In Norway, a neo-Nazi terrorist on his way to bomb a synagogue took a tram going the wrong way and dynamited a mosque instead.15 Although the efforts of would-be terrorists have often seemed pathetic, even comical or absurd, the comedy remains a dark one. Left to their own devices, at least a few of these often inept and almost always self-deluded individuals could eventually have committed some serious, if small-scale, damage.16

#### Prolif will be limited and slow

Yusuf 9 (Moeed, Fellow and Ph.D. Candidate in the Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Longer-Range

Future – Boston University, “Predicting Proliferation: The History of the Future of Nuclear Weapons”, Brookings Policy Paper 11, January, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2009/01\_nuclear\_proliferation\_ yusuf/01\_nuclear\_proliferation\_yusuf.pdf)

It is a paradox that few aspects of international security have been as closely scrutinized, but as incorrectly forecast, as the future nuclear landscape. Since the advent of nuclear weapons in 1945, there have been dozens, if not hundreds of projections by government and independent analysts trying to predict horizontal and vertical proliferation across the world. Various studies examined which countries would acquire nuclear weapons, when this would happen, how many weapons the two superpowers as well as other countries would assemble, and the impact these developments might have on world peace. The results have oscillated between gross underestimations and terrifying overestimations. Following the September 11, 2001 attacks, the fear that nuclear weapons might be acquired by so-called “rogues states” or terrorist groups brought added urgency – and increased difficulty – to the task of accurately assessing the future of nuclear weapons. A survey of past public and private projections provides a timely reminder of the flaws in both the methodologies and theories they employed. Many of these errors were subsequently corrected, but not before, they made lasting impressions on U.S. nuclear (and non-nuclear) policies. This was evident from the time the ‘Atoms for Peace’ program was first promulgated in 1953 to the 1970 establishment of the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and more recently during the post-Cold War disarmament efforts and debates surrounding U.S. stance towards emerging nuclear threats. This study offers a brief survey of attempts to predict the future of nuclear weapons since the beginning of the Cold War.1 The aim of this analysis is not merely to review the record, but to provide an overall sense of how the nuclear future was perceived over the past six decades, and where and why errors were made in prediction, so that contemporary and future predictive efforts have the benefit of a clearer historical record. The survey is based on U.S. intelligence estimates as well as the voluminous scholarly work of American and foreign experts on the subject. Six broad lessons can be gleaned from this history. First, it reveals consistent misjudgments regarding the extent of nuclear proliferation. Overall, projections were far more pessimistic than actual developments; those emanating from independent experts more so than intelligence estimates. In the early years of the Cold War, the overly pessimistic projections stemmed, in part, from an incorrect emphasis on technology as the driving factor in horizontal proliferation, rather than intent, a misjudgment, which came to light with the advent of a Chinese bomb in 1964. The parallel shift from developed-world proliferation to developing-world proliferation was accompanied by greater alarm regarding the impact of proliferation. It was felt that developing countries were more dangerous and irresponsible nuclear states than developed countries. Second, while all the countries that did eventually develop nuclear weapons were on the lists of suspect states, the estimations misjudged when these countries would go nuclear. The Soviet Union went nuclear much earlier than had been initially predicted, intelligence estimates completely missed China’s nuclear progress, and India initially tested much later than U.S. intelligence projections had anticipated and subsequently declared nuclear weapon status in 1998 when virtually no one expected it to do so. Third, the pace of proliferation has been consistently slower than has been anticipated by most experts due to a combination of overwhelming alarmism, the intent of threshold states, and many incentives to abstain from weapons development. In the post-Cold War period, the number of suspected threshold states has gradually decreased and the geographical focus has shifted solely to North-East Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. There is also much greater concern that a nuclear chain reaction will break out than was the case during the Cold War.

#### Nuke leadership fails – it’s an ineffective tool and outdated

Weiss 9 (Leonard, Affiliated Scholar – Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation, “Reliable Energy Supply and Nonproliferation,” Nonproliferation Review, 16(2), July, http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/npr\_16-2\_weiss.pdf)

Part of the problem is that its value as a nonproliferation tool was at its height at the beginning of the nuclear age**,** when few countries were in a position to achieve nuclear autarky. The probability of consensus on establishing a worldwide regime in which there are fuel guarantees and no nationally owned fuel cycle facilities has been on a decreasing slope. Technology denial has become a less effective tool, thanks especially to A.Q. Khan and others. The spread of fuel cycle technologies has perhaps reached a tipping point in which the technology is**,** if not widely available, then sufficiently available to any determined party**.** Hence, the argument made by proponents of internationalization that giving up national nuclear development in favor of more restrictive international efforts will result in much greater security for all does not have the power it may once have had.

#### Alt cause – nuclear hypocrisy

**Caldicott, 6** – Founder and President of the Nuclear Policy Research Institute (Helen, “Nuclear Power is not the answer.” pp. 134-135)

In light of terrorist attacks using conventional weapons, it is only a matter of time before someone steals enough plutonium to make an adequate nuclear weapon. Then we proceed into the age of nuclear terrorism. Meanwhile, with the world awash in plutonium and highly enriched uranium, the Bush administration pursues its own nuclear armament development policy that makes it increasingly likely that a rogue nation will procure and possibly use nuclear weapons. The United States has adopted three contradictory stances at the same time: It is aggressively forging ahead to build more nuclear weapons, stating that it will use them preemptively even against non- nuclear nations. It is instrumental in denying the right to build nuclear weapons to all but a handful of countries. In the context of promoting nuclear energy, it has offered dozens of countries nuclear technology and access to nuclear power fuel. The fission process makes plutonium, which can then be separated by reprocessing and converted to fuel for nuclear weapons. While the Bush proposal includes taking the spent fuel back to the United States, it is not clear that that process can be undertaken with no cheating. Thus, even as there is much hand-wringing at the United Nations about the possibility that Iran and North Korea may be developing nuclear weapons, eight nation-states-Russia, the United States, France, China, Britain, India, Israel, and Pakistan- possess their own nuclear arsenals, and others are free to develop weapons without the admonitions that the United States and the United Nations are imposing upon Iran and North Korea. This strange juxtaposition of opposing attitudes needs to be examined in the context of the sixty-five-year history of nuclear fission and related weapons development.

#### Alt cause – waste management

**Moniz, 11** – Cecil and Ida Green Distinguished Professor of Physics and Engineering Systems and Director of the Energy Initiative at MIT, served as Undersecretary of the U.S. Department of Energy in 1997-2001 (Ernest, December. “Why We Still Need Nuclear Power.” Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6, EBSCO.)

The United States' dysfunctional nuclear waste management system has an unfortunate international side effect: it limits the options for preventing other countries from using nuclear power infrastructure to produce nuclear weapons. If countries such as Iran are able to enrich uranium to make new reactor fuel and separate out the plutonium to recover its energy value, they then have access to the relevant technology and material for a weapons program. Safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency are intended to make sure that civilian programs do not spill over into military ones, but the agency has only a limited ability to address clandestine programs.

#### Proliferation reduces the likelihood of nuclear war

**Asal and Beardsley**, **2007** (Victor – assistant professor of political science at SUNY Albany, and Kyle – assistant professor of political science at Emory, Proliferation and international crisis behavior, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 44, No. 2, p. 142)

Other, more optimistic, scholars see benefits to nuclear proliferation or, perhaps not actively advocating the development of more nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapon states, see that the presence of nuclear weapons has at least been stabilizing in the past. For example, some scholars are confident of the promise of the ‘nuclear peace’.4 While those who oppose proliferation present a number of arguments, those who contend that nuclear weapons would **reduce interstate wars** are fairly consistent in focusing on one key argument: nuclear weapons make the risk of war **unacceptable for states**. As Waltz argues, the higher the stakes and the closer a country moves toward winning them, the more surely that country invites retaliation and risks its own destruction. States are not likely to run major risks for minor gains. War between nuclear states may escalate as the loser uses larger and larger warheads. Fearing that, states will want to draw back. Not escalation but **deescalation becomes likely**. War remains possible, but victory in war is too dangerous to fight for. (Sagan & Waltz, 2003: 6–7) ‘Nuclear war simply makes the risks of war much higher and shrinks the chance that a country will go to war’ (Snyder & Diesing, 1977: 450). Using similar logic, Bueno de Mesquita & Riker (1982) demonstrate formally that a world with almost universal membership in the **nuclear club will be much less likely to experience nuclear war** than a world with only a few members

#### Proliferation does not escalate to war. It de-escalates conflicts

**Tepperman**, 9/7/**2009** (John - journalist based in New York Cuty, Why obama should learn to love the bomb, Newsweek, p.lexis)

**A growing and compelling body of research** suggests that nuclear weapons may not, in fact, make the world more dangerous, as Obama and most people assume. The bomb may actually make us safer. In this era of rogue states and transnational terrorists, that idea sounds so obviously wrongheaded that few politicians or policymakers are willing to entertain it. But that's a mistake. Knowing the truth about nukes would have a profound impact on government policy. Obama's idealistic campaign, so out of character for a pragmatic administration, may be unlikely to get far (past presidents have tried and failed). But it's not even clear he should make the effort. There are more important measures the U.S. government can and should take to make the real world safer, and these mustn't be ignored in the name of a dreamy ideal (a nuke-free planet) that's both unrealistic and possibly undesirable. The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, there's never been a nuclear, or even a nonnuclear, war between two states that possess them. Just stop for a second and think about that: it's hard to overstate how remarkable it is, especially given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading "nuclear optimist" and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, "We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It's striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states." To understand why--and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way--you need to start by recognizing that all states are **rational on some basic level**. Their leaders may be stupid, petty, venal, even evil, but they tend to do things only when they're **pretty sure they can get away with them**. Take war: a country will start a fight only when it's almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price. **Not even Hitler or Saddam** waged wars they didn't think they could win. The problem historically has been that leaders often make the **wrong gamble and underestimate** the other side--and millions of innocents pay the price. Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war **obvious**, inevitable, **and unacceptable**. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a button--and everybody knows it--the basic math shifts. Even the **craziest tin-pot dictator** is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is **unwinnable** and thus not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, "**Why fight if you can't win and might lose everything**?" Why indeed? The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling, it's led to what's known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world's major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight proxy wars, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these never matched the furious destruction of full-on, great-power war (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there's very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring--because in each instance, very different **leaders all came to the same safe conclusion**. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have **meant curtains** for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, "It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time." The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, **then pull back**, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did **dramatically mellow their behavior**. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, **despite severe provocations** (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### Military nuclear installments will be targeted for sabotage – causes accidents

Wong 12 (Kelvin, Associate Research Fellow – S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, “Beyond Weapons: The Military’s Quest For Nuclear Power – Analysis,” Eurasia Review, 5-22, http://www.eurasiareview.com/22052012-beyond-weapons-the-militarys-quest-for-nuclear-power-analysis/)

Civilian And Military Nuclear Incidents Despite improvements in nuclear safety, public sentiment on nuclear power is generally unfavourable, particularly after a series of high-profile nuclear incidents over the years. Disasters like Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, and the recent Fukushima episodes have sorely demonstrated the perils of operating nuclear reactors, emanating be it from human error or natural calamities. Military forces have also been stung by peacetime nuclear incidents. In March 2008, the American nuclear submarine USS Houston leaked minute amounts of radiation into Sasebo naval base while on a port call, triggering condemnation from Japanese citizens in the district. In the same year, the British nuclear submarine HMS Trafalgar leaked hundreds of litres of radioactive wastewater into a nearby river while docked at Devonport naval base, raising concerns from nuclear safety experts. Mainstream Nuclear Power In The Military? Yet military scientists have not ceased to be tempted by the potential of nuclear power. In response to increasing oil prices and global supply uncertainties, and well-documented cases of logistical strain on forces operating in the Middle East in recent conflicts, the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) issued a proposal for innovative solutions in deployable compact nuclear reactors in 2010. In the proposal, DARPA outlined the need to reduce the logistical burden of supplying forward operating bases and forces without access to reliable fuel supply lines. The proposal also suggested that materials science have advanced to the stage where it might have a positive impact on deployable nuclear reactor research. While recent developments suggest that nuclear power technology can potentially be employed in unmanned aircraft and on the ground, it is unlikely to have mainstream military utility. The Cold War period was an era when general attitudes towards nuclear energy were quite favourable, and military experimentation was only limited by funding and scientific expertise. In contrast, nuclear power today has become a hotly debated issue despite its importance in powering the economies of advanced nations today. For the military, the problem with nuclear power is not just about cost and safety, but also of the nature of its operating environment. Deploying volatile nuclear reactors into harm’s way on the battlefield, where their destruction and sabotage are likely, should give military planners cause to pause.

#### Nuclear accidents risk extinction

**Caldicott 94** (Helen, Australian Physician, Nuclear Madness, p. 21)

As a physician, I contend that nuclear technology **threatens life on our planet with extinction.** If present trends continue, the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the water we drink will soon be contaminated with enough radioactive pollutants to post a potential health hazard far greater than any plague humanity has ever experienced. Unknowingly exposed to these radioactive poisons, some of us may be developing cancer right now. Others may be passing damaged genes, the basic chemical units that transmit hereditary characteristics, to future generations. And more of us will inevitably be affected unless we bring about a dramatic reversal of the world’s pronuclear policies

#### Siting requirements blocks solvency

King 11 (Marcus, Ph.D., Center for Naval Analyses Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, March 2011, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S.Military Installations, www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear Power on Military Installations D0023932 A5.pdf)

A reactor owner/operator, typically a utility, will select a site and may apply for an early site permit from the NRC. They select a reactor design, (certified under a separate process), to construct on the site and then apply for a combined operating license. Construction begins after approval. With respect to the requirement to “consider the potential impact on the quality of life of personnel stationed at military installations at which a nuclear power plant is installed and ways to mitigate those impacts,” it is impossible to talk in specific terms without knowing details about which specific power plant is being considered and the specific locations being considered. In general terms, finding an appropriate site will be challenging. Part of the reason finding an appropriate site will be challenging is because the NRC site consideration process will force full consideration of these factors. Describing the NRC site assessment process is the best and most relevant information that can be provided with respect to this aspect of feasibility at this stage in the process. The NRC approval process described in this section will require that any potential impacts on the quality of life of personnel stationed at military installations at which a nuclear power plant is proposed will be fully consdered and that ways are planned to mitigate those impacts.

## 2NC

### 2NC – Econ Impact Overview

#### Impact outweighs and turns the case –

#### A. Magnitude – US collapse goes global and draws in every major country – treaties increase the probability of draw in and guarantees escalation.

#### B. Timeframe – decline causes lash out and outward pressure to secure economic gains – that’s Auslin

#### War is worse than warming

**Shaefer 7**—and Lieberman, – Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs. Senior Policy Analyst, Energy and Environment. 2007 (Brett D. Shaefer and Ben Lieberman. “Discussing Global Warming in the Security Council: Premature and a Distraction from More Pressing Crises.” http://www.heritage.org/Research/InternationalOrganizations/wm1425.cfm)

The United Kingdom is wrong to foist this issue on the Council. First, the extent, source, and consequences of global warming are subject to debate, and the possible implications of global warming, particularly the security implications, are speculative. Even if these consequences occur as predicted in the IPCC report, they are not immediate security threats. Second, numerous policy initiatives, forums, and organizations are focused on studying and evaluating the consequences of global warming. The focus of these efforts and discussions is to clarify the science of global warming and weigh the costs of action to address global warming against the risks of inaction. A debate in the Security Council is unlikely to contribute to these ongoing efforts. Finally, the Security Council has a full docket of immediate threats to international peace and security that is has failed to resolve. Focusing on speculative threats that may arise decades in the future undermines the seriousness of the body and is an affront to those suffering from immediate crises. Worse, it distracts the Council from pressing threats to international peace and security.

#### Turns case – econ decline tanks nuke power – undermines necessary investment

Simpson 9 (Fiona, associate director of New York University's Center on International Cooperation, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, "The recession alone won't stop nuclear power's growth," [http://www.thebulletin.org/web–edition/features/the–recession–alone–wont–stop–nuclear–powers–growth](http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-recession-alone-wont-stop-nuclear-powers-growth))

None of the IAEA's projections, however, account for the financial crisis, which may negatively impact the appeal of nuclear energy. Clearly, investors that need credit to build new nuclear plants face a great deal more uncertainty and difficulty securing financing. Such a situation, on the surface, would indicate that nuclear power will be less attractive to investors. The downturn also may reduce electricity demand and thus, potentially, make the need for new power plants less urgent. At the same time, prices for natural gas and oil have fallen from earlier highs, increasing their attractiveness as energy sources (although the price of each has increased recently). Additionally, nuclear power plants have significant "front–loaded" costs, requiring much more investment at the outset than fossil–fuel burning plants, even if nuclear plants may eventually be cheaper to run. In light of the ongoing credit crunch, investors in countries that don't rely on state–owned enterprises may find the economic circumstances simply too difficult to justify an investment in nuclear power––especially if there's reliable (and domestic) access to natural gas, coal, or oil. One also would expect private lenders to shy from nuclear projects––both because they have less money to lend and because of nuclear power's history of cost overruns and delays. Finally, from the point of view of developing countries interested in nuclear power, multilateral development banks, such as the World Bank, tend to prohibit investment in new nuclear projects.

#### Causes more proliferation because people will look to black market to make more money

#### Turns global proliferation, genocide, famine, and disease

**Silk 93** (Leonard, Professor of Economic – Pace University, “Dangers of Slow Growth,” FOREIGN AFFAIRS v. 72 n. 1, Winter 1993, p. 173–174)

In the absence of such shifts of human and capital resources to expanding civilian industries, there are strong economic pressures on arms–producing nations to maintain high levels of military production and to sell weapons, both conventional and dual–use nuclear technology, wherever buyers can be found. Without a revival of national economies and the global economy, the production and proliferation of weapons will continue, creating more Iraqs, Yuugoslavias, Somalias and Cambodias – or worse. Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues. Growth will not solve all those problems by itself But economic growth – and growth alone – creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

### Uniq

#### Group the uniqueness debate –

#### Electricity prices are on the decline and will remain low for the next years – the natural gas boom means that current supply is already meeting demand – that’s Burtraw. Prefer our evidence –

#### A. Predictive – it assumes rising demands for the next 20 years, their evidence is a snapshot and doesn’t occur for future changes.

#### B. More qualified – Burtraw is an expert is the electricity sector – their evidence is from a random news outlet.

#### Uniqueness determines the direction of the link – the only chance for consequence is a scenario where the plan increases prices. It means there’s no chance of their link turn being offense.

#### More reasons –

#### 1. Electricity prices are historically low now – MWh price data proves

Ryser 11/20**/12** (Jeff, Platts Energy, "US and Europe through a prism of electricity prices," http://blogs.platts.com/2012/11/20/electric\_prices/)

Persistently low electricity prices are having an impact on virtually everything that touches the US power sector. Something of the opposite is beginning to be said in Europe.¶ Dozens of US-based companies reporting third quarter earnings—and earnings thus far this year—have said their revenue is down due not just to reduced demand but also due to low prices.¶ On November 12, the Moody’s ratings agency noted that a dozen big-name firms that own unregulated power affiliates, or are pure merchant generators—the list included PSEG, Exelon, PPL, First Energy, NextEra Energy, Dominion, Entergy, NRG Energy, Dynegy, Energy Future Holdings and Edison Mission Energy—have been experiencing “financial stress” for four years and can expect “little relief from today’s commodity price environment—a main cause of the stress—over the next 24 months.”¶ The ratings agency said the combination of low prices and “tepid expectations for growth in electricity volumes” could mean that companies will have to cut costs and delay capital investments.¶ Today, US wholesale peak power prices are in the high $20’s—low $30’s/MWh range. They are essentially at that low level because natural gas prices are in the $3.30/MMBtu to $3.40/MMBtu range. Five years ago, according to Platts data, that wholesale electricity price range was between $52-$55/MWh.¶

#### 2. Gas boom and lower demand

Hough 12/6/12 (Jack, Barron's, "When a Dividend Cut Says "Buy," http://online.barrons.com/article/SB50001424052748703555704578161103614771598.html?mod=BOL\_da\_aft)

No longer. New techniques in the gas-drilling business have unlocked vast stores of the stuff from porous rock, creating a glut and depressing prices. Seven years ago, the U.S. produced more electricity from nuclear plants than gas ones, but now it produces much more from gas.¶ A weak economy and mild weather, meanwhile, have dampened electricity demand. Wholesale electricity prices have fallen, stripping nuclear operators of much of their profit power. Last month, Dominion Resources (D) said it would close a small nuclear plant in Wisconsin because it was no longer profitable to operate and there were no buyers.

#### 3. Most recent EPA decision guarantees low prices

Platts Energy Week 8/27/12 ("Platts Energy Week TV: Analyst Sees $2 drop in U.S. Electricity Prices," http://www.platts.com/PressReleases/2012/082712/No)

A U.S. federal court decision last week striking down the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) attempt at regulating interstate emissions from coal–fired power plants will likely mean electricity prices will drop between $1 and $2 per megawatt hour (MWh) over the next two years, an analyst for Standard & Poor's said Sunday on the all–energy news and talk program Platts Energy Week.

#### 4. Your evidence doesn’t account for inflation – prices are down

ACCCE 12 (American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, "Energy Cost Impacts on American Families,

2001–2012," Feb., http://www.americaspower.org/sites/default/files/Energy\_Cost\_Impacts\_2012\_FINAL.pdf)

Electricity is the bargain among all consumer energy products. Among consumer energy goods and services, electricity has maintained relatively lower annual average price increases compared to residential natural gas and gasoline. Electricity prices have increased by 51% in nominal dollars since 1990, well below the 72% rate of inflation in the Consumer Price Index. The nominal prices of residential natural gas and gasoline have nearly doubled and tripled, respectively, over this period.

### AT: DoD Doesn’t Commercialize

#### Cross-ex proves DOD jumpstarts the private sector – their ev says

Private industry and the public will see that nuclear reactors can indeed be utilized safely and effectively, resulting in a renewed push

#### This jumpstarts the US domestic industry

Madia ‘12 (William Madia, Stanford Energy Journal, Dr. Madia serves as Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University. Previously, he was the Laboratory Director at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory from 2000-2004 and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory from 1994-1999., “SMALL MODULAR REACTORS: A POTENTIAL GAME-CHANGING TECHNOLOGY”, <http://energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small_Modular_Reactors_by_William_Madia>, Spring 2012)

Significant schedule advantages are also available because weather delay considerations are reduced. Of course, from a total cost perspective, some of these savings will be offset by the capital costs associated with building multiple modules to get the same total power output. Based on analyses I have seen, overnight costs in the range of $5000 to $8000 per installed kilowatt are achievable. If these analyses are correct, it means that the economies of scale arguments that drove current designs to GW scales could be countered by the simplicity and factory-build possibilities of SMRs. No one has yet obtained a design certification from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for an SMR, so we must consider licensing to be one of the largest unknowns facing these new designs. Nevertheless, since the most developed of the SMRs are mostly based on proven and licensed components and are configured at power levels that are passively safe, we should not expect many new significant licensing issues to be raised for this class of reactor. Still, the NRC will need to address issues uniquely associated with SMRs, such as the number of reactor modules any one reactor operator can safely operate and the size of the emergency planning zone for SMRs. To determine if SMRs hold the potential for changing the game in carbon-free power generation, it is imperative that we test the design, engineering, licensing, and economic assumptions with some sort of public-private development and demonstration program. Instead of having government simply invest in research and development to “buy down” the risks associated with SMRs, I propose a more novel approach. Since the federal government is a major power consumer, it should commit to being the “first mover” of SMRs. This means purchasing the first few hundred MWs of SMR generation capacity and dedicating it to federal use. The advantages of this approach are straightforward. The government would both reduce licensing and economic risks to the point where utilities might invest in subsequent units, thus jumpstarting the SMR industry. It would then also be the recipient of additional carbon-free energy generation capacity. This seems like a very sensible role for government to play without getting into the heavy politics of nuclear waste, corporate welfare, or carbon taxes. If we want to deploy power generation technologies that can realize near-term impact on carbon emissions safely, reliably, economically, at scale, and at total costs that are manageable on the balance sheets of most utilities, we must consider SMRs as a key component of our national energy strategy.

#### DoD procurement spurs commercialization – their author

Andres and Breetz 11 [Richard Andres, Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and a Senior Fellow and Energy and Environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic Research, Institute for National Strategic Studies, at the National Defense University, and Hanna Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications, [www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/StrForum/SF-262.pdf](http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/StrForum/SF-262.pdf)]

**By taking an early “first mover” role in the small reactor market, DOD could mitigate these risks and secure the long-term availability and appropriateness of these technologies for U.S. military applications.** The “Valley of Death Given the promise that small reactors hold for military installations and mobility, **DOD has a compelling interest in ensuring that they make the leap from paper to production**. However, **if DOD does not provide an initial** demonstration and **market, there is a chance that the U.S. small reactor industry may never get off the ground**. **The leap from the laboratory to the marketplace is so difficult to bridge that it is widely referred to as the “Valley of Death.”** **Many promising technologies are never commercialized due to a variety of market failures**— **including technical and financial uncertainties**, information asymmetries, **capital market imperfections, transaction costs**, and environmental and security externalities— **that impede financing and early adoption and can lock innovative technologies out of the marketplace**. 28 In such cases, **the Government can help a worthy technology to bridge the Valley of Death by accepting the first mover costs and demonstrating the technology’s scientific and economic viability**.29 [FOOTNOTE 29: **There are** numerous **actions that the Federal Government could take**, such as conducting or funding research and development, stimulating private investment, demonstrating technology, mandating adoption, and guaranteeing markets. **Military procurement** is thus only one option, but it has often **played a decisive role in technology development and is likely to be the catalyst for the U.S. small reactor industry.** See Vernon W. Ruttan, Is War Necessary for Economic Growth? (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Kira R. Fabrizio and David C. Mowery, “The Federal Role in Financing Major Inventions: Information Technology during the Postwar Period,” in Financing Innovation in the United States, 1870 to the Present, ed. Naomi R. Lamoreaux and Kenneth L. Sokoloff (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2007), 283–316.] Historically, **nuclear power has been “the most clear-cut example . . . of an important general-purpose technology that in the absence of military** and defense related **procurement would not have been developed at all.”**30 **Government involvement is likely to be crucial for innovative, next-generation nuclear technology** as well. Despite the widespread revival of interest in nuclear energy, Daniel Ingersoll has argued that radically innovative **designs face an uphill battle, as “the high capital cost of nuclear plants and the painful lessons learned during the first nuclear era have created a prevailing fear of first-of-a-kind designs**.”31 In addition, **M**assachusetts **I**nstitute of **T**echnology reports on the Future of Nuclear Power **called for the Government to provide modest “first mover” assistance to the private sector due to several barriers that have hindered the nuclear renaissance**,

### 2NC – Link

#### Nuclear power drives up electricity prices – rising construction costs and lower efficiency ratings compared to renewable guarantee higher prices – that’s Cooper. All of those costs get directly placed on ratepayers, not the company.

#### Prefer our ev – their makes assertions with no support while ours has warranted reasons

#### Link outweighs the link turn – even failed projects jack up the price

Madsen et al 9 (Travis, Analyst @ Frontier Group and Maryland PIRG Foundation, Johanna Neumann @ Maryland PIRG Foundation, and Emily Rusch @ CalPIRG Education Fund, "The High Cost of Nuclear Power," <http://www.nirs.org/nukerelapse/calvert/highcostnpower_mdpirg.pdf>)

N o power company has successfully ordered a nuclear reactor in the United States since 1973. Despite promises of power that would be “too cheap to meter,” the last generation of nuclear reactors ran aground on skyrocketing construction costs. Of 75 nuclear reactors completed between 1966 and 1986, the average reactor cost more than triple its original construction budget. 1 Later–built reactors came in as much as 1,200 percent over–budget. 2 In 1985, Forbes magazine wrote that “the failure of the U.S. nuclear power program ranks as the largest managerial disaster in business history, a disaster on a monumental scale.” 3 Electricity customers ended up paying the price. Only one–half of the reactors proposed were ever built, and ratepayers often had to bear the costs of abandoned projects. Where reactor projects were completed, rates often increased. Finally, during the restructuring of the electricity industry in the 1990s, ratepayers were saddled with billions in “stranded costs” from failed investments in nuclear power, saving nuclear power plant owners (and their shareholders) from huge losses.

#### also their ev is not specific to SMRS – SMRs produce electricity that is THREE times more expensive than conventional nuke power

Lyman 12 (Edwin, Senior Scientist in Global Security Program @ Union of Concerned Scientists, "Small Modular Reactor Panel Discussion," May 9, http://cstsp.aaas.org/files/SummaryFinalSMR.pdf)

Lyman was skeptical about the prospects for reductions in manufacturing cost resulting from the industrial learning process, and therefore argued that the US should expect smaller reactors to be more expensive per MW. Further, Lyman said that standard economics of scale point to SMRs having overnight capital costs of a factor of 2 to 3 higher per MW than large reactors.

#### Nuclear power triples the cost that consumers pay

Madsen et al 9 (Travis, Analyst @ Frontier Group and Maryland PIRG Foundation, Johanna Neumann @ Maryland PIRG Foundation, and Emily Rusch @ CalPIRG Education Fund, "The High Cost of Nuclear Power," <http://www.nirs.org/nukerelapse/calvert/highcostnpower_mdpirg.pdf>)

Compounding the problem are the high cost estimates for new nuclear reactors. Some estimates of the cost of power from a new nuclear reactor range as high as 25 to 30 cents per kWh – triple electricity rates in most parts of the country. 57 Adding power at even half this price to a service territory could increase the cost that consumers pay for electricity, motivating additional efforts to conserve and dampening the power demand the plant was built to serve. This exact situation contributed to the failure of the last wave of nuclear power plant construction in the United States. Dozens of reactors were cancelled, and billions of dollars in unnecessary investment were lost.

### Internals

#### Higher prices jack consumer spending which are poised to inject an energy based stimulus to the economy which is also the Perry evidence

#### Prefer historical studies over this question

Emmons 12 (William, Asst VP + Economist @ Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis, "Don't Expect Consumer Spending To Be the Engine of Economic Growth It Once Was," Jan, <http://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/re/articles/?id=2201>)

It is no exaggeration to say that consumer spending was the dominant source of economic growth in the United States during recent decades. For example: During the 10 years ending in the last prerecession quarter (third quarter of 2007), inflation–adjusted personal consumption expenditures (PCE) grew at a continuously compounded annual rate of 3.47 percent, while overall inflation–adjusted annual growth of gross domestic product (GDP) averaged only 2.91 percent. During that period, the remainder of the economy—consisting of investment (I), government purchases of goods and services (G), and net exports (NX)—grew at only a 1.70 percent inflation–adjusted annual rate. Expressed in terms of its contribution to average quarterly real GDP growth during the decade ending in the third quarter of 2007, PCE accounted for 81.3 percent, while the other components (I, G and NX) contributed only 18.7 percent. Over the quarter–century ending in the third quarter of 2007, consumer expenditures grew, on average, at a 3.50 continuously compounded annual rate, while the rest of the economy (I, G and NX) grew at a 2.79 percent annual rate. PCE accounted for 70.8 percent of average real GDP growth during those 25 years (1982: Q3 through 2007: Q3), while all other components (I, G and NX) contributed 29.2 percent. Consumer spending accounts for a majority of spending in all advanced nations. What makes the U.S. experience of recent decades unusual is that the share of consumer spending in GDP was relatively high already before it began to increase substantially further during the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. In dollar terms, PCE's share of GDP in the third quarters of 1977, 1987, 1997 and 2007 were 62.5, 65.9, 66.7 and 69.5 percent, respectively. (See Figure 1.) Thus, consumer spending was a large and increasingly important part of the American economy during the decades preceding the recession and remains so today. International dimensions of U.S. consumer spending. As consumer spending grew rapidly in the U.S., we imported consumer–oriented goods and services even more rapidly. Imports of all goods and services increased at an annual, inflation–adjusted rate of 6.5 percent during the decade ending in the third quarter of 2007. But imports of consumer goods—44 percent of all imports—increased at an annual average rate of 7.5 percent. U.S. imports contributed importantly to growth in many exporting countries around the world. U.S. consumers, therefore, served as the locomotive not only for the U.S. economy but for the global economy. Because we incurred large trade deficits, we required a corresponding inflow of foreign capital to finance them.

#### Independently they’ve conceded Prices are key to manufacturing – companies are making the move to the US due to low electricity prices. The plan causes those companies to move back offshore – removing any competitive advantage the US has in terms of economic growth.

#### Cheap energy is a driving factor for manufacturing reshoring

Washington Post 11-19 [“American manufacturing is coming back. Manufacturing jobs aren’t”, November 19th, 2012, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2012/11/19/american-manufacturing-is-coming-back-manufacturing-jobs-arent/>, Chetan]

And another advantage for the United States is relatively affordable energy, thanks in no small part to lots of supply of natural gas. There are some sectors of manufacturing, such as of wood products, refined petroleum, and basic metals, in which energy is an overwhelming driver of costs. It is therefore most economical to locate production in the places with the cheapest energy, even if labor costs are high. That increasingly fits the United States to a tee.

### AT: No War

#### Decline cause miscalculation and conflict – prefer statistically significant evidence

**Royal 10** (Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213–215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre–eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre–eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases**,** as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularlyduring periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self–reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate externalmilitary conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in theuse of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflictat systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic–security debate and deserves more attention.

### Grid

#### SQUO solves – Grids will survive – each installaition has standby generators that are maintained and fueled during emergencies – that’s Aimone – our ev is recent

#### New developments sure up grid stability – solves blackouts

Kemp 12 -- Reuters market analyst (John, 4/5/12, "COLUMN-Phasors and blackouts on the U.S. power grid: John Kemp," http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/05/column-smart-grid-idUSL6E8F59W120120405)

The hoped-for solution to grid instability is something called the North American SynchroPhasor Initiative (NASPI), which sounds like something out of Star Trek but is in fact a collaboration between the federal government and industry to improve grid monitoring and control by using modern communications technology. More than 500 phasor monitoring units have so far been installed across the transmission network to take precise measurements of frequency, voltage and other aspects of power quality on the grid up to 30 times per second (compared with once every four seconds using conventional technology). Units are synchronised using GPS to enable users to build up a comprehensive real-time picture of how power is flowing across the grid (www.naspi.org/Home.aspx and). It is a scaled-up version of the monitoring system developed by the University of Tennessee's Power Information Technology Laboratory using inexpensive frequency monitors that plug into ordinary wall sockets. Tennessee's FNET project provides highly aggregated data to the public via its website. The systems being developed under NASPI provide a much finer level of detail that will reveal congestion and disturbances on individual transmission lines and particular zones so that grid managers can act quickly to restore balance or isolate failures ().

#### \*\*\*No risk of cyberattack and no impact

Birch, 10/1/12 – former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy (Douglas, “Forget Revolution.” Foreign Policy. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget\_revolution?page=full)

"That's a good example of what some kind of attacks would be like," he said. "You don't want to overestimate the risks. You don't want somebody to be able to do this whenever they felt like it, which is the situation now. But this is not the end of the world." The question of how seriously to take the threat of a cyber attack on critical infrastructure surfaced recently, after Congress rejected a White House measure to require businesses to adopt stringent­ new regulations to protect their computer networks from intrusions. The bill would have required industries to report cyber security breaches, toughen criminal penalties against hacking and granted legal immunity to companies cooperating with government investigations. Critics worried about regulatory overreach. But the potential cost to industry also seems to be a major factor in the bill's rejection. A January study by Bloomberg reported that banks, utilities, and phone carriers would have to increase their spending on cyber security by a factor of nine, to $45.3 billion a year, in order to protect themselves against 95 percent of cyber intrusions. Likewise, some of the bill's advocates suspect that in the aftermath of a truly successful cyber attack, the government would have to bail the utilities out anyway. Joe Weiss, a cyber security professional and an authority on industrial control systems like those used in the electric grid, argued that a well-prepared, sophisticated cyber attack could have far more serious consequences than this summer's blackouts. "The reason we are so concerned is that cyber could take out the grid for nine to 18 months," he said. "This isn't a one to five day outage. We're prepared for that. We can handle that." But pulling off a cyber assault on that scale is no easy feat. Weiss agreed that hackers intent on inflicting this kind of long-term interruption of power would need to use a tool capable of inflicting physical damage. And so far, the world has seen only one such weapon: Stuxnet, which is believed to have been a joint military project of Israel and the United States. Ralph Langner, a German expert on industrial-control system security, was among the first to discover that Stuxnet was specifically designed to attack the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system (SCADA) at a single site: Iran's Natanz uranium-enrichment plant. The computer worm's sophisticated programs, which infected the plant in 2009, caused about 1,000 of Natanz's 5,000 uranium-enrichment centrifuges to self-destruct by accelerating their precision rotors beyond the speeds at which they were designed to operate. Professionals like Weiss and others warned that Stuxnet was opening a Pandora's Box: Once it was unleashed on the world, they feared, it would become available to hostile states, criminals, and terrorists who could adapt the code for their own nefarious purposes. But two years after the discovery of Stuxnet, there are no reports of similar attacks against the United States. What has prevented the emergence of such copycat viruses? A 2009 paper published by the University of California, Berkeley, may offer the answer. The report, which was released a year before Stuxnet surfaced, found that in order to create a cyber weapon capable of crippling a specific control system ­­-- like the ones operating the U.S. electric grid -- six coders might have to work for up to six months to reverse engineer the targeted center's SCADA system. Even then, the report says, hackers likely would need the help of someone with inside knowledge of how the network's machines were wired together to plan an effective attack. "Every SCADA control center is configured differently, with different devices, running different software/protocols," wrote Rose Tsang, the report's author. Professional hackers are in it for the money -- and it's a lot more cost-efficient to search out vulnerabilities in widely-used computer programs like the Windows operating system, used by banks and other affluent targets, than in one-of-a-kind SCADA systems linked to generators and switches. According to Pollard, only the world's industrial nations have the means to use the Internet to attack utilities and major industries. But given the integrated global economy, there is little incentive, short of armed conflict, for them to do so. "If you're a state that has a number of U.S. T-bills in your treasury, you have an economic interest in the United States," he said. "You're not going to have an interest in mucking about with our infrastructure." There is also the threat of retaliation. Last year, the U.S. government reportedly issued a classified report on cyber strategy that said it could respond to a devastating digital assault with traditional military force. The idea was that if a cyber attack caused death and destruction on the scale of a military assault, the United States would reserve the right to respond with what the Pentagon likes to call "kinetic" weapons: missiles, bombs, and bullets. An unnamed Pentagon official, speaking to the Wall Street Journal, summed up the policy in less diplomatic terms: "If you shut down our power grid, maybe we will put a missile down one of your smokestacks." Deterrence is sometimes dismissed as a toothless strategy against cyber attacks because hackers have such an easy time hiding in the anonymity of the Web. But investigators typically come up with key suspects, if not smoking guns, following cyber intrusions and assaults -- the way suspicions quickly focused on the United States and Israel after Stuxnet was discovered. And with the U.S. military's global reach, even terror groups have to factor in potential retaliation when planning their operations.

#### No escalation from grid collapse – even if it’s purposeful US won’t retaliate – the probability is close to zero

That’s Kislov

### Heg no solve war

#### No wars absent hegemony – nuclear deterrence, globalization, insituitions and democracy will exist with or without the US and will check great power conflict

#### Reject their vague assertions for conflict scenarios absent hegemony – their authors overestimate the importance of the US - *star this card*

**Fettweis 11** [Christopher J. Fettweis - Department of Political Science Tulane University and Professor of National Security Affairs at the US Naval War College, “Free Riding or Restraint Examining European Grand Strategy”, Comparative Strategy; Sep/Oct2011, Vol. 30 Issue 4, p316-332, 17p, Chetan]

**Assertions that without** the combination of **U.S. capabilities, presence and commitments instability would return** to Europe and the Pacific Rim **are usually rendered in rather vague language**. If the United States were to decrease its commitments abroad, argued Robert Art, “**the world will become a more dangerous place** and, sooner or later, that will redound to America’s detriment.”53 **From where would this danger arise? Who** precisely **would do the fighting, and over what issues?** Without the United States, **would Europe really descend into Hobbesian anarchy? Would the Japanese attack** mainland **China again**, to see if they could fare better this time around? Would the Germans and French have another go at it? In other words, **where exactly is hegemony is keeping the peace?** With one exception, **these questions are rarely addressed**. That exception is in the Pacific Rim. Some analysts fear that a de facto surrender of U.S. hegemony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become “the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture,” and that Beijing would come to “dominate science and technology, in all its forms” to the extent that soon theworldwould witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but “plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future.”54 Indeed Chin a is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it still is only about 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed, **decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to somewhere between one-tenth and one-fifth of the U.S. level. It is hardly clear that a restrained United States would invite Chinese** regional, must less global, political **expansion.** Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where war is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less severe than ever before. **Believers in the pacifying power of hegemony ought to keep in mind** a rather basic tenet: When it comes to policymaking, **specific threats are more significant than vague, unnamed dangers**. Without specific risks, it is just as plausible to interpret U.S. presence as redundant, as overseeing a peace that has already arrived. **Strategy should not be based upon vague images emerging from the dark reaches of the neoconservative imagination.**  Overestimating Our Importance One of **the most basic insights of cognitive psychology provides the final reason to doubt the power of hegemonic stability: Rarely are our actions as consequential** upon their behavior **as we perceive them to be.** A great deal of **experimental evidence exists to support the notion that** people (and therefore **states) tend to overrate the degree to which** **their behavior is responsible for the actions of others.** Robert Jervis has argued that two processes account for this overestimation, both ofwhichwould seem to be especially relevant in theU.S. case. 55 First, **believing that we are responsible** **for their actions gratifies our national ego** (which is not small to begin with; the United States is exceptional in its exceptionalism). The hubris of the United States, long appreciated and noted, has only grown with the collapse of the Soviet Union.56 **U.S. policymakers famously have comparatively little knowledge of—or interest in—events that occur outside of their own borders**. **If there is any state vulnerable to the overestimation of its importance due to the fundamental misunderstanding of the motivation of others, it would have to be the United States.** Second, policymakers in the United States are far more familiar with our actions than they are with the decision-making processes of our allies. Try as we might**, it is not possible to** fully **understand the threats, challenges, and opportunities that our allies see from their perspective.** The European great powers have domestic politics as complex as ours, and they also have competent, capable strategists to chart their way forward. **They react to many international forces, of which U.S. behavior is only one**. Therefore, for any actor trying to make sense of the action of others, Jervis notes, “in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, the most obvious and parsimonious explanation is that he was responsible.”57 **It is natural**, therefore, **for U.S**. policymakers and **strategists to believe that the behavior of our allies (and rivals) is shaped largely by what Washington does**. Presumably Americans are at least as susceptible to the overestimation of their ability as any other people, and perhaps more so. At the very least, political psychologists tell us, **we are probably not as important to them as we think**. **The importance of U.S. hegemony in contributing to international stability is therefore almost certainly overrated**. In the end, one can never be sure why our major allies have not gone to, and do not even plan for, war. Like deterrence, **the hegemonic stability theory rests on faith; it can only be falsified, never proven**. It does not seem likely, however, that hegemony could fully account for twenty years of strategic decisions made in allied capitals if the international system were not already a remarkably peaceful place. **Perhaps these states have no intention of fighting one another to begin with**, and our commitments are redundant. European great powers may well have chosen strategic restraint because they feel that their security is all but assured, **with or without the United States**.

#### We’ve got empirics – the world grew more peaceful when heg declined

#### There is no statistical proof that unipolarity has prevened conflicts – our Montiero evidence indicates there is an 18.2% chance conflict will break out under hegemony which is more than 4 times other systems

### AT: intervention inev

#### Intervention’s not inevitable - The public won’t support it – we cite polls

MacDonald and Parent 11 [Joesph M. Parent is the Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Miami, Paul K. MacDonald is the Assistant Professor of Political Science, Wellesley College, “The Wisdom of Retrenchment”, Foreign Affairs; Nov/Dec2011, Vol. 90 Issue 6, p32-47, 16p, 3, Chetan]

Today, **electoral pressures support a more modest approach to foreign affairs**. According to a 2009 study by the Pew Research Center, **70 percent of Americans would rather the U**nited **S**tates **share global leadership** than go it alone. And a 2010 study by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs found that **79 percent of them thought the U**nited **S**tates **played the role of world policeman more than it should**. Even on sacrosanct issues such as the defense budget, the public has demonstrated a willingness to consider reductions. In a 2010 study conducted by the Program for Public Consultation at the University of Maryland, **64 percent** of respondents **endorsed reductions in defense spending**, supporting an average cut of $109 billion to the base-line defense budget.

#### More evidence

Kupchan 11 [Charles A Kupchan is a professor of international affairs at Georgetown University and Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. “The false promise of unipolarity: constraints on the exercise of American power”, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 24:2, 165-173 – June2011, Chetan]

The challenge in this decade, however, may be not too much US power and resolve, but an unsteady America that grows weary of the burdens of unipolarity. Brooks and Wohlforth assume that the United States will as a matter of course continue to deploy its preponderant power on a global basis; the unipole will automatically defend unipolarity. But in the aftermath of the draining wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the economic duress and ballooning deficits associated with the global financial crisis, the United States may lose some of its enthusiasm for serving as the global guardian of last resort. Democrats and Republicans are divided on issues ranging from the war in Afghanistan to climate change to arms control. If a political compromise is to be struck, it may well entail fashioning a more modest and less costly strategy of retrenchment (Kupchan and Trubowitz 2007b). At a minimum, US grand strategy may swing between stark alternatives depending upon which party is in power. In broad terms, the Republicans favour the use of force and shun institutionalized multilateralism. Meanwhile, the Democrats favour multilateralism and engagement rather than the exercise of force. Even if unipolarity persists, its international effects may be overridden by the unpredictable choices Americans may make about when and how to deploy their national power.

### 2NC Prolif Leadership Fails

#### They can’t solve proliferation –

#### First – it’s an outdated tool – tech for proliferation is already widespread – US has limited influence and can hardly deter – that’s Weiss. Prefer our evidence – theirs assumes the peak of nuke power development when supply was limited.

#### No enforcement mechanism for regulations

**Mez, 12** – senior Associate Professor at the Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universität Berlin, and managing director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre (Lutz, "Nuclear energy–Any solution for sustainability and climate protection?” Energy Policy. ScienceDirect.)

Viewed in historical terms, military use of nuclear energy has gone hand in hand with the development of civil nuclear technology, because most countries attached first priority to the development of nuclear weapons and other military uses, with production of energy in nuclear power plants at first only being a waste product. This by-product developed its own momentum, however: nuclear power became an icon for clean, highly modern technology and technological progress. Moreover, it was a risk-free, highly profitable business for operators of plants because governments paid considerable sums in subsidies and producers could pass on costs to electrical power customers. Branches of the economy which are the most intensive users of electrical power profited from ‘cheap nuclear power’—as did the militaries in countries with nuclear weapons—because civil nuclear facilities offer many possibilities for military use. The borderlines between military and civil nuclear technology and thus between war and peace are often hazy (Mez et al., 2010). In order to minimize the risks of military use, regulation of civil use of nuclear energy have been contemplated within a multilateral framework for some time. The idea of establishing an international atomic energy agency (IAEA), to which states are to transfer uranium stocks and other fissionable material, was proposed by former US President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his ‘Atoms for Peace’ speech3 as far back as 1953 and during the first Geneva atomic conference in 1955. The purpose of the IAEA was to develop methods to ensure that fissionable nuclear material can be used by humankind in a ‘peaceful’ manner—in agriculture, medicine and energy production for countries and regions of the world with limited energy resources. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, which went into effect in 1970, constituted an attempt to prevent nuclear ‘beggars’ from becoming nuclear powers through civil nuclear technology transfer. In reality, however, a series of countries including Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea have obtained nuclear weapons under the pretext of civil use of nuclear power, while other countries such as Iran are accused of having this same intention. This development shows that it is difficult to prevent nuclear weapons from being built and that there is a great likelihood that more and more countries will obtain nuclear capabilities in the future. When a nuclear infrastructure is in place and the basic material for weapons is being produced in facilities for enrichment or reprocessing—in military reactors, dual-purpose reactors or fast breeder-reactors—then it is merely a question of political will and willingness to invest in nuclear technology which decides whether a country develops nuclear weapons or not.

#### Second – hypocrisy – US push for non-enriched nuclear power causes blowback of its contradictory stance – that’s Caldicott. States will use this as a tool to ignore the US.

#### Third – waste management – it shows that US has poor technology making the US an international standard for failed nuclear power – that’s Moniz.

## 1NR

### Politics – Hagel

#### Prefer this impact - fastest time frame --- strikes by April unless Hagel stops it.

**Burston**, **1/8**/2013 (Bradley, Will Israel bomb Iran by April? Not if Chuck Hagel can help it, Haaretz, p. <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/a-special-place-in-hell/will-israel-bomb-iran-by-april-not-if-chuck-hagel-can-help-it.premium-1.492737>)

In the winter of an election year, a prominent American columnist relates that the U.S. defense secretary's "biggest worry is the growing possibility that Israel will attack Iran over the next few months," perhaps by April. In retrospect, and with Israel keeping a curious recent silence over Tehran's nuclear program, David Ignatius' Washington Post column seems as if it were written long ago - and not in February of last year. Nonetheless, with all indicators pointing to Benjamin Netanyahu's re-election as prime minister when Israelis go to the polls two weeks from now, it might be time to revisit Ignatius' report, with an eye to the coming spring. "Israeli leaders are said to accept, and even welcome, the prospect of going it alone and demonstrating their resolve," Ignatius wrote. “'You stay to the side, and let us do it,' one Israeli official is said to have advised the United States." In a piece that had the flavor of an administration-spawned cease-and-desist signal to Israel, Ignatius said that Defense Secretary Leon Panetta "believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May or June — before Iran enters what Israelis described as a 'zone of immunity' to commence building a nuclear bomb." Thanks largely to the prime minister's virtual silence on the issue, the Iranian bomb – which Netanyahu once routinely compared to the dawn of a second Nazi Holocaust - has played no appreciable role in the current election campaign. In fact, Netanyahu has been uncharacteristically quiet on Iran ever since Barack Obama's re-election. Maybe, as they used to say in war movies, too quiet. There is every possibility that a parallel scenario is being played out, even as we sleep through a dreary, foreordained campaign. What if Benjamin Netanyahu is exactly the person we have come to know, still desperate to embody the legend in his own mind, still dying to be the Menachem Begin that his father Benzion was too picky and professorial and extreme and footloose to be? What if it all boils down to a history unwritten – of an Israeli leader who saw himself bombing a reactor and fighting the Nazis and foiling a world jihad, all in one master stroke? Consider this assessment, from this week, from a former senior aide to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, on the prospect of a go-it-alone Israeli bombing attack on Iranian nuclear sites: From Netanyahu's standpoint, "April, 2013, more or less, is the correct time for this matter," Eitan Haber wrote on Monday. "The fact that no one is writing, nor is anyone reading (about this), nor is anyone slotting this issue at the top of news broadcasts, doesn't mean that the Iranian atomic program is no longer of current relevance. It is all too relevant." By April, not only the weather will have cleared. The elections – and, more to the point, the politburo-purge of a Likud primary that preceded it – will by then have eliminated Netanyahu's weightiest in-house inhibitors to an Iran strike (Benny Begin, Dan Meridor and Ehud Barak) and cowed former fence-sitters like Moshe Yaalon into acquiescence. Significantly, one of Netanyahu's few recent references to Iran came during a Monday night Jerusalem speech to thousands of Birthright participants, about to return home to the States. "We’ve always had the ability to send a message from this city to change the lives of so many people," Netanyahu declared. And, in an indirect message to Washington that managed to hint at both E1 and the atomic bomb, he said "it’s our job to wake up the world. It’s time for many who don’t see these dangers to wake up to this." "The great danger to the world is not from Jews building in our ancestral capital in Jerusalem," Netanyahu continued, "It’s from nuclear weapons in Iran…" But two, it turns out, can send a message. And President Obama's message to Netanyahu on Iran is succinct enough to be spelled out in ten letters: Chuck Hagel. If there is anyone in American governance who stands for finding all possible diplomatic means to avert war, it is the decorated, twice-wounded Vietnam veteran. Over and over this week, Israeli news broadcasts featured a clip of Hagel describing war as a last resort. The Hagel nomination sends another message as well. A second-term Obama administration is unlikely grant the same flexibility to an Israeli prime minister who did all he could to aid the Republican Party a few short months ago. Here is an Israeli leader who spent years preparing to scratch the only itch he apparently really has, attacking Iran. Being who is, though, he couldn't help himself from reaching a bit too far, doing everything he could to put Mitt Romney in the White House. Only to put Hagel in the Pentagon. In the hole he dug with his ostentatious contempt for Obama, a hole he cannot afford to deepen, Netanyahu may have stumbled into paving the way for Hagel's nomination and confirmation. Thus, the prime minister may ultimately become the factor that blocked a war with Iran.

#### Israeli strikes escalate to a nuclear world war --- draws in major powers

**Reuveny**, August **2010** (Rafael – professor in the School of Public and Environmental affairs at Indiana University, Unilateral strike on Iran could trigger world depression, p. http://www.indiana.edu/~spea/news/speaking\_out/reuveny\_on\_unilateral\_strike\_Iran.shtml)

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities would likely have dire consequences, including a regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash. For an Israeli campaign to succeed, it must be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so overwhelming that Iran would not dare to respond in full force. Such an outcome is extremely unlikely since the locations of some of Iran’s nuclear facilities are not fully known and known facilities are buried deep underground. All of these widely spread facilities are shielded by elaborate air defense systems constructed not only by the Iranians, but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well. By now, Iran has also built redundant command and control systems and nuclear facilities, developed early-warning systems, acquired ballistic and cruise missiles and upgraded and enlarged its armed forces. Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, conventional Israeli strike — or even numerous strikes — could not destroy all of its capabilities, giving Iran time to respond. A regional war Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear program Israel destroyed in 1981, Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of Iranian, Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas, and, perhaps, Turkish forces. Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt, and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault, turning a bad situation into a regional war. During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon’s shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel’s numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. Despite Israel’s touted defense systems, Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces, and terrorist attacks would likely wreak havoc on its enemy, leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat. In the absence of massive U.S. assistance, Israel’s military resources may quickly dwindle, forcing it to use its alleged nuclear weapons, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973. An Israeli nuclear attack would likely destroy most of Iran’s capabilities, but a crippled Iran and its coalition could still attack neighboring oil facilities, unleash global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf and impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean. Middle Eastern oil shipments would likely slow to a trickle as production declines due to the war and insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would likely stop selling oil to the United States and Europe. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens might fully turn on the United States, immediately requiring the deployment of more American troops. Russia, China, Venezuela, and maybe Brazil and Turkey — all of which essentially support Iran — could be tempted to form an alliance and openly challenge the U.S. hegemony. Replaying Nixon’s nightmare Russia and China might rearm their injured Iranian protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel, and threaten to intervene, just as the U.S.S.R. threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President Obama’s response would likely put U.S. forces on nuclear alert, replaying Nixon’s nightmarish scenario. Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head-to-head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran’s response would likely be muted. If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons, but would probably not risk using force. While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. If attacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.

#### Evaluate uniqueness through political capital – Hagel’s gaining support BECAUSE of PC

EJP 1-16 (European Jewish Press, “Obama’s defence nomination likely to be confirmed as Hagel lobbies Senators,” 2013, <http://www.ejpress.org/article/64483>)

US Defence Secretary-in-waiting Chuck Hagel took one step closer to confirmation of his nomination by President Barack Obama earlier this month, after determined lobbying of all 100 Senators appeared to have secured the support of the influential pro-Israel camp Tuesday. Following an intense 90-minute meeting at the White House earlier in the day, leading Jewish Democrat Charles E. Schumer confirmed that “based on several key assurances provided by Senator Hagel, I am currently prepared to vote for his confirmation”. As the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) member and stridently pro-Israel Senator announced plans to lobby sceptics to similarly support Hagel’s candidacy, he added: “I know some will question whether Senator Hagel’s assurances are merely attempts to quiet critics as he seeks confirmation to this critical post, but I don’t think so. Senator Hagel realises the situation in the Middle East has changed, with Israel in a dramatically more endangered position than it was even five years ago.” He also revealed that Hagel had committed to supporting Obama’s current sanctions policy against Iran in response to its contentious nuclear weapons programme, whilst conceding that “further unilateral sanctions against Iran could be effective and necessary”. Expressing the need to “keep all options on the table confronting that country”, Schumer added that “Hagel made a crystal-clear promise that he would do ‘whatever it takes’ to stop Tehran from obtaining nuclear weapons, including the use of military force”. In announcing Hagel’s nomination, Obama attempted to head off criticism of his cross-political choice for the post, following the former Senator’s contentious position on Israel during his Senate mandate, insisting he had shown him evidence of his leadership qualities “in our travels together across the Middle East”, as he concluded that his candidate “understands that America stands strongest when we stand with allies and with friends”. Although refraining to reference criticism of his previous voting position on Israel during his acceptance speech that followed, Hagel subsequently told his local Nebraska newspaper the Lincoln Journal Star that peace must remain the primary concern and objective of Israelis and Palestinians alike. Speaking of the Jewish State’s increasingly fractured relationship with the international community, in light of a series of widely-condemned settlement expansion announcements which provoked both US and EU ire: "Israel is in a very, very difficult position. No border that touches Israel is always secure. We need to work to help protect Israel, so it doesn't get isolated. "Furthering the peace process in the Middle East is in Israel's interest." Amongst other instances of his courting of critics, Hagel wrote a letter to another Democrat, California Senator Barbara Boxer regretting past comments attributed to him invoking the so-called “Jewish lobby” as he acknowledged such “language can be construed as anti-Israel”. “In the Senate, I was a strong supporter of defense appropriations, which provided enduring support for Israel’s security. Most Americans, myself included, are overwhelmingly supportive of a strong U.S.-Israel strategic and security relationship,” he added as he concluded that, should his post be confirmed: “I fully intend to expand the depth and breadth of U.S.-Israel cooperation”. Hagel’s candidacy received its first significant boost Sunday since his nomination was announced earlier this month, after former Secretary of State and fellow Centrist Republican Colin Powell described him as “superbly qualified” for the role. The choice of the controversial former Senator is still likely to face some degree of opposition from within the Senate, however, particularly amongst Republican and Jewish groups concerned about the prospective defence secretary’s positions on Israel, Iran, Hezbollah, with 2008 Republican presidential candidate and Arizona Senator John McCain an outspoken opponent of his.

#### Pc’s the make it or break it – opposition exists but the question is which way they vote

Stirewalt, writer for Fox News, 1/7/2013

(Chris, “Obama Antagonizes with Hagel Pick,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/07/obama-antagonizes-with-hagel-pick/#ixzz2HIw1d0GW)

With Republicans still resentful of Hagel’s ostentatious opposition of Bush-era policies and support for Obama’s two presidential runs, confirmation would have been tricky enough. But the queasy feelings of pro-Israel Democrats on the tough-talking Vietnam vet will make it so much worse.

Maryland Sen. Ben Cardin, a dutiful Democrat if ever there was one, told the soon-to-be-former cable news network Current TV on Sunday that there are “some statements that [Hagel] needs to clarify” and called the nomination “controversial.”

Coming from Cardin, ranked in the 10 most liberal senators by National Journal, that’s the equivalent of a cannon shot across Obama’s bow.

**It will take lots of time and effort to drag Hagel**, **opinionated and confrontational**, **across the finish line**. **The president can get it done**, **but the ordeal will be frightful and expend plenty of political capital**.

#### This window is key

Linda Feldman, Christian Science Monitor, 1/7/13, www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2013/0107/Chuck-Hagel-why-Obama-is-using-political-capital-on-Pentagon-pick-video

Chuck Hagel: why Obama is using political capital on Pentagon pick (+video) President Obama just made it by one 'fiscal cliff,' with more to come. But he has shown he won't shy away from a fight in nominating former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel to run the Pentagon. At first blush, former Sen. Chuck Hagel of Nebraska seems an odd pick for secretary of Defense. He is a Republican, a point that frustrates Democrats who would rather see one of their own in this key Cabinet slot. But, to many Republicans, he’s a RINO – a Republican in Name Only – owing in part to his opposition to the Iraq war and to his general wariness toward foreign entanglements. Mr. Hagel has also irritated Democrats with past anti-gay comments (for which he has since apologized). And he has riled members of both parties with his criticism of pro-Israel groups and his stance toward Iran, including opposition to some sanctions. In a way, Mr. Hagel is a man without a party. Many Washington analysts predict a tough confirmation fight in the Senate. But to President Obama, who announced Hagel’s selection Monday, he is someone worth fighting for. “Chuck Hagel is the leader that our troops deserve,” Mr. Obama said. “He is an American patriot.” Hagel would be the first enlisted man, and the first Vietnam veteran, to head the Pentagon. He “bears the scars and the shrapnel” from his military service, Obama noted. The president takes the “man without a party” argument and turns it on its head, returning to his first-term promise to rise above party politics. “Chuck represents the bipartisan tradition that we need more of in Washington,” Obama said. “For his independence and commitment to consensus, he's earned the respect of national security and military leaders, Republicans and Democrats, including me.” Some Senate Democrats have endorsed Hagel, and at least three Republican senators have come out against him, while others of both parties have expressed skepticism. Democrats have a 55-45 majority in the Senate, but Republicans could decide to filibuster – which would require 60 votes to overcome. And there’s no guarantee that all the Democrats vote with the president. So why is Obama willing to have this fight, after watching one of his top prospects for secretary of State – UN Ambassador Susan Rice – remove her name from contention over what would have been a contentious confirmation battle, had she been nominated? (Her combative style and in particular misstatements about the Sept. 11 attack on the US mission in Benghazi, Libya, riled Republicans.) Administration officials say Obama had not necessarily settled on Ambassador Rice for State, but her withdrawal left the impression that the president’s choice had been preemptively defeated. So it may, in fact, be partly because of Rice that Obama is proceeding with Hagel. The president does not want to look weak again. He also expressed clear personal affection for Hagel in his statement Monday. As Senate colleagues, the two had traveled together in Iraq and Afghanistan. Hagel is also close to Vice President Biden, a longtime Senate colleague. Hagel has already served the Obama administration in other capacities, including as co-chair of the president's Intelligence Advisory Board. Now that Hagel has been nominated for the Pentagon, it is crucial that the next stage – courtesy calls to key Senate members – goes well. It is especially imperative that he reassure senators on his commitment to Israel.

#### The vote is this month – and he’ll be confirmed

Cassata 1-17 (Donna, Editor – Associated Press, “Hagel Confirmation Hearing Set for Jan. 31,” Military News, 2013, http://www.military.com/daily-news/2013/01/17/hagel-confirmation-hearing-set-for-jan-31.html?comp=700001075741&rank=2)

The Senate Armed Services Committee will hold a confirmation hearing on the nomination of Chuck Hagel to be the next defense secretary on Jan. 31. The panel announced the hearing in a statement issued Wednesday. The committee's chairman, Sen. Carl Levin of Michigan, has expressed support for Hagel, President Barack Obama's pick to replace Leon Panetta as Pentagon chief. The panel's top Republican, Sen. Jim Inhofe of Oklahoma, said in a statement late Tuesday that he would oppose the nomination. Inhofe is one of a handful of Republicans who have expressed their opposition to Hagel, a Republican who served two terms as senator from Nebraska. Hagel has been widely criticized by media pundits and organzations with strong pro-Israel views since his name was first floated as a successor to Panetta. But Hagel got a significant boost recently when he got the support of Sen. Chuck Shumer of New York and Sen. Barbara Boxer of California., two of the staunchest pro-Israel Democrats. Schumer and Boxer said Tuesday that they had spoken extensively with Hagel and he had addressed their earlier reservations about whether he was "anti-Israel," too soft on Iran and opposed to gay rights. "Based on several key assurances provided by Senator Hagel, I am currently prepared to vote for his confirmation," Schumer said the day after a 90-minute meeting with Hagel at the White House. "I encourage my Senate colleagues who have shared my previous concerns to also support him." Boxer expressed her support and urged fellow senators to do the same after receiving a letter from Hagel in which he insisted that he supports Obama's foreign policy positions. In the letter, the former Nebraska senator also expressed regret for using the term "Jewish lobby" to describe pro-Israel groups, calling it a "very poor choice of words." Republicans said it was highly unlikely that Schumer and Boxer would have opposed a Democratic president's nominee at the start of Obama's second term. Still, the support of two of the most prominent Jewish members of the Senate is certain to ease concerns among pro-Israel lawmakers and rally noncommittal Democrats to Hagel's side.

#### Gun-control doesn’t cost capital and will be delayed.

**The Republic**, **1/4**/2013 (‘Cliff’ fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight, p. <http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130103immigration-reform-at-crossroads.html>)

Instead, Flake expressed skepticism about Obama and the Democrats’ commitment to gun-control measures. “I don’t know how much they’ll do there, I really don’t,” Flake said. “I can’t imagine that’s going to consume a lot of capital or a lot of time for very long.” Advocacy campaigns Immigrant advocates, meanwhile, are determined not to let immigration reform get pushed aside again. Several groups, including the League of United Latin American Citizens, have launched campaigns to keep the pressure on Obama to take the lead on immigration reform. “I don’t think we can go backwards,” said Petra Falcon, executive director of Promise Arizona, a group that worked to increase the number of Latino voters in Arizona. “I think we are at a different place, and I think a lot of that has to do with the results of the election.” But they admit that more time and energy spent by Obama and Congress on solving issues such as the fiscal cliff and gun control diminish the chances of passing immigration reform. Brent Wilkes, national executive director of LULAC, is hopeful Congress will introduce a comprehensive immigration bill by March or April and vote on it by August. After that, lawmakers facing midterm elections in 2014 will be less willing to take on controversial issues such as immigration reform out of fear their vote could hurt their chances of re-election, he said. After the midterm election, the 2016 presidential election immediately will begin to heat up, and by then, the impact of the 2012 Latino vote may have worn off, he said. Although still optimistic that Obama and Congress will move forward on immigration reform early this year, Wilkes said he is concerned that the protracted battle over spending cuts and the debt ceiling will divert the president’s attention from immigration reform. A drawn-out debate over spending cuts could also divert the attention of pro-comprehensive-reform advocacy groups like LULAC that don’t want to see spending cuts to domestic programs that help Hispanic families, he said. Wilkes said he is less worried about gun control because that issue will have to travel through different subcommittees from immigration reform. He also thinks gun-control legislation won’t be introduced until next year.

#### No risk of a turn - Powerful lobbies will fight the plan

**Szondy, 12** – freelance writer based in Monroe, Washington (David, 2/16. “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/)

Indeed, it is in government regulations that the modular reactors face their greatest challenges. Whatever the facts about nuclear accidents from Windscale to Fukushima, a large fraction of the public, especially in the West, is very nervous about nuclear energy in any form. There are **powerful lobbies opposed to any nuclear reactors** operating and the regulations written up by governments reflect these circumstances. Much of the cost of building nuclear plants is due to meeting all regulations, providing safety and security systems, and just dealing with all the legal barriers and paperwork that can take years and millions of dollars to overcome. Modular reactors have the advantage of being built quickly and cheaply, which makes them less of a financial risk, and factory manufacturing means that a reactor intended for a plant that missed approval can be sold to another customer elsewhere. And some SMRs are similar enough to conventional reactors that they don't face the burden of being a "new" technology under skeptical scrutiny. However, red tape is still a very real thing.

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

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

#### Military renewables cost capital – caught up in larger debates about renewable energy

Cardwell, 8/27 (Diane, “Military Spending on Biofuels Draws Fire”, New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/28/business/military-spending-on-biofuels-draws-fire.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)

When the Navy put a Pacific fleet through maneuvers on a $12 million cocktail of biofuels this summer, it proved that warships could actually operate on diesel from algae or chicken fat. “It works in the engines that we have, it works in the aircraft that we have, it works in the ships that we have,” said Ray Mabus, secretary of the Navy. “It is seamless.” The still-experimental fuels are also expensive — about $27 a gallon for the fuel used in the demonstration, compared with about $3.50 a gallon for conventional military fuels. And that has made them a flash point in a larger political battle over government financing for new energy technologies. “You’re not the secretary of energy**,**” Representative Randy Forbes, a Republican from Virginia, told Mr. Mabus as he criticized the biofuels program at a hearing in February. “You’re the secretary of the Navy.” The House, controlled by Republicans, has already approved measures that would all but kill Pentagon spending on purchasing or investing in biofuels. A committee in the Senate, led by Democrats, has voted to save the program. The fight will heat up again when Congress takes up the Defense Department’s budget again in the fall.

#### 2. Link outweighs the link turn on timeframe

**Silber 07** [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

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

#### 3. Winners don’t win – controversies hurt capital – Obama will do a poor job spinning the plan

**GERSON 12 – 19 – 10** Washington Post Political Commentator

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/12/16/AR2010121604039.html>

In some areas - such as education reform or the tax deal - Obama's governing practice is better than his political skills. But these skills matter precisely because political capital is limited. The early pursuit of ambitious health-care reform was a political mistake, as former chief of staff Rahm Emanuel internally argued. But every president has the right to spend his popularity on what he regards as matters of principle. Political risks, taken out of conviction with open eyes, are an admirable element of leadership. Yet political errors made out of pique or poor planning undermine the possibility of achievement. Rather than being spent, popularity is squandered - something the Obama administration has often done. Why so many unforced mistakes? The ineffectiveness of Obama's political and communications staff may be part of the problem - and the administration is now hinting at significant White House personnel changes in the new year. But an alternative explanation was on display this week. Perhaps Democrats did not elect another Franklin Roosevelt or John Kennedy but another Woodrow Wilson - a politician sabotaged by his sense of superiority.

# Round 4 vs. Towson RJ

## 1NC

### 1NC – Framework

#### A. Interpretation – debate is a game that requires the aff to defend USFG action on energy policy –

#### --‘resolved’ means to enact a policy by law

Words and Phrases 64 (Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### --“United States Federal Government should” means the debate is solely about the outcome of a policy established by governmental means

Ericson 3 (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### B. Violation – they claim to win for reasons other than the desirability of that action

#### C. Reasons to prefer:

#### 1. Education – debate as a competitive political game is the best framework to solve dogmatism and human brutality

Carter 8 – prof @ The Colorado College, research support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the staff of the Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio, Italy, the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Benezet Foundation at The Colorado College (Lief H, 2008, "LAW AND POLITICS AS PLAY," Chicago-Kent Law Review, 83(3), http://www.cklawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/vol83no3/Carter.pdf)

Vico asked his audience at the University of Naples in 1708 to debate two competing ways of knowing: Cartesian rationality versus the poetic world of the ancients. Vico, the “pre-law advisor” of his day, saw law as a rhetorical game. That is, he understood the civic (ethical) value of competi-tion itself.12 He understood that Cartesian rationality, like religious and ideological fundamentalism, generates a kind of certainty that shuts down robust debate. Vico’s comprehensive vision suggests, in effect, that people should practice law and politics not as the search for the most rational or logically correct outcomes but rather as passionate and embodied yet peaceful competitive play. Vico inspires this vision of law and politics as play because he sees that all things in the human mind, including law and politics, are at one with the human body. As Vico put it as he concluded his 1708 address, “[T]he soul should be drawn to love by means of bodily images; for once it loves it is easily taught to believe; and when it believes and loves it should be inflamed so that it wills things by means of its normal intemperance.”13 Vico had no hope that such abstract moral principles as liberty, equality, justice, and tolerance could effectively offset the “crude and rough” nature of men.14 The Holy Bible and the Qur’an contain normative principles of love, tolerance, equal respect, and peace, but these commands have not forestalled ancient and modern religious warfare. This essay proposes that humans learn how to keep the peace not by obeying the norms, rules, and principles of civil conduct but by learning how to play, and thereby reintegrating the mind and the body. People do law, politics, and economic life well when they do them in the same ways and by the same standards that structure and govern good competitive sports and games. The word “sport” derives from “port” and “portal” and relates to the words “disport” and “transport.” The word at least hints that the primitive and universal joy of play carries those who join the game across space to a better, and ideally safer, place—a harbor that Vico him-self imagined. This essay’s bold proposition honors Vico in many ways. Its “grand theory” matches the scope of Vico’s comprehensive and integrated vision of the human condition. It plausibly confirms Vico’s hope for a “concep-tion of a natural law for all of humanity” that is rooted in human historical practice.15 Seeing these core social processes as play helps us to escape from arid academic habits and to “learn to think like children,” just as Vico urged.16 Imagining law and politics as play honors Vico above all because, if we attain Ruskin’s epigraphic ideal,17 we will see that the peace-tending qualities of sports and games already operate under our noses. Seeing law and politics as play enables us “to reach out past our inclination to make experience familiar through the power of the concept and to engage the power of the image. We must reconstruct the human world not through concepts and criteria but as something we can practically see.”18 If at its end readers realize that they could have seen, under their noses, the world as this essay sees it without ever having read it, this essay will successfully honor Vico. As Vico would have predicted, formal academic theory has played at best a marginal role in the construction of competitive games. Ordinary people have created cricket and football, and common law and electoral politics and fair market games, more from the experience of doing them than from formal theories of competitive games. When they play interna-tional football today, ordinary people in virtually every culture in the world recreate the experience of competitive games. Playing competitive games unites people across cultures in a common normative world.19 Within Vico’s social anthropological and proto-scientific framework, the claim that competitive play can generate peaceful civic life is purely empirical: law and politics in progressively peaceful political systems already are nothing more or less than competitive games. All empirical description operates within some, though too often ob-scured, normative frame. This essay’s normative frame is clear. It holds, with Shaw’s epigraph, above: Human brutalities waged against other hu-mans—suicide bombings, genocides, tribal and religious wars that provoke the indiscriminate rape, murder, torture, and enslavement of men, women, and children, often because they are labeled “evil”—are the worst things that we humans do. We should learn not to do them. In Vico’s anti-Cartesian, non-foundational world, no method exists to demonstrate that this essay’s normative core is “correct,” or even “better than,” say, the core norm holding that the worst thing humans do is dishonor God. Readers who reject Shaw’s and this essay’s normative frame may have every reason to reject the essay’s entire argument. However, this essay does describe empirically how those whose core norm requires honoring any absolute, including God, above all else regu-larly brutalize other human beings, and why those who live by the norms of good competitive play do not. People brutalize people, as Shaw’s Caesar observed, in the name of right and honor and peace. Evaluated by the norm that human brutality is the worst thing humans do, the essay shows why and how the human invention of competitive play short circuits the psy-chology of a righteousness-humiliation-brutality cycle. We cannot help but see and experience on fields of contested play testosterone-charged males striving mightily to defeat one another. Yet at the end of play, losers and winners routinely shake hands and often hug; adult competitors may dine and raise a glass together.20 Whether collectively invented as a species-wide survival adaptation or not, institutionalized competitive play under-cuts the brutality cycle by displacing religious and other forms of funda-mentalist righteousness with something contingent, amoral, and thus less lethal. Play thereby helps humans become Shaw’s “race that can under-stand.”

#### 2. Decision-making – debate gaming through dramatic rehearsal strengthens decision-making – only maintained by a confined educational space

Haghoj 8 – PhD, affiliated with Danish Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials, asst prof @ the Institute of Education at the University of Bristol (Thorkild, 2008, "PLAYFUL KNOWLEDGE: An Explorative Study of Educational Gaming," PhD dissertation @ Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies, University of Southern Denmark, http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information\_til/Studerende\_ved\_SDU/Din\_uddannelse/phd\_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf)

Joas’ re-interpretation of Dewey’s pragmatism as a “theory of situated creativity” raises a critique of humans as purely rational agents that navigate instrumentally through meansendsschemes (Joas, 1996: 133f). This critique is particularly important when trying to understand how games are enacted and validated within the realm of educational institutions that by definition are inscribed in the great modernistic narrative of “progress” where nation states, teachers and parents expect students to acquire specific skills and competencies (Popkewitz, 1998; cf. chapter 3). However, as Dewey argues, the actual doings of educational gaming cannot be reduced to rational means-ends schemes. Instead, the situated interaction between teachers, students, and learning resources are played out as contingent re-distributions of means, ends and ends in view, which often make classroom contexts seem “messy” from an outsider’s perspective (Barab & Squire, 2004). 4.2.3. Dramatic rehearsal The two preceding sections discussed how Dewey views play as an imaginative activity of educational value, and how his assumptions on creativity and playful actions represent a critique of rational means-end schemes. For now, I will turn to Dewey’s concept of dramatic rehearsal, which assumes that social actors deliberate by projecting and choosing between various scenarios for future action. Dewey uses the concept dramatic rehearsal several times in his work but presents the most extensive elaboration in Human Nature and Conduct: Deliberation is a dramatic rehearsal (in imagination) of various competing possible lines of action… [It] is an experiment in finding out what the various lines of possible action are really like (...) Thought runs ahead and foresees outcomes, and thereby avoids having to await the instruction of actual failure and disaster. An act overtly tried out is irrevocable, its consequences cannot be blotted out. An act tried out in imagination is not final or fatal. It is retrievable (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). 86 This excerpt illustrates how Dewey views the process of decision making (deliberation) through the lens of an imaginative drama metaphor. Thus, decisions are made through the imaginative projection of outcomes, where the “possible competing lines of action” are resolved through a thought experiment. Moreover, Dewey’s compelling use of the drama metaphor also implies that decisions cannot be reduced to utilitarian, rational or mechanical exercises, but that they have emotional, creative and personal qualities as well. Interestingly, there are relatively few discussions within the vast research literature on Dewey of his concept of dramatic rehearsal. A notable exception is the phenomenologist Alfred Schütz, who praises Dewey’s concept as a “fortunate image” for understanding everyday rationality (Schütz, 1943: 140). Other attempts are primarily related to overall discussions on moral or ethical deliberation (Caspary, 1991, 2000, 2006; Fesmire, 1995, 2003; Rönssön, 2003; McVea, 2006). As Fesmire points out, dramatic rehearsal is intended to describe an important phase of deliberation that does not characterise the whole process of making moral decisions, which includes “duties and contractual obligations, short and long-term consequences, traits of character to be affected, and rights” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Instead, dramatic rehearsal should be seen as the process of “crystallizing possibilities and transforming them into directive hypotheses” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Thus, deliberation can in no way guarantee that the response of a “thought experiment” will be successful. But what it can do is make the process of choosing more intelligent than would be the case with “blind” trial-and-error (Biesta, 2006: 8). The notion of dramatic rehearsal provides a valuable perspective for understanding educational gaming as a simultaneously real and imagined inquiry into domain-specific scenarios. Dewey defines dramatic rehearsal as the capacity to stage and evaluate “acts”, which implies an “irrevocable” difference between acts that are “tried out in imagination” and acts that are “overtly tried out” with real-life consequences (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). This description shares obvious similarities with games as they require participants to inquire into and resolve scenario-specific problems (cf. chapter 2). On the other hand, there is also a striking difference between moral deliberation and educational game activities in terms of the actual consequences that follow particular actions. Thus, when it comes to educational games, acts are both imagined and tried out, but without all the real-life consequences of the practices, knowledge forms and outcomes that are being simulated in the game world. Simply put, there is a difference in realism between the dramatic rehearsals of everyday life and in games, which only “play at” or simulate the stakes and 87 risks that characterise the “serious” nature of moral deliberation, i.e. a real-life politician trying to win a parliamentary election experiences more personal and emotional risk than students trying to win the election scenario of The Power Game. At the same time, the lack of real-life consequences in educational games makes it possible to design a relatively safe learning environment, where teachers can stage particular game scenarios to be enacted and validated for educational purposes. In this sense, educational games are able to provide a safe but meaningful way of letting teachers and students make mistakes (e.g. by giving a poor political presentation) and dramatically rehearse particular “competing possible lines of action” that are relevant to particular educational goals (Dewey, 1922: 132). Seen from this pragmatist perspective, the educational value of games is not so much a question of learning facts or giving the “right” answers, but more a question of exploring the contingent outcomes and domain-specific processes of problem-based scenarios.

#### Decisionmaking is a trump impact—it improves all aspects of life regardless of its specific goals

Shulman 9, president emeritus – Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, (Lee S, Education and a Civil Society: Teaching Evidence-Based Decision Making, p. ix-x)

These are the kinds of questions that call for the exercise of practical reason, a form of thought that draws concurrently from theory and practice, from values and experience, and from critical thinking and human empathy. None of these attributes is likely to be thought of no value and thus able to be ignored. Our schools, however, are unlikely to take on all of them as goals of the educational process. The goal of education is not to render practical arguments more theoretical; nor is it to diminish the role of values in practical reason. Indeed, all three sources—theoretical knowledge, practical knowhow and experience, and deeply held values and identity—have legitimate places in practical arguments. An educated person, argue philosophers Thomas Green (1971) and Gary Fenstermacher (1986), is someone who has transformed the premises of her or his practical arguments from being less objectively reasonable to being more objectively reasonable. That is, to the extent that they employ probabilistic reasoning or interpret data from various sources, those judgments and interpretations conform more accurately to well-understood principles and are less susceptible to biases and distortions. To the extent that values, cultural or religious norms, or matters of personal preference or taste are at work, they have been rendered more explicit, conscious, intentional, and reflective. In his essay for this volume, Jerome Kagan reflects the interactions among these positions by arguing: We are more likely to solve our current problem, however, if teachers accept the responsibility of guaranteeing that all adolescents, regardless of class or ethnicity, can read and comprehend the science section of newspapers, solve basic mathematical problems, detect the logical coherence in non-technical verbal arguments or narratives, and insist that all acts of maliciousness, deception, and unregulated self-aggrandizement are morally unacceptable. Whether choosing between a Prius and a Hummer, an Obama or a McCain, installing solar panels or planting taller trees, a well-educated person has learned to combine their values, experience, understandings, and evidence in a thoughtful and responsible manner. Thus do habits of mind, practice, and heart all play a significant role in the lives of citizens.

### 1NC – K

#### Their narrative relies on ‘hysterial women’ who dribble at imperial soldiers. Hysterical has abelist roots to gendered norms about overly emotional females

Abby Jean 9 (10/13, “Ableist Word Profile: Hysterical”, [http://disabledfeminists.com/2009/10/13/ableist–word–profile–hysterical/](http://disabledfeminists.com/2009/10/13/ableist-word-profile-hysterical/) Accessed 2/24, GAL)

Today’s word: hysterical. There are a lot of different contemporary definitions of the word (Merriam–Webster, Cambridge, Encarta), but the theme among all of them is emotions that are extreme and unmanageable. A movie described as hysterically funny is likely funnier than most and may cause you to laugh uncontrollably and snort soda out your nose. Someone at a funeral who is crying loudly and who cannot seem to stop crying would likely be described as crying hysterically. But while your mental picture of the movie–goer laughing hysterically could have been either a man or a woman, the person hysterical with grief or worry is much more likely to be a woman than a man. That’s no accident – the history of this term is very gendered. The word itself is derived from the Latin word hystericus, meaning “of the womb,” and from the Greek word hysterikos, meaning “of the womb, suffering in the womb,” from the Greek word hystera, meaning “womb.” And they understood the uterus to be the direct cause of hysteria. As Hannah S. Decker writes, “Various ancient Greek philosophers and physicians, including Plato, had argued that the uterus is an independent entity within a woman’s body… these thinkers concluded that the uterus had an ardent desire to create children. If the womb remained empty for long after the owner’s puberty, it became unhappy and angry and began to travel through the body. In its wanderings it pressed against various bodily organs, creating “hysterical” — that is, uterus–related — symptoms.” So when someone on a blog tells me to chill out because it sounds like I’m hysterical about an issue, the etymological meaning is that my failure to put a baby in my uterus (which has independent will and agency inside my body) has caused it to become angry, loose itself from its mooring, and start floating around inside of my body until it bangs into my brain and starts making me unreasonably upset. There’s also a strong historical tradition of labeling women as “hysterical” in order to silence, marginalize, or even kill them. During the Roman Catholic inquisitions, thousands of European women were [tortured and burnt as witches](http://www.billcasselman.com/dictionary_of_medical_derivations/fifteen_hysteria.htm) because they were thought to show signs of hysteria. But it was during the Nineteenth Century that things really got going. Some doctors considered the force of the uterus so powerful that it might overcome the brain and cause a woman to have pathological sexual feelings, “requiring” the physicians to “medically manipulate” the genitals in order to release the woman from control of her uterus. Yes, you read that right, the doctors were obligated to fondle their patients sexually for their own medical good. Conveniently, both mental or emotional distress and any physical symptom could be an indication of a woman’s hysteria, so doctors could diagnose literally any woman as hysterical. Once hysterical women were no longer burned at the stake, the most common treatment was to send them to bed or to an asylum to prevent any activity or thought that would inflame their hysteria. This was an extremely effective way to marginalize or silence women, as any protest that she was not hysterical would be seen as conclusive proof that the diagnosis of hysteria had been correct. This meant, practically, that any woman categorized as hysterical was forever silenced and lost all credibility. That’s a whole big mess of etymology and history, so let’s unpack that a bit. When I am told I am hysterical, there is both 1) the implication that I am excessively or unreasonably emotional AND 2) the implication that my condition is unique to my femaleness. It’s also 3) implied that hysterical statements (or even statements from hysterical people) should be discounted and hysterical people need to change in order to participate in the discussion, or should be removed from it entirely. Now let’s look at each one of those individually. The first is a criticism of and dismissal of my personal emotions based on the observer’s judgment on whether they conform to what “normal” or “reasonable” emotions would be for that situation. The idea of “extremeness” is built into every definition of the word, implying that there is an assumed agreed–upon “normal” range for emotions. In the past, that likely meant “emotions acceptable to white men with money.” Currently, though, the idea is strikingly parallel to current definitions of mental disabilities and mental health diagnoses in the DSM–IV, which require that a specific set of symptoms “must cause significant impairment in social, occupational, or other areas of functioning” in order for a person to meet diagnostic criteria. This means that thee idea of emotions that are outside the “normal” range of experience to the degree that they affect a person’s function is the very definition of mental illness. So the accusation of “hysteria,” with the implication that the hysterical person has abnormally extreme emotions, is very clearly an accusation of mental illness. And remember part 3 — the conclusion that a hysterical person (or a person with a mental disability, by equivalency) should be discounted in discussions because of their hysteria/disability. THAT IS ABLEIST. But that’s not all. The other implication of the term is that this over–emotional condition is a uniquely female condition and is caused directly by female reproductive organs being sad about not having a baby. While that’s not literally how it’s meant today, it still feels like a slightly nicer way of saying “you’re just upset because it’s that time of the month,” another way to marginalize and dismiss females based explicitly on their femaleness. It’s a way to say “that sounds like something a woman would say when she’s being super woman–y and influenced by being a woman.” And again, this is assumed to be a reason to discount the information or perspective offered and to exclude that person from the conversation. THAT IS SEXIST. And here’s where the intersectionality comes in. Hysterical is a handy dandy insta–dismissal that slams two marginalized groups at the same time – and it only works because to be related to either group is considered to make you lesser. It also means that this word, with its invocation of both ableism and sexism, is particularly sharp when aimed at women with disabilities. That’s why arguments like “It’s sexist because it makes all women sound like crazies! Who’d want to be a crazy!” are extremely problematic – not only does the word rely on both sexism and ableism, it relies on the interaction between those two axes of oppression to be a super strong word.

#### Voting Issue – Ableist Speech strengthens oppression and destroys the purposes of public debate

**Wheelchair Dancer 8** (“On Making Argument: Disability and Language”, 4/28/8, http://cripwheels.blogspot.com/2008/04/on–making–argument–disability–and.html)

If you are feeling a little bit of resistance, here, I'd ask you to think about it. If perhaps what I am saying feels like a burden –– too much to take on? a restriction on your carefree speech? –– perhaps that feeling can also serve as an indicator of how pervasive and thus important the issue is. As a community, we've accepted that commonly used words can be slurs, and as a rule, we avoid them, hopefully in the name of principle, but sometimes only in the name of civility. Do you go around using derivatives of the b\*ch word? If you do, I bet you check which community you are in.... Same thing for the N word. These days, depending on your age, you might say something is retarded or spastic, but you probably never say that it's gay. I'd like to suggest that society as a whole has not paid the same kind of attention to disabled people's concerns about language. By not paying attention to the literal value, the very real substantive, physical, psychological, sensory, and emotional experiences that come with these linguistic moves, we have created a negative rhetorical climate. In this world, it is too easy for feminists and people of colour to base their claims on argumentative strategies that depend, as their signature moves, on marginalizing the experience of disabled people and on disparaging their appearance and bodies. Much of the blogosphere discourse of the previous weeks has studied the relationships between race, (white) feminism and feminists, and WOC bloggers. To me, the intellectual takeaway has been an emerging understanding of how, in conversation, notions of appropriation, citation, ironization, and metaphorization can be deployed as strategies of legitimation and exclusion. And, as a result, I question how "oppressed, minoritized" groups differentiate themselves from other groups in order to seek justice and claim authority. Must we always define ourselves in opposition and distance to a minoritized and oppressed group that can be perceived as even more unsavory than the one from which one currently speaks? As I watched the discussion about who among the feminist and WOC bloggers has power and authority and how that is achieved, I began to recognise a new power dynamic both on the internet and in the world at large. Feminism takes on misogyny. The WOC have been engaging feminism. But from my point of view, a wide variety of powerful feminist and anti–racist discourse is predicated on negative disability stereotyping. There's a kind of hierarchy here: the lack of awareness about disability, disability culture and identity, and our civil rights movement has resulted in a kind of domino effect where disability images are the metaphor of last resort: the bottom, the worst. Disability language has about it a kind of untouchable quality –– as if the horror and weakness of a disabled body were the one true, reliable thing, a touchstone to which we can turn when we know we can't use misogynistic or racist language. When we engage in these kinds of argumentative strategies, we exclude a whole population of people whose histories are intricately bound up with ours. When we deploy these kinds of strategies to underscore the value of our own existence in the world, we reaffirm and strengthen the systems of oppression that motivated us to speak out in the first place.

The use of gendered language is nothing short of the daily construction of the patriarchal order

Spender 80 [Dale, U of Utah, Man Made Language]

Each day we construct the world we live in according to these man made rules. We select. pattern and interpret the flux of events in the attempt to make life meaningful and few of us suspect how deeply entrenched, and arbitrary, these rules are. We impose them on the world so that what we see conforms to what we have been led to see. And one of the crucial factors in the construction of this reality is language. Language is our means of classifying and ordering. the world: our means of manipulating reality .In its structure and in its use we bring our world into realization., and if it is inherently inaccurate, then we are mislead. If the rules which underlay our language system, our symbolic order, are invalid, then we are daily deceived. Yet the rules for meaning, which are part of language, are not natural; they were not present in the world and merely awaiting discovery by human beings. On the contrary, they had; to be invented before anything could be discovered, for without them there is no frame of reference, no order, no possibility for systematic interpretation and understanding. Once made, however, these rules have a habit of becoming self-validating and self-perpetuating, regardless of any misapprehension on which they may have initially been based. Although it is not possible to ‘begin at the beginning’ and identify the forces which were at work in the construction of these rules to determine whether or not they were accurate or justified it is possible to analyse the contemporary classification system on our language and to speculate on the origins, and the reasons for these rules | which now play such a vital role in the construction of our world view. One semantic rule which we on see in operation in the language is that of .the male-as-norm. At the outset it may appear to be a relatively innocuous rule for classifying the objects and events of the world, but closer examination exposes it at one of the most pervasive and pernicious rules that has been encoded. While this rule operates we are required to classify the world on the premise that the standard or normal human being is a male one and when there is but one standard, then those who are not of it are allocated to a category of deviation. Hence our fundamental classification scheme is one which divides humanity not into two equal parts (if two is to be the significant number) but into those who are plus male and those who are minus male. At the most basic level of meaning the status of the female is derived from the status of the male and on this has been erected many strata of positive and negative classifications. Outside the way in which we order the world there is no compelling reason to classify people according to their genitalia, and even if there were, there would still be no compelling reason to classify them simply dichotomously, a division 'which we even find frequently inadequate, despite our mental set which helps to construe difference along sexually dimorphous lines. If we did feel obliged to use genitalia as a reference point for the classification of humanity, it would be just as reasonable to classify, for example, according to the degree of protection proved for sexual organs, in which case we would not be confined to a dichotomy but would have a continuum along which people could be placed, with some enjoying better protection than others. But we do divide on the basis of genitalia we do construct only two sexes; we do insist upon a whole range of gender determined behaviours. And we do all this for a purpose. By arranging the objects and events of the world according to these rules we set up the rationale, and the vindication for male supremacy. While at one level we may support or refute the myth of male superiority - it being a matter of political choice - at another level we are unaware of the way in which it structures our behaviour and forms some of the limits of our world. With the crucial underlying rule that the world can be divided into minus male or plus male categories we have seen the construction of the patriarchal order. It is a symbolic order into which we are born and as we become members of society and begin to enter the meanings which the symbols represent, we also begin to structure the world so that those symbols are seen to be applicable: we enter into the meaning of patriarchal order and then we help to give it life.

### 1NC – K

#### All humans are inherently interconnected --- we share a common bond of consciousness and our identities only form through co-creation. This recognition must ground our reaction to domination and oppression. The affirmative’s challenge to identity anchors is rooted in dualism between self and other, white and black, colonizer and colonized. This denies the fundamental truth of interconnectedness and re-creates the oppression that the affirmative seeks to challenge. Only a shift in consciousness towards a politics of love can fundamentally transform society

Michele Carrie Butot, 2004. B.Ed University of Calgary, 1985; B.S.W. University of Calgary, 1988; MA Social Work University of Victoria “Love as Ernancipatory Praxis: An Exploration of Practitioners' Conceptualizations of Love in Critical Social Work Practice,” Masters Thesis, Proquest Thesis and Dissertation Database

Non-judging and non-interference in the Buddhist view do not imply non-engagement. In Chodron's discussion with hooks about Buddhism and working to end racism and sexism - hooks , a critical feminist and race analyst, struggles to know how to begin where she is and how the world is, and still have a vision of how it might be different. Chodron suggests it is less a situation of hoping for change (where there is too much hope, she contends, one often begins to have a "strong sense of enemy" or 'other'), but of aspiring to an end to suffering for all beings. She says: "I give up both the hope that something is going to change and the fear that it isn't. We may long to end suffering but somehow it paralyses us if we're too goal-oriented. Do you see the balance there?" (Chodron & hook, 1999, pp. 1-2). This is similar to the paradox we d hear participants &cuss in the interpretive chapter on critical practice, about hoping for change and spealung one's own truth without being attached to how the change ought to unfold, and without trying to change the other. Other critical-feminist Buddhst authors also take up the concept of aspiration towards change, along with non-interference and its implicit notion of engaged non-attachment. Klein (1996), for example, argues that: ... self-awareness and simple self-acceptance is the foundation of all practice. Buddhists call it mindfulness, and it involves among other things the ability to just see what is, without rushing in to criticize, enhance, or change. Just see. Just be. (p. 40) The ability to just be is basic and healing ... we have to start from where we are. And to do th we must accept the person we are at this very moment, in all its unglory, is the perfect place for us to start from. (p. 41) She also contends that it is crucial to be able to make effort toward something without at the same time belittling ourselves because t h has not yet been accomplished (p. 42). Thich Nhat Hanh is a Vietnamese Buddhist monk, teacher, writer and peace activist who embodies the principles he teaches. He suggests the need for "mindfulness, insight, and altruistic love as the only sustainable bases for political action" (Thich Nhat Ha&, 1993, p. 155). He was mentioned by two of the participants during our dialogues as someone who understood, stood for, and lived the principles about which we were speaking. Coincidentally, although I am not a Buddhist, and had not mentioned him to participants, h writings, which I had not reviewed for several years, were fundamental in my own early understandings of love in practice; and be1 hooks, whom I have cited extensively, considers him one of her key teachers. In his work on non-violent resistance to war, Thich Nhat Hanh (1993) discusses ahimsa, Sanskrit for 'non- harming', a concept also key in yoga philosophy. In parallel with Hart (l999), and participants who we will hear speak of the need for ongoing self-work before and alongside work with others, he states that ahimsa must first be practiced in relation to oneself, not as an achievable goal, but as a guide of the direction in which to proceed. His argument that "Among the three individual, society, and nature - it is the individual who begins to effect change" (p. 123) echoes the words of Chodron above. Thich Nhat Hanh (1993) adds another critical notion to this discussion, complicating the notion of intersubjectivity. In congruence with participants and other theorists who spoke of interconnection, he speaks of "interbeing" (1993, pp. 67-8; see also 1998, p. 134) as a holistic approach to activism. Through the practice of non-harming, he says, we can come to an understanding and experience of "interbeing", recognizing the roots of violence and oppression in all of us, not just those termed the 'oppressor' or the 'enemy' (p. 67). In concert with hooks, he suggests that if we are able to recognize this intrinsic interconnection, we will naturally stop creating an 'other' to blame, argue with, harm, kill (p. 68). In the concept of interbeing, we hear echoes of Ermine and Hart's (1999) 'interconnection' and 'enmeshment', and a connection point with Leonard's (2001) notion of a constant dialectical tension between interdependence and diversity. This notion of interbeing is absolutely key to my inquiry because it speaks eloquently to the apparent contradiction between the universal and the particular: "All phenomena are interdependent ... but if we truly realm! the interdependent nature of the dust, the flower, and the human being, we see that unity cannot exist without diversity. Unity and diversity interpenetrate each other freely. Unity is diversity, and diversity is unity. This is the principle of interbeing" W c h Nhat Hanh, 1993, p. 129). While he consciously connects Buddhist beliefs to ddferent faith tdtions, each of which he perceives as containing the 'elements' of each other (p. 136), and while he asserts that some concepts, such as the notion of 'no-enemy' is "enshrined in all the great spiritual, humanist, and religious traditions of the world" (pp. 143-4), he also sides with Baskin (2002) in her critique of the absence of spirituality in structwahst social work, saying: "We know there is no place for spiritdty in Marxism" (Thich Nhat Hanh, 1993, p. 57). In keeping with the Aboriginal belief, cited earlier in this conceptual chapter, and by participants in the next, of the intrinsic value of all beings, he states: "Each person is important. Each being is important. Each moment is important" (p. 99). As we will hear participants in later chapters discuss love as a guiding force, and non-judging and truth-telltng as coexistent, lhch Nhat Hanh, speaking of the juxtaposition of a strongly nonviolent stance andworking activelyfor peace and other justice issues, names compassion as a guide in knowing how to be and do (or not do) in each moment. "[In] confronting the situation and having compassion in our hearts, ways of acting c[o]me by themselves ... If you are alert and creative, you will know what to do and what not to don (p. 45). "In many circumstances, non-action can help a lot ... sometimes it is best not to say anything ... [but wlhen we see social injustice, if we practice nonaction, we may cause harm" (p. 69). Like Chodron, Thich Nhat Hanh (1993) suggests the possibility of movements for social justice that do not dehumanize or demonize our oppressors and enemies. The keys to social action he suggests are embodied deep listening, non-harming, loving kindness and discernment (pp. 68-71; see also 1998, p. 1 16). The recognition of interbeing, he asserts, is a way towards sustainability of the work for social and ecological justice (1993, p. 138). In her work on 'contemplation and transformation' hooks (1996) takes up contemplative engagement practices as congruent with a critical conceptualization of love and with the notion of interbeing. She conceptualizes love as beyond dualism, and makes a strong link between deep engagement and activism. Her work is so eloquent, and feels so critical to t h discussion that I cite some of the text here in detail as a ground from which to move into the rest of the inquiry: Love as an active practice - whether Buddhist, Christian, or Islamic mysticism - requires that one embraces being a lover, being in love with the universe ... To commit to love is fundamentally to commit to a life beyond dualism. That's why, in a culture of domination**,** love is so sacred. It erodes dualisms - the binary oppositions of black and white, male and female, right and wrong. Love transforms. (hooks, 1996, p. 287) She goes on to describe a loving stance as a way of dissolving dualities. In a loving stance, she argues, we recognize the complexity of life, and must come to our critical and political engagements both actively and from contemplative stdhess: If we are concerned with dissolving these apparent dualities we have to identify anchors to hold onto in the midst of fragmentation, in the midst of loss of grounding. My anchor is love. It is life-sustaining to understand that things are always more complex than they seem. This is what it means to see clearly. Such understanding is more useful and more difficult than the idea that there is a right and a wrong, or a good or bad, and you only have to decide what side you're on. In real love, real union or communion, there are no simple rules. (p. 289) Not only does she argue that love is life-sustaining, as we will hear participants agree later, hooks also suggests that it has the potential to lead us to deeper engagement and clarity in our work towards social justice. Participants will be heard to speak to this as well, suggesting that a loving stance demands that we engage deeply, and that such a loving stance requires the self-care and selfwork that hooks contends contemplation can provide. Love as a foundation also takes us more deeply into practice as action in the world ... love leads to a greater commitment and involvement with the world, not a turning away from the world. The wisdom I seek is that which enables us to know what is needed at a given moment in time. When do I need to reside in that location of stillness and contemplation, and when do I need to rise and do whatever is needed to be done in terms of physical work, or engagement with others, or confrontation with others? (p. 289) It is not useful to rank one type of action over the other. (hooks, 1996, p. 290) What is required, she concludes, and what love might provide to our work for social justice, is a "fundamental shift in consciousness": A fundamental shift in consciousness is the only way to transform a culture of domination and oppression into one of love. Contemplation is the key to this shift. There is no change without contemplation ... here [she is referring to the Buddha under the Bodhi tree] is an action taking place that may not q w r t o be a meaningful action. Yet it transforms. (p. 292, italics in original) Whether this shdt in consciousness is defined as spiritual is, I thmk a matter of preference for the practitioner, but the transformative relationship between love, critical practice and interconnection that hooks refers to is key it brings me back to the notions of intersubjectivity explored earlier.

#### Embracing the “no-self” also produces a sense of unity with all living things and brings the realization that violence against the other will always damage the self. This provides the foundation for global solidarity and nonviolence.

Dale Snauwaert, Fall 2009. Associate Professor of Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education; Chair of the Department of Foundations of Education, University of Toledo. “The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity,” Current Issues in Comparative Education 12.1, <http://www.tc.edu/cice/Issues/12.01/PDFs/12_01_Complete_Issue.pdf>

Cosmopolitans assert the existence of a duty of moral consideration to all human beings on the basis of a shared humanity. What is universal in, and definitive of, cosmopolitanism is the presupposition of the shared inherent dignity of humanity. As Martha Nussbaum states: [Human good can] be objective in the sense that it is justifiable by reference to reasons that do not derive merely from local traditions and practices, but rather from features of humanness that lie beneath all local traditions and are there to be seen whether or not they are in fact recognized in local traditions. (Perry, 1998, p. 68) If a shared humanity is presupposed, and if humanity is understood to possess an equal inherent value and dignity, then a shared humanity possesses a fundamental moral value. If the fundamental moral value of humanity is acknowledged, then a universal duty of moral consideration follows, for to deny moral consideration to any human being is to ignore (not recognize) their intrinsic value, and thereby, to violate their dignity. The duty of moral consideration in turn morally requires nations and peoples to conduct their relations in accordance with ethical principles that properly instantiate the intrinsic value and dignity of a shared humanity. If valid, the fundamental aims of the education of citizens should be based upon this imperative. In order to further explicate this cosmopolitanism perspective, the philosophy of one of history’s greatest cosmopolitans, Mohandas K. Gandhi, is explored below. Reflections on Gandhi’s Cosmopolitan Philosophy While most commentators focus on Gandhi’s conception and advocacy of nonviolence, it is generally recognized that his core philosophical beliefs regarding the essential unity of humanity and the universal applicability of nonviolence as a moral and political ideal places Gandhi in the cosmopolitan tradition as broadly understood (Iyer, [1973] 1983; Kumar Giri, 2006). At the core of Gandhi’s philosophy are the interdependent values of Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (nonviolence). Gandhi’s approach to nonviolent social transformation, Satyagraha, is the actualization in action of these two values (Bondurant, 1965; Iyer, [1973] 1983; Naess, 1974). Gandhi’s Satya is multifaceted. Its most fundamental meaning pertains to Truth as self-realization. Satya is derived from sat, Being. Truth is Being; realizing in full awareness one’s authentic Being. Truth, in this sense, is the primary goal of life. Gandhi writes:

What I want to achieve . . . is self-realization . . . I live and move and have my being in pursuit of that goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing, and all my ventures in the political field are directed to this same end. (Naess 1974, p. 35) Self-realization, for Gandhi, requires “shedding the ego,” ”reducing one self to zero” (cited in Naess 1974, p. 37). The ego per se is not the real self; it is a fabrication. This egoic self must be transcended. As the egoic self loosens and one becomes increasingly self-aware, one deepens the realization of one’s authentic being, and that being is experienced as unified with humanity and all living things. Scholars normally understand human identity in terms of personality, which is a socially constructed self-concept constituted by a complex network of identifications and object relations. This construction is what we normally refer to as the ego or self-identity. Our egoic self-identity is literally a construction, based upon psychological identifications (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Batchelor, 1983). From this perspective, the ego is a socially constructed entity, ultimately a fabrication of the discursive formations of culture; from this point of view, the self is exclusively egoic. This perspective has its origins in the claim that consciousness is solely intentional: the claim that consciousness is always consciousness of some object. From this presupposition, the socially constructed, discursive nature of the self is inferred. If consciousness is solely intentional, then the self is a construction, and, if the self is a construction, then it is always discursive – a prediscursive self cannot exist. It can be argued, however, that intentionality itself presupposes pre-intentional awareness. A distinction can be made between intentional consciousness and awareness. Intentional consciousness presupposes awareness that is always implicit in intentional consciousness. If intentional consciousness does not presuppose a pre-intentional awareness, if there is only consciousness of, then there is always a knower-known duality, and that duality leads to an infinite regress. To be conscious of an object X, one has to be conscious of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X . . . ad infinitum¾reductio ad absurdum. Therefore, there must be implicit in intentional consciousness a level of awareness that is pre-intentional, pre-discursive, and non-positional (Forman, 1999). To be conscious of anything presupposes pre-intentional self-awareness, and being pre-intentional, awareness must be in turn pre-discursive and non-positional (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Aurobindo, 1989, 2001; Batchelor, 1983; Buber, 1970; Forman, 1999; Fromm, 1976). When the ego is shed, a pre-discursive, nonpositional self-awareness is revealed. One can be reflexively aware of one’s consciousness. Gandhi held that pre-discursive self-awareness, the core of our being, is unified and interdependent with all living things. He writes: “I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives (Naess 1974, p. 43).” In an ontological sense, Gandhi maintains that Satya, Truth, is selfrealization, a realization of one’s self-awareness as essentially unified with and thereby existing in solidarity with all human beings and with all living things. Pre-discursive self-awareness is experienced as non-positional, and, being non-positional, it is unbounded; it exists as a field of awareness that is interconnected with all sentient beings. This state is an experience and is only known experientially. Therefore, the assertion of a shared humanity is based upon a common level of being. Human intentional consciousness is expressed in a vast plurality of cultural expressions; implicit within this plurality, existing as its ground, is a shared level of awareness of being that unites us. From the perspective of ontological Truth, nonviolence follows from the unity and interdependence of humanity and life; violence damages all forms of life, including one’s self. Nonviolence uplifts all. Gandhi writes:

I do not believe . . . that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in advaita (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him and, if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent. (Naess 1974, p. 43)

In this experience, one becomes aware of the interrelated and interdependent nature of being. On an existential level, there exists a fundamental interconnection between one’s self and other beings. As Buber suggests, “we live in the currents of universal reciprocity (Buber, 1970, p. 67).” From the perspective of this experience—and this is a direct experience—to harm the other is to harm one’s self. From the perspective of existential interconnection, nonviolence, the essence of morality, rests upon an awareness of our fundamental interconnection.

#### Our alternative allows for a non-adversarial reaction to domination that recognizes that oppression is bad for both the oppressed and the oppressor. This produces a more effective foundation for social ethics. CX of the 1AC proves that there is not equal blame for the injustice in the squo

Ethan Mills, 2006. Department of Philosophy, University of New Mexico. “Review of Being Benevolence: The Social Ethics of Engaged Buddhism,” Journal of Buddhist Ethics 13, <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/files/2010/04/mills-review.pdf>

The movement known as Engaged Buddhism has emerged in the last several decades as one of the most original and fascinating developments in recent Buddhist history; therefore, it is fitting that a volume on the subject should be part of the Topics in Contemporary Buddhism Series, published by the University of Hawai'i Press. Sallie B. King, a specialist in the study of Engaged Buddhism, has previously co-edited an anthology that was more descriptive and informational in nature (Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist Liberation Movements in Asia, 1996). In this volume, however, King presents what may be the first book-length philosophical treatment of the social ethics underlying the movement as a whole, a task whose time has come given the movements influence in contemporary Buddhism. Concentrating on Asian Engaged Buddhists, including A. T. Ariyaratne, Aung San Suu Kyi, Buddhadasa Bhikkhu, the Dalai Lama and Thich Nhat Hanh, King notes that there are differences in idiom (e.g., Theravāda vs. Mahāyāna) and some differences of interpretation among Engaged Buddhists. However, the basic ethical structure of Engaged Buddhism can be summarized as an effort to put Buddhist concepts such as interdependence, loving-kindness, and compassion into action in social and/or political spheres as opposed to the rather individualistic, withdrawn outlook of some traditional forms of Buddhism. King's most prominent thesis, supported throughout the book, is that Engaged Buddhism is a native Buddhist reformist development. This is important, as Engaged Buddhism has often been dismissed as merely a product of Western influence rather than an authentically Buddhist movement. While it is true that many Engaged Buddhists adopt Western terminology such as talk about human rights or justice, King shows that this is always done via Buddhist interpretations and with Buddhist motivations. Thus, Engaged Buddhism is an organic outgrowth of the Buddhist tradition. Chapters two, three and four are concerned with the fundamentals of Engaged Buddhist ethics, while chapters five, six and seven apply these insights to human rights, nonviolence and justice and reconciliation respectively. Chapter two shows how Engaged Buddhists have reinterpreted classic features of Buddhist philosophy such as dependent origination, the four noble truths, and meditation techniques. Dependent origination proves to be one of the most important reinterpretations and King returns to it throughout the book. The idea here is that "… human beings are social beings—that is, each one of us lives in a condition of interdependence within society." (p. 13) This social interpretation proves to have dramatic and far-reaching effects on a large range of Engaged Buddhist theories from responsibility and punishment to nonviolence and economic justice. Chapter three places Engaged Buddhism in the context of debates about which Western ethical theory most closely resembles Buddhist ethics. King suggests that Engaged Buddhism exhibits features of several Western systems while showing the prevalence of such ideas as natural law, holism and an outlook that is nonadversarial and pragmatic. Chapter four shows how a holistic, socially interdependent theory of the relationship between the individual and society has emerged. Largely expanding on Engaged Buddhist interpretations of dependent origination and no-self, the most interesting discussion of the chapter focuses on a reaction to the Western debate between free will and determinism. King argues that neither the free will nor determinist positions are suitable and shows how Engaged 3 Journal of Buddhist Ethics Buddhists think about moral responsibility given their theories about causality, no-self and personal development. The more practically oriented chapters begin with a discussion of human rights, centered on the debate about whether human rights can be defended in an Asian Buddhist context (often referred to as the "Asian values debate"). While most Western interpretations of human rights are too individualistic and adversarial for Engaged Buddhism, some Engaged Buddhists have argued for the pragmatic necessity of human rights to end suffering, especially in countries such as Cambodia or Myanmar/Burma. Others have argued that human rights can be interpreted as expressing a nonadversarial stance, namely that violation of human rights is morally good neither for the abused nor the abuser. While acknowledging that all Engaged Buddhists promote nonviolence, chapter five details a spectrum of views from principled to pragmatic nonviolence, often along similar lines of nonviolence found outside of Buddhism. Aside from the more familiar views of personal nonviolence as developed in the tradition, the chapter includes an innovative discussion of the role of violence in the military and how Engaged Buddhists may or may not promote a defensive military force. In the chapter called "Justice/Reconciliation," King notes that Engaged Buddhists have tended not to use language of justice as much as that of human rights. However, she finds that almost all Engaged Buddhists are concerned with economic justice out of their efforts to promote equality and to eradicate the greed caused by economic models of perpetual growth and the suffering caused by extreme poverty. In terms of political justice, King suggests that Engaged Buddhists move more toward a model of reconciliation in which both sides of a conflict benefit. This does not mean, however, that Engaged Buddhists have no concepts of blame and punishment, as the section on criminal justice details. Here Engaged Buddhists opt for a rehabilitative model rather than a retributive model, although King adds that there is much work to be done to fully develop this model in Buddhist terms.

### 1NC – Case

Endless investigation of power makes real struggles against oppression impossible.

**Hicks**, **03-** Professor and chair of philosophy at 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)

Hence, the only “ethico-political choice” we have, one that Foucault thinks we must make every day, is simply to determine which of the many insidious forms of power is “the main danger” and then to engage in an activity of resistance in the “nexus” of opposing forces. 72 “Unending action is required to combat ubiquitous peril.” 73 But this ceaseless Foucauldian “recoil” from the ubiquitous power perils of “normalization” precludes, or so it would seem, formulating any defensible alternative position or successor ideals. And if Nietzsche is correct in claiming that the only prevailing human ideal to date has been the ascetic ideal, then even Foucauldian resistance will continue to work in service of this ideal, at least under one of its guises, viz., the nihilism of negativity. Certainly Foucault's distancing of himself from all ideological commitments, his recoiling from all traditional values by which we know and judge, his holding at bay all conventional answers that press themselves upon us, and his keeping in play the “twists” and “recoils” that question our usual concepts and habitual patterns of behavior, all seem a close approximation, in the ethicopolitical sphere, to the idealization of asceticism.

#### Identity politics fractures warming movements---reformism is necessary

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

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

#### Extinction

Mazo 10 (Jeffrey Mazo – PhD in Paleoclimatology from UCLA, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 122)

The best estimates for global warming to the end of the century range from 2.5-4.~C above pre-industrial levels, depending on the scenario. Even in the best-case scenario, the low end of the likely range is 1.goC, and in the worst 'business as usual' projections, which actual emissions have been matching, the range of likely warming runs from 3.1--7.1°C. Even keeping emissions at constant 2000 levels (which have already been exceeded), global temperature would still be expected to reach 1.2°C (O'9""1.5°C)above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century." Without early and severe reductions in emissions, the effects of climate change in the second half of the twenty-first century are likely to be catastrophic for the stability and security of countries in the developing world - not to mention the associated human tragedy. Climate change could even undermine the strength and stability of emerging and advanced economies, beyond the knock-on effects on security of widespread state failure and collapse in developing countries.' And although they have been condemned as melodramatic and alarmist, many informed observers believe that unmitigated climate change beyond the end of the century could pose an existential threat to civilisation." What is certain is that there is no precedent in human experience for such rapid change or such climatic conditions, and even in the best case adaptation to these extremes would mean profound social, cultural and political changes.

#### Reject their affirmation of performance as a strategy for contesting racial oppression – anti-racist performance isn’t revolutionary or transformative but rather functions to re-inscribe and conceal oppression.

Ahmed 4 (Sara Ahmed, Reader in Race and Cultural Studies, Goldsmiths College, University of London, Borderlands E-Journal, Volume 3, Number 2, “Declarations of Whiteness: The Non-Performativity of Anti-Racism,” http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2\_2004/ahmed\_declarations.htm)

50. This might sound like an argument about the performativity of race. I am sympathetic with the idea that race is performative in Judith Butler’s (1993) sense of the term: race as a category is brought into existence by being repeated over time (race is an effect of racialisation). I have even argued for the performativity of race myself (Ahmed 2002). But throughout this paper I have insisted on the non-performativity of anti-racism. It might, seem now, a rather odd tactic. If race is performative, and is itself an effect of racism, then why isn’t anti-racism performative as well? Is anti-racism a form of ‘race trouble’ that is performative as it ‘exposes’ the performativity of race, and which by citing the terms of racism (such as ‘white’) allows those terms to acquire new meanings? I would suggest the potential ‘exposure’ of the performativity of race does not make ‘anti-racism’ performative as a speech act. As I stated in my introduction, I am using performativity in Austin’s sense as referring to a particular class of speech, where the issuing of the utterance ‘is the performing of an action’ (1975, 6). In such speech the saying is the doing; it is not that saying something leads to something, but that it does something at the moment of saying. It is important to note here that, for Austin, performativity is not a quality of a sign or an utterance; it does not reside within the sign, as if the sign was magical. For an utterance to be performative, certain conditions have to be met. When these conditions are met, then the performative is happy. This model introduces a class of ‘unhappy performatives’: utterances that would ‘do something’ if the right conditions had been met, but which do not do that thing, as the conditions have not been met. 51. I would hasten to add that in my view performativity has become rather banal and over-used within academic writing; it seems as if almost everything is performative, where performative is used as a way of indicating that something is ‘brought into existence’ through speech, representation, writing, law, practice, or discourse. Partly, I am critiquing this ‘banalisation’ of the performative, as well as how performativity as a concept can be used in a way that ‘forgets’ how performativity depends upon the repetition of conventions and prior acts of authorization (see Butler 1997). I am also suggesting that the logic that speech ‘brings things into existence’ (as a form for positive action) only goes so far, and indeed the claim that saying is doing can bypass that ways in which saying is not sufficient for an action, and can even be a substitute for action. 52. My concern with the non-performativity of anti-racism has hence been to examine how sayings are not always doings, or to put it more strongly, to show how the investment in saying as if saying was doing can actually extend rather than challenge racism. Implicitly, I am critiquing a claim that I have not properly attributed: that is, the claim that anti-racism is performative. I would argue that the six declarations of whiteness I have analysed function as implicit claims to the performativity of anti-racism. The claim to the performativity of anti-racism would be to presume that ‘being anti’ is transcendent, and that to declare oneself as being something shows that one is not the thing that one declares oneself to be. It might be assumed that the speech act of declaring oneself (to be white, or learned, or racist) ‘works’ as it brings into existence the non- or anti-racist subject or institution. None of these claims I have investigated operate as simple claims. None of them say ‘I/we are not racists’ or ‘I/we are anti-racists’, as if that was an action. They are more complex utterances, for sure. They have a very specific form: they define racism in a particular way, and then they imply ‘I am not’ or ‘we are not’ that. 53. So it is not that such speech acts say ‘we are anti-racists’ (and saying makes us so); rather they say ‘we are this’, whilst racism is ‘that’, so in being ‘this’ we are not ‘that’, where ‘that’ would be racist. So in saying we are raced as whites, then we are not racists, as racism operates through the unmarked nature of whiteness; or in saying we are racists, then we are not racists, as racists don’t know they are racists; or in expressing shame about racism, then we are not racists, as racists are shameless; or in saying we are positive about our racial identity, as an identity that is positive insofar as it involves a commitment to anti-racism, then we are not racists, as racists are unhappy, or in being self-critical about racism, then we are not racists, as racists are ignorant; or in saying we exist alongside others, then we are not racists, as racists see themselves as above others, and so on. 54. These statements function as claims to performativity rather than as performatives, whereby the declaration of whiteness is assumed to put in place the conditions in which racism can be transcended, or at the very least reduced in its power. Any presumption that such statements are forms of political action would be an overestimation of the power of saying, and even a performance of the very privilege that such statements claim they undo. The declarative mode, as a way of doing something, involves a fantasy of transcendence in which ‘what’ is transcended is the very thing ‘admitted to’ in the declaration: so, to put it simply, if we admit to being bad, then we show that we are good (see also paper by Hill and Riggs in this issue). So it is in this specific sense that I have argued that anti-racism is not performative. Or we could even say that anti-racist speech in a racist world is an ‘unhappy performative’: the conditions are not in place that would allow such ‘saying’ to ‘do’ what it ‘says’. 55. Our task is not to repeat anti-racist speech in the hope that it will acquire performativity. Nor should we be satisfied with the ‘terms’ of racism, or hope they will acquire new meanings, or even look for new terms. Instead, anti-racism requires much harder work, as it requires working with racism as an ongoing reality in the present. Anti-racism requires interventions in the political economy of race, and how racism distributes resources and capacities unequally amongst others. Those unequal distributions also affect the ‘business’ of speech, and who gets to say what, about whom, and where. We need to consider the intimacy between privilege and the work we do, even in the work we do on privilege. 56. You might not be surprised to hear that a white response to this paper has asked the question, ‘but what are white people to do’. That question is not necessarily misguided, although it does re-center on white agency, as a hope premised on lack rather than presence. It is a question asked persistently in response to hearing about racism and colonialism: I always remember being in an audience to a paper on the stolen generation and the first question asked was: ‘but what can we do’. The impulse towards action is understandable and complicated; it can be both a defense against the ‘shock’ of hearing about racism (and the shock of the complicity revealed by the very ‘shock’ that ‘this’ was a ‘shock’); it can be an impulse to reconciliation as a ‘re-covering’ of the past (the desire to feel better); it can be about making public one’s judgment (‘what happened was wrong’); or it can be an expression of solidarity (‘I am with you’); or it can simply an orientation towards the openness of the future (rephrased as: ‘what can be done?’). But the question, in all of these modes of utterance, can work to block hearing; in moving on from the present towards the future, it can also move away from the object of critique, or place the white subject ‘outside’ that critique in the present of the hearing. In other words, the desire to act, to move, or even to move on, can stop the message ‘getting through’. 57. To hear the work of exposure requires that white subjects inhabit the critique, with its lengthy duration, and to recognise the world that is re-described by the critique as one in which they live. The desire to act in a non-racist or anti-racist way when one hears about racism, in my view, can function as a defense against hearing how that racism implicates which subjects, in the sense that it shapes the spaces inhabited by white subjects in the unfinished present. Such a question can even allow the white subject to re-emerge as an agent in the face of the exposure of racism, by saying ‘I am not that’ (the racists of whom you speak), as an expression of ‘good faith’. The desire for action, or even the desire to be seen as the good white anti-racist subject, is not always a form of bad faith, that is, it does not necessarily involve the concealment of racism. But such a question rushes too quickly past the exposure of racism and hence ‘risks’ such concealment in the very ‘return’ of its address. 58. I am of course risking being seen as producing a ‘useless’ critique by not prescribing what an anti-racist whiteness studies would be, or by not offering some suggestions about ‘what white people can do’. I am happy to take that risk. At the same time, I think it is quite clear that my critique of ‘anti-racist whiteness’ is prescriptive. After all, I am arguing that whiteness studies, even in its critical form, should not be about re-describing the white subject as anti-racist, or constitute itself as a form of anti-racism, or even as providing the conditions for anti-racism. Whiteness studies should instead be about attending to forms of white racism and white privilege that are not undone, and may even be repeated and intensified, through declarations of whiteness, or through the recognition of privilege as privilege.

#### Focusing on participation in debate as a method for social change conceives of deliberation as the conclusion of politics – understanding political dialogue in this way oversimplifies social consequences and exaggerates bias and conflict because policy trainees are blamed for the problems created by policymakers they can’t yet affect

Adolf G. Gundersen, Assoc Prof Polisci at Texas A&M, 2000 *Political Theory and Partisan Politics* p. 100

With roots that extend at least as far back as Pericles' funeral oration,3 the participatory alternative is certainly the most venerable of the two dominant strategies for containing partisanship. It is also the more ambitious of the two, aiming as it does not simply at the diffusion or containment of partisanship but rather at its transcendence. The for­mula is as well known as it is simple: Participation in democratic decision-making turns self-interest into civic virtue. Notice that the emphasis here is on participation in the act of mak­ing public decisions. Even when participatory democrats underline the deliberative nature of public decision making, they are assuming that citizens are deliberating at the point of decision, that deliberation will issue in proximate action. For example, Benjamin Barber's "strong talk" (1984) and John S. Dryzek's "discursive democracy" (1990) are both decision-making procedures as much as they are modes of deliberating. Given what I said earlier about the inescapable necessity of par­tisanship, it will come as no surprise that I find this strategy hope­lessly naive. More specifically, it is the immediacy of the link between deliberation and decision-making or action that I believe is problem­atic in the participatory strategy for countering partisanship. Partici­patory democrats are right to suppose that public discussion does encourage civic virtue, and does allow at least a partial transcendence of partisanship. But deliberation's chances of blunting partisanship are hindered, not helped, by wedding it to participation. By binding deliberation directly to decision-making, the participatory strategy renders deliberation itself partisan. Deliberation is only complete when it issues in decision, and de­cisions are inherently partisan. No form of deliberation is exempt from the requirement to move from thought to action, from a consideration of plural options to a decision that this or that particular option is best. Hence, no form of deliberation can do away with partisanship alto­gether. Collective choice is always a matter of moving from plural wills to the unity of decision. As soon as the demand for unity, re­quired by action itself, is imposed, deliberation must come to an end. The closer the choice point comes, the greater the pressure will be to cease deliberating. Participatory arrangements thus tend to exaggerate existing partisan biases. The participatory strategy for dealing with partisanship envisions citizens deliberating about public affairs over which they have some immediate control. Partisanship, in other words, is to be controlled (or transcended) by engaging citizens directly in public decision making. The participatory strategy thus views partisanship as a kind of disease that can be cured homeopathically: inject partisanship into the politi­cal process early on, and the body politic will fight it. On the face of it, this prescription seems promising. Direct action in the public sphere might conceivably transform partisanship by heightening citizen in­terest in public affairs, by discouraging the narrow consideration of self-interest, and/or by promoting an exploration of shared interests. But notice what the metaphor assumes: that the body politic really does have the equivalent of an autoimmune system that need only be triggered so as to kick into high gear. Unfortunately, we cannot simply presume that such an immune system exists. As a result, partisanship cannot be expected to give way automatically before the beneficent dynamics of public participation. On the contrary, the closer citizens get to the point of decision, the more likely partisanship is to become contagious. Inserting partisanship into politics before deliberation has had a chance to develop any immunity to it in the form of public mindedness will render politics more, not less, partisan. Aristotle and Rousseau, who occupy lofty positions in the partici­patory democratic pantheon, understood the problem well. Ruling and being ruled in turn requires a certain kind of citizen. For Aristotle, this meant that the polis had to take special care in educating its young and in attending to the formative influence of its laws. And Rousseau admitted that, absent the intervention of a civil religion or civic savior, such citizens were likely to be hard to come by. Both thinkers were sensitive, in a way their contemporary disciples are not, to the fact that fashioning publicly minded citizens on the potter's wheel of participation presupposes a certain kind of clay. Both were aware that participation will transform partisanship only if participants are al­ready ready to participate as citizens. Likewise, Pericles knew full well that he was preaching to the converted.

## 2NC

### 2NC Overview

**The aff must defend topical USFG action on energy policy – we view debate as a competitive political game that has only a few rules, one of them being the resolution – this is the best framework**

**1. Political education – framing debate as a legal game with strict rules is our only chance to engage power institutions – it unites cultures under a common normative framework – this displaces the human brutality cycle with amoral rules capable of short-circuiting righteousness – encompasses a broad range of violence – that’s Carter.**

#### The bulk of human atrocities can be explained by the human brutality cycle

Carter 8 – prof @ The Colorado College, research support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the staff of the Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio, Italy, the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Benezet Foundation at The Colorado College (Lief H, 2008, "LAW AND POLITICS AS PLAY," Chicago-Kent Law Review, 83(3), http://www.cklawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/vol83no3/Carter.pdf)

Fratricides like Cain’s, genocides, suicide bombings of innocent bus riders and pedestrians, the indiscriminate napalming of villages in Vietnam, and the entirely predictable resistance to the U.S. occupation of Iraq begin-ning in 2003 follow a common pattern. No doubt other dynamics—a rumor spread, or drunkenness, and of course opportunistic (and at times socio-pathological) political leadership, for example—play a specific role in par-ticular events. Still, a three-part pattern holds across human cultures and historical eras. First, a group identifies itself as rightfully entitled to something. In some, but not all, cases, someone senses that his superior status in the dominance hierarchy—God’s status as, well, God; Cain’s status as older brother; presumed Hutu superiority over Tutsi; the inerrancy of the Holy Bible; or the unquestionable authority of Islam—privileges him over his inferiors.79 Often those who perceive themselves as superior also perceive themselves as “purer” and “cleaner” than their inferiors. For some, divine authority ordains their entitlements. For others, it is simply “the homeland.” In all such cases, something like pride goes before the fall into brutality. Second, the fall into brutality begins when members of the superior group feel dishonored, humiliated, and, in that pithy American street-slang expression, “dissed.” Often encouraged and incited by opportunistic lead-ers, people label as “evil” those who challenge and threaten their privileges and entitlements, perhaps to their women (the Trojan War), their turf (the taking of Palestinian land for a Jewish state), or their symbols (the conflict over the Dome of the Rock or “blasphemous” publication of cartoon im-ages of Muhammad). Political rhetoric routinely amplifies the anger by claiming that “the other” has defied the group’s moral superiority and its purity. Osama bin Laden’s defense of the purity of sacred Saudi soil and George W. Bush’s commitment to “freedom and democracy” make such claims. Third, the superior group brutally overreacts and punishes the disre-spectful other out of all proportion to the threat. The earth must be cleansed of the impure other in the name of right, honor, and purity. It is a remarka-bly robust pattern. Impersonal natural disasters—plagues, droughts, and famines—trigger the killing of witches, Jews, or whatever scapegoat best serves in the moment. Some brutal acts seem consistent with economic models of rational choice. The push to kill aboriginal Americans if they did not convert to Christianity served as a convenient pretext for Europeans bent on taking their gold and land. The United States destroyed the Japa-nese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with nuclear bombs both to end the war quickly and to demonstrate to the Soviets, who by then knew the U.S. possessed nuclear weapons, its will to use them. Perhaps the regime in China crushed students in Tiananmen Square merely to protect its hold on power. However, neither extreme poverty nor extreme inequalities of wealth systematically trigger human brutality as often or as intensely as do humiliating challenges to claims of righteousness.80 Across cultures, humans become brutal when these conditions exist. Drivers experience road rage. The benches suddenly empty when a baseball pitcher deliberately throws at a batter’s head. When Zidane head-butted Materazzi in the 2006 World Cup finals, viewers intuitively knew that something like Materazzi’s sexual insult to Zidane’s family must have pro-voked him. Legal systems permit jurors to acquit via jury nullification (or reduce the punishment for) those who kill their adulterous spouses in the “heat of passion.” Many legal systems permit people to kill intruders in their homes even when those intruders pose no visible threat to safety or property. Threats and insults to identities and the symbols and traditions that construct identities—bombing the golden-domed al-Askari mosque in Samarra and destroying the World Trade Center monument to capitalism in New York City—explain the bulk of human atrocities better than do factors like poverty, resource inequality, and greed. If an “untouchable,” and in too many cultures simply a woman, defines herself as inferior because that is the proper order of things, she will not think of herself as entitled to any-thing that can be threatened or humiliated. Untouchables depicted in Bol-lywood films occasionally become disoriented and confused when their superiors treat them as valued equals.81 American slaves sought to escape far more frequently than they mounted bloody uprisings, and most slaves did neither. But those who do brutalize others, e.g., the torturers at Abu Ghraib, do not typically act for conventional economic motives. They act, as Shaw’s Caesar knew, in the name of right and honor and peace. At least four sets of conditions seem to correlate with brutality: chal-lenges and insults to status in a dominance hierarchy; challenges and insults to turf; challenges and insults to group and ethnic sexual, physical, and moral purity; and challenges and insults to a sense of justice. Experimental social psychologists Sheldon Solomon, Jeff Greenberg, and Tom Pyszczynski suggest that the uniquely human consciousness of individual mortality underlies the cycle.82 To ward off the anxiety caused by their knowledge of their inevitable death, people construct religious, political, or moral value systems that reinforce the individual’s self-worth in the face of death’s certainty. People cannot empirically validate their defense systems, the belief in an everlasting life in heaven after death, or in the righteousness of the Marxist vision of the social order, for example. Their efficacy in warding off the fear of death instead impels people to join social groups—sects, tribes, parties, or teams, for example—that reinforce the truth and righteousness of this psychological buffer. In a warped version of the im-pulse to kill in self defense, people who perceive threats to these symbolic support systems may see no alternative but to kill those who threaten the systems, for it is these very systems on which the individual’s escape from the fear of death depends.83

**2. Decision-making – dramatic rehearsal of possible courses of action in domain-specific scenarios provide a meaningful way for participants to make mistakes without consequences and project outcomes – that's Haghoj. Decision-making outweighs because it's the only portable skill – Shulman says critical thinking has intrinsic value – even absent a specific goal, it improves all aspects of life.**

#### Role-playing as the government does not necessitate acceptance of that role but rather provides an epistemic frame for knowledge gained

Haghoj 8 – PhD, affiliated with Danish Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials, asst prof @ the Institute of Education at the University of Bristol (Thorkild, 2008, "PLAYFUL KNOWLEDGE: An Explorative Study of Educational Gaming," PhD dissertation @ Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies, University of Southern Denmark, http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information\_til/Studerende\_ved\_SDU/Din\_uddannelse/phd\_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf)

For Shaffer, it is not only professionals who benefit from participating in a practicum; students can also benefit from learning through the distinctive epistemologies of professional practices, which represent “ways of knowing and ways of deciding what is worth knowing” (Shaffer, 2004: 1403). In this way, Shaffer assumes that Schön’s theory is “essential to all complex learning: cognitive, practical, and civic” (Shaffer, 2004: 1403). Here, Shaffer is not only referring to Schön but also to Dewey, who believed that the traditional organisation of knowledge was misaligned with the social and cultural realities of the industrial era (Dewey, 1916). Thus, Shaffer views the epistemologies of professional practitioners as a “powerful model” for changing education in the post-industrial era by developing technology-based learning environments for middle and high school students (Shaffer, 2004: 1403). Shaffer exemplifies this claim by referring to his own on-going design and research projects: Escher’s World, The Pandora Project, and Science.net. In all these projects, students are supposedly able to learn by participating in learning environments modelled on the practices and epistemologies of professional practitioners. Thus, students are able to learn about basic concepts in transformational geometry through graphic design activities in a computer-aided design studio (Escher’s World), human immunobiology and biomedical ethics through computer-supported negotiation modelled on exercises similar to the training professional mediators receive (The Pandora Project), and emerging technologies such as the Internet, wireless communications, and weapons of mass destruction by writing online stories about the impact of such technologies on the community (Science.net). According to Shaffer, all these projects “illustrate the effectiveness of pedagogical praxis as a method for developing compelling learning environments” (Shaffer, 2004: 1403).15 Shaffer further develops the role of epistemologies in profession-based learning environments by introducing the term epistemic frame, which he defines as an “organising principle” that “orchestrates (and is orchestrated by) participation in a community of practice by linking practice, identity, values, and knowledge within a particular way of thinking – within the epistemology of a practice” (Shaffer, 2005: 3). Based upon this definition, Shaffer describes each of the profession-based learning environments mentioned above as an epistemic game. Thus, an epistemic game “deliberately creates the epistemic frame of a socially valued community by recreating the process by which the individuals develop the skills, knowledge, identities, values, and epistemology of that community” (Shaffer, 2006: 164). Even though The Power Game is not based on a professional practice model of learning, the election scenario shares important similarities with Shaffer’s epistemic games. Thus, the participating students are expected to adopt important aspects of the epistemological models of professional journalists, politicians and spin doctors in a parliamentary election scenario. This means that in order to play a politician in The Power Game, the students must be able to identify with the knowledge forms and practices of real-life politicians which involves finding and analysing information in relation to different ideological positions, preparing ideologically key issues, and giving “performances” in front of a public audience, which in this case is made up of their classmates (cf chapters 6 and 8). Both Gee and Shaffer’s theoretical frameworks are valuable when trying to understand how students make meaning through particular game environments. Gee’s notion of semiotic domains is particularly useful for analysing the discursive interplay between game practices and educational practices. Similarly, Shaffer convincingly argues how students may learn through game environments that attempt to re-create the practices of real-life professionals. However, Gee and Shaffer’s approaches also differ from the aim of this study as they do not provide detailed empirical descriptions of how educational games are enacted and validated within particular educational contexts. Gee makes several bold claims about how the “bad” learning that takes place in schools could be replaced with the learning principles of “good” games (Gee, 2003). As Julian SeftonGreen argues, this black and white dichotomy is somewhat speculative, since Gee provides no empirical examples of how the literacy of games can do “anything other than support the playing of more games” (Sefton-Green, 2006: 291). It is also questionable whether Gee’s attempt to identify the learning principles of video games is able to affect the changes at the policy-level his critique aims to achieve. Hence, Gee mostly presents video games as an idealised symbol of how educational systems could and should be designed differently. In comparison to Gee, Shaffer’s work is clearly more focused on the actual practices of designing and enacting game environments, i.e. his example with middle school students that play a debate game in a history class clearly shares some similarities with my analysis of how students enact the election scenario of The Power Game (Shaffer, 2006: 17-40; cf. chapter 8). Still, Shaffer only offer limited descriptions of how this debate game and a number of other game examples are actually enacted within particular educational contexts such as classroom settings or after-school programs. Consequently, it is difficult to determine to what extent Shaffer’s examples of particular games are able to “fit in” with everyday school practices, and how the generated knowledge is or can be validated by participating teachers and students in relation to their existing knowledge traditions (Barth, 2002). My second objection to Shaffer’s otherwise inspiring work regards his theory of epistemic frames (Shaffer, 2005, 2006). Shaffer defines the term by drawing on a wide range of different theoretical sources, especially Goffman’s frame analysis and Schön’s notion of epistemologies (Goffman, 1974; Schön, 1983, 1987). In doing so, Shaffer creates a theoretical framework, which may explain how games can be used to organise particular forms of knowledge, skills, values and identities. However, when combining the work of Goffman and Schön, Shaffer is clearly closer to the aims of Schön than Goffman. For Goffman, a frame is defined as an “organising principle” that govern everyday, face-to-face interaction through social actors’ mutual interplay of meaning (Goffman, 1974: 10). Schön, on the other hand, explores how professionals learn to act and reflect in relation to the particular epistemologies of their professions, i.e. design, architecture, engineering, medicine etc. (Schön, 1983, 1987). According to Shaffer, these two analytical perspectives are congruent since “learning happens along a continuum of time scales” (Shaffer, 2005: 3). However, these theories are based on quite different ontological assumptions of social agency and meaning-making, which cannot be reduced only to a matter of time scales. Unlike Schön, Goffman’s frame analysis does not describe how learning and reflection are related to particular professions. Instead, Goffman’s theory address the minutiae communicative processes of establishing and negotiating “the interaction order” of social encounters – including gaming encounters (Goffman, 1961a, 1983; cf. chapter 4). By evening out these theoretical and analytical differences, Shaffer’s conception of epistemic frames limits the context of interpretive framing to the epistemologies of the professional practices that his epistemic games are trying to re-create. Put differently, Shaffer’s notion of epistemic frames implicitly assumes that social actors more or less accept their assigned roles as professional practitioners by taking on a particular “pair of glasses” (Shaffer, 2006: 160). However, from a Goffmanian perspective it is questionable whether students playing an educational game readily “embrace” their assigned roles as if they were merely taking on a pair of glasses. Individuals often disassociate themselves from particular roles for various reasons through different forms of “role distance” (Goffman, 1961b). Furthermore, as Gary Alan Fine argues, Goffman’s frame analysis implies a dynamic “oscillation” between different interpretive frames within particular social contexts, i.e. by continually stepping in and out of character in a role-playing game (Fine, 1983: 182-3; cf. chapter 4). Taken at a glance, the students that performed as politicians in The Power Game generally accepted and adopted the norms and expectations of their assigned roles as professional politicians. However, as my analysis indicates, they clearly also distanced themselves from various ideological and performative aspects of their roles, which elicited different responses from their teachers and classmates (cf. chapter 8). Moreover, the game participants also interpreted their assigned roles in relation to their everyday roles as “social studies students”, and the educational goals set by the teachers and the social studies curriculum. In this way, the students explored a wide range of different knowledge aspects that were not necessarily related to the epistemologies of real-life politicians (Barth, 2002). The point here is that even though the upper secondary students were assigned roles as professional politicians, the game participants still defined themselves as students in a school setting. Thus, when discussing and reflecting upon their game experiences, the students primarily validated their game knowledge and performance in relation to the existing knowledge criteria of the everyday context of upper secondary education.

### Deliberation

#### Reject their affirmation of performance as a strategy for contesting oppression – anti-racist performance isn’t revolutionary or transformative but rather functions to re-inscribe and conceal oppression.

Ahmed 4 (Sara Ahmed, Reader in Race and Cultural Studies, Goldsmiths College, University of London, Borderlands E-Journal, Volume 3, Number 2, “Declarations of Whiteness: The Non-Performativity of Anti-Racism,” http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2\_2004/ahmed\_declarations.htm)

50. This might sound like an argument about the performativity of race. I am sympathetic with the idea that race is performative in Judith Butler’s (1993) sense of the term: race as a category is brought into existence by being repeated over time (race is an effect of racialisation). I have even argued for the performativity of race myself (Ahmed 2002). But throughout this paper I have insisted on the non-performativity of anti-racism. It might, seem now, a rather odd tactic. If race is performative, and is itself an effect of racism, then why isn’t anti-racism performative as well? Is anti-racism a form of ‘race trouble’ that is performative as it ‘exposes’ the performativity of race, and which by citing the terms of racism (such as ‘white’) allows those terms to acquire new meanings? I would suggest the potential ‘exposure’ of the performativity of race does not make ‘anti-racism’ performative as a speech act. As I stated in my introduction, I am using performativity in Austin’s sense as referring to a particular class of speech, where the issuing of the utterance ‘is the performing of an action’ (1975, 6). In such speech the saying is the doing; it is not that saying something leads to something, but that it does something at the moment of saying. It is important to note here that, for Austin, performativity is not a quality of a sign or an utterance; it does not reside within the sign, as if the sign was magical. For an utterance to be performative, certain conditions have to be met. When these conditions are met, then the performative is happy. This model introduces a class of ‘unhappy performatives’: utterances that would ‘do something’ if the right conditions had been met, but which do not do that thing, as the conditions have not been met. 51. I would hasten to add that in my view performativity has become rather banal and over-used within academic writing; it seems as if almost everything is performative, where performative is used as a way of indicating that something is ‘brought into existence’ through speech, representation, writing, law, practice, or discourse. Partly, I am critiquing this ‘banalisation’ of the performative, as well as how performativity as a concept can be used in a way that ‘forgets’ how performativity depends upon the repetition of conventions and prior acts of authorization (see Butler 1997). I am also suggesting that the logic that speech ‘brings things into existence’ (as a form for positive action) only goes so far, and indeed the claim that saying is doing can bypass that ways in which saying is not sufficient for an action, and can even be a substitute for action. 52. My concern with the non-performativity of anti-racism has hence been to examine how sayings are not always doings, or to put it more strongly, to show how the investment in saying as if saying was doing can actually extend rather than challenge racism. Implicitly, I am critiquing a claim that I have not properly attributed: that is, the claim that anti-racism is performative. I would argue that the six declarations of whiteness I have analysed function as implicit claims to the performativity of anti-racism. The claim to the performativity of anti-racism would be to presume that ‘being anti’ is transcendent, and that to declare oneself as being something shows that one is not the thing that one declares oneself to be. It might be assumed that the speech act of declaring oneself (to be white, or learned, or racist) ‘works’ as it brings into existence the non- or anti-racist subject or institution. None of these claims I have investigated operate as simple claims. None of them say ‘I/we are not racists’ or ‘I/we are anti-racists’, as if that was an action. They are more complex utterances, for sure. They have a very specific form: they define racism in a particular way, and then they imply ‘I am not’ or ‘we are not’ that. 53. So it is not that such speech acts say ‘we are anti-racists’ (and saying makes us so); rather they say ‘we are this’, whilst racism is ‘that’, so in being ‘this’ we are not ‘that’, where ‘that’ would be racist. So in saying we are raced as whites, then we are not racists, as racism operates through the unmarked nature of whiteness; or in saying we are racists, then we are not racists, as racists don’t know they are racists; or in expressing shame about racism, then we are not racists, as racists are shameless; or in saying we are positive about our racial identity, as an identity that is positive insofar as it involves a commitment to anti-racism, then we are not racists, as racists are unhappy, or in being self-critical about racism, then we are not racists, as racists are ignorant; or in saying we exist alongside others, then we are not racists, as racists see themselves as above others, and so on. 54. These statements function as claims to performativity rather than as performatives, whereby the declaration of whiteness is assumed to put in place the conditions in which racism can be transcended, or at the very least reduced in its power. Any presumption that such statements are forms of political action would be an overestimation of the power of saying, and even a performance of the very privilege that such statements claim they undo. The declarative mode, as a way of doing something, involves a fantasy of transcendence in which ‘what’ is transcended is the very thing ‘admitted to’ in the declaration: so, to put it simply, if we admit to being bad, then we show that we are good (see also paper by Hill and Riggs in this issue). So it is in this specific sense that I have argued that anti-racism is not performative. Or we could even say that anti-racist speech in a racist world is an ‘unhappy performative’: the conditions are not in place that would allow such ‘saying’ to ‘do’ what it ‘says’. 55. Our task is not to repeat anti-racist speech in the hope that it will acquire performativity. Nor should we be satisfied with the ‘terms’ of racism, or hope they will acquire new meanings, or even look for new terms. Instead, anti-racism requires much harder work, as it requires working with racism as an ongoing reality in the present. Anti-racism requires interventions in the political economy of race, and how racism distributes resources and capacities unequally amongst others. Those unequal distributions also affect the ‘business’ of speech, and who gets to say what, about whom, and where. We need to consider the intimacy between privilege and the work we do, even in the work we do on privilege. 56. You might not be surprised to hear that a white response to this paper has asked the question, ‘but what are white people to do’. That question is not necessarily misguided, although it does re-center on white agency, as a hope premised on lack rather than presence. It is a question asked persistently in response to hearing about racism and colonialism: I always remember being in an audience to a paper on the stolen generation and the first question asked was: ‘but what can we do’. The impulse towards action is understandable and complicated; it can be both a defense against the ‘shock’ of hearing about racism (and the shock of the complicity revealed by the very ‘shock’ that ‘this’ was a ‘shock’); it can be an impulse to reconciliation as a ‘re-covering’ of the past (the desire to feel better); it can be about making public one’s judgment (‘what happened was wrong’); or it can be an expression of solidarity (‘I am with you’); or it can simply an orientation towards the openness of the future (rephrased as: ‘what can be done?’). But the question, in all of these modes of utterance, can work to block hearing; in moving on from the present towards the future, it can also move away from the object of critique, or place the white subject ‘outside’ that critique in the present of the hearing. In other words, the desire to act, to move, or even to move on, can stop the message ‘getting through’. 57. To hear the work of exposure requires that white subjects inhabit the critique, with its lengthy duration, and to recognise the world that is re-described by the critique as one in which they live. The desire to act in a non-racist or anti-racist way when one hears about racism, in my view, can function as a defense against hearing how that racism implicates which subjects, in the sense that it shapes the spaces inhabited by white subjects in the unfinished present. Such a question can even allow the white subject to re-emerge as an agent in the face of the exposure of racism, by saying ‘I am not that’ (the racists of whom you speak), as an expression of ‘good faith’. The desire for action, or even the desire to be seen as the good white anti-racist subject, is not always a form of bad faith, that is, it does not necessarily involve the concealment of racism. But such a question rushes too quickly past the exposure of racism and hence ‘risks’ such concealment in the very ‘return’ of its address. 58. I am of course risking being seen as producing a ‘useless’ critique by not prescribing what an anti-racist whiteness studies would be, or by not offering some suggestions about ‘what white people can do’. I am happy to take that risk. At the same time, I think it is quite clear that my critique of ‘anti-racist whiteness’ is prescriptive. After all, I am arguing that whiteness studies, even in its critical form, should not be about re-describing the white subject as anti-racist, or constitute itself as a form of anti-racism, or even as providing the conditions for anti-racism. Whiteness studies should instead be about attending to forms of white racism and white privilege that are not undone, and may even be repeated and intensified, through declarations of whiteness, or through the recognition of privilege as privilege.

#### Focusing on participation in debate as a method for social change conceives of deliberation as the conclusion of politics – understanding political dialogue in this way oversimplifies social consequences and exaggerates bias and conflict because policy trainees are blamed for the problems created by policymakers they can’t yet affect

Adolf G. Gundersen, Assoc Prof Polisci at Texas A&M, 2000 *Political Theory and Partisan Politics* p. 100

With roots that extend at least as far back as Pericles' funeral oration,3 the participatory alternative is certainly the most venerable of the two dominant strategies for containing partisanship. It is also the more ambitious of the two, aiming as it does not simply at the diffusion or containment of partisanship but rather at its transcendence. The for­mula is as well known as it is simple: Participation in democratic decision-making turns self-interest into civic virtue. Notice that the emphasis here is on participation in the act of mak­ing public decisions. Even when participatory democrats underline the deliberative nature of public decision making, they are assuming that citizens are deliberating at the point of decision, that deliberation will issue in proximate action. For example, Benjamin Barber's "strong talk" (1984) and John S. Dryzek's "discursive democracy" (1990) are both decision-making procedures as much as they are modes of deliberating. Given what I said earlier about the inescapable necessity of par­tisanship, it will come as no surprise that I find this strategy hope­lessly naive. More specifically, it is the immediacy of the link between deliberation and decision-making or action that I believe is problem­atic in the participatory strategy for countering partisanship. Partici­patory democrats are right to suppose that public discussion does encourage civic virtue, and does allow at least a partial transcendence of partisanship. But deliberation's chances of blunting partisanship are hindered, not helped, by wedding it to participation. By binding deliberation directly to decision-making, the participatory strategy renders deliberation itself partisan. Deliberation is only complete when it issues in decision, and de­cisions are inherently partisan. No form of deliberation is exempt from the requirement to move from thought to action, from a consideration of plural options to a decision that this or that particular option is best. Hence, no form of deliberation can do away with partisanship alto­gether. Collective choice is always a matter of moving from plural wills to the unity of decision. As soon as the demand for unity, re­quired by action itself, is imposed, deliberation must come to an end. The closer the choice point comes, the greater the pressure will be to cease deliberating. Participatory arrangements thus tend to exaggerate existing partisan biases. The participatory strategy for dealing with partisanship envisions citizens deliberating about public affairs over which they have some immediate control. Partisanship, in other words, is to be controlled (or transcended) by engaging citizens directly in public decision making. The participatory strategy thus views partisanship as a kind of disease that can be cured homeopathically: inject partisanship into the politi­cal process early on, and the body politic will fight it. On the face of it, this prescription seems promising. Direct action in the public sphere might conceivably transform partisanship by heightening citizen in­terest in public affairs, by discouraging the narrow consideration of self-interest, and/or by promoting an exploration of shared interests. But notice what the metaphor assumes: that the body politic really does have the equivalent of an autoimmune system that need only be triggered so as to kick into high gear. Unfortunately, we cannot simply presume that such an immune system exists. As a result, partisanship cannot be expected to give way automatically before the beneficent dynamics of public participation. On the contrary, the closer citizens get to the point of decision, the more likely partisanship is to become contagious. Inserting partisanship into politics before deliberation has had a chance to develop any immunity to it in the form of public mindedness will render politics more, not less, partisan. Aristotle and Rousseau, who occupy lofty positions in the partici­patory democratic pantheon, understood the problem well. Ruling and being ruled in turn requires a certain kind of citizen. For Aristotle, this meant that the polis had to take special care in educating its young and in attending to the formative influence of its laws. And Rousseau admitted that, absent the intervention of a civil religion or civic savior, such citizens were likely to be hard to come by. Both thinkers were sensitive, in a way their contemporary disciples are not, to the fact that fashioning publicly minded citizens on the potter's wheel of participation presupposes a certain kind of clay. Both were aware that participation will transform partisanship only if participants are al­ready ready to participate as citizens. Likewise, Pericles knew full well that he was preaching to the converted.

## 1NR

### Overview

#### The critique solves by confronting ableism at the level of rhetoric– it exposes the attitudes that keep ableism alive, leads to productive corrective practices, and failure to confront it means that ALL efforts to challenge oppression will operate within the context of ableism.

**Cherney 11** (James L., Wayne State University, “The Rhetoric of Ableism”, Disability Studies Quarterly, Vol. 31, No. 3, http://dsq–sds.org/article/view/1665/1606 Accessed 1/27/12 GAL)

In this essay I analyze ableism as a rhetorical problem for three reasons. First, ableist culture sustains and perpetuates itself via rhetoric; the ways of interpreting disability and assumptions about bodies that produce ableism are learned. The previous generation teaches it to the next and cultures spread it to each other through modes of intercultural exchange. Adopting a rhetorical perspective to the problem of ableism thus exposes the social systems that keep it alive. This informs my second reason for viewing ableism as rhetoric, as revealing how it thrives suggests ways of curtailing its growth and promoting its demise. Many of the strategies already adopted by disability rights activists to confront ableism explicitly or implicitly address it as rhetoric. Public demonstrations, countercultural performances, autobiography, transformative histories of disability and disabling practices, and critiques of ableist films and novels all apply rhetorical solutions to the problem. Identifying ableism as rhetoric and exploring its systems dynamic reveals how these corrective practices work. We can use such information to refine the successful techniques, reinvent those that fail, and realize new tactics. Third, I contend that any means of challenging ableism must eventually encounter its rhetorical power. As I explain below, ableism is that most insidious form of rhetoric that has become reified and so widely accepted as common sense that it denies its own rhetoricity—it "goes without saying." To fully address it we must name its presence, for cultural assumptions accepted uncritically adopt the mantle of "simple truth" and become extremely difficult to rebut. As the neologism "ableism" itself testifies, we need new words to reveal the places it resides and new language to describe how it feels. Without doing so, ableist ways of thinking and interpreting will operate as the context for making sense of any acts challenging discrimination, which undermines their impact, reduces their symbolic potential, and can even transform them into superficial measures that give the appearance of change yet elide a recalcitrant ableist system.

#### Ableism is so pervasive that it must be vigilantly challenged and made into an irredeemable practice via social castigation. Empirically, confronting hierarchical attitudes at the level of rhetoric solves.

Cherney 11 (James L., Wayne State University, “The Rhetoric of Ableism”, Disability Studies Quarterly, Vol. 31, No. 3, http://dsq–sds.org/article/view/1665/1606 Accessed 1/27/12 GAL)

If we locate the problem in disability, then the ableist absolves his or her responsibility for discrimination and may not even recognize its presence. If we locate the problem in ableism, then the ableist must question her or his orientation. The critic's task is to make ableism so apparent and irredeemable that one cannot practice it without incurring social castigation. This requires substantial vigilance, for ableist thinking pervades the culture. For example, as I write this, I am tempted to use medical metaphors to explain the task and script something like "we cannot simply excise the tumor of ableism and heal the culture, for it has metastasized and infiltrated every organ of society." Yet this metaphor relies on an ableist perspective that motivates with the fear of death and turns to medical solutions to repair a body in decay. Using it, I would endorse and perpetuate ableist rhetoric, just as I would by using deafness as a metaphor for obstinacy ("Marie was deaf to their pleas for bread") or blindness to convey ignorance ("George turned a blind eye to global warming"). The pervasiveness of these and similar metaphors, like the cultural ubiquity of using images of disabled bodies to inspire pity, suggest the scale of the work ahead, and the ease with which one can resort to using them warns of the need for critical evaluation of one's own rhetoric. Yet the task can be accomplished. Just as feminists have changed Western culture by naming and promoting recognition of sexism, the glass ceiling, and patriarchy—admittedly a work in progress, yet also one that can celebrate remarkable achievements—we can reform ableist culture by using rhetoric to craft awareness and political action.

### Link Debate

#### Patriarchy is the cause of all proliferation, environmental destruction, domestic violence, and war

Warren & Cady 94 (Karen J, Duane L, feminists &authors, Hypatia, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing connections,” pg 16-17, JL)

Much of the current "unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors -- the symptoms of dysfunctionality -- that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is -- as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy. 11The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989 , 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "a militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" ( Spretnak 1989 , 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility ties in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

#### Their authors who vouch for social justice don’t see disability issues as entering the realm of actual oppression and further entrench the processes of dehumanization for the disabled

Anna 10 (5/24, “Ableist Word Profile: Why I write about ableist language”, [http://disabledfeminists.com/2010/05/24/ableist–word–profile–why–i–write–about–ableist–language/](http://disabledfeminists.com/2010/05/24/ableist-word-profile-why-i-write-about-ableist-language/) , Accessed 2/24/11, GAL)

I talk about ableist language for a variety of reasons. The most obvious, I think, is to challenge ableist ideas that center the experiences of non–disabled people. When someone proudly assures me that words like “lame” and “dumb” and “retarded” are never used to describe actual people with disabilities, I’m fairly certain I’m talking to one of the currently non–disabled. Currently non–disabled readers, I’m here to tell you: those words, and any similar words you think are “archaic” and not used anymore, are used all the time, as taunts and insults towards people with disabilities, and in some cases as official diagnoses. Some of them are also used in reclamatory ways by some disabled people, but certainly not all. But it’s more than that. Part of why I challenge ableist ideas and ableist language is because I would like more Social Justice bloggers to think “Oh, yeah. People with disabilities also read social justice blogs! I should remember that more often when I’m writing.” [I also like to challenge it in other places, which is why I occasionally go through spaces like Wikipedia & TVTropes and re–write every instance of "wheelchair bound".] There’s a strong tendency to assume that disability–related issues are somehow a separate thing, as though there’s a Disability Silo and things like reproductive justice, racism, heterosexism, anti–immigration, transphobia, classism, and misogyny, etc, don’t actually enter into that silo. As though no one with a disability is interested in reading about these topics, or is affected by them in any way, or is an activist on the topic, or wants to be more of one. When someone writes something like “Wow, those anti–immigrant people are r#tarded idiots!” [I made this example up] or giggles about seeing Dick Cheney “wheelchair bound” because “it couldn’t happen to a more deserving person!” [I did not make this example up], I bring up the ableism, and my activity in the disability rights movement, as a way of reminding them that we’re here. We’re reading. We’re participating. And it’s more than a little–bit alienating to see social justice bloggers using our experiences and oppressions as their go–to for “insulting people we don’t agree with”.

#### Sexism, racism and ethnicism are all caused by ableism

Wolbring, 8 [Gregor, Prof @ U Calgary, Development (2008) 51, 252–258]

Sexism is partly driven by a formof ableismthat favours certain abilities, and the labelling of women as not having those certain necessary abilities is used to justify sexism and the dominance of males over females. Similarly, racismand ethnicism are partly driven by forms of ableism, which have two components. One favours one race or ethnic group and discriminates against another. The book The Bell Curve (Herrnstein and Murray, 1994) judged human beings on their ‘cognitive abilities’ (their IQ). It promoted racismby claiming that certain ethnic groups are less cognitively able than others. The ableist judgement related to cognitive abilities continues justifying racist arguments. Casteism, like racism, is based on the notion that socially defined groups of people have inherent, natural qualities or ‘essences’that assign themto social positions, make them fit for specific duties and occupations (Omvedt,2001).The natural inherent qualities are ‘abilities’ that make them fit for specific duties and occupations.

#### Ableism is the root cause of oppresion

**Davis 2** (Lennard J., Professor of English as well as of Disability and Human Development, U Illinois–Chicago, Disability, Dismodernism, and Other Difficult Positions , p. 13 GAL)

Disability offers us a way to rethink some of these dilemmas, but in order to do so, I think we need to reexamine the identity of disability, and to do so without flinching, without hesitating because we may be undo­ing a way of knowing. As with race, gender, and sexual orientation, we are in the midst of a grand reexamination. Disability, as the most recent identity group on the block, offers us the one that is perhaps least resis­tant to change or changing thoughts about identity. And, most impor­tantly, as I will argue, disability may turn out to be the identity that links other identities, replacing the notion of postmodernism with something I want to call "dismodernism." I am arguing that disability can be seen as the postmodern subject po­sition for several reasons. But the one I want to focus on now is that these other discourses of race, gender, and sexuality began in the mid–nine­teenth century, and they did so because that is when the scientific study of humans began. The key connecting point for all these studies was the development of eugenics.4 Eugenics saw the possible improvement of the race as being accomplished by diminishing problematic peoples and their problematic behaviors—these peoples were clearly delineated under the rubric of feeble–mindedness and degeneration as women, people of color, homosexuals, the working classes, and so on. All these were considered to be categories of disability, although we do not think of them as connected in this way today. Indeed, one could argue that categories of oppression were given scientific license through these medicalizcd, scientificized dis­courses, and that, in many cases, the specific categories were established through these studies.

#### Our argument trumps all of their plan–specific impacts – Prioritizing ableism is the only way to address participation, which is the prerequisite for any benefits of debate – i.e. this K internal link turn all their claims. Diversity Recognition and Promotion has been a huge plus for Debate over the last 20 years – NOW is the time to incorporate Disability Studies into our mission

Shelton & Matthews ‘1 [Mike, frmr asst prof and debate coach at Louisville; Cynthia, Comm PhD student, “Extending the Diversity Agenda in Forensics: Invisible Disabilities and Beyond,” Argumentation & Advocacy, v38, pp121–130]

#### Diversity issues have become a corner­stone of higher education, and forensic ac­tivities are certainly no exception to that rule. Indeed, in many regards the forensic community has been on the leading edge of inclusiveness within higher education. The forensic community has made remarkable progress and it has vividly illuminated the need to share the unique benefits of forensic practice with often socially marginalized de­mographic groups, particularly women and minorities. Perhaps the next logical step would be to consider the evolving "invisible" elements of that domain, and those with in­visible disabilities offer an informative illus­trative case. Disabled people make up one–fifth of the population in the United States (McNeil, 1993), and it has been predicted that at least 40% of these people have disabilities which cannot be seen, or are "invisible" (Asch, 1984). Invisible disability has been defined as "one that is hidden so as not to be imme­diately noticed by an observer except under unusual circumstances or by disclosure from the disabled person or other outside source" (Matthews, 1994, p. 7) and encompasses both physical and mental conditions. Physi­cal conditions include various chronic ill­nesses, such as heart disease and lung dis­ease; mental conditions include learning disabilities and cognitive processing prob­lems like dementia and mental retardation. There has been a significant increase in the number of people with invisible disabilities in the United States as indicated by several factors. For the last quarter century the num­ber of people with chronic diseases and dis­abilities has been climbing (Hayden, 1993; Kaye, LaPlante, Carlson, & Wenger, 1997). Activity limitations are most frequently caused by conditions that are chronic, in­cluding diabetes, arthritis, heart disease, mental and nervous disorders, and lung dis­ease, all of which are, for the most part, invisible (LaPlante, 1991). These chronic conditions make up two–thirds of the dis­abling conditions reported in the United States (LaPlante, 1997). New treatments and therapeutic interventions have made it pos­sible for people with chronic conditions and disabilities to survive in dramatically increasing numbers in the last twenty–five years. Examples of particularly remarkable changes in survival rates are: cystic fibrosis, up 700%, spina bifida, up 200%, and heart disease, up 300% (Blum, 1992). Additionally, a distinct increase in disability rates reported by The National Center for Health Statistics among people under 4.5 years of age are accounted for by a greater prevalence in the diagnosis of asthma, mental disorders (e.g., Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, Attention Defi­cit Disorder), and orthopedic impairments (e.g., back and joint problems) (Kaye et al,, 1997), conditions which again are invisible under most conditions. These increases in the numbers of persons with invisible disabilities make it important both to declare the reality of invisible dis­ability and to understand the impact of the visibility factor on the attitudes and behav­iors of those living with the condition, for others who interact with them, and the larger forensic community's drive to address diver­sity. Western societies value self–reliance, beauty, health and independence. This ob­session with health is particularly prevalent in United States culture (Galanti, 1997). Peo­ple tend to believe that healthy is normal and that illness is a deviance (Hayden, 1993). Therefore persons with invisible disabilities have great incentive to keep their conditions concealed. Unfortunately, concealing dis­abilities can carry serious negative ramifica­tions in terms of relationships. Those nega­tive ramifications can dramatically impact the individuals with invisible disabilities, the able–bodied others with whom they interact and ultimately the larger collective—includ­ing the forensic community–to which they belong.
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#### Hagel will get confirmed now, but it’s close – new controversy derails passage

Reuters 1-15 (“Chuck Hagel's Chances of Confirmation Improve,” Jewish Daily Forward, 2013, <http://forward.com/articles/169341/chuck-hagels-chances-of-confirmation-improve/>)

Former Republican Senator Chuck Hagel appears increasingly likely to be confirmed as U.S. defense secretary, thanks to support from two key senators and the lack of an overt campaign against him by mainstream pro-Israel groups. Hagel, whose comments on Israel, Iran and gay rights have sparked opposition to his candidacy, on Tuesday won the backing of Senator Charles Schumer, the Senate’s No. 3 Democrat, who had been conspicuously on the fence. Sen. Barbara Boxer, a California Democrat, also weighed in with support. Schumer’s support was seen as pivotal given his record as a strong supporter of Israel. Both he and Boxer are Jewish. Neoconservative activists have vociferously attacked Hagel, a decorated Vietnam veteran, over past statements questioning the wisdom of using military force to stop Iran’s nuclear program and complaining about what he called the intimidating influence of the “Jewish lobby” in Washington. Larger, more mainstream organizations have not mounted a concerted public effort to derail Hagel’s nomination to replace Leon Panetta as President Barack Obama’s Pentagon chief. Kenneth Bandler, a spokesman for the American Jewish Committee, said his group was “in the concerned camp, not the opposition camp” and would decide whether to oppose or support the nomination depending upon what emerges during the Senate confirmation process. That process is likely to be messy. Mississippi Republican Roger Wicker, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which will hold confirmation hearings, issued a tweet calling him “a divisive and disastrous nominee.” But those views are unlikely to gain more traction, aides say, unless Hagel mishandles his confirmation hearing or additional controversial statements from the past emerge. “I’ve had a few conversations with Republicans on the Hill who admittedly don’t like Hagel for his ‘malleability,’” said one well-connected former Republican congressional and Bush administration aide. Hagel will get “raked over the coals” for some of his statements on Israel and Iran and grilled on his willingness to send troops into battle, the aide said. “But in the end he will be confirmed,” the former official said. Democratic officials offered a similar assessment. One close to the Armed Services Committee said, “There is no groundswell on Capitol Hill” against Hagel. “Have I seen anything that looks truly disqualifying? No.” Hagel will garner votes from all 53 Senate Democrats and between 10 and 15 Republicans, predicted one observer who has been counting votes. Should Hagel’s nomination come to a vote in the full Senate, he would need a simple majority of its 100 members to win confirmation.

#### Plan unpopular

Korte, 12 (Gregory, “Politics stands in the way of nuclear plant's future”, USA Today, April 27, http://www.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/story/2012-04-13/usec-centrifuges-loan-guarantees/54560118/1)

Three dozen 43-foot-tall centrifuges swirl quietly in a cavernous building in southern Ohio, ready to turn uranium hexafluoride into the enriched fuel that can power America's nuclear power plants. They stand like stacks of poker chips on a table — the ante for what could be a $2 billion national gamble on nuclear energy. Energy company USEC wants federal loan guarantees to allow it to build 11,000 centrifuges here, which would spin out enough fuel to power about three dozen nuclear power plants non-stop. But while plenty of politicians whose districts could benefit from the project support it, the Piketon plant remains stymied by a political standoff. Many Republicans who back the project — called the American Centrifuge Project — have savaged the Obama administration loan program that would pay for it, while the Obama Energy Department, burned by Republican criticism, has voiced tentative support for the plan but won't authorize federal money for it without congressional approval. For almost a year, congressional Republicans have criticized the administration's $535 million loan guarantee to now-bankrupt solar panel maker Solyndra. The administration, they say, is unfairly picking "winners and losers" in energy. Both sides say they want the project to move forward. Both support short-term "bridge" funding to keep the project going until the financing can be worked out. Both say the other side has to make the first move. **The stakes are high: It's an election year**, and Ohio is a swing state. USEC estimates the project at its peak will generate 3,158 jobs in Ohio, and 4,284 elsewhere. Pike County, home to the centrifuges, has a 13% unemployment rate — the highest in Ohio. The median household income is about $40,000. The average job at USEC pays $77,316.

#### Capital is key to get the confirmation through.

**Politico**, **1/6**/2013 (Chuck Hagel takes fire from Capitol Hill, p. <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/chuck-hagel-takes-fire-from-capitol-hill-85805.html>)

Senate Democrats and Republicans are far from sold on President Barack Obama’s expected nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense. In fact, Obama’s decision to tap the Vietnam veteran and outspoken former Republican senator is likely to spark another nasty fight with Congress right on the heels of the fiscal cliff showdown and just before another likely battle royal over the debt ceiling. Republicans on Sunday unleashed a fresh barrage of attacks amid reports Obama would nominate Hagel on Monday for the top job at the Pentagon. The new Senate minority whip, Texas Republican John Cornyn, said he’s firmly against Hagel’s nomination. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), an Air Force reservist who serves on the Armed Services Committee that will consider the nod, said Hagel would hold the “most antagonistic” views toward Israel of any defense secretary in U.S. history. And despite heaping praise on Hagel when he retired from the Senate after the 2008 elections, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Sunday failed to extend an olive branch to the Nebraska Republican, instead suggesting there would be “tough questions” ahead. Even Senate Democrats are privately signaling they‘re not yet on board with the Hagel pick, and that the White House has a lot of work to do to get him across the finish line. The nomination comes at a tricky time for the administration — just as the fights over raising the debt ceiling and government appropriations are set to begin. And it could put a number of at-risk or pro-Israel Democrats in tough political spots — especially if the nomination fight grows even more contentious. Democrats are also scratching their heads over why Obama appears willing to go to the mat for Hagel, while abandoning his push for a close friend and member of his inner circle, U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, to become secretary of state. Rice, an unabashed Democrat, abandoned her bid after withering GOP criticism over the deadly attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Libya. Though different in substance, the controversy over Rice’s remarks is not unlike the current pushback over Hagel’s past foreign policy positions and controversial remarks. But Hagel lacks a natural constituency in the Senate, given that he’s grown alienated from the GOP, yet Democrats are suspicious of his record. “It is a strange signal for the White House to send that they are willing to fight for Hagel but not Rice,” one Senate Democratic aide said Sunday. “Democrats are not currently unified behind Hagel, and it will take some real work by the administration to get them there, if it’s even possible.” Senior Republicans agreed, noting that after Hagel infuriated Republicans and Democrats alike over the years, there isn’t a natural base for him. “I can’t imagine why [Obama] would choose to burn his political capital on this nomination. For what? There is no constituency for Chuck Hagel,” one senior GOP aide said. “Obama will expend every ounce of political capital he has to get him across the finish line. Dems will hate this.”

#### Hagel confirmation prevents Iran war --- leads to peaceful negotiations.

**Barnes**, **1/8**/2013 (Diana, Hagel Pick Could Signal U.S. Policy Shift on Iran, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/hagel-pick-could-signal-u-s-policy-shift-on-iran-20130108)

Washington and Tehran have been "inching towards a confrontation" as the United States has sought to pressure Iran through isolation and covert action, said Hossein Mousavian, a one-time spokesman for Iran's nuclear negotiating team. However, the nomination of former Republican Senator Chuck Hagel (Neb.) could create "an opportunity to bring a peaceful solution to the Iranian nuclear dilemma" if the Senate confirms his nomination to the top Pentagon post and the designation of Senator John Kerry (D-Mass.) to become the next secretary of State, the former envoy told Global Security Newswire.

#### Iran strikes escalates to a nuclear world war

**Chossudovsky**, 12/26/**2011** (Michel, Preparing to attack Iran with Nuclear Weapons, Global Research, p. <http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28355>)

An attack on Iran would have devastating consequences, It would unleash an all out regional war from the Eastern Mediterranean to Central Asia, potentially leading humanity into a World War III Scenario. The Obama Administration constitutes a nuclear threat. NATO constitutes a nuclear threat Five European "non-nuclear states" (Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey) with tactical nuclear weapons deployed under national command, to be used against Iran constitute a nuclear threat. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu not only constitutes a nuclear threat, but also a threat to the security of people of Israel, who are misled regarding the implications of an US-Israeli attack on Iran. The complacency of Western public opinion --including segments of the US anti-war movement-- is disturbing. No concern has been expressed at the political level as to the likely consequences of a US-NATO-Israel attack on Iran, using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state. Such an action would result in "the unthinkable": a nuclear holocaust [catastrophe] over a large part of the Middle East.

### 1NC - CP

#### Text: the fifty state governments of the United States should substantially increase the available funding for the nuclear loan guarantee program.

#### States solves upfront capital costs of nuclear power

Yanosek 12 (Kassia, Entrepreneur-in-Residence – Stanford University’s Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance, “Financing Nuclear Power in the US,” Stanford Energy Journal, Spring, <http://energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Financing_Nuclear_Power_by_Kassia_Yanosek>)

Furthermore, capital costs are inherently high, ranging in the billions or tens of billions of dollars, and are compounded by financing charges during long construction times. Without government support, financing nuclear is currently not possible in the capital markets. Recently, Constellation Energy and NRG separately pulled the plug on new multi-billion dollar plants, citing financing problems. Projects, however, will get done on a one-off basis. Southern Company’s Vogtle Plant in Eastern Georgia is likely to be the sponsor of the first new generation to be constructed, taking advantage of local regulatory and federal support. Two new reactors of next-generation technology are in the permitting stage, which will bring online 2,200 megawatts (MW) of new capacity, and will cost $14 billion. The project will take advantage of tax credits and loan guarantees provided in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. What is the ideal financial structure for funding new nuclear generation? The simplest answer is “through the rate base.” This is typically accomplished by state-level legislation which allows utilities to pass the construction costs through to the ratepayers. The ideal mechanism, which exists in a few states, allows the utility to raise rates during plant construction and adjust rates periodically for delays or cost overruns. However, this structure is not possible in most markets. California, for example, has a moratorium where utilities are not legislatively authorized to recover rates for nuclear development. And even with a regulated territory, utilities often require additional financing to raise sufficient up-front funds for construction or to mitigate risks in markets where cost recovery through the rate base is not assured. Another option, which could be a complementary solution, is a project finance model, in which debt is raised at the project level and backstopped by long-term contracts with creditworthy parties. Even this would be complex, since project financing would require finding a suite of investors willing to take on the different risk/return profiles that exist at different stages of the project. In addition, federal and/or state-based financial support designed specifically for nuclear would still be critical.

#### And – the signal is the same

Bickers 8 (Richard, Editor – NPO, quarterly journal published by the Nuclear Energy Institute, “The Trickle-Up Effect,” Nuclear Policy Outlook, Second Quarter, [www.nei.org/filefolder/Outlook\_June.pdf](http://www.nei.org/filefolder/Outlook_June.pdf))

States Put Singular Stamp on Energy Policy—With National Implications Spurred by federal legislation and public concern about energy costs, electricity supply and environmental issues, the pace of state and local government activity on energy policy in general— and nuclear power in particular—has skyrocketed in the past few years. Energy, environmental and economic concerns are coalescing, and states are taking action. “For most people, the federal government seems too removed from their daily lives,” said Del. Sally Jameson (D), a member of the Maryland House of Delegates since 2003. Her district straddles the nation’s capital and Calvert County, Md., home to Constellation Energy’s Calvert Cliffs nuclear plant. “Most people look to the state for policy. They know us one-on-one and state policy directly affects their lives. “The federal government is so huge that they believe they will get lost in it. At the state level,” she noted, “their voices are heard.” Looking to the future, the United States must maintain at least the current 30 percent share of non-emitting electric generating capacity if it is to meet its clean-air goals. Even with conservative assumptions about increases in electricity demand and a doubling of renewable energy production, the United States faces a challenge to maintain its current proportion of carbon-free electricity production. A substantial increase in nuclear energy is essential. The Energy Policy Act of 2005, which incorporated a wide range of measures to support current nuclear plants and provided important incentives for building new nuclear plants, reflects a national commitment to carbon-free energy sources. The legislation includes investment incentives to encourage construction of new nuclear plants, including production tax credits, loan guarantees and business risk protection for companies pursuing the first new reactors. Now, states are linking environment and energy in the policy calculus. “The view is that when the federal government isn’t taking the lead, the legislatures need to step up to the plate,” said Melissa Savage, program director for the Agriculture, Energy and Environmental Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). States are “repealing moratoriums, holding committee session study hearings, looking at changing regulations, and just getting the conversation started in some cases,” she noted. “We’re facing a pretty critical energy crunch in the country. The issue is starting to bubble back up,” Savage said. “In some states, it never went away.” Ten states have passed policies instituting some form of cost recovery assurance for nuclear plant construction. Three states have introduced and one has passed legislation requiring that nuclear energy be included in some form of clean or alternative energy portfolio. Six of the 13 states with moratoriums preventing new nuclear plants are considering removing those bans. Two states have passed local tax incentives for nuclear plants. For Maryland’s Jameson, the link between environmental and energy policy is a driving factor in policy formulation. “We are nearly surrounded by water in Maryland,” she said, pointing to the Chesapeake Bay, Atlantic Ocean and a network of rivers. “We are doing everything we can to limit harm to our waterways and environment because of climate change and global warming.” The state has taken a “fairly proactive approach” to addressing both environmental and energy issues in the face of a Maryland Public Service Commission warning that electricity customers could face power restrictions or rolling blackouts as early as 2011, she said. STATES AS POLICY LABORATORIES “It is one of the happy incidents of the federal system that a single courageous state may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country,” Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis wrote in 1932. Historically, state and local governments have led the way on issues as varied as child labor, the environment and social reform. And state governments indeed are serving as laboratories in the development of policy supporting nuclear energy. One such policy is the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, or RGGI, a cooperative effort by 10 Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Participating states have agreed to implement RGGI through a regional cap-andtrade program whereby participating states anticipate auctioning nearly the entire annual regional emissions budget, approximately 188 million tons of carbon dioxide. Each ton of carbon dioxide will constitute an “allowance.” The multi-state agreement treats all carbon-free sources of electricity, such as nuclear energy and renewables, equally in the framework for awarding monetary credits for greenhouse gas reduction. The RGGI states have agreed to participate in regional auctions for the allowances, beginning this September. Officials have scheduled a second auction in December.

### 1NC – K

#### Revealing the world as threats to national security naturalizes the instrumentalization of Beings and warfare – makes war and intervention inevitable

**Burke 7** (Anthony Burke- Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at UNSW, Sydney, Ontologies of War: Violence, Existence and Reason, Theory & Event - Volume 10, Issue 2, 2007)

The epistemology of violence I describe here (strategic science and foreign policy doctrine) claims positivistic clarity about techniques of military and geopolitical action which use force and coercion to achieve a desired end, an end that is supplied by the ontological claim to national existence, security, or order. However in practice, technique quickly passes into ontology. This it does in two ways. First, instrumental violence is married to an ontology of insecure national existence which itself admits no questioning. The nation and its identity are known and essential, prior to any conflict, and the resort to violence becomes an equally essential predicate of its perpetuation. In this way knowledge-as-strategy claims, in a positivistic fashion, to achieve a calculability of effects (power) for an ultimate purpose (securing being) that it must always assume. Second, strategy as a technique not merely becomes an instrument of state power but ontologises itself in a technological image of 'man' as a maker and user of things, including other humans, which have no essence or integrity outside their value as objects. In Heidegger's terms, technology becomes being; epistemology immediately becomes technique, immediately being. This combination could be seen in the aftermath of the 2006 Lebanon war, whose obvious strategic failure for Israelis generated fierce attacks on the army and political leadership and forced the resignation of the IDF chief of staff. Yet in its wake neither ontology was rethought. Consider how a reserve soldier, while on brigade-sized manoeuvres in the Golan Heights in early 2007, was quoted as saying: 'we are ready for the next war'. Uri Avnery quoted Israeli commentators explaining the rationale for such a war as being to 'eradicate the shame and restore to the army the "deterrent power" that was lost on the battlefields of that unfortunate war'. In 'Israeli public discourse', he remarked, 'the next war is seen as a natural phenomenon, like tomorrow's sunrise.' The danger obviously raised here is that these dual ontologies of war link being, means, events and decisions into a single, unbroken chain whose very process of construction cannot be examined. As is clear in the work of Carl Schmitt, being implies action, the action that is war. This chain is also obviously at work in the U.S. neoconservative doctrine that argues, as Bush did in his 2002 West Point speech, that 'the only path to safety is the path of action', which begs the question of whether strategic practice and theory can be detached from strong ontologies of the insecure nation-state. This is the direction taken by much realist analysis critical of Israel and the Bush administration's 'war on terror'. Reframing such concerns in Foucauldian terms, we could argue that obsessive ontological commitments have led to especially disturbing 'problematizations' of truth. However such rationalist critiques rely on a one-sided interpretation of Clausewitz that seeks to disentangle strategic from existential reason, and to open up choice in that way. However without interrogating more deeply how they form a conceptual harmony in Clausewitz's thought -- and thus in our dominant understandings of politics and war -- tragically violent 'choices' will continue to be made. The essay concludes by pondering a normative problem that arises out of its analysis: if the divisive ontology of the national security state and the violent and instrumental vision of 'enframing' have, as Heidegger suggests, come to define being and drive 'out every other possibility of revealing being', how can they be escaped? How can other choices and alternatives be found and enacted? How is there any scope for agency and resistance in the face of them? Their social and discursive power -- one that aims to take up the entire space of the political -- needs to be respected and understood. However, we are far from powerless in the face of them. The need is to critique dominant images of political being and dominant ways of securing that being at the same time, and to act and choose such that we bring into the world a more sustainable, peaceful and non-violent global rule of the political.

#### Altenative – reject the affirmative’s security discourse – only resistance can generate genuine political thought

Neoclous 8 – Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, 2008 [Critique of Security, 185-6]

The only way out of such a dilemma, to escape the fetish, is perhaps to eschew the logic of security altogether - to reject it as so ideologically loaded in favour of the state that any real political thought other than the authoritarian and reactionary should be pressed to give it up. That is clearly something that can not be achieved within the limits of bourgeois thought and thus could never even begin to be imagined by the security intellectual. It is also something that the constant iteration of the refrain 'this is an insecure world' and reiteration of one fear, anxiety and insecurity after another will also make it hard to do. But it is something that the critique of security suggests we may have to consider if we want a political way out of the impasse of security. This impasse exists because security has now become so all-encompassing that it marginalises all else, most notably the constructive conflicts, debatesand discussionsthat animate political life. The constant prioritising of a mythical security as a political end - as the political end constitutes a rejection of politics in any meaningful sense of the term. That is, as a mode of action in which differences can be articulated, in which the conflicts and struggles that arise from such differences can be fought for and negotiated, in which people might come to believe that another world is possible - that they might transform the world and in turn be transformed. Security politics simply removes this; worse, it remoeves it while purportedly addressing it. In so doing it suppresses all issues of power and turns political questions into debates about the most efficient way to achieve 'security', despite the fact that we are never quite told - never could be told - what might count as having achieved it. Security politics is, in this sense, an anti-politics,"' dominating political discourse in much the same manner as the security state tries to dominate human beings, reinforcing security fetishism and the monopolistic character of security on the political imagination. We therefore need to get beyond security politics, not add yet more 'sectors' to it in a way that simply expands the scope of the state and legitimises state intervention in yet more and more areas of our lives. Simon Dalby reports a personal communication with Michael Williams, co-editor of the important text Critical Security Studies, in which the latter asks: if you take away security, what do you put in the hole that's left behind? But I'm inclined to agree with Dalby: maybe there is no hole."' The mistake has been to think that there is a hole and that this hole needs to be filled with a new vision or revision of security in which it is re-mapped or civilised or gendered or humanised or expanded or whatever. All of these ultimately remain within the statist political imaginary, and consequently end up reaffirming the state as the terrain of modern politics, the grounds of security. The real task is not to fill the supposed hole with yet another vision of security, but to fight for an alternative political language which takes us beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois security and which therefore does not constantly throw us into the arms of the state. That's the point of critical politics: to develop a new political language more adequate to the kind of society we want. Thus while much of what I have said here has been of a negative order, part of the tradition of critical theory is that the negative may be as significant as the positive in setting thought on new paths. For if security really is the supreme concept of bourgeois society and the fundamental thematic of liberalism, then to keep harping on about insecurity and to keep demanding 'more security' (while meekly hoping that this increased security doesn't damage our liberty) is to blind ourselves to the possibility of building real alternatives to the authoritarian tendencies in contemporary politics. To situate ourselves against security politics would allow us to circumvent the debilitating effect achieved through the constant securitising of social and political issues, debilitating in the sense that 'security' helps consolidate the power of the existing forms of social domination and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms. It would also allow us to forge another kind of politics centred on a different conception of the good. We need a new way of thinking and talking about social being and politics that moves us beyond security. This would perhaps be emancipatory in the true sense of the word. What this might mean, precisely, must be open to debate. But it certainly requires recognising that security is an illusion that has forgotten it is an illusion; it requires recognising that security is not the same as solidarity; it requires accepting that insecurity is part of the human condition, and thus giving up the search for the certainty of security and instead learning to tolerate the uncertainties, ambiguities and 'insecurities' that come with being human; it requires accepting that 'securitizing' an issue does not mean dealing with it politically, but bracketing it out and handing it to the state; it requires us to be brave enough to return the gift."'

### 1NC – DA

#### Renewables are competitive now

**Tickell, 8/20**/12 – British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative (Oliver, “Does the world need nuclear power to solve the climate crisis?” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/20/world-need-nuclear-power-climate-crisis>)

However, non-hydro renewables are growing very fast – up 15% in 2010. And within this figure just three power sources are responsible for most of the growth: wind power, solar PV and solar hot water. From 2005 to 2010, global solar hot water and wind power capacity both grew at 25% per year, while solar PV capacity grew at over 50% per year. If these growth rates were to be sustained for 35 years, wind capacity would rise 6,300-fold from 200 gigawatts (GW) in 2010 to about 1.25 million GW, solar hot water 6,300-fold from 185 GW to 1.15 million GW, and solar PV 40 million-fold from 40 GW to 1.6 billion GW. These figures are not predictions. Exponential growth will not continue for so long, as prime sites for wind turbines and solar panels get used up. Other technologies, such as concentrated solar power, will also become important. And there will be demand-side constraints: the projected 1.6 billion GW of solar PV capacity alone would produce over 3 billion billion kilowatt hours per year, equivalent to a primary energy burn of some 30 million Mtoe – over 1,000 times our projected world primary energy demand in 35 years. We would not even know what to do with so much energy. But while not predictive, the figures are highly indicative of the low-carbon energy choices the world should make. The one, nuclear power, is expensive and becoming more so. It will be a practical impossibility to increase its capacity to a scale big enough to make a real difference to global climate within a realistic time frame. Worse, if we were somehow to build our 11,000 nuclear reactors, we would face the certainty of repeated catastrophic accidents and the spread of nuclear weapons, not to mention unimaginable liabilities for decommissioning and long-term nuclear-waste management. We can fairly say that nuclear power is both repulsive and utterly wrong. The other choice, renewable power, already costs less than fossil fuels for many applications, thanks in large part to generous subsidies in Germany, Japan and other countries, which have had the effect of greatly reducing prices. Solar electricity is now cheaper than power from diesel generators in the tropics and subtropics – and so the rapid spread of solar power across China, India, Africa and Latin America is being driven not by subsidy but by the market. And it is getting cheaper all the time as increased demand, caused by its lower price, stimulates greater competition among manufacturers, technological advance, and even greater price falls, in a delightful virtuous circle. Moreover, renewable energy is free of catastrophic dangers and long- term liabilities. It is both romantic and right.

#### Loan guarantees wipe out the incentive to invest in renewables

**Slocum, 12** – director of Public Citizen’s Energy Program, expert in issues dealing with regulation and deregulation of energy markets, the impact of mergers and lax regulations over electricity, petroleum, and natural gas, and federal energy legislation (Tyson, 2/3. “We Can't Afford to Expand Nuclear Power.” http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/should-nuclear-power-be-expanded/we-cant-afford-to-expand-nuclear-power)

In recent years, industry-driven legislative efforts—most notably the sweep of incentives for nuclear power in the 2005 Energy Policy Act—have been implemented to jump-start the nuclear industry, but even that mountain of money and regulatory rollbacks can't do the impossible: build a nuclear power plant affordably, safely, or timely and find a solution to the thousands of tons of highly radioactive waste. From loan guarantees to charging ratepayers up front for the cost of construction, to liability protections from Fukushima-style accidents, the industry has been unable to bring a new reactor online. Why? Because even with all this taxpayer help, it's still too costly. Photovoltaic solar this year will break the dollar-per-watt barrier, ushering in a rooftop revolution of cheap, clean, and consumer-owned energy. In addition to turning our buildings into power stations, investing in making our structures more energy-efficient remains the most cost-effective energy investment. Energy-efficiency programs can displace 23 percent of projected demand and provide a huge return for consumers. Charging taxpayers billions of dollars to bring a new reactor online wipes out any incentives to invest in these programs and suppresses local renewable projects that could bring green jobs and advance U.S. leadership in clean energy technology.

#### Renewables solve extinction

Wood 10 (Duncan, Director – Program in International Relations and Canadian Studies Program – Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, “Environment, Development and Growth: U.S.-Mexico Cooperation in Renewable Energies,” Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars – Mexico Institute, May, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/U.S.%20Mexico%20Cooperation%20in%20Renewable%20Energies.pdf)

It is by now common knowledge that the world is facing a climate change crisis caused by the effects of fossil fuel driven industrialization. A significant rise in global temperatures, combined with more severe weather conditions, more frequent floods and droughts, are bringing a paradigm shift to the way we think about our relationship with the planet. For the first time in over 150 years policy makers are thinking seriously about decreasing dependency on fossil fuels and looking for alternatives that may be more expensive in the short and medium terms, but ultimately more sustainable. 7 All of this has happened at the same time as two other, related phenomena. The first is that the global population is reaching new highs and by 2040‐50 will total over 9 billion people. Experts predict that 85% of the world’s population will be located in the developing world, which will mean a rapidly growing demand for goods and for energy. Both of these factors will result in a need to increase energy efficiency as well as find new sources of energy. What’s more, this massive jump in population will coincide not only with climate change but also with increasingly difficult conditions for hydrocarbons exploration and production. As most of the world’s “easy” oil has already been discovered, oil companies and nation states are turning to alternatives such a non‐conventional oil reserves (tar sands, complex fields) and reserves that in the past would have been considered unrecoverable, such as in very deep ocean waters. Furthermore, political conditions in many of the world’s oil rich regions are uncertain, unstable and often unfriendly to private oil companies and to the countries of the West. Climate change and natural disasters The urgency of finding alternatives to fossil fuels has been confirmed in recent years by mounting scientific evidence that we are undergoing a noticeable **anthropogenic shift** in the world’s weather and temperature. Not only are a range of indicators showing that the planet is warming, but the retreat of the polar ice caps, the melting of glaciers, and most importantly in the short term extreme weather conditions and increased incidence of natural disasters have highlighted the consequences of maintaining the status quo in our patterns of energy consumption and industrial development. It is estimated that we have experienced a 1 degree Celsius rise in global temperatures over the past 100 years and that by the end of the current century global temperatures may have risen by as much 7 or 8 degrees. Even with the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions that is contemplated by the most ambitious mitigation strategies, global temperatures may rise by as much as 6%. This would have a dramatic and disastrous impact on both developed and developing nations and will **threaten the existence of both humans and animal and plant species**. Though the connection between man‐made greenhouse gases and global warming was denied for many years by industry and governments alike, it has now been accepted that something must be done to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases released into the atmosphere. Given that 86% of all global energy comes from fossil fuels, and that these fossil fuels produce 27,000,000,000 tons of CO2 emissions annually, finding alternative sources of energy is a crucial component of climate change mitigation strategies.

### 1NC – China

#### Obama already announced loan guarantees, so it’s already challenging China

#### Asian war is unlikely --- regional initiatives check

Bitzinger and Desker ‘8 (senior fellow and dean of S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies respectively (Richard A. Bitzinger, Barry Desker, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December 2008, http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328\_731200556\_906256449.pdf)

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnationa terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints**. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect**. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common eopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

#### No US-China war – economics

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, “Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?”, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

**While the United States no longer dominates** the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, **it still is the leading economic power in the world**. **However**, **over the last few decades China**, with all its internal contradictions, **has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot**. In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, **a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors**. [5] On the other hand, **China is also the** largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. **This may be one of the reasons** mitigating full-blown conflict **with the U.S. now**, since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

#### Chinese influence isn’t zero-sum with the west – shared regional values mitigate the risk of conflict

Bitzinger and Desker 8 (Richard A. and Barry, Senior Fellow and Dean – S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December)

The argument that there is an emerging Beijing Consensus is not premised on the rise of the East and decline of the West, as sometimes seemed to be the sub-text of the earlier Asian-values debate.7 However, like the earlier debate, the new one reflects alternative philosophical traditions. The issue is the appropriate balance between the rights of the individual and those of the state. This emerging debate will highlight the shared identity and values of China and the other states in the region, even if conventional realist analysts join John Mearsheimer to suggest that it will result in ‘intense security competition with considerable potential for war’ in which most of China’s neighbours ‘will join with the United States to contain China’s power’.8 These shared values are likely to reduce the risk of conflict and result in regional pressure for an accommodation of and engagement with an emerging China, rather than confrontation.

#### Deterrence checks indo-pak

Giorgio et al 10 (Maia Juel, Tina Søndergaard Madsen, Jakob Wigersma, Mark Westh, “Nuclear Deterrence in South Asia: An Assessment of Deterrence and Stability in the Indian – Pakistan Conflict,” Global Studies, Autumn, http://dspace.ruc.dk/bitstream/1800/6041/1/Project%20GS-BA%2c%20Autumn%202010.pdf)

To what extent has nuclear deterrence enhanced stability in the India-Pakistan conflict? Recalling the logical structure of the paper, we here wish to reconcile the three analyses and offer a coherent synthesis of the results in relation to the research question. In order to gather the threads it is beneficial to shortly reflect upon the main results of the three analyses. Firstly, the aim with the thesis was to explore if there is nuclear deterrence between India and Pakistan, based upon Waltz three requirements. After having undertaken this analysis, we can conclude that Waltz’s requirements for effective nuclear deterrence are in fact fulfilled in both countries. Thus, from a neorealist perspective, is it then possible to deduce that stability reigns between India and Pakistan as a result of nuclear deterrence? Taking a point of departure in neorealist assumptions and nuclear deterrence theory, there is indeed stability between India and Pakistan, as no major war has taken place between the countries, and more importantly, nuclear war has been avoided. Nuclear deterrence has thus been successful in creating stability on a higher structural level.

US hegemony will guarantee US-Sino conflict with flashpoints across Asia

Layne 12 [Christopher Layne is the Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University and Research Fellow with the Center on Peace and Liberty at The Independent Institute, “The Global Power Shift from West to East”, April 25th, 2012, <http://nationalinterest.org/article/the-global-power-shift-west-east-6796>, Chetan]

Certainly, the Chinese have not forgotten. Now **Beijing aims to dominate its own** East and Southeast Asian **backyard,** just as a rising America sought to dominate the Western Hemisphere a century and a half ago. **The United States and China now are competing for supremacy in East and Southeast Asia**. Washington has been the incumbent hegemon there since World War II, and many in the American foreign-policy establishment view China’s quest for regional hegemony as a threat that must be resisted. **This contest for regional dominance is fueling escalating tensions and possibly could lead to war**. In geopolitics, **two great powers cannot simultaneously be hegemonic in the same region. Unless one of them abandons its aspirations, there is a high probability of hostilities. Flashpoints that could spark a Sino-American conflict include the** **unstable Korean Peninsula; the disputed status of Taiwan; competition for control of oil and other natural resources; and the burgeoning naval rivalry between the two powers.**

#### Intervention’s not inevitable

Kupchan 11 [Charles A Kupchan is a professor of international affairs at Georgetown University and Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. “The false promise of unipolarity: constraints on the exercise of American power”, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 24:2, 165-173 – June2011, Chetan]

The challenge in this decade, however, may be not too much US power and resolve, but an unsteady America that grows weary of the burdens of unipolarity. Brooks and Wohlforth assume that the United States will as a matter of course continue to deploy its preponderant power on a global basis; the unipole will automatically defend unipolarity. But in the aftermath of the draining wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the economic duress and ballooning deficits associated with the global financial crisis, the United States may lose some of its enthusiasm for serving as the global guardian of last resort. Democrats and Republicans are divided on issues ranging from the war in Afghanistan to climate change to arms control. If a political compromise is to be struck, it may well entail fashioning a more modest and less costly strategy of retrenchment (Kupchan and Trubowitz 2007b). At a minimum, US grand strategy may swing between stark alternatives depending upon which party is in power. In broad terms, the Republicans favour the use of force and shun institutionalized multilateralism. Meanwhile, the Democrats favour multilateralism and engagement rather than the exercise of force. Even if unipolarity persists, its international effects may be overridden by the unpredictable choices Americans may make about when and how to deploy their national power.

### 1NC – Economy

#### Nuclear can’t compete – market forces inevitably overwhelm the aff

Williams, 12/18/12 – worked in the nuclear power industry for over 20 years (Glenn S.K., “The Nation's Nuclear Plants Are Nuked.” http://energy.aol.com/2012/12/18/the-nation-s-nuclear-plants-are-nuked/)

While the nation has been focused on new sources of natural gas and shale oil, few noticed the slow decline of an older energy source, nuclear power. Today, commercial nuclear power is struggling to stay in the game. The power markets are hammering the nation's nukes. Over a decade ago, several regions decided to create Regional Transmission Organizations (or Independent System Operators) and use the market to set power prices. Today, North America has ten independent RTOs/ISOs, where wholesale power is auctioned every few minutes. Power auctions are about energy, not power plants. Auctions don't care how power plants produce energy; they only care about the bid. The primary focus is on the last bid that clears the auction; it sets the price for all participants. That's why the last bid is called the market-clearing price. The difference between the market-clearing price and the generator's production cost is the gross margin. The last bid is technically on the margin and it earns little to no gross margin. But every dollar above production costs contributes towards the generator's fixed costs. Most nuclear units are "must run plants" and they will produce power even if market-clearing prices fall below production costs. Recently, some nuclear plants have been booking negative gross margins. They hope they can make up losses with subsequent gains and average a gross margin. A gross margin is not always enough. Nuclear units must pay all their bills and leave something for shareholders. Recently, some nuclear units are achieving modest gross margins, but not enough left to pay all the bills or achieve any earnings. Just ask Dominion Resources. They recently announced the retirement of their Wisconsin nuclear plant 20 years early. Dominion claims they sought buyers for their Kewaunee Power Station. None could be found. It appears that not only did Dominion conclude their nuclear plant would remain unprofitable; Dominion's competitors concurred. It turns out that Kewaunee is located near NextEra Energy's Point Beach Nuclear Plant. Point Beach operates in the same market and shares a similar design. It would seem that Point Beach must be as economically challenged as Kewaunee. It's likely because the nation's largest fleet of nuclear power plants is operating nearby and they are financially challenged. Exelon owns 10 generating stations and 17 reactors, which are located in Illinois, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Altogether, these power plants are struggling to provide their owners with earnings to the point where Exelon's management warned shareholders they might be forced to cut dividends. A Different Picture in Regulated States, but Challenges Remain Nuclear plants operating in regulated states are faring better. While consumers' demand for electric power is down, nuclear power plants are safely embedded in states' rate bases. Owners of regulated nuclear assets are protected, up to a point. Two nuclear power stations are finding their state regulators are losing patience. One is Duke Energy's Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant operating near Tampa, Florida. The other is Edison International's San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station operating in Southern California. Both stations are experiencing unusual and costly maintenance expenses. Crystal River's containment repairs could exceed $2 billion, a price that state regulators may find excessive. San Onofre also incurred unexpected and costly maintenance challenges. But San Onofre's 2,350 megawatts is a critical resource for Southern California and without that resources California could see rolling blackouts. Nevertheless, San Onofre's headaches provide new opportunities for opposition groups to pressure regulators and political leaders. San Onofre could survive, but it is at risk of early retirement. Entergy is at war with two states at the same time. Vermont wants Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station to retire 20 years early. Politicians and regulators are fighting with everything they have to prevent Entergy from continuing nuclear operations. The State of New York wants Entergy's Indian Point to retire 20 years early and they are vowing a fight to prevent further operations. Governor Cuomo believes the state can import enough power from Canada to provide them with enough power to assure regional reliability. But in the case of New York City, existing transmission lines are inadequate and they are constrained. New lines will be needed to deliver Canadian power to the energy hungry city. New Jersey regulators already negotiated the early retirement of Exelon's Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. Oyster Creek is 630-megawatt facility and it will go on the scrap heap ten years early in 2019. A pattern is developing. It may take a few years, but it appears small nuclear plants will face increasing pressure to retire early. They cannot compete, particularly in soft markets. Some plants will find their costs consistently exceed any benefits they earn and their owners will be forced to retire and dismember plants. Natural gas may replace retiring nuclear plants. New turbine technologies and low fuel costs allow some gas turbines to outperform nuclear power plants. But it is unlikely fuel prices will remain low for the next 60 years, the design life of a new nuclear unit.

#### Natural gas prices prevents nuke solvency

**Kitazume, 12** – staff writer for the Japan Times (Takashi, 7/17. “Global demand for nuclear power remains high.” http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nb20120717d1.html#.UAiQIDFSQ10)

Still, construction of new reactors in the U.S. faces an uphill battle, "but not because of Fukushima," Nakano observed. "Given the current serious deficit issues the government has, it is unlikely that the federal loan guarantee would be sustained at a strong level in the next couple of administrations, whoever gets elected," she said. The price of natural gas — a major competitor to nuclear power in the U.S. energy mix — has come down quite sharply in recent months, Nakano said. And current debate in Congress suggests that there is "very little chance for the U.S. to have either cap-and-trade or carbon tax" plans to cut carbon dioxide emissions for at least the coming decade, and without these mechanisms in place, "nuclear power will have a harder time economically vis-a-vis natural gas," she observed. Out of the 104 nuclear reactors in operation in the U.S. today, the operational life of 50 has so far been extended to 60 years. But there are movements in some states to reconsider the life extension of reactors beyond 40 years, and if there are no additional life extensions, "about one-third of nuclear power generation capacity will disappear in the U.S. by 2035," she said, adding that that is a "possibility given the low price of natural gas."

#### New loan guarantees ensure taxpayer bailouts

Frumhoff, 9 – director of science and policy and chief scientist for the Climate and Energy Program at UCS, member of the Nobel Prize-winning U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Peter, 3/4. “Massive Federal Loan Guarantees for New Nuclear Power Plants Would Put Taxpayers, Ratepayers at Risk.” <http://www.ucsusa.org/news/press_release/federal-loan-guarantees-0204.html>)

Bailout estimates for failed projects could range from hundreds of billions to more than a trillion The nuclear power industry is pressuring Congress to dramatically expand federal loan guarantees for building new plants, which would put taxpayers and ratepayers at significant financial risk, according to a report released today by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS). Congress already has authorized $60 billion for loan guarantees in which the federal government would shield utilities and private investment firms from the risk of default on loans for building new electricity generation plants. The Department of Energy (DOE) has allocated $18.5 billion of that money for new nuclear plants over the next few years. Given the average projected cost of building one reactor is currently $9 billion, the industry is clamoring for considerably more. To date, the DOE has received $122 billion in applications for loan guarantees for new nuclear power plants. The report, "Nuclear Loan Guarantees: Another Taxpayer Bailout Ahead?," recounts the nuclear industry's disastrous financial history and documents the hundreds of billions of dollars taxpayers and ratepayers already have spent to keep the industry afloat. (For more, go to our Nuclear Bailout Report.) "Taxpayers and ratepayers have been forced to bail out the nuclear power industry twice in the past 30 years, and if Congress gives the industry the massive loan guarantees it wants, we likely will have to cough up hundreds of billions of dollars to do it yet again," said Ellen Vancko, the nuclear energy and climate change project manager at UCS, which commissioned the report. "The industry has gone from promising electricity 'too cheap to meter' to being too costly to consider." The first bailout occurred after the industry abandoned some 100 plants in the 1970s and 1980s when construction costs skyrocketed and growth in electricity demand slowed. The result was what Forbes magazine in 1985 called "the largest managerial disaster in business history." Taxpayers and ratepayers covered most of the more than $40 billion (in today's dollars) for the abandoned plants, while ratepayers had to pay more than $200 billion to cover cost overruns for plants that were completed. The second bailout came in the 1990s, when states restructured the electric industry to reduce regulation and increase competition in generation markets. As part of that restructuring, utilities were allowed to charge their ratepayers for "stranded costs"—the difference between the book value of the plants and the lower market value they were worth at the time. As a result, ratepayers were forced to pay more than $40 billion in stranded costs. Given the industry's record, Wall Street firms have publicly stated that they will not invest in new nuclear power plants without federal loan guarantees. Utility executives also have said they will not place their companies at risk by financing new nuclear plant construction. They would rather place that risk on taxpayers. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimates that the average risk of default for a federal loan guarantee for the nuclear industry is 50 percent. UCS's report estimates that the potential risk for guaranteeing nuclear plant construction loans ranges from $360 billion—based on current cost estimates for the 100 new plants needed to replace current plants by 2040—to as much as $1.6 trillion based on 300 plants (with 50 percent higher costs) that some in the industry have proposed building. "The potential cost of a third public bailout would make the first two look like chump change," said Vancko. "Congress should think twice about pushing the industry to invest in plants that Wall Street and even the industry itself say are too risky to finance on their own."

#### That hurts every part of the economy

Carroll and Prante, 12 – executive-in-residence with American University’s School of Public Affairs and co-founder and co-director of the University’s Center for Public Finance Research; and senior economist at the Tax Foundation (Robert and Gerald, July. Long-run macroeconomic impact of increasing tax rates on high-income taxpayers in 2013.” <http://majorityleader.gov/uploadedfiles/Ernst_And_Young_Study_July_2012.pdf>)

Through lower after-tax rewards to work, the higher tax rates on wages reduce work effort and labor force participation. The higher tax rates on capital gains and dividend increase the cost of equity capital, which discourages savings and reduces investment. Capital investment falls, which reduces labor productivity and means lower output and living standards in the long-run.¶  Output in the long-run would fall by 1.3%, or $200 billion, in today’s economy.¶  Employment in the long-run would fall by 0.5% or, roughly 710,000 fewer jobs, in today’s economy.¶  Capital stock and investment in the long-run would fall by 1.4% and 2.4%, respectively.¶  Real after-tax wages would fall by 1.8%, reflecting a decline in workers living standards relative to what would have occurred otherwise.¶ These results suggest real long-run economic consequences for allowing the top two ordinary tax rates and investment tax rates to rise in 2013. This policy path can be expected to reduce long-run output, investment and net worth.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

**Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature.** In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that **the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad**. Similarly, **Fordham** (1998a, 1998b), **DeRouen** (1995), **and** **Gowa** (1998) **find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force**. Furthermore, **Leeds and Davis** (1997) conclude **that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani** (2005) **and Russett and Oneal** (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. **These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise**. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

### 1NC – Asteroids Mining

#### Expansion of nuclear power prevents us from getting off the rock – uses up finite fissionable material

**Pwanson, 9** – software engineer (Saul, 1/29. “Why Nuclear Power Dooms Humanity to Extinction.” http://saulpwanson.com/2009/why-nuclear-power-dooms-humanity-to-extinction)

Recently, I discovered John McCarthy’s (creator of LISP) pages on sustainability that he’s been working on for many years. Prof. McCarthy is a proponent of using nuclear energy to achieve sustainability on this planet, and he has a lot of good information on his site. According to him, we’ll enjoy perhaps a billion years of sustainable energy with the nuclear fission available from materials on this planet. He also thinks conservation of energy (applying mental effort and resources to the reduction of energy consumption) is a huge mistake. I too think nuclear energy is an important energy source to explore, but I am not as “extremely optimistic” as Prof. McCarthy. Conservation of energy, particularly fissionable materials, is not a huge mistake. My argument is: The amount of fissionable nuclear material on the planet right now (and indeed, in the solar system) is the most there will ever be. Fissionable elements decay at a fixed rate, and new heavy elements are only created in a star’s death. Energy consumption has historically grown at a pace faster than population growth. In addition, cheap energy makes people optimize other (larger) economic factors. In other words, when gasoline prices are cheap and stable, people will move further from cities, where housing prices are cheaper, and consume more fuel in transportation between the city and themselves. This leads to energy consumption expanding to consume any additional supply. Space travel is widely recognized as the only infinite-horizon survival mechanism, for any life form (or: any life form that is confined to a single planet is doomed to extinction in the longest term). The more we understand about physics, the more we are certain that the theories of relativity are true. There don’t seem to be any shortcuts to getting around the universe; it just takes a huge amount of time and energy. The biggest misconception that most people have is exactly how much energy or time it would take to move a sustainable colony from the earth to another solar system (and no other planets in our solar system seem to be habitable). It is several orders of magnitude larger than traveling within our solar system, which is already almost prohibitive to do via chemical propulsion. Human interstellar travel using chemical energy is basically impossible. Well, nuclear fission has 10 million times (7 orders of magnitude) more energy than chemical reactions. The power and energy density in nuclear material makes it ideal as a portable long-distance fuel. Other energy conveyances for interstellar transport have been proposed, but every one is almost as ridiculous as using the LHC to construct our own personal wormhole. (Fusion has the capability to generate even more energy, and the materials are abundant, but it’s pretty much not going to work out for energy production either). The huge amount of energy required to get to another star in a “reasonable” amount of time (only hundreds of years) means that it’ll even take a fair amount of fission fuel. So, consuming nuclear fuel to satisfy our insatiable thirst for domestic energy may prevent us from ever leaving this planet. And our continuing disregard for the potential long-term effects of our short-term actions will very likely amplify those negative long-term effects. Nuclear haste makes nuclear waste. Don’t get me wrong: we absolutely need to continue developing fission technology, for both space travel and energy emergencies here on earth (heaven forbid the aliens come and we don’t have powerful enough lasers to destroy them). This development should go beyond theoretical research, to large-scale engineering and “field tests” that may as well be used as civilian energy sources. But to retool our civilization’s energy infrastructure to rely on “abundant” nuclear energy is a huge mistake: without active conservation, our consumption will grow to take advantage of as much energy as we can produce, we’ll be consuming a fuel that is absolutely finite, and that fuel won’t be available when the asteroid is 50 years away and we really do need to get off the planet. And that’s why abundant nuclear power ultimately dooms humanity to extinction.

#### The resources in asteroid mining is worth less than average dirt

Brak, Ronald, 2/6/06, Research scientist, The Great Mining Con,

<http://ronaldbrak.blogspot.com/2006/02/great-asteroid-mining-con.html>

There are some people who think that mining asteroids is a good idea. And not just for building things to use in space, but to ship metals to earth to sell. They say things like, “The metals in the near-earth iron asteroid Amun are worth 20 trillion dollars.” But is the current market value of metals the proper way to value an asteroid? Wouldn’t it make just as much sense to say that since I can buy meteorites for 25 cents a gram on e-bay, the market value of the asteroid is 25 cents per gram? And since it weighs 30 billion tons, therefore the asteroid is actually worth 7,500 trillion dollars? I mean that’s using the market price, isn’t it? And while these asteroid mining enthusiasts like to tell you how much money Amun is supposed to be worth, they never tell you how much a similar amount of earth dirt is worth. Well according to my calculations 30 billion tons of earth dirt is worth over $1,700,000,000,000,000. Which makes a ton of dirt worth about $57,000. Not bad, hey? Might be a good idea to run outside with a shovel. But wait a minute, you say! How can plain earth dirt be worth that much? Well it’s quite simple. You see 99.9999% pure silicon sells for about $200 per kilogram and the earth’s crust is 27.7% silicon. Of course it’s only worth that much after you have removed and purified the silicon. Before that the dirt is only worth as much as dirt. But counting an asteroid as being worth what it would be if all it’s substances were refined, purified and sold at today’s prices is pretty much just as stupid. To really test how much the asteroid is worth, let’s assume that there is a hole in the space-time continuum in your bedroom cupboard that not only allows instantaneous transportation of material from this asteroid, but it delivers it in conveniently sized chunks. Ignoring its novelty value, how much could you sell this asteroid material for on earth? Well the answer to that is simple. You could sell it for about $300 U.S. per ton because that’s what scrap metal sells for these days and an iron asteroid is basically a big chunk of stainless steel. The good news is there are plenty of scrap metal dealers around so you won’t have to lug it too far to trade it for cash. This means that But wait a minute! Some people say asteroids are supposed to be chock full of valuable metals such as platinum which currently sells for about $33 a gram! Couldn’t we just extract the platinum and forget about the steel? Well there are some problems with this. You see on earth there’s all sorts of geological activity, mostly involving water, that can concentrate ores and metals. But iron asteroids don’t have this activity. They’re just chunks of a busted planetoid’s core. As a result, precious metals aren’t going to be concentrated but are going to be evenly spread throughout the damn thing.

#### The plan takes forever- mining operations take years to prepare

**AAPG ’09** [American Association of Petroleum Geologists Energy Minerals Div. Uranium Committee, “Developing Industrial Minerals, Nuclear Minerals and Commodities of Interest via Off-World Exploration and Mining,”<http://www.searchanddiscovery.com/documents/2009/80067campbell/ndx_campbell.pdf>]

Identifying and mining nickel, cobalt, and a variety of other **commodities** that are in short supply on Earth, or those that **could be mined**, produced, and delivered **more cheaply in space than on Earth** could contribute to and drive the world‟s technology and associated economy to a scale never before contemplated. This is based, of course, on the assumption that the economics are favorable. **Large multi-national, quasi-governmental industrial groups are likely to develop over the next few decades** to handle projects of such magnitude, if they haven‟t already begun to assemble. In the beginning, the economics would likely be underwritten by governmental support, perhaps by a group of governments cooperating in funding and technology but followed later by some governments funding programs to accommodate their own particular self-interests. **Because long-term planning is a prerequisite to exploration and development in space, these programs will proceed step by step over the decades ahead as they make sense politically and economically within industry**. Although funding by the federal government has provided the basic research required to send probes to study the solar system as well as the early applied research in the Apollo Lunar program involving astronauts, in the decades ahead, **industry will likely assume the lead in ventures into space that are based solely on the perceived economic value to the corporations and their stockholders**.

Resource wars won’t happen

**Salehyan 07** assistant professor of political science at the University of North Texas [Idean Salehyan, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, August 2007, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3922>]

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters

### 1NC - Solvency

#### Loan guarantees don’t solve – costs too high

**Slocum, 12** – director of Public Citizen’s Energy Program, expert in issues dealing with regulation and deregulation of energy markets, the impact of mergers and lax regulations over electricity, petroleum, and natural gas, and federal energy legislation (Tyson, 2/3. “We Can't Afford to Expand Nuclear Power.” http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/should-nuclear-power-be-expanded/we-cant-afford-to-expand-nuclear-power)

In recent years, industry-driven legislative efforts—most notably the sweep of incentives for nuclear power in the 2005 Energy Policy Act—have been implemented to jump-start the nuclear industry, but even that mountain of money and regulatory rollbacks can't do the impossible: build a nuclear power plant affordably, safely, or timely and find a solution to the thousands of tons of highly radioactive waste. From loan guarantees to charging ratepayers up front for the cost of construction, to liability protections from Fukushima-style accidents, the industry has been unable to bring a new reactor online. Why? Because even with all this taxpayer help, it's still too costly. Photovoltaic solar this year will break the dollar-per-watt barrier, ushering in a rooftop revolution of cheap, clean, and consumer-owned energy. In addition to turning our buildings into power stations, investing in making our structures more energy-efficient remains the most cost-effective energy investment. Energy-efficiency programs can displace 23 percent of projected demand and provide a huge return for consumers. Charging taxpayers billions of dollars to bring a new reactor online wipes out any incentives to invest in these programs and suppresses local renewable projects that could bring green jobs and advance U.S. leadership in clean energy technology.

#### They’re factually wrong about loan guarantees – investors still have to pay upfront costs – deters investment

Gale et al 9 (Kelley Michael, Finance Department Chair – Latham & Watkins, “Financing the Nuclear Renaissance: The Benefits and Potential Pitfalls of Federal & State Government Subsidies and the Future of Nuclear Power in California,” Energy Law Journal, Vol. 30, p. 497-552, http://www.felj.org/docs/elj302/19gale-crowell-and-peace.pdf)

Much has been written on the DOE‘s loan guarantee program under the EPAct 2005, particularly in light of the changes to that program for renewable projects under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and as such we will not cover its ―nuts and bolts‖ in great detail. But generally speaking, the federal loan guarantee program applicable to nuclear projects authorizes the DOE to make guarantees of debt service under construction loans for up to eighty percent of the construction costs of new nuclear projects that will (1) avoid or reduce air pollutants and emissions of greenhouse gases, and (2) employ new or significantly improved technology to do so. 61 Several requirements must be met before the DOE can enter into a loan guarantee agreement. First, either an appropriation for the cost of the guarantee must have been made or the DOE must receive full payment for the cost of the guarantee from the developer. 62 Because no money has been appropriated to cover these costs and the DOE has stated it does not intend to seek appropriations to pay these costs for any nuclear projects, 63 it appears that project developers may be responsible for pre-paying the full costs of the loan guarantees, 64 unless the Bingaman legislation discussed below is passed as proposed or similar legislation is enacted. Two components currently make up the cost of the guarantee. The first part is an ―Administrative Cost‖: the DOE must receive fees sufficient to cover applicable administrative expenses for the loan guarantee including the costs of evaluating applications, negotiating and closing loan guarantees, and monitoring the progress of projects. 65 These administrative expenses passed on to the developer include an application fee of $800,000, a facility fee of one half of one percent of the amount guaranteed by the loan guarantee, and a maintenance fee of $200,000–$400,000 per year. 66 Second, the DOE must receive a ―Subsidy Cost‖ for the loan guarantee, which is defined as the net present value of the government‘s expected liability from issuing the guarantee. 67 The Subsidy Cost must be estimated by a developer in an application, but cannot be officially determined until the time the loan guarantee agreement is signed. 68 The administrative costs associated with the program have been criticized as overly burdensome, 69 and the Subsidy Cost remains unquantifiable but decisively enormous. In fact, Standard & Poor‘s recently estimated that the Subsidy Cost for a typical nuclear reactor could be as high as several hundred million dollars. 70 The lack of clarity around how to quantify these costs up front and, as discussed below, the position of the DOE that the Subsidy Cost is not an eligible project cost under the loan guarantee program, make it difficult for developers to arrange investment or interim financing to get them through the development process. 71 Additionally, before entering a loan guarantee, the DOE must determine that (1) ―there is reasonable prospect of repayment of the principal and interest on [the guaranteed debt] by the borrower,‖ (2) the amount guaranteed by the government under the loan guarantee, when combined with other available financing sources, is sufficient to carry out the nuclear construction project, and (3) the DOE possesses a first lien on the assets of the project and other assets pledged as security and its security interest in the project is not subordinate to any other financing for the project. 72 Finally, the loan guarantee obligation must bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary to be reasonable, taking into account the range of interest rates prevailing in the private sector for similar Federal government guaranteed obligations of comparable risk and the term of the guarantee cannot exceed the lesser of thirty years or ninety percent of the useful life of the nuclear reactor. 73 These requirements create uncertainties for developers and financiers seeking to understand how the program will work to support the financing of a new nuclear power plant. For instance, it is unclear how government approval of interest rates will work in the context of a deal with multiple debt instruments that each may have different pricing. Setting interest rates in these types of deals is an iterative process of modeling interest rates and testing markets. Further, it is unclear how interest rates will be compared. To our knowledge, there are no ―similar Federal government guaranteed obligations of comparable risk‖ to debt issued for the construction of a nuclear power project. 74

## 2NC

### China

#### Obama already announced loan guarantees, so it’s already challenging China

#### Asian war is unlikely --- regional initiatives check

Bitzinger and Desker ‘8 (senior fellow and dean of S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies respectively (Richard A. Bitzinger, Barry Desker, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December 2008, http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328\_731200556\_906256449.pdf)

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnationa terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints**. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect**. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common eopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

#### No US-China war – economics

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, “Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?”, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

While the United States no longer dominates the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, it still is the leading economic power in the world. However, over the last few decades China, with all its internal contradictions, has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot. In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors. [5] On the other hand, China is also the largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. This may be one of the reasons mitigating full-blown conflict with the U.S. now, since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

#### Chinese influence isn’t zero-sum with the west – shared regional values mitigate the risk of conflict

Bitzinger and Desker 8 (Richard A. and Barry, Senior Fellow and Dean – S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December)

The argument that there is an emerging Beijing Consensus is not premised on the rise of the East and decline of the West, as sometimes seemed to be the sub-text of the earlier Asian-values debate.7 However, like the earlier debate, the new one reflects alternative philosophical traditions. The issue is the appropriate balance between the rights of the individual and those of the state. This emerging debate will highlight the shared identity and values of China and the other states in the region, even if conventional realist analysts join John Mearsheimer to suggest that it will result in ‘intense security competition with considerable potential for war’ in which most of China’s neighbours ‘will join with the United States to contain China’s power’.8 These shared values are likely to reduce the risk of conflict and result in regional pressure for an accommodation of and engagement with an emerging China, rather than confrontation.

#### China/Taiwan War-- Taiwan is stable – no risk of war

Rosenberg 9 (David, Professor of Political Science – Middlebury College and Research Fellow at the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies – Australian National University, “Dire Straits: Competing Security Priorities in the South China Sea”, The Asia-Pacific Journal, 3-20, http://japanfocus.org/-David-Rosenberg/1773)

There is a curious pattern of accommodation in PRC-Taiwan relations. On the one hand, the PRC views Taiwan as a renegade province while Taiwan views the mainland with cultural empathy but political disdain. On many South China Sea issues, however, they are often in agreement. They have not had any direct confrontations in the South China Sea. They make the same claims, use the same definitions, baselines, and maps in stating their interests in the region. There is even some direct cooperation between China and Taiwan on technical issues. Beyond these governmental links, there are very substantial corporate and personal links between China and Taiwan. Taiwanese firms have invested over US $100 billion on the mainland, more than any other country. Much of this involves the relocation of Taiwanese industries to the Shanghai-Suzhou and Fujian areas. To a large extent, Taiwan's continued economic prosperity is tied to reintegration with the mainland. These economic links of investment and trade are reinforced by millions of personal visits as well as mail and email correspondence. Bonds of marriage also strengthen these ties. Nearly 10% of Taiwanese men marry mainland brides, further tying migrant generations to ancestral origins. These deeply-rooted, long-term economic and demographic trends provide a counterbalance to the often strident political clashes. The longer and broader the cross-Strait engagement, the better the prospects for peaceful coexistence. Unfortunately, the cross-Strait issue has become immersed in domestic politics in Taiwan and China. The recent spate of threats and counter-threats over Taiwan's status is linked to maneuvering among domestic political forces seeking popular support. For example, in March 2005, after China passed its anti-secession law, there were widespread protest demonstrations in Taiwan led by Prime Minister Chen Shui-bian's Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). Soon after, a large delegation of Taiwan's main opposition party, the Kuomintang (KMT, Nationalist Party), visited the mainland to encourage trade and political dialogue with China and to pay respects to the memorial shrine of Sun Yat-sen, KMT's founder. This, in turn, was followed in early April by the visit of right-wing Taiwan Solidarity Union party leaders to the Yasukuni shrine, the Japanese war memorial in Tokyo. Clearly issues of national identity and national sovereignty can generate volatile reactions. The big danger across the Taiwan Strait is that misunderstanding and miscalculation, fueled by distrust, xenophobia, and opportunism, may lead to escalating conflict. Senior leaders on both sides of the Strait are beginning to realize the potential consequences if instability erupts into violence. Hu Jintao has recently been signaling that he advocates a long-term policy of stability for eventual reunification. Chen Shui-bian has recently dropped his independence demands. Several Southeast Asian leaders have opposed Taiwan's independence; most explicitly, Singapore's Prime Minister, Lee Hsien Loong. Lee bluntly stated, "If Taiwan goes for independence, Singapore will not recognize it. In fact no Asian country will recognize it. China will fight. Win or lose, Taiwan will be devastated." The prospect of a military confrontation between the mainland and Taiwan is unlikely, in part because the consequences of such a conflict would be extremely destructive for both sides. Diplomatic efforts are needed to avoid even this remote risk. In the March/April 2005 issue of Foreign Affairs, Kenneth Lieberthal offered a useful proposal to change the focus of negotiations over "independence" and "reunification" to a pragmatic question: what is needed to achieve long-term stability and peaceful coexistence between China and Taiwan? What confidence building measures are needed to reassure security strategists that defensive military developments are not offensive? What legal and administrative means are necessary to resolve routine conflicts that will inevitably occur as commercial and civil relations thicken? The current U.S. attempts to help Taiwan "contain" China and to mobilize support in its global war on terrorism threaten to complicate if not weaken regional security developments. As Ronald Montaperto notes, "the almost daily manifestations of Chinese economic power, the effort to demonstrate commitment to the 'new' principle that the economic development of individual nations is inseparable from the development of the region as a whole, and the broad perception within the region that the Chinese are willing to engage actively in multilateral, cooperative policies have combined to provide Beijing with an unprecedented measure of influence and even clout."[6] The Beijing regime is obsessed with economic stability, because it fears that a severe downturn would trigger social and political upheaval. The last thing it wants is a military confrontation with its biggest trading partner, the United States, or with Japan or Taiwan, each of which are major trade and investment partners. It may go on playing the nationalist card over Taiwan to curry domestic political favor, but there has been no massive military build-up and there is no plausible threat of impending war. [7] To the contrary, China is investing heavily in creating a regional security framework to pursue its domestic development. The U.S. goal of achieving genuine regional maritime security would best be served through cooperation with China -- one of its most important creditors, suppliers, and markets -- rather than confrontation.

#### -- No escalation

Pike 4 (John, Global Security, “China’s Options in the Taiwan Confrontation”, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/taiwan-prc.htm)

China would almost certainly not contemplate a nuclear strike against Taiwan, nor would Beijing embark on a course of action that posed significant risks of the use of nuclear weapons. The mainland's long term goal is to liberate Taiwan, not to obliterate it, and any use of nuclear weapons by China would run a substantial risk of the use of nuclear weapons by the United States. An inability to control escalation beyond "demonstrative" detonations would cause utterly disproportionate destruction.

#### Deterrence checks indo-pak

Giorgio et al 10 (Maia Juel, Tina Søndergaard Madsen, Jakob Wigersma, Mark Westh, “Nuclear Deterrence in South Asia: An Assessment of Deterrence and Stability in the Indian – Pakistan Conflict,” Global Studies, Autumn, http://dspace.ruc.dk/bitstream/1800/6041/1/Project%20GS-BA%2c%20Autumn%202010.pdf)

To what extent has nuclear deterrence enhanced stability in the India-Pakistan conflict? Recalling the logical structure of the paper, we here wish to reconcile the three analyses and offer a coherent synthesis of the results in relation to the research question. In order to gather the threads it is beneficial to shortly reflect upon the main results of the three analyses. Firstly, the aim with the thesis was to explore if there is nuclear deterrence between India and Pakistan, based upon Waltz three requirements. After having undertaken this analysis, we can conclude that Waltz’s requirements for effective nuclear deterrence are in fact fulfilled in both countries. Thus, from a neorealist perspective, is it then possible to deduce that stability reigns between India and Pakistan as a result of nuclear deterrence? Taking a point of departure in neorealist assumptions and nuclear deterrence theory, there is indeed stability between India and Pakistan, as no major war has taken place between the countries, and more importantly, nuclear war has been avoided. Nuclear deterrence has thus been successful in creating stability on a higher structural level.

#### No war—both sides want a negotiated solution

Tellis 07(Ashley, Senior Associate @ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 11/27. “Four Crises and a Peace Process,” Brookings Institution.)

The first change, I think, is that there is a growing recognition on both sides that the use of force to resolve their disputes has really hit the aspect of the curve that there are diminishing returns. Although the use of force may have a cathartic kind of quality where you feel the need to hit out in order to send a message, I think both sides have come to the recognition that beyond that, beyond satisfying that cathartic need, there are no clear political objectives that would be solved by the actual use of force. I think that is really very important because as long as the leaderships on both sides are [as] minimally rational as they have been, that acts as a very powerful break with respect to unleashing the use of force. The second element, which again I see as part of the structural changes occurring in the subcontinent, is that there is a very slow but very important transformation in Pakistan’s definition of what it believes the Kashmir dispute is. I think the Pakistanis are moving in an evolutionary form from thinking of Kashmir as a territorial dispute where the solutions must involve territorial changes to something that is more subtle. President Musharraf has, of course, been critical actually in shaping this new recognition. If this new recognition holds and continues to take root, I think we could be moving to a new kind of a status quo where resolution of this issue actually becomes possible over the longer term. The third element is the changes that are taking place at the Indian end. In the old days, the Indian position on Kashmir was there is no problem. There’s nothing to discuss. The only issue out there is the return of territory which Pakistan controls, which New Delhi believes is rightfully its own.p31

**The risk of nuclear exchange is low**

**Lavoy 03** - Senior Lecturer of National Security Affairs @ Naval Postgraduate School. [Peter R. Lavoy (Former Director for Counterproliferation Policy in the Office of the Secretary of Defense & Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley) and MAJ Stephen A. Smith, “The Risk of Inadvertent Nuclear Use Between India and Pakistan,” Strategic Insight, February 3, 2003, pg. http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/rsepResources/si/feb03/southAsia2.asp]

Large-scale conventional warfare between India and Pakistan almost certainly would include air and ballistic missile attacks. Attacks by these inherently dual-use systems have the potential to be interpreted as pre-emptive attacks to destroy or neutralize the adversary's nuclear capability. This is especially true for Pakistan since India has invested heavily in improving its intelligence gathering and precision-strike capability. India also has made a major investment in defensive measures, including a limited ballistic missile defense.[12] Pakistan may believe that India is trying to gain the ability to launch a pre-emptive attack and deny Pakistan the ability to counter with an effective second-strike with a reduced force. Could this concern lead Pakistan to adopt a launch-on-warning or launch-under-attack posture where any Indian air- or ballistic missile attack could be interpreted as a pre-emptive strike and cause Pakistan to launch its nuclear weapons?

Pakistan's limited ability to identify and attack India's strategic nuclear assets probably precludes any appreciable loss of India's retaliatory capability even if Pakistan launched a pre-emptive attack. This condition is reinforced by India's greater strategic depth, and its superior air and ballistic missile defenses. An air- or ballistic missile attack on India probably would elicit a strong response, but probably **not a nuclear response**.

Conclusion - India and Pakistan do not want war; and they certainly do not want to fight a nuclear war. As strong as this desire is, however, New Delhi and Islamabad are caught in a spiral of tension and mistrust that could cause the next regional crisis to flair into armed conflict. If India and Pakistan do find themselves engaged in a large-scale conventional war, escalation to a nuclear exchange probably would be averted because of the strategic balance that now obtains. However, their asymmetrical conventional force capabilities and doctrines could create pressures for one side to launch nuclear weapons, even if they would prefer not to. The three scenarios of inadvertent war outlined above show how India's superior conventional military power might so seriously degrade the Pakistan national command authority's confidence in its nuclear deterrent that a nuclear war begins that nobody wants. Even if the risk of inadvertent nuclear war is judged to be low, steps should be taken to ensure that India and Pakistan do not become embroiled in even a limited war. The United States can play a constructive role in the region by taking steps to help keep the peace and reorienting its arms transfer policy to help stabilize the military balance.

US hegemony will guarantee US-Sino conflict with flashpoints across Asia

Layne 12 [Christopher Layne is the Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University and Research Fellow with the Center on Peace and Liberty at The Independent Institute, “The Global Power Shift from West to East”, April 25th, 2012, <http://nationalinterest.org/article/the-global-power-shift-west-east-6796>, Chetan]

Certainly, the Chinese have not forgotten. Now **Beijing aims to dominate its own** East and Southeast Asian **backyard,** just as a rising America sought to dominate the Western Hemisphere a century and a half ago. **The United States and China now are competing for supremacy in East and Southeast Asia**. Washington has been the incumbent hegemon there since World War II, and many in the American foreign-policy establishment view China’s quest for regional hegemony as a threat that must be resisted. **This contest for regional dominance is fueling escalating tensions and possibly could lead to war**. In geopolitics, **two great powers cannot simultaneously be hegemonic in the same region. Unless one of them abandons its aspirations, there is a high probability of hostilities. Flashpoints that could spark a Sino-American conflict include the** **unstable Korean Peninsula; the disputed status of Taiwan; competition for control of oil and other natural resources; and the burgeoning naval rivalry between the two powers.**

#### Intervention’s not inevitable

Kupchan 11 [Charles A Kupchan is a professor of international affairs at Georgetown University and Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. “The false promise of unipolarity: constraints on the exercise of American power”, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 24:2, 165-173 – June2011, Chetan]

The challenge in this decade, however, may be not too much US power and resolve, but an unsteady America that grows weary of the burdens of unipolarity. Brooks and Wohlforth assume that the United States will as a matter of course continue to deploy its preponderant power on a global basis; the unipole will automatically defend unipolarity. But in the aftermath of the draining wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the economic duress and ballooning deficits associated with the global financial crisis, the United States may lose some of its enthusiasm for serving as the global guardian of last resort. Democrats and Republicans are divided on issues ranging from the war in Afghanistan to climate change to arms control. If a political compromise is to be struck, it may well entail fashioning a more modest and less costly strategy of retrenchment (Kupchan and Trubowitz 2007b). At a minimum, US grand strategy may swing between stark alternatives depending upon which party is in power. In broad terms, the Republicans favour the use of force and shun institutionalized multilateralism. Meanwhile, the Democrats favour multilateralism and engagement rather than the exercise of force. Even if unipolarity persists, its international effects may be overridden by the unpredictable choices Americans may make about when and how to deploy their national power.

#### Nuke leadership fails – it’s an ineffective tool and outdated

Weiss 9 (Leonard, Affiliated Scholar – Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation, “Reliable Energy Supply and Nonproliferation,” Nonproliferation Review, 16(2), July, http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/npr\_16-2\_weiss.pdf)

Part of the problem is that its value as a nonproliferation tool was at its height at the beginning of the nuclear age**,** when few countries were in a position to achieve nuclear autarky. The probability of consensus on establishing a worldwide regime in which there are fuel guarantees and no nationally owned fuel cycle facilities has been on a decreasing slope. Technology denial has become a less effective tool, thanks especially to A.Q. Khan and others. The spread of fuel cycle technologies has perhaps reached a tipping point in which the technology is**,** if not widely available, then sufficiently available to any determined party**.** Hence, the argument made by proponents of internationalization that giving up national nuclear development in favor of more restrictive international efforts will result in much greater security for all does not have the power it may once have had.

#### Hegemony causes China war – our Layne evidence indicates that China’s rise guarantees conflict with the US as they vy for supremacy in East Asia – causes multiple hotspots in Korea, Taiwan and over oil

#### Hegemony instigates Asian conflict.

Singh 11 [Dr. Sawraj, MD F.I.C.S., Chairman of the Washington State Network for Human Rights and Chairman of the Central Washington Coalition for Social Justice, “Obama Unable To Change America’s Anti-Muslim, Anti-Arab, Racist, And Hegemonic Policies,” 3-6, <http://thelinkpaper.ca/?p=5107>]

When Obama became President, many people in the world hoped that he would change Bush’s anti-Muslim, anti-Arab, racist, hegemonic, Chauvinistic, and jingoist policies. Now, it is increasingly becoming clear that Obama has not been able to change any of those policies. As a matter of fact, **American policies have become even more aggressive and America seems bent upon pushing the world into a third world war. America is vigorously** pursuing the policy of **containing China and seems bent upon making Asia the arena for the third world war. In a desperate effort to preserve its hegemony, America is pushing India to start a war against China and pushing South Korea to start a war with North Korea. America sees this as the only way to preserve the western domination and prolong the America era**; both which have out lived their natural life span.

### Economy

#### Nuclear can’t compete – market forces inevitably overwhelm the aff

Williams, 12/18/12 – worked in the nuclear power industry for over 20 years (Glenn S.K., “The Nation's Nuclear Plants Are Nuked.” http://energy.aol.com/2012/12/18/the-nation-s-nuclear-plants-are-nuked/)

While the nation has been focused on new sources of natural gas and shale oil, few noticed the slow decline of an older energy source, nuclear power. Today, commercial nuclear power is struggling to stay in the game. The power markets are hammering the nation's nukes. Over a decade ago, several regions decided to create Regional Transmission Organizations (or Independent System Operators) and use the market to set power prices. Today, North America has ten independent RTOs/ISOs, where wholesale power is auctioned every few minutes. Power auctions are about energy, not power plants. Auctions don't care how power plants produce energy; they only care about the bid. The primary focus is on the last bid that clears the auction; it sets the price for all participants. That's why the last bid is called the market-clearing price. The difference between the market-clearing price and the generator's production cost is the gross margin. The last bid is technically on the margin and it earns little to no gross margin. But every dollar above production costs contributes towards the generator's fixed costs. Most nuclear units are "must run plants" and they will produce power even if market-clearing prices fall below production costs. Recently, some nuclear plants have been booking negative gross margins. They hope they can make up losses with subsequent gains and average a gross margin. A gross margin is not always enough. Nuclear units must pay all their bills and leave something for shareholders. Recently, some nuclear units are achieving modest gross margins, but not enough left to pay all the bills or achieve any earnings. Just ask Dominion Resources. They recently announced the retirement of their Wisconsin nuclear plant 20 years early. Dominion claims they sought buyers for their Kewaunee Power Station. None could be found. It appears that not only did Dominion conclude their nuclear plant would remain unprofitable; Dominion's competitors concurred. It turns out that Kewaunee is located near NextEra Energy's Point Beach Nuclear Plant. Point Beach operates in the same market and shares a similar design. It would seem that Point Beach must be as economically challenged as Kewaunee. It's likely because the nation's largest fleet of nuclear power plants is operating nearby and they are financially challenged. Exelon owns 10 generating stations and 17 reactors, which are located in Illinois, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Altogether, these power plants are struggling to provide their owners with earnings to the point where Exelon's management warned shareholders they might be forced to cut dividends. A Different Picture in Regulated States, but Challenges Remain Nuclear plants operating in regulated states are faring better. While consumers' demand for electric power is down, nuclear power plants are safely embedded in states' rate bases. Owners of regulated nuclear assets are protected, up to a point. Two nuclear power stations are finding their state regulators are losing patience. One is Duke Energy's Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant operating near Tampa, Florida. The other is Edison International's San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station operating in Southern California. Both stations are experiencing unusual and costly maintenance expenses. Crystal River's containment repairs could exceed $2 billion, a price that state regulators may find excessive. San Onofre also incurred unexpected and costly maintenance challenges. But San Onofre's 2,350 megawatts is a critical resource for Southern California and without that resources California could see rolling blackouts. Nevertheless, San Onofre's headaches provide new opportunities for opposition groups to pressure regulators and political leaders. San Onofre could survive, but it is at risk of early retirement. Entergy is at war with two states at the same time. Vermont wants Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station to retire 20 years early. Politicians and regulators are fighting with everything they have to prevent Entergy from continuing nuclear operations. The State of New York wants Entergy's Indian Point to retire 20 years early and they are vowing a fight to prevent further operations. Governor Cuomo believes the state can import enough power from Canada to provide them with enough power to assure regional reliability. But in the case of New York City, existing transmission lines are inadequate and they are constrained. New lines will be needed to deliver Canadian power to the energy hungry city. New Jersey regulators already negotiated the early retirement of Exelon's Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. Oyster Creek is 630-megawatt facility and it will go on the scrap heap ten years early in 2019. A pattern is developing. It may take a few years, but it appears small nuclear plants will face increasing pressure to retire early. They cannot compete, particularly in soft markets. Some plants will find their costs consistently exceed any benefits they earn and their owners will be forced to retire and dismember plants. Natural gas may replace retiring nuclear plants. New turbine technologies and low fuel costs allow some gas turbines to outperform nuclear power plants. But it is unlikely fuel prices will remain low for the next 60 years, the design life of a new nuclear unit.

#### Natural gas prices prevents nuke solvency

**Kitazume, 12** – staff writer for the Japan Times (Takashi, 7/17. “Global demand for nuclear power remains high.” http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nb20120717d1.html#.UAiQIDFSQ10)

Still, construction of new reactors in the U.S. faces an uphill battle, "but not because of Fukushima," Nakano observed. "Given the current serious deficit issues the government has, it is unlikely that the federal loan guarantee would be sustained at a strong level in the next couple of administrations, whoever gets elected," she said. The price of natural gas — a major competitor to nuclear power in the U.S. energy mix — has come down quite sharply in recent months, Nakano said. And current debate in Congress suggests that there is "very little chance for the U.S. to have either cap-and-trade or carbon tax" plans to cut carbon dioxide emissions for at least the coming decade, and without these mechanisms in place, "nuclear power will have a harder time economically vis-a-vis natural gas," she observed. Out of the 104 nuclear reactors in operation in the U.S. today, the operational life of 50 has so far been extended to 60 years. But there are movements in some states to reconsider the life extension of reactors beyond 40 years, and if there are no additional life extensions, "about one-third of nuclear power generation capacity will disappear in the U.S. by 2035," she said, adding that that is a "possibility given the low price of natural gas."

#### New loan guarantees ensure taxpayer bailouts

Frumhoff, 9 – director of science and policy and chief scientist for the Climate and Energy Program at UCS, member of the Nobel Prize-winning U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Peter, 3/4. “Massive Federal Loan Guarantees for New Nuclear Power Plants Would Put Taxpayers, Ratepayers at Risk.” <http://www.ucsusa.org/news/press_release/federal-loan-guarantees-0204.html>)

Bailout estimates for failed projects could range from hundreds of billions to more than a trillion The nuclear power industry is pressuring Congress to dramatically expand federal loan guarantees for building new plants, which would put taxpayers and ratepayers at significant financial risk, according to a report released today by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS). Congress already has authorized $60 billion for loan guarantees in which the federal government would shield utilities and private investment firms from the risk of default on loans for building new electricity generation plants. The Department of Energy (DOE) has allocated $18.5 billion of that money for new nuclear plants over the next few years. Given the average projected cost of building one reactor is currently $9 billion, the industry is clamoring for considerably more. To date, the DOE has received $122 billion in applications for loan guarantees for new nuclear power plants. The report, "Nuclear Loan Guarantees: Another Taxpayer Bailout Ahead?," recounts the nuclear industry's disastrous financial history and documents the hundreds of billions of dollars taxpayers and ratepayers already have spent to keep the industry afloat. (For more, go to our Nuclear Bailout Report.) "Taxpayers and ratepayers have been forced to bail out the nuclear power industry twice in the past 30 years, and if Congress gives the industry the massive loan guarantees it wants, we likely will have to cough up hundreds of billions of dollars to do it yet again," said Ellen Vancko, the nuclear energy and climate change project manager at UCS, which commissioned the report. "The industry has gone from promising electricity 'too cheap to meter' to being too costly to consider." The first bailout occurred after the industry abandoned some 100 plants in the 1970s and 1980s when construction costs skyrocketed and growth in electricity demand slowed. The result was what Forbes magazine in 1985 called "the largest managerial disaster in business history." Taxpayers and ratepayers covered most of the more than $40 billion (in today's dollars) for the abandoned plants, while ratepayers had to pay more than $200 billion to cover cost overruns for plants that were completed. The second bailout came in the 1990s, when states restructured the electric industry to reduce regulation and increase competition in generation markets. As part of that restructuring, utilities were allowed to charge their ratepayers for "stranded costs"—the difference between the book value of the plants and the lower market value they were worth at the time. As a result, ratepayers were forced to pay more than $40 billion in stranded costs. Given the industry's record, Wall Street firms have publicly stated that they will not invest in new nuclear power plants without federal loan guarantees. Utility executives also have said they will not place their companies at risk by financing new nuclear plant construction. They would rather place that risk on taxpayers. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimates that the average risk of default for a federal loan guarantee for the nuclear industry is 50 percent. UCS's report estimates that the potential risk for guaranteeing nuclear plant construction loans ranges from $360 billion—based on current cost estimates for the 100 new plants needed to replace current plants by 2040—to as much as $1.6 trillion based on 300 plants (with 50 percent higher costs) that some in the industry have proposed building. "The potential cost of a third public bailout would make the first two look like chump change," said Vancko. "Congress should think twice about pushing the industry to invest in plants that Wall Street and even the industry itself say are too risky to finance on their own."

#### That hurts every part of the economy

Carroll and Prante, 12 – executive-in-residence with American University’s School of Public Affairs and co-founder and co-director of the University’s Center for Public Finance Research; and senior economist at the Tax Foundation (Robert and Gerald, July. Long-run macroeconomic impact of increasing tax rates on high-income taxpayers in 2013.” <http://majorityleader.gov/uploadedfiles/Ernst_And_Young_Study_July_2012.pdf>)

Through lower after-tax rewards to work, the higher tax rates on wages reduce work effort and labor force participation. The higher tax rates on capital gains and dividend increase the cost of equity capital, which discourages savings and reduces investment. Capital investment falls, which reduces labor productivity and means lower output and living standards in the long-run.¶  Output in the long-run would fall by 1.3%, or $200 billion, in today’s economy.¶  Employment in the long-run would fall by 0.5% or, roughly 710,000 fewer jobs, in today’s economy.¶  Capital stock and investment in the long-run would fall by 1.4% and 2.4%, respectively.¶  Real after-tax wages would fall by 1.8%, reflecting a decline in workers living standards relative to what would have occurred otherwise.¶ These results suggest real long-run economic consequences for allowing the top two ordinary tax rates and investment tax rates to rise in 2013. This policy path can be expected to reduce long-run output, investment and net worth.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

#### Expansion of nuclear makes accidents inevitable – safe reactor designs don’t solve

**Tickell, 8/20**/12 – British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative (Oliver, “Does the world need nuclear power to solve the climate crisis?” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/aug/20/world-need-nuclear-power-climate-crisis>)

That does not mean it's impossible to build 11,000 reactors in 35 years if the world dedicates sufficient resources to the task. At a construction cost of about US$10 billion per reactor, we would need to dedicate US$110 trillion, or about two years' gross world product, while also providing for long-term liabilities. But before we seriously consider doing so, we should ask what an 11,000-reactor world would be like. For a start, it would be much more radioactive than it is now. Routine radioactive discharges, for example of gaseous fission products like xenon-133, would be 25 times greater. Serious accidents, such as those at Windscale, Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima – the last of which came very close to making Tokyo uninhabitable for decades to come – would become commonplace events. To date the nuclear industry has produced one major radiation release for every 3,000 years of reactor operation. On that basis our 11,000 reactors would give us four such events a year. Safer reactor design would reduce the danger, but as nuclear power reaches into countries where safety standards are not so exacting as in the UK, the US, Russia and Japan, and where suitably trained personnel may be hard to recruit, the risk would surely rise.

#### Accidents cause extinction

Wasserman 2 (Harvey, Senior Editor – Free Press, Earth Island Journal, Spring, www.earthisland.org/eijournal/new\_articles.cfm?articleID=457&journalID=63)

The intense radioactive heat within today's operating reactors is the hottest anywhere on the planet. Because Indian Point has operated so long, its accumulated radioactive burden far exceeds that of Chernobyl. The safety systems are extremely complex and virtually indefensible. One or more could be wiped out with a small aircraft, ground-based weapons, truck bombs or even chemical/biological assaults aimed at the work force. A terrorist assault at Indian Point could yield three infernal fireballs of molten radioactive lava burning through the earth and into the aquifer and the river. Striking water, they would blast gigantic billows of horribly radioactive steam into the atmosphere. Thousands of square miles would be saturated with the most lethal clouds ever created, depositing relentless genetic poisons that would kill forever. Infants and small children would quickly die en masse. Pregnant women would spontaneously abort or give birth to horribly deformed offspring. Ghastly sores, rashes, ulcerations and burns would afflict the skin of millions. Heart attacks, stroke and multiple organ failure would kill thousands on the spot. Emphysema, hair loss, nausea, inability to eat or drink or swallow, diarrhea and incontinence, sterility and impotence, asthma and blindness would afflict hundreds of thousands, if not millions. Then comes the wave of cancers, leukemias, lymphomas, tumors and hellish diseases for which new names will have to be invented. Evacuation would be impossible, but thousands would die trying. Attempts to quench the fires would be futile. More than 800,000 Soviet draftees forced through Chernobyl's seething remains in a futile attempt to clean it up are still dying from their exposure. At Indian Point, the molten cores would burn uncontrolled for days, weeks and years. Who would volunteer for such an American task force? The immediate damage from an Indian Point attack (or a domestic accident) would render all five boroughs of New York City an apocalyptic wasteland. As at Three Mile Island, where thousands of farm and wild animals died in heaps, natural ecosystems would be permanently and irrevocably destroyed. Spiritually, psychologically, financially and ecologically, our nation would never recover. This is what we missed by a mere 40 miles on September 11. Now that we are at war, this is what could be happening as you read this. There are 103 of these potential Bombs of the Apocalypse operating in the US. They generate a mere 8 percent of our total energy. Since its deregulation crisis, California cut its electric consumption by some 15 percent. Within a year, the US could cheaply replace virtually all the reactors with increased efficiency. Yet, as the terror escalates, Congress is fast-tracking the extension of the Price-Anderson Act, a form of legal immunity that protects reactor operators from liability in case of a meltdown or terrorist attack.  Do we take this war seriously? Are we committed to the survival of our nation?  If so, the ticking reactor bombs that could obliterate the very core of our life and of all future generations must be shut down.

### Asteroids Mining

#### Expansion of nuclear power prevents us from getting off the rock – uses up finite fissionable material

**Pwanson, 9** – software engineer (Saul, 1/29. “Why Nuclear Power Dooms Humanity to Extinction.” http://saulpwanson.com/2009/why-nuclear-power-dooms-humanity-to-extinction)

Recently, I discovered John McCarthy’s (creator of LISP) pages on sustainability that he’s been working on for many years. Prof. McCarthy is a proponent of using nuclear energy to achieve sustainability on this planet, and he has a lot of good information on his site. According to him, we’ll enjoy perhaps a billion years of sustainable energy with the nuclear fission available from materials on this planet. He also thinks conservation of energy (applying mental effort and resources to the reduction of energy consumption) is a huge mistake. I too think nuclear energy is an important energy source to explore, but I am not as “extremely optimistic” as Prof. McCarthy. Conservation of energy, particularly fissionable materials, is not a huge mistake. My argument is: The amount of fissionable nuclear material on the planet right now (and indeed, in the solar system) is the most there will ever be. Fissionable elements decay at a fixed rate, and new heavy elements are only created in a star’s death. Energy consumption has historically grown at a pace faster than population growth. In addition, cheap energy makes people optimize other (larger) economic factors. In other words, when gasoline prices are cheap and stable, people will move further from cities, where housing prices are cheaper, and consume more fuel in transportation between the city and themselves. This leads to energy consumption expanding to consume any additional supply. Space travel is widely recognized as the only infinite-horizon survival mechanism, for any life form (or: any life form that is confined to a single planet is doomed to extinction in the longest term). The more we understand about physics, the more we are certain that the theories of relativity are true. There don’t seem to be any shortcuts to getting around the universe; it just takes a huge amount of time and energy. The biggest misconception that most people have is exactly how much energy or time it would take to move a sustainable colony from the earth to another solar system (and no other planets in our solar system seem to be habitable). It is several orders of magnitude larger than traveling within our solar system, which is already almost prohibitive to do via chemical propulsion. Human interstellar travel using chemical energy is basically impossible. Well, nuclear fission has 10 million times (7 orders of magnitude) more energy than chemical reactions. The power and energy density in nuclear material makes it ideal as a portable long-distance fuel. Other energy conveyances for interstellar transport have been proposed, but every one is almost as ridiculous as using the LHC to construct our own personal wormhole. (Fusion has the capability to generate even more energy, and the materials are abundant, but it’s pretty much not going to work out for energy production either). The huge amount of energy required to get to another star in a “reasonable” amount of time (only hundreds of years) means that it’ll even take a fair amount of fission fuel. So, consuming nuclear fuel to satisfy our insatiable thirst for domestic energy may prevent us from ever leaving this planet. And our continuing disregard for the potential long-term effects of our short-term actions will very likely amplify those negative long-term effects. Nuclear haste makes nuclear waste. Don’t get me wrong: we absolutely need to continue developing fission technology, for both space travel and energy emergencies here on earth (heaven forbid the aliens come and we don’t have powerful enough lasers to destroy them). This development should go beyond theoretical research, to large-scale engineering and “field tests” that may as well be used as civilian energy sources. But to retool our civilization’s energy infrastructure to rely on “abundant” nuclear energy is a huge mistake: without active conservation, our consumption will grow to take advantage of as much energy as we can produce, we’ll be consuming a fuel that is absolutely finite, and that fuel won’t be available when the asteroid is 50 years away and we really do need to get off the planet. And that’s why abundant nuclear power ultimately dooms humanity to extinction.

#### The resources in asteroid mining is worth less than average dirt

Brak, Ronald, 2/6/06, Research scientist, The Great Mining Con,

<http://ronaldbrak.blogspot.com/2006/02/great-asteroid-mining-con.html>

There are some people who think that mining asteroids is a good idea. And not just for building things to use in space, but to ship metals to earth to sell. They say things like, “The metals in the near-earth iron asteroid Amun are worth 20 trillion dollars.” But is the current market value of metals the proper way to value an asteroid? Wouldn’t it make just as much sense to say that since I can buy meteorites for 25 cents a gram on e-bay, the market value of the asteroid is 25 cents per gram? And since it weighs 30 billion tons, therefore the asteroid is actually worth 7,500 trillion dollars? I mean that’s using the market price, isn’t it? And while these asteroid mining enthusiasts like to tell you how much money Amun is supposed to be worth, they never tell you how much a similar amount of earth dirt is worth. Well according to my calculations 30 billion tons of earth dirt is worth over $1,700,000,000,000,000. Which makes a ton of dirt worth about $57,000. Not bad, hey? Might be a good idea to run outside with a shovel. But wait a minute, you say! How can plain earth dirt be worth that much? Well it’s quite simple. You see 99.9999% pure silicon sells for about $200 per kilogram and the earth’s crust is 27.7% silicon. Of course it’s only worth that much after you have removed and purified the silicon. Before that the dirt is only worth as much as dirt. But counting an asteroid as being worth what it would be if all it’s substances were refined, purified and sold at today’s prices is pretty much just as stupid. To really test how much the asteroid is worth, let’s assume that there is a hole in the space-time continuum in your bedroom cupboard that not only allows instantaneous transportation of material from this asteroid, but it delivers it in conveniently sized chunks. Ignoring its novelty value, how much could you sell this asteroid material for on earth? Well the answer to that is simple. You could sell it for about $300 U.S. per ton because that’s what scrap metal sells for these days and an iron asteroid is basically a big chunk of stainless steel. The good news is there are plenty of scrap metal dealers around so you won’t have to lug it too far to trade it for cash. This means that But wait a minute! Some people say asteroids are supposed to be chock full of valuable metals such as platinum which currently sells for about $33 a gram! Couldn’t we just extract the platinum and forget about the steel? Well there are some problems with this. You see on earth there’s all sorts of geological activity, mostly involving water, that can concentrate ores and metals. But iron asteroids don’t have this activity. They’re just chunks of a busted planetoid’s core. As a result, precious metals aren’t going to be concentrated but are going to be evenly spread throughout the damn thing.

#### The plan takes forever- mining operations take years to prepare

**AAPG ’09** [American Association of Petroleum Geologists Energy Minerals Div. Uranium Committee, “Developing Industrial Minerals, Nuclear Minerals and Commodities of Interest via Off-World Exploration and Mining,”<http://www.searchanddiscovery.com/documents/2009/80067campbell/ndx_campbell.pdf>]

Identifying and mining nickel, cobalt, and a variety of other **commodities** that are in short supply on Earth, or those that **could be mined**, produced, and delivered **more cheaply in space than on Earth** could contribute to and drive the world‟s technology and associated economy to a scale never before contemplated. This is based, of course, on the assumption that the economics are favorable. **Large multi-national, quasi-governmental industrial groups are likely to develop over the next few decades** to handle projects of such magnitude, if they haven‟t already begun to assemble. In the beginning, the economics would likely be underwritten by governmental support, perhaps by a group of governments cooperating in funding and technology but followed later by some governments funding programs to accommodate their own particular self-interests. **Because long-term planning is a prerequisite to exploration and development in space, these programs will proceed step by step over the decades ahead as they make sense politically and economically within industry**. Although funding by the federal government has provided the basic research required to send probes to study the solar system as well as the early applied research in the Apollo Lunar program involving astronauts, in the decades ahead, **industry will likely assume the lead in ventures into space that are based solely on the perceived economic value to the corporations and their stockholders**.

Resource wars won’t happen

**Salehyan 07** assistant professor of political science at the University of North Texas [Idean Salehyan, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, August 2007, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3922>]

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters

#### Countries will cooperate on the Moon, not compete – host of factors

Moltz 9 [James Clay Moltz is an associate professor in the Department of National Security Studies at the Naval Postgraduate School. “Toward Cooperation or Conflict on the Moon Considering Lunar Governance in Historical Perspective”, Fall 2009, <http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/2009/Fall/moltz.pdf>, Chetan]

**While pressures for “enclosure” of the moon and** the privatization of **its resources are likely to increase in the coming decades**—at least until more speciic management structures are developed and implemented—there are reasonable grounds for believing that **cooperative eforts may** eventually **succeed. The** combined **effects of** economic globalization, modern **communications**, increasing **lunar mission transparency**, **and the** recent **internationalization of large space activities** (such as the International Space Station), **should help facilitate these trends**. **Broader international trends toward** the adoption of rule-based behavior (such as in the World Trade Organization) and **negotiated approaches to conlict resolution** support institutionally based **outcomes on the moon**. Thus, **while history’s “lessons” in regard to** international **cooperation on the moon may be pessimistic, specific diferences** in the factors **surrounding lunar settlement offer reasons to believe that the negative experience on certain past frontiers may be avoided**. The remaining question seems to be the willingness of current and future leaders to recognize the remaining risks and chal­ lenges that exist regarding successful lunar governance and to begin talks to address possible **disputes** through preventive diplomacy and existing international agreements and organizational structures. These develop­ ments **are far from inevitable**, but such possibilities—in the context of the relevant history of similar environments and the implications of direct military conlict today—seem to have the force of mutual self-interest behind them

### Solvency

#### No solvency – licensing issues, lack of nuclear waste management, and inefficient government intervention – plan solvency is long term – China will surpass us

**Spencer and Loris 11** (Jack, Senior Research Fellow at Heritage for Nuclear Energy Policy, and Nicolas D., Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow at Heritage, focuses on energy and regulatory issues,"A Big Future for Small Nuclear Reactors?", Feb 2, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/a-big-future-for-small-nuclear-reactors)

While some designs are closer to market introduction than others, the fact is that America’s regulatory and policy environment is not sufficient to support a robust expansion of existing nuclear technologies, much less new ones. New reactor designs are difficult to license efficiently, and the lack of a sustainable nuclear waste management policy causes significant risk to private investment. Many politicians are attempting to mitigate these market challenges by offering subsidies, such as loan guarantees. While this approach still enjoys broad support in Congress and industry, the reality is that it has not worked. Despite a lavish suite of subsidies offered in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including loan guarantees, insurance against government delays, and production tax credits, no new reactors have been permitted, much less constructed. These subsidies are in addition to existing technology development cost-sharing programs that have been in place for years and defer significant research and development costs from industry to the taxpayer. The problem with this approach is that it ignores the larger systemic problems that create the unstable marketplace to begin with. These systemic problems generally fall into three categories: 1. Licensing. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is ill prepared to build the regulatory framework for new reactor technologies, and no reactor can be offered commercially without an NRC license. In a September 2009 interview, former NRC chairman Dale E. Klein said that small nuclear reactors pose a dilemma for the NRC because the commission is uneasy with new and unproven technologies and feels more comfortable with large light water reactors, which have been in operation for years and has a long safety record. 11 The result is that enthusiasm for building non-light-water SMRs is generally squashed at the NRC as potential customers realize that there is little chance that the NRC will permit the project within a timeframe that would promote near-term investment. So, regardless of which attributes an SMR might bring to the market, the regulatory risk is such that real progress on commercialization is difficult to attain. This then leaves large light water reactors, and to a lesser extent, small ones, as the least risky option, which pushes potential customers toward that technology, which then undermines long-term progress, competition, and innovation. 2. Nuclear Waste Management. The lack of a sustainable nuclear waste management solution is perhaps the greatest obstacle to a broad expansion of U.S. nuclear power. The federal government has failed to meet its obligations under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, to begin collecting nuclear waste for disposal in Yucca Mountain. The Obama Administration’s attempts to shutter the existing program to put waste in Yucca Mountain without having a backup plan has worsened the situation. This outcome was predictable because the current program is based on the flawed premise that the federal government is the appropriate entity to manage nuclear waste. Under the current system, waste producers are able to largely ignore waste management because the federal government is responsible. The key to a sustainable waste management policy is to directly connect financial responsibility for waste management to waste production. This will increase demand for more waste-efficient reactor technologies and drive innovation on waste-management technologies, such as reprocessing. Because SMRs consume fuel and produce waste differently than LWRs, they could contribute greatly to an economically efficient and sustainable nuclear waste management strategy. 3. Government Intervention. Too many policymakers believe that Washington is equipped to guide the nuclear industry to success. So, instead of creating a stable regulatory environment where the market value of different nuclear technologies can determine their success and evolution, they choose to create programs to help industry succeed. Two recent Senate bills from the 111th Congress, the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative Improvement Act (S. 2052) and the Nuclear Power 2021 Act (S. 2812), are cases in point. Government intervention distorts the normal market processes that, if allowed to work, would yield the most efficient, cost-effective, and appropriate nuclear technologies. Instead, the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted, and provides capital subsidies that allow investors to ignore the systemic problems that drive risk and costs artificially high. This approach is especially detrimental to SMRs because subsidies to LWRs distort the relative benefit of other reactor designs by artificially lowering the cost and risk of a more mature technology that already dominates the marketplace.

## 1NR

### Warming

#### Don’t solve warming – timeframe and insufficient amount of reductions

**Smith, 11** [Gar, environmental journalist, He is the former editor of Earth Island Journal, and currently edits Earth Island Institute's weekly "eco-zine" The-Edge. NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCEhttp://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf]

More than 200 new reactors have been proposed around the world but not enough reactors can be built fast enough to replace the world’s vanishing fossil fuel resources.2 Even if nuclear output could be tripled by 2050 (which seems unlikely in light of the industry’s record to date), this would only lower greenhouse emissions by 25 to 40 billion annual tons—12.5 to 20 percent of the reductions needed to stabilize the climate.3 The International Energy Agency estimates that renewables and efficiency measures could produce ten times these savings by 2050. The IEA estimates that cutting CO2 emissions in half by mid-century would require building 1,400 new 1,000-MW reactors—32 new reactors every year. But since it usually takes about 10 years from groundbreaking to atom-smashing, these reactors could not be constructed fast enough to prevent an irreversible “tipping” of world climate. This hardly seems feasible since the industry has only managed to bring 30 new reactors on-line over the past ten years. Of the 35 reactors the IEA listed as “under construction” in mid-2008, a third of these had been “under construction” for 20 years or longer. Some may never be completed. By contrast, a 1.5 MW wind turbine can be installed in a single day and can be operational 4 | The Watts Bar-1 reactor, 60 miles southwest of Knoxville, Tennesee, took 24 years to build. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION in two weeks.4 Still, the pace of nuclear construction has picked up lately. In 2010, the number of reactor projects underway had ballooned to 66—with most located in China (27) and Russia (11). And it’s not just a matter of designing and building new reactors.The construction of 1,400 new nuclear reactors also would require building 15 new uranium enrichment plants, 50 new reprocessing plants and 14 new waste storage sites—a deal-breaker since the sole proposed U.S. storage site at Yucca Mountain is apparently dead .The cost of this additional nuclear infrastructure has been estimated at $3 trillion.5 Moreover, since the operating lifetime of these new reactors would still be a mere 40 years, even if new construction was practical, quick and affordable, it would only “solve” the global-warming problem for another 40 years, at which point the plants would need to be decommissioned.

### Impact 2NC

#### DA outweighs – US and Iran are itching to go to war as the US has pushed Iran into isolation and attacked them via covert action – Hagel’s nomination creates a venue for peaceful negotiation – this is from the former spokesman for Iran’s nuclear program. Iran strike escalates to regional war in the Middle East that involves nuclear weapons causing World War III

#### Prefer this impact - fastest time frame --- strikes by April unless Hagel stops it.

**Burston**, **1/8**/2013 (Bradley, Will Israel bomb Iran by April? Not if Chuck Hagel can help it, Haaretz, p. <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/a-special-place-in-hell/will-israel-bomb-iran-by-april-not-if-chuck-hagel-can-help-it.premium-1.492737>)

In the winter of an election year, a prominent American columnist relates that the U.S. defense secretary's "biggest worry is the growing possibility that Israel will attack Iran over the next few months," perhaps by April. In retrospect, and with Israel keeping a curious recent silence over Tehran's nuclear program, David Ignatius' Washington Post column seems as if it were written long ago - and not in February of last year. Nonetheless, with all indicators pointing to Benjamin Netanyahu's re-election as prime minister when Israelis go to the polls two weeks from now, it might be time to revisit Ignatius' report, with an eye to the coming spring. "Israeli leaders are said to accept, and even welcome, the prospect of going it alone and demonstrating their resolve," Ignatius wrote. “'You stay to the side, and let us do it,' one Israeli official is said to have advised the United States." In a piece that had the flavor of an administration-spawned cease-and-desist signal to Israel, Ignatius said that Defense Secretary Leon Panetta "believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May or June — before Iran enters what Israelis described as a 'zone of immunity' to commence building a nuclear bomb." Thanks largely to the prime minister's virtual silence on the issue, the Iranian bomb – which Netanyahu once routinely compared to the dawn of a second Nazi Holocaust - has played no appreciable role in the current election campaign. In fact, Netanyahu has been uncharacteristically quiet on Iran ever since Barack Obama's re-election. Maybe, as they used to say in war movies, too quiet. There is every possibility that a parallel scenario is being played out, even as we sleep through a dreary, foreordained campaign. What if Benjamin Netanyahu is exactly the person we have come to know, still desperate to embody the legend in his own mind, still dying to be the Menachem Begin that his father Benzion was too picky and professorial and extreme and footloose to be? What if it all boils down to a history unwritten – of an Israeli leader who saw himself bombing a reactor and fighting the Nazis and foiling a world jihad, all in one master stroke? Consider this assessment, from this week, from a former senior aide to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, on the prospect of a go-it-alone Israeli bombing attack on Iranian nuclear sites: From Netanyahu's standpoint, "April, 2013, more or less, is the correct time for this matter," Eitan Haber wrote on Monday. "The fact that no one is writing, nor is anyone reading (about this), nor is anyone slotting this issue at the top of news broadcasts, doesn't mean that the Iranian atomic program is no longer of current relevance. It is all too relevant." By April, not only the weather will have cleared. The elections – and, more to the point, the politburo-purge of a Likud primary that preceded it – will by then have eliminated Netanyahu's weightiest in-house inhibitors to an Iran strike (Benny Begin, Dan Meridor and Ehud Barak) and cowed former fence-sitters like Moshe Yaalon into acquiescence. Significantly, one of Netanyahu's few recent references to Iran came during a Monday night Jerusalem speech to thousands of Birthright participants, about to return home to the States. "We’ve always had the ability to send a message from this city to change the lives of so many people," Netanyahu declared. And, in an indirect message to Washington that managed to hint at both E1 and the atomic bomb, he said "it’s our job to wake up the world. It’s time for many who don’t see these dangers to wake up to this." "The great danger to the world is not from Jews building in our ancestral capital in Jerusalem," Netanyahu continued, "It’s from nuclear weapons in Iran…" But two, it turns out, can send a message. And President Obama's message to Netanyahu on Iran is succinct enough to be spelled out in ten letters: Chuck Hagel. If there is anyone in American governance who stands for finding all possible diplomatic means to avert war, it is the decorated, twice-wounded Vietnam veteran. Over and over this week, Israeli news broadcasts featured a clip of Hagel describing war as a last resort. The Hagel nomination sends another message as well. A second-term Obama administration is unlikely grant the same flexibility to an Israeli prime minister who did all he could to aid the Republican Party a few short months ago. Here is an Israeli leader who spent years preparing to scratch the only itch he apparently really has, attacking Iran. Being who is, though, he couldn't help himself from reaching a bit too far, doing everything he could to put Mitt Romney in the White House. Only to put Hagel in the Pentagon. In the hole he dug with his ostentatious contempt for Obama, a hole he cannot afford to deepen, Netanyahu may have stumbled into paving the way for Hagel's nomination and confirmation. Thus, the prime minister may ultimately become the factor that blocked a war with Iran.

#### Turns the economy bc of Oil

Turns resource wars

### A2 Uniqueness O/Whelms Link – Dem Support = Hagel Inevitable

#### Evaluate uniqueness through political capital – Hagel’s gaining support BECAUSE of PC

EJP 1-16 (European Jewish Press, “Obama’s defence nomination likely to be confirmed as Hagel lobbies Senators,” 2013, <http://www.ejpress.org/article/64483>)

US Defence Secretary-in-waiting Chuck Hagel took one step closer to confirmation of his nomination by President Barack Obama earlier this month, after determined lobbying of all 100 Senators appeared to have secured the support of the influential pro-Israel camp Tuesday. Following an intense 90-minute meeting at the White House earlier in the day, leading Jewish Democrat Charles E. Schumer confirmed that “based on several key assurances provided by Senator Hagel, I am currently prepared to vote for his confirmation”. As the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) member and stridently pro-Israel Senator announced plans to lobby sceptics to similarly support Hagel’s candidacy, he added: “I know some will question whether Senator Hagel’s assurances are merely attempts to quiet critics as he seeks confirmation to this critical post, but I don’t think so. Senator Hagel realises the situation in the Middle East has changed, with Israel in a dramatically more endangered position than it was even five years ago.” He also revealed that Hagel had committed to supporting Obama’s current sanctions policy against Iran in response to its contentious nuclear weapons programme, whilst conceding that “further unilateral sanctions against Iran could be effective and necessary”. Expressing the need to “keep all options on the table confronting that country”, Schumer added that “Hagel made a crystal-clear promise that he would do ‘whatever it takes’ to stop Tehran from obtaining nuclear weapons, including the use of military force”. In announcing Hagel’s nomination, Obama attempted to head off criticism of his cross-political choice for the post, following the former Senator’s contentious position on Israel during his Senate mandate, insisting he had shown him evidence of his leadership qualities “in our travels together across the Middle East”, as he concluded that his candidate “understands that America stands strongest when we stand with allies and with friends”. Although refraining to reference criticism of his previous voting position on Israel during his acceptance speech that followed, Hagel subsequently told his local Nebraska newspaper the Lincoln Journal Star that peace must remain the primary concern and objective of Israelis and Palestinians alike. Speaking of the Jewish State’s increasingly fractured relationship with the international community, in light of a series of widely-condemned settlement expansion announcements which provoked both US and EU ire: "Israel is in a very, very difficult position. No border that touches Israel is always secure. We need to work to help protect Israel, so it doesn't get isolated. "Furthering the peace process in the Middle East is in Israel's interest." Amongst other instances of his courting of critics, Hagel wrote a letter to another Democrat, California Senator Barbara Boxer regretting past comments attributed to him invoking the so-called “Jewish lobby” as he acknowledged such “language can be construed as anti-Israel”. “In the Senate, I was a strong supporter of defense appropriations, which provided enduring support for Israel’s security. Most Americans, myself included, are overwhelmingly supportive of a strong U.S.-Israel strategic and security relationship,” he added as he concluded that, should his post be confirmed: “I fully intend to expand the depth and breadth of U.S.-Israel cooperation”. Hagel’s candidacy received its first significant boost Sunday since his nomination was announced earlier this month, after former Secretary of State and fellow Centrist Republican Colin Powell described him as “superbly qualified” for the role. The choice of the controversial former Senator is still likely to face some degree of opposition from within the Senate, however, particularly amongst Republican and Jewish groups concerned about the prospective defence secretary’s positions on Israel, Iran, Hezbollah, with 2008 Republican presidential candidate and Arizona Senator John McCain an outspoken opponent of his.

**Dem support doesn’t ensure confirmation - GOP support matters more for Hagel’s confirmation prospects**

**Halperin 1/7/13 (**Mark, Time, “Team Hagel Versus Team Anti-Hagel”, <http://thepage.time.com/2013/01/07/team-hagel-versus-team-anti-hagel/>)

The potential swing point in this fight would be if a Democratic senator came out in opposition to Hagel. The current post-Thomas dynamic in most nominations is for senators, regardless of party, to keep their powder dry until confirmation hearings are underway. If that pattern holds, both sides are likely to be fighting a meta-war until February.¶ The two most important senators in this nomination right now are McConnell and McCain. If Hagel has their support, he should be home free. **If he loses one or both of them**, and even a single Democrat, the dynamics become more challenging for the White House.

#### Hagel will be confirmed but it will be a bruising fight – GOP senators are skeptical

Bennett 1/14/13 (John, Federal Times, "Hagel's confirmation fight may be easier than feared," http://www.federaltimes.com/article/20130114/DEPARTMENTS01/301140003/Hagel-8217-s-confirmation-fight-may-easier-than-feared?odyssey=tab%7Ctopnews%7Ctext%7CFRONTPAGE)

“It’s unfortunate that so many people are coming out as ‘no’ votes before the first word of testimony has happened. That is very unusual,” said one source familiar with the confirmation preparations. “You have paid political ads, people like [former Pennsylvania GOP] Sen. Rick Santorum saying they’ll fight the nomination.¶ “So what’s different is there is a strong political undertone here,” the source said. “This is more Republicans trying to weaken President Obama than it is about policy issues. They smell blood in the water, and they’re going after the president. This is not about substance. It’s all politics.”¶ Ironically, as the source notes, Hagel’s fellow Republicans have led the charge in fighting his nomination. But a close examination of their words and desires during the nominee’s coming confirmation hearing suggests Hagel — though likely with some political bruises — will win confirmation.¶ The harsher rhetoric and threats of procedural blocks were on full display last year as lawmakers tried to prevent U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice from being nominated for secretary of State. GOP senators, led by John McCain of Arizona and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, used terms like “not qualified” and “not very bright.”¶ They repeatedly accused her of lying to the American people in public and lawmakers behind closed doors about the Sept. 11 attack on a U.S. diplomatic facility in Benghazi, Libya, that left four Americans dead.¶ Sen. Kelly Ayotte, R-N.H., harshly questioned Rice’s judgment, suggesting she lacked the kind needed to be America’s top diplomat.¶ Graham told Defense News in mid-November he would place a hold on Rice’s nomination if Obama tapped her for secretary of State because of her role in the Benghazi attack’s fallout. Weeks later, she withdrew her name from consideration for a Cabinet post.¶ Two months later, an examination of GOP lawmakers’ statements about Hagel reveals such sharp rhetoric and threats are nowhere to be found.¶ One of the most stringent anti-Hagel Republican senators has been Minority Whip John Cornyn of Texas. Cornyn flatly says he “will not support Chuck Hagel’s [expected] nomination to the Department of Defense [because] his record and past statements, particularly with respect to rogue nations like Iran, are extremely concerning to me.¶ “[Hagel’s] opposition to Iranian sanctions and support for direct, unconditional talks with its leaders is both at odds with current U.S. policy and a threat to global security. To make matters worse, he has called for direct negotiations with Hamas,” Cornyn said last week. “As Iran becomes increasingly hostile and gains influence in the region, the worst possible message we could send to our friend Israel and the rest of our allies in the Middle East is Chuck Hagel.”¶ Graham and a handful of other GOP senators have been equally critical and have bluntly said they will vote no on Hagel.¶ Washington veterans are busy prepping Hagel for what the source called “the things every Defense secretary nominee gets asked about.” That list includes the necessary budget level, acquisition reform, whether to allow women in combat, and openly homosexual troops.¶ “But you always have to expect the unexpected in a confirmation process,” the source said. “You know the opposition research will continue. The team has a mix of people who are new to the process and people who are very experienced with it. Sen. Hagel has the right kind of expertise available to him.¶ “I think this will be a very difficult confirmation process,” the source said. “You have people who have never met Chuck Hagel, never heard him utter a word, but have said already they will vote against him.”

#### Pc’s the make it or break it – opposition exists but the question is which way they vote

Stirewalt, writer for Fox News, 1/7/2013

(Chris, “Obama Antagonizes with Hagel Pick,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/07/obama-antagonizes-with-hagel-pick/#ixzz2HIw1d0GW)

With Republicans still resentful of Hagel’s ostentatious opposition of Bush-era policies and support for Obama’s two presidential runs, confirmation would have been tricky enough. But the queasy feelings of pro-Israel Democrats on the tough-talking Vietnam vet will make it so much worse.

Maryland Sen. Ben Cardin, a dutiful Democrat if ever there was one, told the soon-to-be-former cable news network Current TV on Sunday that there are “some statements that [Hagel] needs to clarify” and called the nomination “controversial.”

Coming from Cardin, ranked in the 10 most liberal senators by National Journal, that’s the equivalent of a cannon shot across Obama’s bow.

**It will take lots of time and effort to drag Hagel**, **opinionated and confrontational**, **across the finish line**. **The president can get it done**, **but the ordeal will be frightful and expend plenty of political capital**.

### 1NR – Link

#### Plan unpopular – GOP ties nuclear spending to Solyndra- causes backlash – that’s Korte

#### Plan’s unpopular – Republicans want to phase out loan guarantees

**The Hill, 12** (Ben German and Zack Colman, 7/11. “OVERNIGHT ENERGY: Loan guarantee battle flares in House,” http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/237399-overnight-energy-loan-guarantee-battle-flares-in-house)

State of Play: House Republicans will take fresh shots at the Energy Department’s (DOE) loan guarantee program Thursday, with the House Energy and Commerce Committee holding a hearing about the GOP’s “No More Solyndras” bill. The draft legislation – named after the failed DOE-backed solar company – would sunset the loan guarantee program; place new parameters on reviews of existing applications; and prevent so-called subordination of taxpayer interests to private investors in any loan guarantees. The panel will hear from witnesses including the acting head of DOE’s loan program. Republicans say the “No More Solyndras” bill is needed to reform and ultimately phase out a program that they allege has been wasteful with taxpayer dollars, noting the collapse of Solyndra and bankruptcy of some other companies that have received loan guarantees. “Our ‘No More Solyndras Act’ will ensure taxpayers are no longer vulnerable to the Obama administration’s game of crony capitalism,” said Rep. Cliff Stearns (R-Fla.), the GOP’s point man on the Solyndra probe, when rolling out the draft bill Tuesday. But DOE officials say those headwinds shouldn’t obscure the wider successes of the program. Damien LaVera, a DOE spokesman, said the department takes the use of taxpayer dollars seriously and is strengthening oversight of the program, which was first authorized in a bipartisan 2005 energy law and expanded in the 2009 stimulus. “As we have consistently said, there is a degree of risk inherent in helping new, innovative technologies get off the ground. Congress recognized that risk by putting aside $10 billion in loan loss reserves,” he said in a statement. “But this Administration believes that just because there is risk here, that doesn’t mean we should throw up our hands and cede the jobs of the future to China, Spain, or anywhere else.” The loan guarantee program is authorized to support technologies including renewables, nuclear power and low-emissions fossil energy projects. The hearing will also delve into separate legislation to improve the federal government’s energy efficiency. Copies of both bills are available [here](http://energycommerce.house.gov/hearings/hearingdetail.aspx?NewsID=9668).

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

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

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

#### The plan’s controversial – difficult to defend loan guarantees in this fiscal environment

**Niemeyer, 12** – science writer for Ars Technica. He has B.S. and M.S. degrees in Aerospace Engineering from Case Western Reserve University, and is currently a Ph.D. candidate focusing on combustion modeling (Kyle, 3/6. “Chain reaction: the (slow) revival of US nuclear power.” http://arstechnica.com/science/2012/03/chain-reaction-the-slow-revival-of-us-nuclear-power/)

However, authors of the report contend the combination of the current deficit-spending environment and the high cost of nuclear plants (especially compared to natural gas) makes it difficult to defend continued loan guarantees from the federal government. Instead, they argue for a viable bond market to finance long-term projects like these. This would require, for example, stable Federal Reserve policies, low corporate tax and capital gain rates, a strong currency, and stable economic growth. According to the report, the main obstacle to financing nuclear power plant construction is federal deficit spending. With a growing deficit, the supply of US Treasury bonds increases and corporate debt is either displaced or becomes more expensive. This makes it increasingly difficult to finance nuclear plant construction, outside of federal loan guarantees.

#### Increasing loan guarantees costs capital – opposition from environmental groups and fiscal hawks

The Hill, 10 (Jim Snyder, 2/1. “Nuclear energy firms seek more than loan guarantees for revival.” http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/78943-nuclear-energy-industry-seeks-more-than-loan-guarantees-for-revival)

Raising the amount of federal loan guarantees available for new nuclear plants is just part of what the industry wants Congress to do to spur its revival. Department of Energy Secretary Steven Chu told reporters on Friday that the DoE budget, which will be released on Monday, would call for a $54 billion loan guarantee program, tripling the current amount. The move was praised by industry lobbyists but criticized by some environmental and fiscal watchdog groups for putting too much taxpayer money at risk. Congress has already approved an $18.5 billion loan guarantee program in hopes of reassuring Wall Street investors about an industry with a history of cost overruns. But the industry said additional financial support was needed. The loan guarantee program prompted 17 applications for projects that were estimated to cost $122 billion to build.¶ The announcement of the additional loan guarantees “is a very important signal of the seriousness about getting a clean energy industry back up and running,” said Jim Connaughton, a former director of the White House Council on Environmental Quality in the Bush administration. ¶ Connaughton is now an executive at Constellation, an electric utility that operates five nuclear reactors at three sites.\*¶ Connaughton said negotiations with DoE are ongoing over what percentage a company should have to pay to DoE to reduce its risk. The industry wants to keep the “credit cost” at 1 percent or below the anticipated total cost to build a new plant. A company would be required to pay DoE $100 million to reduce the risks for a $10 billion project, but industry critics have sought a much higher percentage.¶ The guarantees would mean the government would step in to repay 80 percent of a loan should a company default.¶ In addition to loan guarantees, the industry is also lobbying to remain eligible for support from a clean energy fund Congress is also considering. ¶ The entity would support a variety of clean energy technologies through loans, grants and guarantees to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.¶ Industry lobbyists participating in the United States Climate Action Partnership (USCAP), a coalition of environmental groups and energy companies that support climate change legislation, are working within the group to have nuclear power counted as clean energy in a Clean Energy Standard. ¶ Such a standard would be an alternative to a Renewable Energy Portfolio renewable production mandate under consideration in Congress that is now limited largely to wind and solar power. It is opposed by environmental groups within USCAP. The industry also continues to press for regulatory changes to speed the time it takes the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to approve a nuclear application. Industry officials say the long process of winning regulatory approval discourages potential investors. Utilities like Constellation and Exelon, which operate nuclear plants, also continue to press for a cap-and-trade bill that would give the plants a competitive advantage over coal and natural gas plants that emit carbon dioxide. ¶ And Connaughton said the industry would press for an even higher level of loan guarantees. There are around 100 nuclear reactors in operation, but the NRC has not approved a new application for a reactor in more than two decades.¶ Politically, the industry has already undergone a revival of sorts. Before DoE announced it would seek additional loan guarantees, President Barack Obama said a comprehensive climate and energy bill should include support for new nuclear plants. ¶ Nuclear power is likely to be a central component of the climate legislation compromise that emerges from the negotiations led by Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.), Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) and Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.). But much of the industry’s agenda will be opposed by environmental groups and by fiscal watchdogs that worry billions of taxpayer dollars are at risk with the loan guarantee program. “Increasing loan guarantees for nuclear power beyond what Congress already has authorized would shift unacceptable risks from the nuclear industry to U.S. taxpayers,” said Ellen Vancko, nuclear energy and climate change project manager at Union of Concerned Scientists.

### AT: Puppet

#### No ev that Obama is changing his stance he’s said all options are on the table, but more importantly our IL evidence cites what IRAN thinks, they’ll still be beligerant because they think Obama will bomb them, but they trust HAGEL, our evidence from the the Iranian nuclear negotiator

#### Hagel changes the conversation on Iran -- avoids war

**Beinart 1/7/13** (Peter, associate professor of journalism and political science at City University of New York + writer for the Daily Beast, “Hagel: A New Era In Foreign Policy?,” <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/07/hagel-a-new-era-in-american-foreign-policy.html>)

The final reason for the resiliency of this Republican foreign-policy cocoon is the American media, especially the television media, which take an entirely à la carte view of foreign-policy debates. Rarely is anything a commentator or legislator said yesterday about war with Iraq or Afghanistan deemed relevant to his or her credibility today on the subject of war with Iran. On cable, you shake an Etch a Sketch every time you go on air. Thus, the same Republican commentators and politicians who pushed a hawkish line on Iraq moved seamlessly to pushing a hawkish line on Afghanistan, and once that too became a lost cause, to **pushing a hawkish line on Iran** and everything else.¶ That hawkish line consists of hostility to any diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear standoff that involves meaningful American compromise and **cautious optimism about the impact of an American military strike**. More generally, it means supporting as large a defense budget as possible, irrespective of its impact on America’s fiscal health. This is the perspective that Republican foreign-policy pundits call “mainstream” and from which they say Hagel diverges. And they are right. Taking a hawkish line on Iran and military spending is as mainstream in today’s GOP as was taking a hawkish line on Iraq and Afghanistan between 20**01** and 20**03**, because Republican Washington has created an ecosystem in which the wisdom of that prior hawkishness is irrelevant to contemporary debates.¶ What makes Hagel so important, and so threatening to the Republican foreign-policy elite, is that he is one of the few prominent Republican-aligned politicians and commentators (George Will and Francis Fukuyama are others, but such voices are rare) who was intellectually changed by Iraq. And Hagel was changed, in large measure, because he bore within him intellectual (and physical) scar tissue from Vietnam. As my former colleague John Judis captured brilliantly in a 2007 New Republic profile, the Iraq War sparked something visceral in Hagel, as the former Vietnam rifleman realized that, once again, detached and self-interested elites were sending working-class kids like himself to die in a war they couldn’t honestly defend. It is certainly true that some politicians who served in Vietnam—for instance, John McCain—did not react to Iraq that way. But it is also true that the fact that so few American politicians and pundits lived the kind of wartime hell Hagel endured made it easier for them to pass through the Iraq years unscathed. It’s no coincidence that the other senator most deeply enraged by Iraq was ex-Marine James Webb, another former hawkish Republican who saw the war through his own personal Vietnam prism.¶ At the heart of the opposition to Hagel is the fear that he will do what Republicans have thus far largely prevented: bring America’s experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan into the Iran debate. Much of the Republican and establishment Jewish criticism of Hagel centers on his comments about the “Jewish lobby.” Some critics genuinely consider those comments offensive (though I don’t). But ultimately, Hagel’s “Jewish lobby” remarks are a sideshow. Were he as hawkish on Iran as McCain is, Republican senators, conservative journalists, and American Jewish officials would almost certainly have overlooked them, as they largely overlooked (or outright defended) the more problematic recent comments about Jewish media ownership by Rupert Murdoch. The bald truth is that for many conservatives today, the key test of how someone feels about Jews is whether they support Israel’s security needs, as conservatives define them. Had Hagel passed that test, conservative Republicans and Jewish “leaders” would be as bothered by his use of the term “Jewish lobby” in 2005 as they were when Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations executive vice chairman Malcolm Hoenleinused the phrase last month. Which is to say, not at all.¶ My point is not that because the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have proved disastrous, war with Iran would too. Every war is different, and I wrote a whole book about how difficult it is to predict, on the basis of one conflict, how the next will turn out. But a Hagel nomination will ensure that when Obama officials discuss a third Middle Eastern war, the ghosts of Iraq and Afghanistan sit at the table. And while that won’t make American military action impossible, it will raise the bar.¶ What the Republican foreign-policy establishment fears is that with Hagel as secretary of defense, it will be impossible for Obama to minimize the dangers of war with Iran, as George W. Bush minimized the dangers of war with Iraq. Hagel would be to the Obama administration what Dwight Eisenhower was in the 1950s, what Colin Powell was in the 1990s, and what, to some degree, ex-Mossad head Meir Dagan was in the Netanyahu government, the military man who bluntly reminds his colleagues that war, once unleashed, cannot be easily controlled. “Once you start” a war with Iran, Hagel told the Atlantic Council in 2010, “you’d better be prepared to find 100,000 troops, because it may take that.” You can’t say “it’ll be a limited warfare. I don’t think any nation can ever go into it that way.” For Hagel’s ex-friends in the Republican foreign-policy class, such a statement is kryptonite, because they know that given the American public’s weariness of war, a president who outlined the risks that way would have trouble gaining popular support. It’s also likely that Hagel’s position would be reinforced by the leaders of the uniformed military, some of whom have already expressed skepticism about bombing Iran.

### AT: Another Nominee

#### Alternatives to Hagel group-think --- results in Iran war

**Greenwald**, **1/5**/2013 (Glenn, Chuck Hagel and liberals: what are the priorities?, Guardian, p. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jan/05/hagel-liberals-gays-israel-democrats)

Anyone on the left who suggested in the run-up to the 2012 election that principled opposition to Obama's policies meant they would not vote for his re-election was instantly attacked as irrational. One cannot simply focus on Obama's flaws, they were instructed, but rather must consider the plausible alternatives. Fine: let's apply this standard to the Hagel nomination. All of the Democratic alternatives to Hagel who have been seriously mentioned are nothing more than standard foreign policy technocrats, fully on-board with the DC consensus regarding war, militarism, Israel, Iran, and the Middle East. That's why Kristol, the Washington Post and other neocons were urging Obama to select them rather than Hagel: because those neocons know that, unlike Hagel, these Democratic technocrats pose no challenge whatsoever to their agenda of sustaining destructive US policy in the Middle East and commitment to endless war.

### AT: Fiscal cliff

#### Hagel nomination comes first --- it’s Obama’s top priority.

**Karl**, **1/4**/2013 (Jonathan, Obama Poised to Name New Defense, Treasury Chiefs, ABC News, p. <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/obama-poised-defense-treasury-chiefs/story?id=18133924>)

With the "fiscal cliff" crisis behind him, President Obama is poised to name two new key players to his cabinet, with both announcements expected to come next week. Obama will name the replacement for outgoing Defense Secretary Leon Panetta as soon as Monday, sources told ABC News. Former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel is the likely nominee, they said. Meanwhile, the president is also eyeing a replacement for outgoing Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, the longest-serving member of Obama's first-term economic team and one-time lead negotiator for the administration in the "fiscal cliff" talks. Current chief of staff Jack Lew is all but certain to get the nod for Treasury, according to people familiar with Obama's thinking. A White House spokesman cautioned that the president has not yet made a final decision on either post, calling reports about Hagel and Lew "merely guessing." Still, when Obama returns from his Hawaiian vacation on Sunday, he's expected to waste little time filling out his team for a second term.

#### Hagel’s nomination comes first.

**LoGiurato**, **1/6**/2013 (Brett, Obama Plans To Nominate Chuck Hagel For Defense Secretary And Set Up A Confirmation Fight With Republicans, Business Insider, p. http://www.businessinsider.com/chuck-hagel-nomination-defense-secretary-obama-confirmation-senate-republicans-2013-1)

According to numerous reports, President Barack Obama is preparing to nominate former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel to serve as Secretary of Defense, setting up a clash with Senate Republicans over his potential confirmation. The Los Angeles Times reports that the Hagel nomination will come Monday. Hagel would succeed outgoing Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta.

### AT: Winners Win

#### 2. Link outweighs the link turn on timeframe

**Silber 07** [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

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

#### 3. Winners don’t win – controversies hurt capital – Obama will do a poor job spinning the plan

**GERSON 12 – 19 – 10** Washington Post Political Commentator

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/12/16/AR2010121604039.html>

In some areas - such as education reform or the tax deal - Obama's governing practice is better than his political skills. But these skills matter precisely because political capital is limited. The early pursuit of ambitious health-care reform was a political mistake, as former chief of staff Rahm Emanuel internally argued. But every president has the right to spend his popularity on what he regards as matters of principle. Political risks, taken out of conviction with open eyes, are an admirable element of leadership. Yet political errors made out of pique or poor planning undermine the possibility of achievement. Rather than being spent, popularity is squandered - something the Obama administration has often done. Why so many unforced mistakes? The ineffectiveness of Obama's political and communications staff may be part of the problem - and the administration is now hinting at significant White House personnel changes in the new year. But an alternative explanation was on display this week. Perhaps Democrats did not elect another Franklin Roosevelt or John Kennedy but another Woodrow Wilson - a politician sabotaged by his sense of superiority.

### AT: Intrinsicness

intrinsicness is a voter – counterinterp you are a citizen with limited resources – a few net benefits:

a) neg ground – they can spike out of any disad because the usfg could decide to block the terminal impact

b) politics disads are good – they’re key to current events education which internal link turns their opportunity cost arguments – knowing the relevant information is a prerequisite to making effective decisions

### A2: Fiat Solves / Magic Wand

#### -- Voting issue –

#### Uneducational – details of enactment are important

#### Not real world – there’s no magic wand, nothing passes instantly

#### Crushes ground – politics DAs are core offense on a broad topic

#### -- Our interpretation: plan passes immediately via normal political processes

#### -- Links worse: rushed enactment amplifies opposition, backlash is greater because there’s no time for debate

### A2: Vote No

#### -- Illogical – the status quo should always be an option – they create bad policy-making – destroying real-world education – voting issue

#### -- Not real world – we aren’t Congress – just citizen-advocates debating ideas – they confuse roles

#### -- Politics DAs are good – encourage timely research key to education and its core ground on a huge topic

# Round 8 vs. U Pitt LM

## 1NC

### 1NC – Framework

#### A. Interpretation – debate is a game that requires the aff to defend USFG action on energy policy –

#### --‘resolved’ means to enact a policy by law

Words and Phrases 64 (Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### --“United States Federal Government should” means the debate is solely about the outcome of a policy established by governmental means

Ericson 3 (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### B. Violation – they claim to win for reasons other than the desirability of that action

#### C. Reasons to prefer:

#### 1. Education – debate as a competitive political game is the best framework to solve dogmatism and human brutality

Carter 8 – prof @ The Colorado College, research support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the staff of the Villa Serbelloni, Bellagio, Italy, the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Benezet Foundation at The Colorado College (Lief H, 2008, "LAW AND POLITICS AS PLAY," Chicago-Kent Law Review, 83(3), http://www.cklawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/vol83no3/Carter.pdf)

Vico asked his audience at the University of Naples in 1708 to debate two competing ways of knowing: Cartesian rationality versus the poetic world of the ancients. Vico, the “pre-law advisor” of his day, saw law as a rhetorical game. That is, he understood the civic (ethical) value of competi-tion itself.12 He understood that Cartesian rationality, like religious and ideological fundamentalism, generates a kind of certainty that shuts down robust debate. Vico’s comprehensive vision suggests, in effect, that people should practice law and politics not as the search for the most rational or logically correct outcomes but rather as passionate and embodied yet peaceful competitive play. Vico inspires this vision of law and politics as play because he sees that all things in the human mind, including law and politics, are at one with the human body. As Vico put it as he concluded his 1708 address, “[T]he soul should be drawn to love by means of bodily images; for once it loves it is easily taught to believe; and when it believes and loves it should be inflamed so that it wills things by means of its normal intemperance.”13 Vico had no hope that such abstract moral principles as liberty, equality, justice, and tolerance could effectively offset the “crude and rough” nature of men.14 The Holy Bible and the Qur’an contain normative principles of love, tolerance, equal respect, and peace, but these commands have not forestalled ancient and modern religious warfare. This essay proposes that humans learn how to keep the peace not by obeying the norms, rules, and principles of civil conduct but by learning how to play, and thereby reintegrating the mind and the body. People do law, politics, and economic life well when they do them in the same ways and by the same standards that structure and govern good competitive sports and games. The word “sport” derives from “port” and “portal” and relates to the words “disport” and “transport.” The word at least hints that the primitive and universal joy of play carries those who join the game across space to a better, and ideally safer, place—a harbor that Vico him-self imagined. This essay’s bold proposition honors Vico in many ways. Its “grand theory” matches the scope of Vico’s comprehensive and integrated vision of the human condition. It plausibly confirms Vico’s hope for a “concep-tion of a natural law for all of humanity” that is rooted in human historical practice.15 Seeing these core social processes as play helps us to escape from arid academic habits and to “learn to think like children,” just as Vico urged.16 Imagining law and politics as play honors Vico above all because, if we attain Ruskin’s epigraphic ideal,17 we will see that the peace-tending qualities of sports and games already operate under our noses. Seeing law and politics as play enables us “to reach out past our inclination to make experience familiar through the power of the concept and to engage the power of the image. We must reconstruct the human world not through concepts and criteria but as something we can practically see.”18 If at its end readers realize that they could have seen, under their noses, the world as this essay sees it without ever having read it, this essay will successfully honor Vico. As Vico would have predicted, formal academic theory has played at best a marginal role in the construction of competitive games. Ordinary people have created cricket and football, and common law and electoral politics and fair market games, more from the experience of doing them than from formal theories of competitive games. When they play interna-tional football today, ordinary people in virtually every culture in the world recreate the experience of competitive games. Playing competitive games unites people across cultures in a common normative world.19 Within Vico’s social anthropological and proto-scientific framework, the claim that competitive play can generate peaceful civic life is purely empirical: law and politics in progressively peaceful political systems already are nothing more or less than competitive games. All empirical description operates within some, though too often ob-scured, normative frame. This essay’s normative frame is clear. It holds, with Shaw’s epigraph, above: Human brutalities waged against other hu-mans—suicide bombings, genocides, tribal and religious wars that provoke the indiscriminate rape, murder, torture, and enslavement of men, women, and children, often because they are labeled “evil”—are the worst things that we humans do. We should learn not to do them. In Vico’s anti-Cartesian, non-foundational world, no method exists to demonstrate that this essay’s normative core is “correct,” or even “better than,” say, the core norm holding that the worst thing humans do is dishonor God. Readers who reject Shaw’s and this essay’s normative frame may have every reason to reject the essay’s entire argument. However, this essay does describe empirically how those whose core norm requires honoring any absolute, including God, above all else regu-larly brutalize other human beings, and why those who live by the norms of good competitive play do not. People brutalize people, as Shaw’s Caesar observed, in the name of right and honor and peace. Evaluated by the norm that human brutality is the worst thing humans do, the essay shows why and how the human invention of competitive play short circuits the psy-chology of a righteousness-humiliation-brutality cycle. We cannot help but see and experience on fields of contested play testosterone-charged males striving mightily to defeat one another. Yet at the end of play, losers and winners routinely shake hands and often hug; adult competitors may dine and raise a glass together.20 Whether collectively invented as a species-wide survival adaptation or not, institutionalized competitive play under-cuts the brutality cycle by displacing religious and other forms of funda-mentalist righteousness with something contingent, amoral, and thus less lethal. Play thereby helps humans become Shaw’s “race that can under-stand.”

#### 2. Decision-making – debate gaming through dramatic rehearsal strengthens decision-making – only maintained by a confined educational space

Haghoj 8 – PhD, affiliated with Danish Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials, asst prof @ the Institute of Education at the University of Bristol (Thorkild, 2008, "PLAYFUL KNOWLEDGE: An Explorative Study of Educational Gaming," PhD dissertation @ Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies, University of Southern Denmark, http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information\_til/Studerende\_ved\_SDU/Din\_uddannelse/phd\_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf)

Joas’ re-interpretation of Dewey’s pragmatism as a “theory of situated creativity” raises a critique of humans as purely rational agents that navigate instrumentally through meansendsschemes (Joas, 1996: 133f). This critique is particularly important when trying to understand how games are enacted and validated within the realm of educational institutions that by definition are inscribed in the great modernistic narrative of “progress” where nation states, teachers and parents expect students to acquire specific skills and competencies (Popkewitz, 1998; cf. chapter 3). However, as Dewey argues, the actual doings of educational gaming cannot be reduced to rational means-ends schemes. Instead, the situated interaction between teachers, students, and learning resources are played out as contingent re-distributions of means, ends and ends in view, which often make classroom contexts seem “messy” from an outsider’s perspective (Barab & Squire, 2004). 4.2.3. Dramatic rehearsal The two preceding sections discussed how Dewey views play as an imaginative activity of educational value, and how his assumptions on creativity and playful actions represent a critique of rational means-end schemes. For now, I will turn to Dewey’s concept of dramatic rehearsal, which assumes that social actors deliberate by projecting and choosing between various scenarios for future action. Dewey uses the concept dramatic rehearsal several times in his work but presents the most extensive elaboration in Human Nature and Conduct: Deliberation is a dramatic rehearsal (in imagination) of various competing possible lines of action… [It] is an experiment in finding out what the various lines of possible action are really like (...) Thought runs ahead and foresees outcomes, and thereby avoids having to await the instruction of actual failure and disaster. An act overtly tried out is irrevocable, its consequences cannot be blotted out. An act tried out in imagination is not final or fatal. It is retrievable (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). 86 This excerpt illustrates how Dewey views the process of decision making (deliberation) through the lens of an imaginative drama metaphor. Thus, decisions are made through the imaginative projection of outcomes, where the “possible competing lines of action” are resolved through a thought experiment. Moreover, Dewey’s compelling use of the drama metaphor also implies that decisions cannot be reduced to utilitarian, rational or mechanical exercises, but that they have emotional, creative and personal qualities as well. Interestingly, there are relatively few discussions within the vast research literature on Dewey of his concept of dramatic rehearsal. A notable exception is the phenomenologist Alfred Schütz, who praises Dewey’s concept as a “fortunate image” for understanding everyday rationality (Schütz, 1943: 140). Other attempts are primarily related to overall discussions on moral or ethical deliberation (Caspary, 1991, 2000, 2006; Fesmire, 1995, 2003; Rönssön, 2003; McVea, 2006). As Fesmire points out, dramatic rehearsal is intended to describe an important phase of deliberation that does not characterise the whole process of making moral decisions, which includes “duties and contractual obligations, short and long-term consequences, traits of character to be affected, and rights” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Instead, dramatic rehearsal should be seen as the process of “crystallizing possibilities and transforming them into directive hypotheses” (Fesmire, 2003: 70). Thus, deliberation can in no way guarantee that the response of a “thought experiment” will be successful. But what it can do is make the process of choosing more intelligent than would be the case with “~~blind~~” trial-and-error (Biesta, 2006: 8). The notion of dramatic rehearsal provides a valuable perspective for understanding educational gaming as a simultaneously real and imagined inquiry into domain-specific scenarios. Dewey defines dramatic rehearsal as the capacity to stage and evaluate “acts”, which implies an “irrevocable” difference between acts that are “tried out in imagination” and acts that are “overtly tried out” with real-life consequences (Dewey, 1922: 132-3). This description shares obvious similarities with games as they require participants to inquire into and resolve scenario-specific problems (cf. chapter 2). On the other hand, there is also a striking difference between moral deliberation and educational game activities in terms of the actual consequences that follow particular actions. Thus, when it comes to educational games, acts are both imagined and tried out, but without all the real-life consequences of the practices, knowledge forms and outcomes that are being simulated in the game world. Simply put, there is a difference in realism between the dramatic rehearsals of everyday life and in games, which only “play at” or simulate the stakes and 87 risks that characterise the “serious” nature of moral deliberation, i.e. a real-life politician trying to win a parliamentary election experiences more personal and emotional risk than students trying to win the election scenario of The Power Game. At the same time, the lack of real-life consequences in educational games makes it possible to design a relatively safe learning environment, where teachers can stage particular game scenarios to be enacted and validated for educational purposes. In this sense, educational games are able to provide a safe but meaningful way of letting teachers and students make mistakes (e.g. by giving a poor political presentation) and dramatically rehearse particular “competing possible lines of action” that are relevant to particular educational goals (Dewey, 1922: 132). Seen from this pragmatist perspective, the educational value of games is not so much a question of learning facts or giving the “right” answers, but more a question of exploring the contingent outcomes and domain-specific processes of problem-based scenarios.

#### Decisionmaking is a trump impact—it improves all aspects of life regardless of its specific goals

Shulman 9, president emeritus – Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, (Lee S, Education and a Civil Society: Teaching Evidence-Based Decision Making, p. ix-x)

These are the kinds of questions that call for the exercise of practical reason, a form of thought that draws concurrently from theory and practice, from values and experience, and from critical thinking and human empathy. None of these attributes is likely to be thought of no value and thus able to be ignored. Our schools, however, are unlikely to take on all of them as goals of the educational process. The goal of education is not to render practical arguments more theoretical; nor is it to diminish the role of values in practical reason. Indeed, all three sources—theoretical knowledge, practical knowhow and experience, and deeply held values and identity—have legitimate places in practical arguments. An educated person, argue philosophers Thomas Green (1971) and Gary Fenstermacher (1986), is someone who has transformed the premises of her or his practical arguments from being less objectively reasonable to being more objectively reasonable. That is, to the extent that they employ probabilistic reasoning or interpret data from various sources, those judgments and interpretations conform more accurately to well-understood principles and are less susceptible to biases and distortions. To the extent that values, cultural or religious norms, or matters of personal preference or taste are at work, they have been rendered more explicit, conscious, intentional, and reflective. In his essay for this volume, Jerome Kagan reflects the interactions among these positions by arguing: We are more likely to solve our current problem, however, if teachers accept the responsibility of guaranteeing that all adolescents, regardless of class or ethnicity, can read and comprehend the science section of newspapers, solve basic mathematical problems, detect the logical coherence in non-technical verbal arguments or narratives, and insist that all acts of maliciousness, deception, and unregulated self-aggrandizement are morally unacceptable. Whether choosing between a Prius and a Hummer, an Obama or a McCain, installing solar panels or planting taller trees, a well-educated person has learned to combine their values, experience, understandings, and evidence in a thoughtful and responsible manner. Thus do habits of mind, practice, and heart all play a significant role in the lives of citizens.

### 1NC - K

#### Mind-world dualism is the root of environmental destruction --- re-education is critical to creating a sustainable relationship.

C. Jotin Khisty, Ph. D., 2007. Professor emeritus in the department of civil, architectural, and environmental Engineering at the Illinois Institute of Technology He has published extensively in the areas of urban planning, transportation engineering, and systems science. “The Marriage of Buddhism and Deep Ecology,” http://www.theosophical.org/publications/quest-magazine/1670

In 2005, people all across the world sat up in their seats to watch Al Gore’s film An Inconvenient Truth. They were stunned to see the environmental degradation and destruction that has occurred and the profound threat it poses to all life on the planet. Then, in October 2007, many of us jumped with joy when Gore and the U. N. Panel on Climate Change were jointly awarded the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize. This recognition gave us hope of a way to work through our political, economic, and environmental systems in order to reverse the effects of decades of indifference and damage to our planet. One of the paramount reasons for this degradation is not hard to find. The organizing principle of society for at least the last hundred years has been: What will make the economy grow larger and produce greater profit? But with a new consciousness on the horizon and a transformation of the human heart all around the world, it is very likely that for the next hundred years, the organizing principle may be: What will make the planet more sustainable? This has to be the new lens through which we look at the world. After all, the voyage of discovery lies not in seeking new vistas but in having new eyes. This article aims to explore the connections between two important disciplines: spiritual systems, particularly Buddhism, and deep ecology. Spiritual systems are more than a belief in a transcendental deity or a means to an afterlife. They are a way of understanding both the cosmos and our role in its preservation. In this way they are closely connected with ecology, which embraces a cultural awareness of kinship with and dependence on the natural environment for the continuity of all life. Buddhism, one of the world’s great spiritual systems, offers a well-developed philosophy of our connection with nature. Deep ecology is focused on the survival and self-renewal of all living beings. (It is so called in contrast to “shallow” ecology, which is essentially anthropocentric and technocratic.) Celebrating the marriage of spiritual systems and deep ecology fosters a moral and cultural awareness of the kinship of the natural environment and the continuity of life. We hear of ecological disasters occurring around the world almost on a daily basis. Almost all of these crises are a result of human neglect, apathy, and greed. They range from resource depletion, species extinction, pollution growth, climate change, to population explosion and over consumption. As far back as 1992, the Union of Concerned Scientists, consisting of over 100 Nobel laureates and 1600 other distinguished scientists from seventy countries, warned us of the deepening ecological crisis caused by human activities on this planet. They warned that a great change in the stewardship of the earth and the life on it is required if vast misery is to be avoided and our global home on this planet is not to be irretrievably mutilated (Uhl, 124). Almost all such warnings have been ignored and ridiculed by our politicians. One prominent source of disinformation about global warning, for instance, has been the Bush-Cheney administration. It has silenced scientists working for the government about the extreme danger we are facing, and has appointed “skeptics” recommended by oil companies to government positions as our principal negotiators. The world has been thunderstruck by the arrogance and ignorance of such political leaders and their cronies (Gore, 264). The reasons for this disconnection from nature, especially in the West, are not hard to detect. Spiritually and psychologically we live inside a bubble of the “self,” as though we are “in here” and the rest of the world is “out there.” According to Buddhist thought, this sense of separation manifests itself in the form of the Three Poisons—greed, ill will, and delusion. Examples of these poisons can be seen everywhere in the current ecological crisis. Greed rooted in untrammeled economic growth and consumerism is the secular religion of advanced industrial societies. Similarly, the military-industrial complex promotes ill will, fear, and terror, while propaganda and advertising systems are well known for deluding the public about everything under the sun. A fundamental question of our time is whether we can counter these forces by developing attitudes of respect, responsibility, and care for the natural world and so create a sustainable future. From its origins in India about 500 years before the birth of Christ, Buddhism spread throughout Asia and is now exerting an ever-increasing influence on Western culture. We in the West are awakening to the fact that there is a more ancient science of mind than our own. The well-known philosopher Alan Watts pointed out that historically the Buddha (563-483 BCE) was the first great psychologist and psychotherapist. He not only recognized the meaning of existential anxiety or suffering that we all experience but offered ways of treating it. Many psychologists, psychiatrists, and scientists regard the discovery of Buddhist philosophy in the West today as a kind of second renaissance (Varela, 22). Contrary to popular belief, Buddhism is in essence a philosophy and not a religion. Buddhist philosophy over the centuries has been very carefully thought out and documented by some of the best scholars and practitioners across the world. A starting point is the central tenet concerning the interconnectedness of all life—human beings, animals, plants, birds. Buddhist ethical teaching emphasizes that this interdependence comes with a moral component. For humans, that means maintaining a sense of universal responsibility in whatever we do. The cornerstone of all Buddhist teachings is the Four Noble Truths. The first truth is that of suffering (or existential anxiety), starting with birth and continuing on through aging and then on to the inevitability of death. The second truth is the realization that human craving and greed are at the very root of our suffering. The third truth stresses that it is possible to eliminate craving, greed, and suffering by transforming the mind. The fourth truth is the Eightfold Path, the Buddhist formula of practices for cultivating this transformation, leading to the extinction of both craving and suffering (Rifkin, 101). Buddhists assert that mindful awareness of existential anxiety produces compassionate empathy for all forms of life. Two other concepts form the bedrock of Buddhist thinking: impermanence and interdependence. All phenomena are impermanent, because everything is in transition. Interdependence refers to the fact that everything is a part of everything else. The philosophical roots of the deep ecology movement can be found in the writings of Henry David Thoreau, Theodore Roszak, Lewis Mumford, Rachel Carson, and others, going back to Baruch Spinoza and the Buddhist philosophers. But it was in 1972 that the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess coined the term to distinguish it from “shallow” anthropocentric and technocratic ecology. Since then, Naess has spelled out a comprehensive platform describing the meaning and scope of deep ecology, as outlined in an eight-point summary: 1. The well-being of human and nonhuman life on earth have value in themselves. 2. The interdependence, richness, and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values. 3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs. 4. Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening. 5. The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with substantial decrease of the human population. Moreover, the flourishing of nonhuman life requires such a decrease. 6. Policies must therefore be changed. The changes in policies will affect basic economic and technological structures. 7. Ideological change is required in order to emphasize quality of life rather than striving for an ever-higher standard of living. 8. Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation to help implement these changes (Naess, 68). To imagine oneself as a separate ego, separate from everything else, locked up in a bag of skin, is a hallucination. Everything is indeed connected with everything else. Given the profound similarity of Buddhist thought to deep ecology, it is not difficult to realize that the “egocentricity” of an apparently isolated self needs to be replaced by “ecocentricity.” How can we harness this obvious interconnection between Buddhist thought and deep ecology in order to tackle the urgent problems that continue to threaten the sentient beings on this planet? As Vaclav Havel, the former president of the Czech Republic, wrote: “The only option for us is a change in the sphere of the spirit, in the sphere of human conscience. It’s not enough to invent new machines, new regulations, and new institutions. We must develop a new understanding of the true purpose of our existence on earth. Only by making such a fundamental shift will we be able to create new models of behavior and a new set of values for the planet” (Uhl, 307). Like Havel, scores of philosophers, economists, and politicians have recognized that the advancing human crisis is result of the lack of deep spiritual roots, brought on to a great extent by the divorce of spiritual meaning and identity from life. But how can we wake up to face this human crisis? Today there is already evidence of an emerging cultural shift as millions of people and their leaders are stirring, as if from a trance, to deal with these issues. Here are some possible avenues of approach: \* Collective awakening. Spiritual awakening in an individual is sometimes called the “opening of the third eye.” When this awareness occurs collectively, it can be called the “opening of the fourth eye.” Evidence of this collective awakening started in the 1960s and has matured in subsequent years, dealing head-on with problems as diverse as postmodern anomie, free-market globalization, and global terrorism. \* Building sustainable systems. The great challenge of our time is to build and nurture sustainable communities–social, cultural, and physical. This goal is best attained in four steps: (1) introducing “ecoliteracy” in order to understand how ecosystems evolve for sustaining the web of life; (2) moving toward “ecodesign” by promoting organic farming, energy- and resource-efficient industries, nonmotorized transportation, and low-cost housing, and by reducing energy consumption; (3) thinking in terms of relationships, contexts, patterns, and processes for ecodesign; (4) striving for resource efficiency, service-flow economy, and energy conservation in order to reduce ecological degradation (Capra, 230-32). So far the records in these areas of nurturing have been deplorable. \* Transforming the world economy. According to free-market capitalism, all values are monetary values determined by buyers of goods and services in a competitive market. The prime movers of this system are the transnational corporations (TNCs), whose economic powers frequently surpass that of many sovereign states. To grow, these TNCs must make enormous profits and consume the world’s raw materials. TNCs and their advocate, the World Trade Organization (WTO), have been largely able to get what they want because of their influence in manipulating the global market for their own profit. Poor countries and the poorer sectors of the world are the worst victims of the WTO. Today, one-third of all economic activity worldwide is generated by only 200 corporations, which are linked to each other by strategic alliances. While the WTO was initially hailed by nations rich and poor as an organization that would produce huge economic benefits which would trickle down to everybody, it failed to live up to this promise, instead creating fatal consequences such as the breakdown of democracies, the rapid deterioration of the environment, and increasing poverty and alienation. Consumerism is now recognized as the most successful religion of all time, winning more converts more quickly than any previous belief or value system in human history. Philosopher David Loy has pointed out that the strategies of the WTO and the World Bank have been exposed, with the result that there are regular riots whenever their meetings are held. These two organizations are clearly ill-suited for building a just, sustainable, and compassionate society that can nurture sufficiency, partnership, and respect for life and its values. Naturally, a new kind of civil society, organized to counterbalance globalization is gradually emerging, embodied in powerful nongovernmental organizations such as Oxfam and Greenpeace. \* Transforming ethics. Activists devoted to peace and social justice acknowledge that there is a spirit of coerciveness that is present in all cultures, manifesting particularly in violence and crime. This coerciveness can be counteracted by several strategies. Creative nonviolence in the tradition of Mahatma Gandhi and Buddhist ethics is one well-documented possibility. Essentially this means that one does not struggle against the opponent but rather against the situation. Political and social adversaries are seen as potential partners rather than as enemies. Satyagraha, or nonviolent resistance, also pioneered by Gandhi, is one form of such creative nonviolence. The principle of ahimsa (harmlessness)—the refusal to kill any living beings—has also been put to use in stopping armed conflicts. It is said that when people saw the Buddha soon after his enlightenment, they were so struck by the extraordinary peacefulness of his presence that they stopped to ask: “What are you? Are you a god, a magician, or a wizard?” Buddha’s reply was stunning. He simply said: “I am awake.” His answer became his title, for this is what the word buddha means in Sanskrit–one who is awakened. While the rest of the world was deep in “sleep,” dreaming a dream known as the waking state of life, the Buddha shook off the slumber and woke up (Smith and Novak, 3-4). Although the Buddha’s wake-up call was issued a very long time ago and has since been repeated time and time again by almost every known spiritual system, it is unfortunate that a mistaken metaphysics has led us to an alienation between us and the earth and between us and other sentient beings. It is essential that we reestablish and restore an awareness of this interdependence. **Naturally, such a transformation requires profound reeducation** at every stage of our lives. Private foundations, nongovernmental organizations, businesses, academic institutions, and religious organizations have an equal stake in setting priorities in this endeavor. In this context the advice of the Dalai Lama is particularly poignant: The Earth, our Mother, is telling us to behave. . . . If we develop good and considerate qualities within our own minds, our activities will naturally cease to threaten the continued survival of life on Earth. By protecting the natural environment and working to forever halt the degradation of our planet, we will also show respect for Earth’s human descendants—our future generations—as well as for the natural right to life of all of Earth’s living things. If we care for nature, it can be rich, bountiful, and inexhaustibly sustainable. It is important that we forgive the destruction of the past and recognize that it was produced by ignorance. At the same time, we should reexamine, from an ethical perspective, what kind of world we have inherited, what we are responsible for, and what we will pass on to coming generations (Hunt-Badiner, v).

#### The alternative is to shed the ego --- this creates a realization of our unity with all living things.

Dale Snauwaert, Fall 2009. Associate Professor of Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education; Chair of the Department of Foundations of Education, University of Toledo “The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity,” Current Issues in Comparative Education 12.1, <http://www.tc.edu/cice/Issues/12.01/PDFs/12_01_Complete_Issue.pdf>

Cosmopolitans assert the existence of a duty of moral consideration to all human beings on the basis of a shared humanity. What is universal in, and definitive of, cosmopolitanism is the presupposition of the shared inherent dignity of humanity. As Martha Nussbaum states: [Human good can] be objective in the sense that it is justifiable by reference to reasons that do not derive merely from local traditions and practices, but rather from features of humanness that lie beneath all local traditions and are there to be seen whether or not they are in fact recognized in local traditions. (Perry, 1998, p. 68) If a shared humanity is presupposed, and if humanity is understood to possess an equal inherent value and dignity, then a shared humanity possesses a fundamental moral value. If the fundamental moral value of humanity is acknowledged, then a universal duty of moral consideration follows, for to deny moral consideration to any human being is to ignore (not recognize) their intrinsic value, and thereby, to violate their dignity. The duty of moral consideration in turn morally requires nations and peoples to conduct their relations in accordance with ethical principles that properly instantiate the intrinsic value and dignity of a shared humanity. If valid, **the fundamental aims of the education of citizens should be based upon this imperative**. In order to further explicate this cosmopolitanism perspective, the philosophy of one of history’s greatest cosmopolitans, Mohandas K. Gandhi, is explored below. Reflections on Gandhi’s Cosmopolitan Philosophy While most commentators focus on Gandhi’s conception and advocacy of nonviolence, it is generally recognized that his core philosophical beliefs regarding the essential unity of humanity and the universal applicability of nonviolence as a moral and political ideal places Gandhi in the cosmopolitan tradition as broadly understood (Iyer, [1973] 1983; Kumar Giri, 2006). At the core of Gandhi’s philosophy are the interdependent values of Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (nonviolence). Gandhi’s approach to nonviolent social transformation, Satyagraha, is the actualization in action of these two values (Bondurant, 1965; Iyer, [1973] 1983; Naess, 1974). Gandhi’s Satya is multifaceted. Its most fundamental meaning pertains to Truth as self-realization. Satya is derived from sat, Being. Truth is Being; realizing in full awareness one’s authentic Being. Truth, in this sense, is the primary goal of life. Gandhi writes: What I want to achieve . . . is self-realization . . . I live and move and have my being in pursuit of that goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing, and all my ventures in the political field are directed to this same end. (Naess 1974, p. 35) Self-realization, for Gandhi, requires “shedding the ego,” ”reducing one self to zero” (cited in Naess 1974, p. 37). The ego per se is not the real self; it is a fabrication. This egoic self must be transcended. As the egoic self loosens and one becomes increasingly self-aware, **one deepens the realization of one’s authentic being, and that being is experienced as unified with humanity and all living things**. Scholars normally understand human identity in terms of personality, which is a socially constructed self-concept constituted by a complex network of identifications and object relations. This construction is what we normally refer to as the ego or self-identity. Our egoic self-identity is literally a construction, based upon psychological identifications (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Batchelor, 1983). From this perspective, **the ego is a socially constructed entity**, ultimately a fabrication of the discursive formations of culture; from this point of view, the self is exclusively egoic. This perspective has its origins in the claim that consciousness is solely intentional: the claim that consciousness is always consciousness of some object. From this presupposition, the socially constructed, discursive nature of the self is inferred. If consciousness is solely intentional, then the self is a construction, and, if the self is a construction, then it is always discursive – a prediscursive self cannot exist. It can be argued, however, that intentionality itself presupposes pre-intentional awareness. A distinction can be made between intentional consciousness and awareness. Intentional consciousness presupposes awareness that is always implicit in intentional consciousness. If intentional consciousness does not presuppose a pre-intentional awareness, if there is only consciousness of, then there is always a knower-known duality, and that duality leads to an infinite regress. To be conscious of an object X, one has to be conscious of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X . . . ad infinitum¾reductio ad absurdum. Therefore, there must be implicit in intentional consciousness a level of awareness that is pre-intentional, pre-discursive, and non-positional (Forman, 1999). To be conscious of anything presupposes pre-intentional self-awareness, and being pre-intentional, awareness must be in turn pre-discursive and non-positional (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Aurobindo, 1989, 2001; Batchelor, 1983; Buber, 1970; Forman, 1999; Fromm, 1976). When the ego is shed, a pre-discursive, nonpositional self-awareness is revealed. One can be reflexively aware of one’s consciousness. Gandhi held that pre-discursive self-awareness, the core of our being, is unified and interdependent with all living things. He writes: “I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives (Naess 1974, p. 43).” In an ontological sense, Gandhi maintains that Satya, Truth, is selfrealization, a realization of one’s self-awareness as essentially unified with and thereby existing in solidarity with all human beings and with all living things. Pre-discursive self-awareness is experienced as non-positional, and, being non-positional, it is unbounded; it exists as a field of awareness that is interconnected with all sentient beings. This state is an experience and is only known experientially. Therefore, the assertion of a shared humanity is based upon a common level of being. Human intentional consciousness is expressed in a vast plurality of cultural expressions; implicit within this plurality, existing as its ground, is a shared level of awareness of being that unites us. From the perspective of ontological Truth, nonviolence follows from the unity and interdependence of humanity and life; violence damages all forms of life, including one’s self. Nonviolence uplifts all. Gandhi writes: I do not believe . . . that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in advaita (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him and, if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent. (Naess 1974, p. 43) In this experience, one becomes aware of the interrelated and interdependent nature of being. On an existential level, there exists a fundamental interconnection between one’s self and other beings. As Buber suggests, “we live in the currents of universal reciprocity (Buber, 1970, p. 67).” From the perspective of this experience—and this is a direct experience—to harm the other is to harm one’s self. From the perspective of existential interconnection, nonviolence, the essence of morality, rests upon an awareness of our fundamental interconnection.

#### The alternative challenges the closed economy of the status quo but necessitates a break from Bataille’s dualism. His confrontation with death and fulfillment of desire reifies dualistic systems of power that undermine the ability for this project to achieve any liberating potential – any permutation will inevitably maintain these structures that make it impossible to displace the closed economy
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In this concise metaphor, Hollingdale sweeps away much of the extensive and arcane commentary and obfuscation that lie atop the work of both Nietzsche and Bataille, and reaches the simple heart of what they were both, in different ways, expressing: have no concern for the illusions of past and future, just exist. It is a concept that has been current in spiritual philosophy for centuries, from the time of the Upanishads, through Jesus Christ’s dictum to ‘take therefore no thought for the morrow,’ 527 through Ram Dass’ Be Here Now. 528 Schwarz notes the presence of this philosophy in alchemy, as well as in Hinduism, the cradle of Tantra: ‘…absolute knowledge, which is the goal, the end and thus the Philosopher's stone, is called Jñāna ,a term which indicates not a state of knowledge, but a state of being. ’ 529 Both Zen and Daoism share this focus on the present moment, as well as, not coincidentally, an ambivalent relationship to reason, and frequently make the point that their goals cannot be reached through its use. We can assume that this wariness and questioning attitude towards the dominance of the reason that they so hated attracted the Surrealists more than the stratification and sophistication of Asian cultures repelled them. Certainly the Dadaists, who ‘railed against rationalism and destruction, which 155they saw as inextricably linked within the European heritage,’ 530 would have seen are flection of their own beliefs in the Dao De Jing verse ‘the simplest chastity resemble the fickle, the greatest square has no corner, the largest vessel is never filled,’ 531 or inany number of Zen koans whose sole purpose was to pull the rug of certainty from beneath the reader’s feet, thus liberating the mind from its rut of reason. William Plank reinforces this connection: ‘There is a parallel between Surrealism and its destructionof dualities and such Oriental concepts as the Tao, the ineffable Tao, of which we mayattempt a definition in Western terms as the ‘conscious way’ wherein man becomesaware of his entire psyche, even to the level of biological continuity; or the satori, thesudden enlightenment of Zen…’ 532 In his book Raja-Yoga (which Bataille owned and read), 533 Vivekananda wrote that ‘the mind itself has a higher state of existence, beyondreason, a super conscious state, and when the mind gets to that higher state, then thisknowledge, beyond reasoning, comes to man.’ 534 A state of mind that confines itself to an awareness of the present instant displaces not only the dominance of reason but also two of life’s animating themes: desire and death. An acceptance of the current moment is synonymous with an acceptance of the world as it is, and this acceptance effectively disarms and eradicates not only questions of optimism and pessimism, but also all expressions of desire, which are dependent on the recognition and pursuit of alternatives, and on the passage of time (Eliade identifies time, along with the body and the cosmos, as one of the threefundamental elements of tantric sādhana ) 535 . Awareness of one’s own death (which is by definition in the future) relies upon the recognition of time. Existence in the moment, to the exclusion of all else, short-circuits these concerns and renders them not only powerless but meaningless as well. Amy Hollywood characterizes Bataille’s idiosyncratic use of the writings of Christian mystics such as Angela of Foligno and Teresa of Avila as a ‘necessary apostasy,’ 536 part of a life and a corpus of work that were ‘in a constant state of movement, flux, or chaos’. 537 This chapter will demonstrate that this relationship of movement and constant apostasy is equally applicable to Bataille’s appropriation of Tantric methodologies. Bataille’s relationship to the concepts of transgression and libertinism will be addressed within the context of Tantrism, the intention of this being to show that, in the same way that traditional Tantric ‘indulgence’ in sexual activity and other forbidden matters was characterized by observation of a strict protocol, Bataille’s ‘libertinism’, while still indulgent by some standards, was also subject to a framework of expectation and limitation. The primary limitation in Bataille’s case was his refusal to experience eroticism free of its ultimate connection to mortality and suffering. Like the Tantrics of history, and influenced by them, Bataille was exploring the nature,limitations, and possible spiritual outcomes of transgression.Bataille may have received some of his ideas regarding Buddhism fromSchopenhauer, ‘whose thought, partly under Indian influence, exhibits numerous, andalmost miraculous, coincidences with the basic tenets of Buddhist philosophy.’ 538 Bataille was also very influenced by Nietzsche (who was himself influenced bySchopenhauer), Marx, Hegel, Sade, Durkheim, Kojève, and Mauss, as well as by awide variety of other writers and artists, and by his study of ethnology, includingreadings on Aztec society, the potlatch, and Buddhism. 539 Choucha notes the influence of the Marquis de Sade on Bataille’s thought andwriting: ‘In keeping with his revolutionary message, de Sade disrupted traditionalliterary genres by mingling pornography with philosophy in his novels, attackinghierarchy by showing how the base and the elevated can be combined, and implyingthat their separation is mere artifice.’ 540 Yet again we are presented with the seemingly universal theme of duality and its effects. The philosophies of Hegel and Nietzsche are largely incompatible, but ‘both German philosophers…advocate the necessity of a confrontation with death.’ 541 Bataille and Nietzsche are joined in this particular instance by Hegel, to reaffirm the necessity of the point abîme for the project of eternally unfulfilled desire. In contrast toBreton’s point supreme , located at the apex of idealism, this meeting can be found around a grave, the stone of which is planted at an ‘unlikely crossroad,’ located ‘at theintersection between these two opposing paths [Nietzsche and Hegel]’. 542 Like Masson, Georges Bataille absorbed and utilized spiritual teachings from many different sources, without formally committing to any of them. Bataille’s need and desire for community and communion with others, attested to both by his writings and by the many groups with which he was involved, was in marked contrast to his largely unpopular goals. Bataille involved himself with various groups out of a need for companionship in transgression, and in an attempt to involve others in his search for states of being (not goals) that broke through the barrier that separates the profane from the sacred. It was a journey that he was unwilling and perhaps unable to compromise, and thus, despite his many acquaintances and associations, it was a path that he walked, for the most part, alone. This intransigent nature, coupled with his ability to accept constant change (the latter influenced by his reading of Heraclitus and Nietzsche) 543 , formed Bataille’s life into a series of leave-takings. His early conversion to Catholicism could be seen as a transgression of his largely secular youth, followed fairly quickly by a rejection of Catholicism itself. In the case of Buddhism, a leave-taking was unnecessary, as whenever espoused a formal commitment to it. For Bataille, the journey of desire must be its own goal, and any perceived objective at the ‘end’ of this journey is illusory. He aligns himself with Nietzsche, and in opposition to traditional religion, when he references Nietzsche’s statement deriding ‘working ambitiously, keeping in mind some “goal”, or realizing some desire’ and asks‘ what could be more contrary to the propaganda of Christians and Buddhists?’ 544 This insistence on the primacy of the present instant is heavily influenced not only by Tantra but also by Bataille’s reading of Nietzsche’s concept of the eternal return, two factors that Hussey notes were not unrelated in Bataille’s thought: ‘Bataille…draws upon the cosmology of Tantric literature and, in particular borrows from Tantric meditative practice which aims at the annihilation of perceived chronological realities in a manner not unlike Nietzsche’s promulgation of the notion of the Eternal Return.’ 545 Simon Elmer writes that for Bataille…the eternal return was, first and foremost, an ecstatice experience of losing oneself in the moment: when the subject, no longer entwined in the unfolding continuum - which is to say, in the movement of its becoming – is absorbed, without attachment to either the future or the past, in the instant. 546 Bataille accepted the emphasis placed by Eastern philosophy on the present moment, but was seeking a different goal within that moment. He made no secret of his disdain for the goals of ascetics, as Pierre Prévost notes: ‘George Bataille certainly did not pursue this research for the purpose of a spiritual realization similar to that of the Hindu yogi, nor did he hide his harsh criticisms of Hinduism’. 547 Bataille sought to fill the instant, not with peace and acceptance, but with a passion and longing that would burn hotly enough to evaporate the self entirely: ‘a sudden impulse and anti-repressible need – these annihilate the heaviness of the world’. 548 While Bataille frequently questioned the value of a dualistic system of thought in which individuals are atomized and separated from their surroundings, he also saw the perpetual presence of unsatisfied desire as critical to the continued vitality of an individual’s identity and thought: It seems to me that the point at which the attention awakens here completely is that which merits this exasperating tension, which becomes irritated at any possibility of reduction. But would awakening be awakening if the one who was awakened were once to find himself satisfied with what he discovers? If he didn’t prolong further and without concern the interrogation which is awakening? 549 Denis Hollier, addressing Bataille’s approach to dualism, equates it with Manichean Gnosticism, 550 as well as relating it indirectly with concepts of the sacred and the profane through a focus on dualism’s two irreconcileable worlds. In addition, Hollier assigns dualism a role in Bataille’s apparent desire to maintain craving when hewrites that dualism itself, as a doctrine, never relinquishes the untenable position it imposes upon the one enticed by it, keeping him in a never resolved dissatisfaction. According to Bataille, this simply results from the factthat one must choose between a perfection which, satisfying the mind, definitely puts it to sleep, and the awakening which requires an ever unresolved dissatisfaction.’ 551 In this case, Bataille’s equation of the pursuit of awakening with the maintenance of dissatisfaction rather than the transcendence of desire places him indirect opposition to Buddhist ideas. Buddhism is contrary to Bataille’s identification with the world of conditioned things, an identification it would view as attachment,while Christian theology would deride his idea that there is nothing better than thisworld, nothing to transcend to , as nihilism. However, one could as easily identifyBataille’s reification of dissatisfaction as a certain kind of ecstasy, a limitless yes to thereality of the world as it is, an alternative yet equally effective means of escaping the bonds of the self. A view of our current condition as ‘the best of all possible worlds’can be seen either as optimism or as nihilism, depending on one’s perspective. Thedichotomy evaporates when the present moment is seen as the only possibility, inwhich case the question of ‘best’ or ‘worst’ becomes irrelevant.Judith Butler addresses Bataille’s view of desire, recognizing its debt to Hegel:Only as dissatisfied desire is consciousness still alive and united withthe being of life, a unity that is the infinite altercation of self and not-self that sets and sustains the organic world in motion...desire’sdissatisfaction is one that is discovered in the midst of life, as aconsequence of movement rather than stasis, as a consequence of theimpossible project to reconcile determinate identity and time. 552 This project is ‘impossible’, of course, because, in the face of death, determinate identity’s struggles against time are inevitably futile. As long as the’ separate self continues to exist, it undertakes actions to continue that existence, to deny its own inevitable demise, or both. These struggles do not alter the fact that the energy animating this self is, in a sense, “borrowed” from the surrounding universe, which will eventually take it back.

#### Inner anger makes violence and nuclear war inevitable

Daisaku Ikeda, 2007. Buddhist philosopher and president of Soka Gokkai International. “Restoring the Human Connection: The First Step to Global Peace,”http://www.sgi-uk.org/resources/PeaceProposal2007.pdf.

The challenge of preventing any further proliferation of nuclear weapons is 8 just such a trial in the quest for world peace, one that cannot be achieved if we are defeated by a sense of helplessness. The crucial element is to ensure that any struggle against evil is rooted firmly in a consciousness of the unity of the human family, something only gained through the mastery of our own inner contradictions. It is this kind of reconfiguration of our thinking that will make possible a skilled and restrained approach to the options of dialogue and pressure. The stronger our sense of connection as members of the human family, the more effectively we can reduce to an absolute minimum any application of the hard power of pressure, while making the greatest possible use of the soft power of dialogue. Tragically, the weighting in the case of Iraq has been exactly the reverse. The need for such a shift has been confirmed by many of the concerned thinkers I have met. Norman Cousins (1915–90), the writer known as the “conscience of America” with whom I published a dialogue, stated with dismay in his work Human Options: “The great failure of education—not just in the United States but throughout most of the world—is that it has made people tribe-conscious rather than species-conscious.”8 Similarly, when I met with Mohamed ElBaradei, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in November of last year, he declared powerfully: “… we continue to emphasize our differences instead of what we have in common. We continue to talk about ‘us’ versus ‘them.’ Only when we can start to talk about ‘us’ as including all of humanity will we truly be at peace….” In our correspondence, Joseph Rotblat posed the question, “Can we master the necessary arts of global security and loyalty to the human race?”9 Three months after writing these words to me, Dr. Rotblat passed away. I believe his choice to leave this most crucial matter in the form of an open question 9 was an expression of his optimism and his faith in humanity. When our thinking is reconfigured around loyalty to the human race—our sense of human solidarity—even the most implacable difficulties will not cause us to lapse into despair or condone the panicked use of force. It will be possible to escape the snares of such shortsighted thinking. We will be empowered to engage in the kind of persistent exertion that Max Weber viewed as the ideal of political action, and the door will be open to the formation of consensus and persuasion through dialogue. The function of anger When my mentor Josei Toda used the words “a devil incarnate, a fiend, a monster,” he was referring to a destructiveness inherent in human life. It is a function of this destructiveness to shred our sense of human solidarity, sowing the seeds of mistrust and suspicion, conflict and hatred. Those who would use nuclear weapons capable of instantaneously killing tens of millions of people exhibit the most desperate symptoms of this pathology. They have lost all sense of the dignity of life, having fallen prey to their own inner demons. Buddhism classifies the underlying destructive impulses that give rise to such behavior as “the three poisons” (Jpn: san-doku) of greed, anger and ignorance. “The world of anger” can be thought of as the state of life of those in whom these forces have been directed outward toward others. Buddhism analyzes the inner state of human life in terms of the following ten categories, or “worlds”: Hell, Hunger, Animality, Anger, Humanity, Rapture, Learning, Realization, Bodhisattva and Buddhahood. Together these worlds constitute an interpenetrating functional whole, referred to as the inherent ten worlds. It is the wisdom and compassion of the world of Buddhahood that bring out the most positive aspect of each of the other 10 worlds. In the Buddhist scriptures we find the statement “anger can function for both good and evil,”10 indicating that just and righteous anger, the kind essential for countering evil, is the form of the world of anger that creates positive value. The anger that we must be on guard against is that which is undirected and unrestrained relative to the other nine worlds. In this case, anger is a rogue and renegade force, disrupting and destroying all in its path. In this form, the world of anger is a condition of “always seeking to surpass, unable to countenance inferiority, disparaging others and overvaluing oneself.”11 When in the world of anger, we are always engaged in invidious comparisons with others, always seeking to excel over them. The resulting distortions prevent us from perceiving the world accurately; we fall easily into conflict, locking horns with others at the slightest provocation. Under the sway of such anger, people can commit unimaginable acts of violence and bloodshed. Another Buddhist text portrays one in the world of anger as “84,000 yojanas tall, the waters of the four oceans coming only up to his knees.”12 A yojana was a measure of distance used in ancient India; there are various explanations as to what the specific distance may be, but “84,000 yojanas” represents an immeasurable enormity. This metaphor indicates how the self-perception of people in the life-state of anger expands and swells until the ocean deeps would only lap their knees. The inner distortions twisting the heart of someone in this state prevent them from seeing things in their true aspect or making correct judgments. Everything appears as a means or a tool to the fulfillment of egotistical desires and impulses. In inverse proportion to the scale of this inflated arrogance, the existence of others—people, cultures, nature—appears 11 infinitely small and insignificant. It becomes a matter of no concern to harm or even kill others trivialized in this way. It is this state of mind that would countenance the use of nuclear weapons; it can equally be seen in the psychology of those who would advocate the use of such hideously cruel weapons as napalm, or, more recently, depleted uranium and cluster bombs. People in such a state of life are ~~blind~~ed, not only to the horrific suffering their actions wreak but also to the value of human life itself. For the sake of human dignity, we must never succumb to the numbing dehumanization of the rampant world of anger. When the atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima, not only military personnel but also many scientists were thrilled by the “success” of this new weapon. However, the consciences of genuinely great scientists were filled with anguish. Einstein greeted this news with an agonized cry of woe, while Rotblat told me he was completely overcome with hopelessness. Their feelings were no doubt intensely resonant with the sentiments that motivated Josei Toda to denounce nuclear weapons. When Toda spoke of “declawing” the demonic nature of nuclear weapons, he had in mind the struggle to prevent the inner forces of anger from disrupting the ten worlds and going on an unrestrained rampage. He was calling for the steady and painstaking work of correctly repositioning and reconfiguring the function of anger in an inner world where wisdom and harmony prevail. This is the true meaning of “declawing.” For SGI members in particular it is thus vital we remember that not only our specific activities for peace and culture but the movement for “human revolution” based on the daily endeavor to transform our lives from within is a consistent and essential aspect of the historic challenge of nuclear disarmament and abolition. 12 **Unless we focus on this inner, personal dimension, we will find ourselves overwhelmed by the structural momentum of a technological civilization, which in a certain sense makes inevitable the birth of such demonic progeny as nuclear weapons**.

### 1NC - K

#### Using visual metaphors like ‘blind’ negatively characterizes disability in opposition to knowledge– this ableist practice should be rejected.

**Ferri & May 5** [Beth – Assoc Prof Disability Studies, Syracuse Univ; Vivian – Asst Prof Women’s Studies, Syracuse Univ; , “Fixated on Ability: Ableist metaphors in feminist theories of resistance,” Prose Studies, v27, http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/160692/Fixated\_on\_Ability\_Questioning\_Ableist\_Metaphors\_in\_Feminist\_Theories\_of\_Resistance]

**A range of disabilities are employed for their "metaphoric" value**. In her poem, "Tomorrow I Am Going To Re–write The English Language," Lois Keith suggests a need to replace "striving ambulist metaphors/ Of power and success" (which include standing on your own two feet, making great strides, standing up for yourself, and standing tall) with alternatives that mirror her way of being and moving through space (57 59). Likewise, Georgina Kleege provides us with a litany of **common figurative uses of the word blind, including: blind faith, blind trust, blind spot, blindside, blind leading the blind, and following blindly** (21 22). Nancy Mairs also highlights "the extent to which we equate physical vigor with positive moral qualities: ... |keep| 'your eyes open' (alertness); .. .(standj 'tall' (pride); ... 'see eye to eye' (accord); 'run rings around' (superiority)" *(The View* 215). Conversely, Mairs notes, "physical debility connotes vice, as in 'sit on your ass' (laziness), 'take it lying down' (weakness), 'listen with half an ear' (inattention), and get left 'without a leg to stand on' (unsound argument)" (215). In other words, **when disability shows up in our everyday language it almost always signals ignorance, confusion, lack, absence, and ineptitude**. **Ableist metaphors also slip into scholarly discourse as evidence of any number of negative qualities or attributes.** As Lennard Davis reminds us, **academics "routinely turn a** 'deaf ear' |or **[‘a blind eye] or find** |**a**n argument) 'lame' or a **political act 'crippling**"' (87). **Unfortunately, scholars within interdisciplinary areas of study**, as well as those in the traditional disciplines, **have been slow to recognize disability studies as a legitimate area of inquiry. This inability to analyze disability through a critical framework further demonstrates the problems with passive empathy or identification, analogic bridging, and assuming the reversibility of experiences.** As Iris Marion Young reminds us, "the idea of reversing perspectives assumes that the perspectives brought to a situation are equally legitimate. Where structural social injustice exists, this may not be true" (48). Thus Davis wonders if "critics of the future will be astounded, puzzled, and disturbed" that works by some of our most known and highly regarded critical scholars "managed to steer so completely away from any discussion of disability" (87). With Davis' question in mind, we are particularly troubled by the ubiquitous use of ableist metaphors in feminist discourses. In fact, our interest in this project grew as we noticed how frequently scholars whom we otherwise greatly admire use disability in problematic ways. It is important to note that we have focused our attention primarily on some of our most favorite contemporary scholars those whose work we have found to be provocative, insightful, critical, and creative. In addition, we find ourselves troubled by close colleagues and friends (as well as our own oversights)—in other words, we butt up against ableist practices in feminism on a daily basis, whether through peer interaction or on the page. For example, recently one of us had to interrupt her feminist theory reading group to request that discussants please stop using blind, blindness, paralyzed, and deafness to critique the perceived deficiencies and oversights in that week's readings. The room stopped dead, she was stared at in total incomprehension, and then the group continued on without a second thought to the request or its meaning. Recently, a similar situation occurred on a feminist philosophy listserv we subscribe to. In response, Shelley Tremain requested that list participants stop relving on ableist notions of disability as a means of critiquing homophobia and conservative backlash at the state and federal level. She wrote: 1 am quite surprised that contributors to this thread have been tossing around the terms 'insane,' 'sane,' 'delusional,' [and| 'mental illness' so uncritically, carelessly, and sarcastically.. ..1 wonder if any of the contributors to the thread (about Virginia outlawing same–sex marriage contracts] have a political analysis of disability, of psychiatrization, |or] of forcible confinement.. ..Should feminists begin the practice of pathologizing individuals (even if only in jest) in order to deal with social problems? (April 27, 2004 FEAST–L). **We offer these examples not as extraordinary, but as rather mundane**. **What they suggest is a problem of understanding.** As philosopher Susan Babbitt explains, understanding frequently operates according to a binary (either something fits ready–made frames of reference or it is incommensurable, outside of logic). In situations where marginalized experience and knowledge are concerned, Babbitt therefore argues that it is often *not* a "matter of being ignored or even misunderstood" that is the core problem. Rather, it is a matter of "being understood all too well in a way that disallows recognition that there is still something that needs to be understood" (303). In other words, **what is missing in much feminist discourse that seems to so easily use disability without a second thought as to its meaning is both a "cognitive need" and a "shifted orientation" toward experiences and knowledges that are different and that do not conform to sedimented frames of reference or epistemic models,** 'Thus Babbitt argues for the need to develop a cognitive awareness of a *lack of understanding* (in this case, of disability as complex and as intersecting with other layers of power and identity) in order for change to be possible (311). This lack of understanding of disability, or a presumed understanding of disability that fixes its meaning in stereotypical ways, is all too common, but **we have noticed two predominant trends in feminist and critical race theorizing: the tendency to characterize disability in opposition to knowledge or insight** (this characterization can be both negative/stigmatized or positive/romanticized); **and the use of disability**\* to identify and describe objects of remediation (**to critique dominant ideologies which are imbued with unacknowledged power and privilege** or to name and reject the effects of oppression). Constructing Disability in Opposition to Knowledge Surprisingly, **many theorists continue to rely on disability as a metaphor for ignorance, stupidity**, **oversight**, **or general incompetence** as a knower. **For example, mixing metaphors of muteness and blindness to underscore exclusions in feminist thinking, Ann DuCille critiques "the silence (and the blindness) of feminism**" (247). **bell hooks uses ableist metaphors to highlight sexist thinking on the part of** Paulo **Freire**. She writes: "For me this Ipatriarchal paradigm of liberation) is always a source of great anguish for it represents a blind spot in the vision of men [like Freire) who have profound insight" (49). Here, Freire's blind spot is his lack of awareness of sexism, which hooks places in opposition to his great insight and otherwise redeemable vision about the politics of race, ethnicity, and social class resistance. Of course, hooks is not alone in her use of visual metaphors for knowing or insight, For example, we found that we, too, relied on the notion of sight to signify understanding in an earlier co–authored article on disability and him (May and Herri 135). Yet **equating visuality and knowing is not innocent it has**, of course, **a history**. For instance, **many have argued that it is an episteme foundational to practices empire building and colonial cartography, of'looking out" over or surveying lands and their inhabitants as property to be conquered or developed** (e.g., Duncan). **Moreover, by reinscribing vision as knowledge** (and, directly or indirectly, blindness as ignorance), **visual metaphors for knowing or insight can reinforce Manichean dualisms of mind/body, I/not–1 in the name of liberation politics**. **Equating visual acuity with knowing is one common way to place disability in opposition to knowledge**. But many others are equally as frequent, including dualisms between mental illness and rationality and/or characterizations of faulty knowledge models as "pathologies" or "illnesses." For example, because Frederic Jameson relies heavily on ableist notions of schizophrenia and pathological illness in his critique of the postmodern subject, these ideas infiltrate Chela Sandoval's reading and critique of Jameson. Sandoval writes that for Jameson, the "euphoria" of the postmodern subject "marks the onset of a new form of mass cultural pathology. It is 'schizophrenic' in nature charged with hallucinogenic intensity" (21). Similarly, June Jordan (in Collins, *Fighting* 150) describes constructivist approaches to identity as a "delusional disease." In asserting her own social theory\*, Patricia Hill Collins writes that deconstructivist theory can be "crippling" because it "runs in circles" and fosters nihilism (Fighting 189). Once again, disability is enlisted to represent foolishness and despair.

#### Voting Issue – Ableist Speech strengthens oppression and destroys the purposes of public debate

**Wheelchair Dancer 8** (“On Making Argument: Disability and Language”, 4/28/8, http://cripwheels.blogspot.com/2008/04/on–making–argument–disability–and.html)

If you are feeling a little bit of resistance, here, I'd ask you to think about it. If perhaps what I am saying feels like a burden –– too much to take on? a restriction on your carefree speech? –– perhaps that feeling can also serve as an indicator of how pervasive and thus important the issue is. As a community, we've accepted that commonly used words can be slurs, and as a rule, we avoid them, hopefully in the name of principle, but sometimes only in the name of civility. Do you go around using derivatives of the b\*ch word? If you do, I bet you check which community you are in.... Same thing for the N word. These days, depending on your age, you might say something is retarded or spastic, but you probably never say that it's gay. I'd like to suggest that society as a whole has not paid the same kind of attention to disabled people's concerns about language. By not paying attention to the literal value, the very real substantive, physical, psychological, sensory, and emotional experiences that come with these linguistic moves, we have created a negative rhetorical climate. In this world, it is too easy for feminists and people of colour to base their claims on argumentative strategies that depend, as their signature moves, on marginalizing the experience of disabled people and on disparaging their appearance and bodies. Much of the blogosphere discourse of the previous weeks has studied the relationships between race, (white) feminism and feminists, and WOC bloggers. To me, the intellectual takeaway has been an emerging understanding of how, in conversation, notions of appropriation, citation, ironization, and metaphorization can be deployed as strategies of legitimation and exclusion. And, as a result, I question how "oppressed, minoritized" groups differentiate themselves from other groups in order to seek justice and claim authority. Must we always define ourselves in opposition and distance to a minoritized and oppressed group that can be perceived as even more unsavory than the one from which one currently speaks? As I watched the discussion about who among the feminist and WOC bloggers has power and authority and how that is achieved, I began to recognise a new power dynamic both on the internet and in the world at large. Feminism takes on misogyny. The WOC have been engaging feminism. But from my point of view, a wide variety of powerful feminist and anti–racist discourse is predicated on negative disability stereotyping. There's a kind of hierarchy here: the lack of awareness about disability, disability culture and identity, and our civil rights movement has resulted in a kind of domino effect where disability images are the metaphor of last resort: the bottom, the worst. Disability language has about it a kind of untouchable quality –– as if the horror and weakness of a disabled body were the one true, reliable thing, a touchstone to which we can turn when we know we can't use misogynistic or racist language. When we engage in these kinds of argumentative strategies, we exclude a whole population of people whose histories are intricately bound up with ours. When we deploy these kinds of strategies to underscore the value of our own existence in the world, we reaffirm and strengthen the systems of oppression that motivated us to speak out in the first place.

### 1NC - Case

#### Turn - we should not conceive of the ballot as a wasteful expenditure—preserving the value of debate as a sphere outside ethical and political obligations is crucial to tolerance and sound critical thought.

**Muir 93** (Star, Communication @ George Mason University, Philosophy & Rhetoric; Fall1993, Vol. 26 Issue 4, p277-295)

The role of switch-side debate is especially important in the oral defense of arguments that foster tolerance without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. The forum is therefore unique in providing debaters with attitudes of tolerance without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, debaters are indeed exposed to a multivalued world, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such "mistaken" values. In this view, the divorce of the game from the "real world" can be seen as a means of gaining perspective without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions.'s Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values— tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. The willingness to recognize the existence of other views, and to grant alternative positions a degree of credibility, is a value fostered by switch-side debate: Alternately debating both sides of the same question . . . inculcates a deep-seated attitude of tolerance toward differing points of view. To be forced to debate only one side leads to an ego-identification with that side. , . . The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one's own. . . .Promoting this kind of tolerance is perhaps one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer. 5' The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, reasons Thompson, because debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this fact who become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted.""\* While Theodore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance. At a societal level, the value of tolerance is more conducive to a fair and open assessment of competing ideas. John Stuart Mill eloquently states the case this way: Complete liberty of contradicting and disproving our opinion is the very condition which justifies us in assuming its truth for purposes of action; and on no other terms can a being with human faculties have any rational assurance of being right. . . . the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race. . . . If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth: if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of the truth, produced by its collision with error."\*' At an individual level, tolerance is related to moral identity via empathic and critical assessments of differing perspectives. Paul posits a strong relationship between tolerance, empathy, and critical thought. Discussing the function of argument in everyday life, he observes that in order to overcome natural tendencies to reason egocentrically and sociocentrically, individuals must gain the capacity to engage in self-reflective questioning, to reason dialogically and dialectically. and to "reconstruct alien and opposing belief systems empathically."\*- Our system of beliefs is. by definition, irrational when we are incapable of abandoning a belief for rational reasons; that is, when we egocentrically associate our beliefs with our own integrity. Paul describes an intimate relationship between private inferential habits, moral practices, and the nature of argumentation. Critical thought and moral identity, he urges, must be predicated on discovering the insights of opposing views and the weaknesses of our own beliefs. Role playing, he reasons, is a central element of any effort to gain such insight. Only an activity that requires the defense of both sides of an issue, moving beyond acknowledgement to exploration and advocacy, can engender such powerful role playing. Redding explains that "debating both sides is a special instance of role-playing,""" where debaters are forced to empathize on a constant basis with a position contrary to their own. This role playing, Baird agrees, is an exercise in reflective thinking, an engagement in problem solving that exposes weaknesses and strengths,\*\* Motivated by the knowledge that they may debate against their own case, debaters constantly pose arguments and counter-arguments for discussion, erecting defenses and then challenging these defenses with a different tact."\*' Such conceptual flexibility, Paul argues, is essential for effective critical thinking, and in turn for the development of a reasoned moral identity.

#### Valuing nature as standing reserve of natural resources for human benefit is essential to the survival of all species

**Younkins 4** (Professor of Business Administration, Wheeling Jesuit (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, Quebecois Libre 147, http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm, gender modified, AG)

Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. **Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer**. These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. **People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently** of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. **All resources are [hu]man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, [humans]** men **affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress**. Mankind’s **survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things**, even man himself. **Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe**. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. **Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value**. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. **The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature**. Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. **Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, [humans]** men **sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them**. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, **only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation**. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This **antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.**

#### Management solves extinction—letting nature “be” cements existing destruction – only nuke power can solve warming

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

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

## 2NC

### 2NC Impact Explanation

#### Our kritik outweighs and turns the case ---

#### (1) Violence --- when we define separate identities it causes us to focus on our differences. This creates a competition where we always want to have *more*. The affirmative exacerbates this type of thinking by focusing on the extravagance. This is what enables violence against the other, and it is also what drives the development of destructive forces like nuclear weapons, making extinction inevitable --- that’s Ikeda. If we recognize our interconnectedness then violence becomes self-defeating --- that’s Snauwert.

#### (2) Desire --- the affirmative embraces desire --- this antagonistic form of politics only reproduces the same violent dichotomies that it seeks to challenge. If human society is ever to progress to the point where global harmony is possible, we must move beyond our desire. – That’s Foljambe

### Links to the Aff

#### We need to remove desire, but Bataille says that desires is essential to indivudal identity rather than transcending pain and suffering – Buddhism fundamentally disagrees with that

#### Khisty ev specifically says we should STOP asking asking questions like What will make the planet more sustainable?

The reasons for this disconnection from nature, especially in the West, are not hard to detect. Spiritually and psychologically we live inside a bubble of the “self,” as though we are “in here” and the rest of the world is “out there.”

#### The closed economy has made natural disaster inevitable by relegating the worlds resources and all of humanity to the standing reserve. The notion of sustainability guarantees resource depletion and environmental destruction

Stoekl 7  (Allan, professor of French and comparative literature @ Penn State) Bataille’s Peak:Energy, Religion and Postsustainability, Pg 132 -133

#### The planet’s carrying capacity will be maintained through a squandering of energy at the level of the body. Energy will continue to be refined until every atom on the planet is put to work, reducing the earth to a colossal powder keg beyond our control

Stoekl 2007 (Allan, Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Penn State University. “Bataille’s Peak: Energy, Religion, and Postsustainability.” P. 141-143)

#### Society at large mimics the movement of the human body. The production of positivity with the end of removing all negative elements leads to cancer and certifies its own death. The energy the system has cast out will return in the form of destruction

Baudrillard 93 (Jean, The Transparency of Evil; Essays on Extreme Phenomena. Translated by James Benedict. Verso London – New York. Page 106)

We impact turn the notion of holding on to the dual nature of the universe – society does not mimic the human body, but external projections of the human mind. Your assertion otherwise only reifies the dualisms between the Nature and Human as though Humans are the only ones that can produce energy ignoring that Nature allows us to be and the energy we create is from it.

#### We can only achieve real sovereignty by confronting our fear of death. Only intimate expenditure allows for this contestation to occur

Hansen and Stepputat 5 (Thomas, Finn) Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World

First, we suggest- on human bodies.

Need to stop being confrontational

#### Reconciling our existence as limited to being carriers of energy is key to value to life.

Sørensen 1/27 (Asger, prof @ U of Aarhus, Denmark) “On a Universal Scale: Economy in Bataille’s General Economy” Philosophy and Social Criticism 2012: 38(2) pg. 180

Incredibly reductionist and only serves to re-enforce Mind-Body dualisms of energy production as though we only exist to manipulate the energy nature has given us

Bataille certainly did not pursue this research for the purpose of a spiritual realization similar to that of the Hindu yogi, nor did he hide his harsh criticisms of Hinduism’. 547 Bataille sought to fill the instant, not with peace and acceptance, but with a passion and longing that would burn hotly enough to evaporate the self entirely: ‘a sudden impulse and anti-repressible need – these annihilate the heaviness of the world’. 548 While Bataille frequently questioned the value of a dualistic system of thought in which individuals are atomized and separated from their surroundings, he also saw the perpetual presence of unsatisfied desire as critical to the continued vitality of an individual’s identity and thought: It seems to me that the point at which the attention awakens here completely is that which merits this exasperating tension, which becomes irritated at any possibility of reduction

### Alt

#### The alternative is to start with the self. Individuals must contemplate their relationship to the world and to other people in order to shed their egos and embrace the “no self.” Once one has reached this starting point, it possible to experience interconnectedness with humanity. Karmic consequences dictate that any violence I conduct against another will also hurt me, at least spiritually or morally if not physically. This realization provides a healthier personal ethic and relationship

#### Our “praxis” is just as practical as that introduced by the affirmative.

#### The alternative challenges the closed economy of the status quo but necessitates a break from Bataille’s dualism. His confrontation with death and fulfillment of desire reifies dualistic systems of power that undermine the ability for this project to achieve any liberating potential – that’s Foljambe

Their ev

Bataille’s equation of the pursuit of awakening with the maintenance of dissatisfaction rather than the transcendence of desire places him indirect opposition to Buddhist ideas. Buddhism is contrary to Bataille’s identification with the world of conditioned things, an identification it would view as attachment,while Christian theology would deride his idea that there is nothing better than thisworld, nothing to transcend to , as nihilism. However, one could as easily identifyBataille’s reification of dissatisfaction as a certain kind of ecstasy, a limitless yes to thereality of the world as it is, an alternative yet equally effective means of escaping the bonds of the self. A view of our current condition as ‘the best of all possible worlds’can be seen either as optimism or as nihilism, depending on one’s perspective. Thedichotomy evaporates when the present moment is seen as the only possibility, inwhich case the question of ‘best’ or ‘worst’ becomes irrelevant.Judith Butler addresses Bataille’s view of desire, recognizing its debt to Hegel:Only as dissatisfied desire is consciousness still alive and united withthe being of life, a unity that is the infinite altercation of self and not-self that sets and sustains the organic world in motion...desire’sdissatisfaction is one that is discovered in the midst of life, as aconsequence of movement rather than stasis, as a consequence of theimpossible project to reconcile determinate identity and time. 552 This project is ‘impossible’, of course, because, in the face of death, determinate identity’s struggles against time are inevitably futile. As long as the’ separate self continues to exist, it undertakes actions to continue that existence, to deny its own inevitable demise, or both. These struggles do not alter the fact that the energy animating this self is, in a sense, “borrowed” from the surrounding universe, which will eventually take it back.

#### Tantric Buddhism = glorious expenditure

Foljambe 8 [Alan Foljambe - A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities, “An Intimate Destruction: Tantric Buddhism, Desire, and the Body in Surrealism and Georges Bataille”, http://www.academia.edu/529400/An\_Intimate\_Destruction\_Tantric\_Buddhism\_Desire\_and\_the\_Body\_in\_Surrealism\_and\_Georges\_Bataille, Chetan]

Bataille was utterly uninterested in this sort of ‘purity’, and devoted his energy to what he saw as more pressing issues: sex and death. Bataille ‘was particularly drawn to astronomical theories that advanced a biocentric cosmogony; such theories bolstered his conception of Eros as a universal (pro-)creative force, and inspired him to imagine the origin of the cosmos in analogues of sexual reproduction.’ 589 This association of sexual intercourse with the birth of the universe is also a central tenet of Tantric philosophy: The Hindus believed that through uniting spiritually and sexually with Shiva, Shakti gave form to his spirit and created the universe. Tantra, therefore, views the creation of the world as an erotic act of love. This, in Tantra, is the nature of the divine, the root of all that exists

### AT: Perm

#### 1NC Foljambe 8 answers this – any form of desire will corrupt the alt by maintaining the death and fulfillment of desire reifies dualistic systems of power which make it impossible to displace the closed economy killing the ability to solve for inner peace

#### And perm cannot solve – K is an impact turn and Bataille has is alllll wrong

Foljambe 8 [Alan Foljambe - A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities, “An Intimate Destruction: Tantric Buddhism, Desire, and the Body in Surrealism and Georges Bataille”, http://www.academia.edu/529400/An\_Intimate\_Destruction\_Tantric\_Buddhism\_Desire\_and\_the\_Body\_in\_Surrealism\_and\_Georges\_Bataille , Chetan]

Bataille’s relationship to Tantric practice appears to have been simultaneously one of relative ignorance, curiosity, rejection, and idiosyncratic involvement. Put briefly, and at the risk of oversimplification, Bataille was attempting to adopt the techniques of Tantric yoga in order to pursue a path that was frequently completely at odds with the stated goals of these practices. He would sometimes veer from endorsement to apparent rejection within the span of a single passage: This mastery of our innermost movements, which in the long run wecan acquire, is well known: it is yoga . But yoga is given in the form of coarse recipes, embellished with pedantism and with bizarre statements. And yoga , practiced for its own sake, advances no further than an aesthetics or a hygiene, whereas I have recourse to the same means (laid bare), in despair Even had he been able, Bataille would not have accepted the Tantric invitation to escape his desires through the engagement and ‘disarming’ of those very desires. He followed a philosophical path that viewed desire as an asset rather than as a liability. This desire was not to be used, as in Tantra, as a self-destroying power that would overcome itself; neither was it a symptom of something missing or ‘wrong’ with existence. While many viewed desire as representative of an essential lack, Bataille saw it as symptomatic of the inherent overflow of existence, an expression of the universe being, in a sense, too big for itself. Jonathan David York comments on Bataille’s distance from a philosophy basedon lack: ‘While most phenomenologists, like ancient Gnostics and contemporary psychoanalysts, describe desire as symptomatic of an essential lack, Bataille followedhis Neoplatonic Renaissance precursors in upholding its life affirming and creativeenergies.’ 598 This opposition to the rejection of worldly life was the basis of many of Bataille’s beliefs and activities, including his indulgence in what some saw as a surfeitof sex and alcohol (‘my true church is a whorehouse’ 599 ), and his opposition to monksand the priesthood: ‘My principle against ascesis is that the extreme limit is accessiblethrough excess, not through want. Jonathan David York comments on Bataille’s distance from a philosophy basedon lack: ‘While most phenomenologists, like ancient Gnostics and contemporary psychoanalysts, describe desire as symptomatic of an essential lack, Bataille followedhis Neoplatonic Renaissance precursors in upholding its life affirming and creativeenergies.’ 598 This opposition to the rejection of worldly life was the basis of many of Bataille’s beliefs and activities, including his indulgence in what some saw as a surfeitof sex and alcohol (‘my true church is a whorehouse’ 599 ), and his opposition to monksand the priesthood: ‘My principle against ascesis is that the extreme limit is accessiblethrough excess, not through want.’ 600 Bataille’s reservations regarding Eastern spiritual practices were the result of amixture of idealization and an eclectic autodidacticism. Of the 836 books borrowed byBataille from the Bibliothèque Nationale between 1922 and 1950, at least 50 aredirectly relevant to his interest in Asia, including historical, ethnological, andsociological works on China, Tibet, India, and Nepal, language textbooks in Sanskritand Chinese, and studies in Oriental philosophy and comparative religion. 601 In ‘The Unarmed Society,’ Bataille’s review of Portrait of the Dalai Lama byCharles Bell, Bataille exhibits a familiarity with many aspects of Tibetan custom and philosophy, but appears to be more impressed with Bell than with his book:The work is poorly done, but it is more lively and offers more than aformal study; it is a jumble, but no matter: We do not have a lesssystematic or more complete document on the civilization of Tibet.Charles Bell is the first white man to have had sustained relations, basedon a kind of friendship, with a Dalai Lama. This very honorablediplomatic agent…felt a genuine concern not only for the interests of hisown country but for those of Tibet, whose language he knew Later in this essay, Bataille relates what he sees as the non-productive lives of the monks to his own theory of dépense : ‘lamaic enlightenment morally realizes the essence of consumption, which is to open, to give, to lose, and which brushes calculations aside’. 603 This is a surprisingly laudatory statement from a man whose disdain for systems of asceticism was well known. Bataille’s compatibility with the concerns and techniques of Tantrism, as well as his distance from more conventional notions of Buddhism, are neatly summed up by Jean Bruno when he writes that ‘Bataille…sought to release in himself a conflagrationor “solar burst”, not to attain harmony or peace’. 604 Whereas a Tantric adept would undertake disciplines of concentration, visualization, and focusing in order to reach enlightenment, Bataille engaged in them for more obscure, idiosyncratic, and, in asense, ‘goal-less’ reasons. Devoting himself to living in the moment, he ‘loves revolution for the revolt, not for the utopia of its realization.’ 605 More interested in experience than in explanation, Bataille sought what Jonathan David York calls ‘a dialectical consummation that owes more to adithyrambic than a teleological resolution, more to the operations of desire than to those of history, more to libido than Cogito .’ 606 Or, to put it more colloquially, Bataille would rather laugh than think: As soon as the effort at rational comprehension ends in contradiction, the practice of intellectual scatology requires the excretion of un assimilable elements , which is another way of stating vulgarly that a burst of laughter is the only imaginable and definitively terminal result – and not the means – of philosophical speculation. 607 We are dealing with a serial apostate whose laughter (he hopes) will drown out the words of the philosophers, and whose study of religion is repeatedly interrupted by drunkenness, gambling, and a virtual residence in whorehouses. 608 Having both discovered and rejected the Catholic Church by his early twenties, he was not likely to be held in check by a discipline such as Tantra, and it is little wonder that his interest in religions eventually took the form of a bizarre attempt to generate one of his own.

### AT: Inev

#### And, neuroplasticity proves Buddhists are correct about mind-world dualism.

Begley 7 (Sharon Begley, 2007. Newsweek’s science editor. “Train Your Mind, Change Your Brain,” p. 13-4.)

The discoveries of neuroplasticity, in particular, resonate with Buddhist teachings and have the potential to benefit from interactions with Buddhism. The reason gets to the very core of Buddhist belief. “Buddhism defines a person as a constantly changing dynamic stream,” says Matthieu Ricard, a French-born Buddhist monk. A veteran of scientific dialogues with the Dalai Lama, he is anchoring the “Buddhist side” of the 2004 meeting. Even scholars who were not involved in the meeting—but who have followed the dialogues closely—point out the consonances between Buddhist teaching and the idea, and potential, of neuroplasticity. “There are many strong parallels between the neuroscientific findings and the Buddhist narrative,” says Francisca Cho, a Buddhist scholar at George Washington University. “Buddhism’s is a story of how we are in pain and suffering and how we have the power to change that. The scientific findings about neuroplasticity parallel the Buddhist narrative of enlightenment because they show that, although we have deeply ingrained ways of thinking and although the brain comes with some hardwiring, we also have the possibility of changing. The idea that we are constantly changing means there is no intrinsic nature to the self or the mind, which is what Buddhism teaches. Instead, both self and mind are extremely plastic. Our activities inform who we are; as we act, so we shall become. We are products of the past, but because of our inherently empty nature, we always have the opportunity to reshape ourselves.” The discovery that mere thought can alter the very stuff of the brain is another natural point of connection between the science of neuroplasticity and Buddhism. Buddhism has taught for twenty-five hundred years that the mind is an independent force that can be harnessed by will and attention to bring about physical change. “The discovery that thinking something produces effects just as doing something does is a fascinating consonance with Buddhism,” says Francisca Cho. “Buddhism challenges the traditional belief in an external, objective reality. Instead, it teaches that our reality is created by our own projections; it is thinking that creates the external world beyond us. The neuroscience findings harmonize with this Buddhist teaching.”

## 1NR

#### The critique solves by confronting ableism at the level of rhetoric– it exposes the attitudes that keep ableism alive, leads to productive corrective practices, and failure to confront it means that ALL efforts to challenge oppression will operate within the context of ableism.

**Cherney 11** (James L., Wayne State University, “The Rhetoric of Ableism”, Disability Studies Quarterly, Vol. 31, No. 3, http://dsq–sds.org/article/view/1665/1606 Accessed 1/27/12 GAL)

In this essay I analyze ableism as a rhetorical problem for three reasons. First, ableist culture sustains and perpetuates itself via rhetoric; the ways of interpreting disability and assumptions about bodies that produce ableism are learned. The previous generation teaches it to the next and cultures spread it to each other through modes of intercultural exchange. Adopting a rhetorical perspective to the problem of ableism thus exposes the social systems that keep it alive. This informs my second reason for viewing ableism as rhetoric, as revealing how it thrives suggests ways of curtailing its growth and promoting its demise. Many of the strategies already adopted by disability rights activists to confront ableism explicitly or implicitly address it as rhetoric. Public demonstrations, countercultural performances, autobiography, transformative histories of disability and disabling practices, and critiques of ableist films and novels all apply rhetorical solutions to the problem. Identifying ableism as rhetoric and exploring its systems dynamic reveals how these corrective practices work. We can use such information to refine the successful techniques, reinvent those that fail, and realize new tactics. Third, I contend that any means of challenging ableism must eventually encounter its rhetorical power. As I explain below, ableism is that most insidious form of rhetoric that has become reified and so widely accepted as common sense that it denies its own rhetoricity—it "goes without saying." To fully address it we must name its presence, for cultural assumptions accepted uncritically adopt the mantle of "simple truth" and become extremely difficult to rebut. As the neologism "ableism" itself testifies, we need new words to reveal the places it resides and new language to describe how it feels. Without doing so, ableist ways of thinking and interpreting will operate as the context for making sense of any acts challenging discrimination, which undermines their impact, reduces their symbolic potential, and can even transform them into superficial measures that give the appearance of change yet elide a recalcitrant ableist system.

#### Ableism is so pervasive that it must be vigilantly challenged and made into an irredeemable practice via social castigation. Empirically, confronting hierarchical attitudes at the level of rhetoric solves.

Cherney 11 (James L., Wayne State University, “The Rhetoric of Ableism”, Disability Studies Quarterly, Vol. 31, No. 3, http://dsq–sds.org/article/view/1665/1606 Accessed 1/27/12 GAL)

If we locate the problem in disability, then the ableist absolves his or her responsibility for discrimination and may not even recognize its presence. If we locate the problem in ableism, then the ableist must question her or his orientation. The critic's task is to make ableism so apparent and irredeemable that one cannot practice it without incurring social castigation. This requires substantial vigilance, for ableist thinking pervades the culture. For example, as I write this, I am tempted to use medical metaphors to explain the task and script something like "we cannot simply excise the tumor of ableism and heal the culture, for it has metastasized and infiltrated every organ of society." Yet this metaphor relies on an ableist perspective that motivates with the fear of death and turns to medical solutions to repair a body in decay. Using it, I would endorse and perpetuate ableist rhetoric, just as I would by using deafness as a metaphor for obstinacy ("Marie was deaf to their pleas for bread") or blindness to convey ignorance ("George turned a blind eye to global warming"). The pervasiveness of these and similar metaphors, like the cultural ubiquity of using images of disabled bodies to inspire pity, suggest the scale of the work ahead, and the ease with which one can resort to using them warns of the need for critical evaluation of one's own rhetoric. Yet the task can be accomplished. Just as feminists have changed Western culture by naming and promoting recognition of sexism, the glass ceiling, and patriarchy—admittedly a work in progress, yet also one that can celebrate remarkable achievements—we can reform ableist culture by using rhetoric to craft awareness and political action.

#### Effective development of energy policy requires an analysis of energy discourse through abelism

Wolbring 11 [Gregor Wolbring, University of Calgary, “Ableism and Energy Security and Insecurity”, Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology: Vol. 5: Iss. 1, Article 3 (2011), Chetan]

However, despite the pervasive importance of energy security so far, no global consensus has emerged as to how far and with which tools to address energy inequity. Techno solutions to energy security proposed are stalled or pushed forward in many places depending on how they impact consumerism and competitiveness. If a form of Ableism that favors productivity, consumerism and competitiveness is the main driver for envisioning and directing solutions for energy security one can expect product developments that further this form of Ableism. Whether one follows an anthropocentric or biocentric view leads to different policies. Ableisms such as GDP-ism (the ability to produce), consumerism (the ability to consume whatever one wants), competitiveness-ism (the ability to out-compete others) very likely favour anthropocentric over biocentric views as long as they do not impede the very isms seen as essential. The ability to live in harmony with one’s surroundings for example might favour the biocentric or ecocentric view. What ability one favours also has direct implications for energy security. The author submits that the development of effective global policies related to energy that will meet local needs and increase global energy security might be furthered if one analyses the energy discourse through the lens of thefields of ableism ethics, ableism studies, ableism governance and ableism foresight (Wolbring 2008a).

#### Our argument trumps all of their plan–specific impacts – Prioritizing ableism is the only way to address participation, which is the prerequisite for any benefits of debate Diversity Recognition and Promotion has been a huge plus for Debate over the last 20 years – NOW is the time to incorporate Disability Studies into our mission

Shelton & Matthews ‘1 [Mike, frmr asst prof and debate coach at Louisville; Cynthia, Comm PhD student, “Extending the Diversity Agenda in Forensics: Invisible Disabilities and Beyond,” Argumentation & Advocacy, v38, pp121–130]

#### Diversity issues have become a corner­stone of higher education, and forensic ac­tivities are certainly no exception to that rule. Indeed, in many regards the forensic community has been on the leading edge of inclusiveness within higher education. The forensic community has made remarkable progress and it has vividly illuminated the need to share the unique benefits of forensic practice with often socially marginalized de­mographic groups, particularly women and minorities. Perhaps the next logical step would be to consider the evolving "invisible" elements of that domain, and those with in­visible disabilities offer an informative illus­trative case. Disabled people make up one–fifth of the population in the United States (McNeil, 1993), and it has been predicted that at least 40% of these people have disabilities which cannot be seen, or are "invisible" (Asch, 1984). Invisible disability has been defined as "one that is hidden so as not to be imme­diately noticed by an observer except under unusual circumstances or by disclosure from the disabled person or other outside source" (Matthews, 1994, p. 7) and encompasses both physical and mental conditions. Physi­cal conditions include various chronic ill­nesses, such as heart disease and lung dis­ease; mental conditions include learning disabilities and cognitive processing prob­lems like dementia and mental retardation. There has been a significant increase in the number of people with invisible disabilities in the United States as indicated by several factors. For the last quarter century the num­ber of people with chronic diseases and dis­abilities has been climbing (Hayden, 1993; Kaye, LaPlante, Carlson, & Wenger, 1997). Activity limitations are most frequently caused by conditions that are chronic, in­cluding diabetes, arthritis, heart disease, mental and nervous disorders, and lung dis­ease, all of which are, for the most part, invisible (LaPlante, 1991). These chronic conditions make up two–thirds of the dis­abling conditions reported in the United States (LaPlante, 1997). New treatments and therapeutic interventions have made it pos­sible for people with chronic conditions and disabilities to survive in dramatically increasing numbers in the last twenty–five years. Examples of particularly remarkable changes in survival rates are: cystic fibrosis, up 700%, spina bifida, up 200%, and heart disease, up 300% (Blum, 1992). Additionally, a distinct increase in disability rates reported by The National Center for Health Statistics among people under 4.5 years of age are accounted for by a greater prevalence in the diagnosis of asthma, mental disorders (e.g., Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, Attention Defi­cit Disorder), and orthopedic impairments (e.g., back and joint problems) (Kaye et al,, 1997), conditions which again are invisible under most conditions. These increases in the numbers of persons with invisible disabilities make it important both to declare the reality of invisible dis­ability and to understand the impact of the visibility factor on the attitudes and behav­iors of those living with the condition, for others who interact with them, and the larger forensic community's drive to address diver­sity. Western societies value self–reliance, beauty, health and independence. This ob­session with health is particularly prevalent in United States culture (Galanti, 1997). Peo­ple tend to believe that healthy is normal and that illness is a deviance (Hayden, 1993). Therefore persons with invisible disabilities have great incentive to keep their conditions concealed. Unfortunately, concealing dis­abilities can carry serious negative ramifica­tions in terms of relationships. Those nega­tive ramifications can dramatically impact the individuals with invisible disabilities, the able–bodied others with whom they interact and ultimately the larger collective—includ­ing the forensic community–to which they belong.

#### Blind people don’t think the word ‘see’ is abelist

Jesse the K ‘9 [self–identified disabled male, <http://www.amptoons.com/blog/archives/2009/06/16/why–not–to–use–the–word–lame–i–think–im–starting–to–get–it/>]

Emily, I think **there’s a difference between somatic metaphors, which come naturally to us because we have bodies in the first place, and disabling metaphors, which devalue some of us based on the kind of bodies we have**. **Countless words for understanding and knowledge reference all the physical senses people typically come with. They are deeply embedded in our language and literature. That’s why most blind people I’ve read or met use “see” freely**: I see your point, she spied an error in your logic, he looked on my resume with great enthusiasm. **My objection is** when blindness, or **any impairment, becomes an epithet unto itself.**

#### their censorship arguments and claims that language is a trivial concern are wrong– rejecting ableist speech has tremendous emancipatory potential

Tremain 97 (Shelley, Book Review: The Rejected Body by Susan Wendell, Hypatia, Vol 12, No 2, Spring, p. 222–3 GAL)

I take exception, nonetheless, with the brief remarks Wendell makes with respect to disablement and language (1996, 77–81). Wendell worries that "acrimonious divisions" among disability activists and theorists with respect to so–called "politically correct" language (for example, disagreements over the metaphorical use of abilities and disabilities) might "weaken" the disability rights movement and might "distract" us from what should be our central concerns (for instance, widespread discrimination and prejudice against us) (1996, 78). I believe, however, that these debates comprise aspects of both the disability rights political agenda and the field of disability studies that have tremendous emancipatory potential. Wendell also worries that certain anti–ableist critiques of language that many of us produce (specifically our critiques of ableist and disableist meta­phors) threaten to "impoverish language" (1996, 80).' But this worry seems philosophically misguided, for it assumes that there is a static, predetermined, and finite set of linguistic practices that we would deplete if we were to render unacceptable the production of those linguistic practices. This cannot be true, for if there is one human invention whose obsolescence is almost guaranteed, it is a linguistic practice; and moreover, we do not seem to be any worse for it. Indeed, I would argue that when (and if) politically responsible, privileged people refuse to endorse discursive practices that disparage members of disempowered constituencies (people with disabilities, to name but one), they effectively open symbolic–discursive spaces in which those constituents may produce a proliferation of meanings with which to redeem themselves, mean­ings that ultimately will enrich the set of linguistic practices available in a given historical moment. Thus, I would suggest that Wendell's worry seems idealistic, for it implies that each and every one of us is equally represented by, and invested in, current discursive practices. 1 think that this is not at all the case; and therefore I would recommend that we conceive the anti–ableist critique of disabling language as conceptually, practically, and concretely continuous with the cultural and political movement that people of the First Nations, people of color, lesbians and gay men, women, and other socially subordinated groups have already initiated to challenge and transform oppressive discursive practices.

#### Language affects the way we understand and act in moments of encounters. Language sustains our perception of the world and this semantic construction ties things we do not understand to representations we can understand. If we can win that the understanding of the AFF is bunk, their plan is suspect.

Veronica **Vasterling 99,** Associate Professor in Philosophy at U of Nijimegen, Butler's Sophisticated Constructivism: A Critical Assessment, Hypatia 14.3, 1999, pg. 17–38

Whereas everything that is intelligible to us is also accessible to us, the reverse is not true. Phenomena that are intelligible to us are phenomena we do understand in some way or other. At the most basic level, to understand something means to be able to name or refer to it. As understanding involves the capacity to name, to refer, or to articulate that which is understood, it is always mediated by language. To equate intelligibility and accessibility would mean that we cannot have access to phenomena we do not understand, that is, phenomena we cannot articulate. That does not seem plausible. By following the hermeneutic model of understanding, I try to show that we can have access to phenomena we do not understand, that is, cannot articulate, though this access is not completely independent of linguistically mediated understanding. In daily life, our behavior and actions are guided by a mostly implicit understanding of the world we inhabit, an understanding that is based upon the ways in which this world is semantically constructed. Even so, our daily routines are on occasion slightly, and sometimes profoundly, disrupted because we are confronted with people, situations, actions, images, texts, things, bodily sensations etcetera that defy our understanding. The context of habitual understanding enables these confrontations or encounters. 5 To become aware of something we do not understand, we need a context of what we do understand. 6 By giving us access to what we do not understand, the context of habitual understanding does, as it were, indicate its own limits. We register these limits not simply as a lack of understanding but, more precisely, as a lack of our capacity to articulate. The nagging feeling or awareness of something we cannot put in words is nothing unusual. This fact of everyday life implies that the range of accessibility is wider than, though not independent of, the range of intelligibility. Whereas the latter more or less coincides with our linguistic capacities, the former indicates that these capacities do not (fully) determine our awareness of and contact with reality.