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### 1NC - T

#### A. Interpretation - “Restrictions” are direct governmental limitations on asset creation --- excludes regulations that do not prohibit production, such as environmental regulations.

#### Restrictions mean direct governmental limitation

**Viterbo 12** (Annamaria, Assistant Professor in International Law – University of Torino, PhD in International Economic Law – Bocconi University and Jean Monnet Fellow – European University Institute, International Economic Law and Monetary Measures: Limitations to States' Sovereignty and Dispute, p. 166)

In order to distinguish an exchange restriction from a trade measure, the Fund chose not to give relevance to the purposes or the effects of the measure and to adopt, instead, a technical criterion that focuses on the method followed to design said measure. An interpretation that considered the economic effects and purposes of the measures (taking into account the fact that the measure was introduced for balance of payments reasons or to preserve foreign currency reserves) would have inevitably extended the Fund's jurisdiction to trade restrictions, blurring the boundaries between the IMF and the GATT. The result of such a choice would have been that a quantitative restriction on imports imposed for balance of payments reasons would have fallen within the competence of the Fund. After lengthy discussions, in 1960 the IMF Executive Board adopted Decision No. 1034-(60/27).46 This Decision clarified that the distinctive feature of a restriction on payments and transfers for current international transactions is "whether it involves a **direct governmental limitation** on the availability or use of exchange as such\*.47 This is a limitation imposed directly on the use of currency in itself, for all purposes.

#### Violation --- Aff reduces regulations that affect the economics of production, but not production itself. Voting issue ---

#### 1. Limits --- restriction by effect explodes the topic: any law that changes relative economics could increase production --- they make thousands of new unpredictable cases topical and force the Neg to research outside of core energy policy --- makes preparation impossible

#### 2. Ground --- energy-specific restriction good is core ground --- they steal links to politics, biz con, prices, regulation CPs and other generics --- crushes fairness

### 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, debates and discussions that 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 – CP

#### The United States Federal Government should implement a 15-year tax of $15 per ton of carbon dioxide emissions on electricity generation in the United States.

#### -- Carbon tax solves the case

**WG 11** (Wilkinson Group, “Natural Gas Big Winner From Carbon Tax – Reputex Research Report,” 9-11-11, <http://www.wilkinson-group.com.au/featured-news/natural-gas-big-winner-from-carbon-tax-reputex-research-report/>)

MELBOURNE, 27th September, 2011 – RepuTex, a leading carbon analytics firm, today released research into the impact of the proposed **carbon tax** on the Australian power industry from 2011 to 2020. The research found that natural gas generators will be the **big winners** with generation projected to increase by 40% by 2020. Over the same period, RepuTex predict that Australian power industry emissions will drop by 9% (equal to a 5% reduction from 2000 levels) and generation from brown and black coal is expected to reduce by 40% and 20% respectively by 2020. A comprehensive research report of RepuTex’s findings will be made available in a forthcoming research report with Standard & Poor’s. Initial findings were made available today at the Powering Australia conference in Melbourne. According to RepuTex Global Director of Research, John Metzler, the carbon price mechanism will make natural gas pricing more competitive and will increase power generation from cleaner fuels. “Domestic coal prices will gradually fall into line with international pricing, pushing up the long run marginal cost (LRMC) of brown and black coal, and making **gas more attractive**. RepuTex projects that gas output will grow from 14% at current levels, to 43% of total NEM generation by 2020.

### 1NC – DA

#### Natural gas prices will rise – supply decreasing

**Finger 12** (Richard, Forbes Contributor, “We're Headed To $8 Natural Gas,” 7-22-12,

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/richardfinger/2012/07/22/were-headed-to-8-00-natural-gas/>)

The British Thermal Unit (btu) equivalent of one barrel of oil equals six thousand cubic feet of natural gas. Therefore if gas at $3.00 per mcf were to be at energy parity with oil, then oil would sell for $18.00. But WTI sells at $90 bbl. So gas must get more expensive or oil will get cheaper. As the gas rig count dwindles and evidence mounts that at least some of the shale plays are depleting much faster than projected, the result has been the aforementioned much lower than normal stockpile injection rates. With the disparity between oil and gas prices at such extremes, all available capital will continue to flow into drilling for gas liquids and oil. Some of the remaining dry gas drilling is probably just to maintain lease rights. Newton’s 3rd Law of Thermodynamics says for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Natural Gas at $13.28 is too high and the April price of $1.89 is too low. The rubber band is becoming stretched in the direction of tight supply. It’s **too cheap** to drill for, so supplies will further dwindle until inexorably the shortage occurs and prices spike irrationally higher. That time is sooner than later. We had an abnormally warm 2011-12 winter season in the US which sank home heating gas demand to extremely low levels. Was it because of an El Nino effect or did global warming play the pivotal role? Or, most likely, it is a confluence of several factors. Whatever the cause, the jet streams carrying the traditional cold temperatures and accompanying snowstorms didn’t reach south as far and as often as usual. Conversely, Europe had an abnormally cold winter last season suggested causes being the abstruse North Atlantic Oscillation Index, low solar activity and attendant low sunspot numbers and associated solar magnetic flux. You understand, right. Natural Gas prices have spent all of 2012 below $3.00. Just the past three trading days, perhaps starting to reflect the fundamentals discussed herein, have seen spot prices nudge above the $3.00 level. So combine 13 year low gas rig counts, declining production levels with resultant ultralow storage injections, shut in gas production, faster than anticipated shale well declines, persistent switching from oil and coal to cheaper and cleaner gas alternatives…..Then consider unending hotter than normal summer temperatures, continued greater than normal nuclear plant outages, a hurricane or two that knocks out Gulf of Mexico natural gas production for a week or two, and a La Nina induced cold winter…….any one of these can light the fuse that pushes the tenuous supply/demand balance into cardiac arrest. That’s the chain and it’s going to lead us to **$8.00** mcf **natural gas** by the approaching winter.

#### EPA rules will increase gas prices

ARI 12 (Advanced Resources International Inc. For the American Petroleum Institute, February 2012

“Estimate of Impacts of EPA Proposals to Reduce Air Emissions from Hydraulic Fracturing Operations,”

<http://www.api.org/~/media/Files/Policy/Hydraulic_Fracturing/NSPS-OG-ARI-Impacts-of-EPA-Air-Rules-Final-Report.ashx>)

For this assessment, the Reference Case crude oil and natural gas price forecasts from the Energy Information Administration’s (EIA) Annual Energy Outlook 2011 (AEO 2011) were assumed. In these forecasts, crude oil prices are forecast to rise from $86.23 per barrel in 2012 to $115.15 per barrel by 2025 (2009 dollars). Average wellhead natural gas prices are forecast to rise from $4.09 per Mcf in 2012 to $5.43 per Mcf in 2025. The price forecasts assumed in this assessment are summarized in Table 2. However, it is important to note that EIA’s price forecasts are used throughout this analysis even if REC equipment availability limits unconventional resource development and production, which might impact natural gas prices. Also important to note is that this analysis only assessed the impact on unconventional resource development (tight gas, CBM and shale wells). To the extent a REC requirement also 11 applies to “conventional” wells that are hydraulically fractured, the phase-in requirement and impacts are underestimated.

.

#### -- Turns the case – price increase key to industry survival

**Hutchinson 12** (Robert, Managing Director of the Rocky Mountain Institute, “Booms and Busts, Tulips and Gas,” 6-7-12, <http://blog.rmi.org/blog_booms_busts_tulips_and_gas>)

There is no doubt that unconventional natural gas resources such as shale gas and tight gas, liberated by horizontal drilling, hydraulic fracturing (fracking) and other technologies, are fundamentally changing the U.S. natural gas supply equation and, over time, maybe that of the rest of the world. We are in a boom yet **spot prices are absurdly low**; below costs in many fields with limited associated liquids (which trade based on oil prices). Many firms say they would not be drilling if they had any choice. So, what’s the deal? Why a boom when the owners of the natural gas supply are not making money (from gas)? A look back to the Netherlands in the early 1600s offers some lessons. Back then, wealthy merchants liked tulips. They were singularly bright colored decorations for their showy houses, in the generally grey world of water and cloud that is the Netherlands. Tulip bulbs saw a significant price spike, at least in the “spot” or “options” portions of the exchange and side deal markets that were set up at the time. The trade—perhaps it was even betting—was widespread enough to attract lawmakers, attempting to structure the markets, which included many players with no intent of taking delivery. Analysts now debate whether this was a full-fledged speculative boom—a national frenzy of trading absurd amounts for single, rare bulbs—or a more rational situation, paying high prices for the unusual (diseased, in fact) bulbs that produced multiple colors but were difficult and slow to propagate—pricey breeding stock, as it were. Fast forward to today, where there are some interesting linkages between tulips and unconventional natural gas. Like the tulip situation, when we look at natural gas it’s important to take into account what is rare—and not rare. Knowledge of fracking is temporarily rare; learning takes time and effort and is fraught with failures, just like in the early years of propagating a handful of fragile tulip bulbs. But as in the tulip case, as the supply and knowledge spreads, the rarity decreases, even if bid up by foreigners eager to take it home. When those wanting into the fracking game—by buying companies with leases and expertise under conditions that encourage continued drilling and production even when not economic—dwindle, then the “knowledge and position grab” stage of getting in on the early special “tulips deal” is over. What happens, then, when next stage, “**real” economics take over**? For gas, it’s a bit complicated, because many of the shale fields have enough liquids to ensure that, at current high oil prices, the gas can temporarily be treated as an afterthought. The liquids pay for the well. **Flaring**, seldom seen onshore, **is back** in some fields, as many wells are not yet connected to gas gathering systems and liquids are hauled by truck. This will prolong the supply boom a bit, but it's still not “real” economics. Rather, it’s picking off the richest (wettest) plays first, knowing that paying the piper and figuring out how to make money with fewer or less valuable liquids is still to come. Business plans focusing on this strategy abound, so this phase may **continue for a while**. But in due course, the liquids game, like the knowledge grab game, ends too. Real economics will happen. And **gas prices will go up**. No one knows when and how much—yet another **overshoot,** or a more steady market due to the large supply (at decent prices).

#### Cheap Gas kills Uranium Market

**Cowie 12** (Dr. Alex Cowie, Editor, Money Morning, “How Low Natural Gas Prices Are Causing Energy Havoc,” 8-1-12, <http://countingpips.com/forex-news/2012/08/how-low-natural-gas-prices-are-causing-energy-havoc/>)

Uranium is now in the cross hairs. ‘Permanently **cheap’ natural gas** is giving the economics of nuclear energy a run for its money too. The uranium spot price held above $52/ lb between last September and this May. But in the last few months, the **uranium price** has been slipping, and is back down to $49 / lb, which is a worrying sign. The CEO of General Electric, Mr Immelt, also had a few words to say about uranium. His company is a major manufacturer of nuclear equipment. He recently said (my emphasis in bold): ‘It’s just hard to justify nuclear. Really hard. Gas is so cheap and at some point, really, **economics rule** … So I think some combination of gas, and either wind or solar … that’s where we see most countries around the world going.”

#### Hurts Kazakhstan’s revenue

**McDermott 11** (Roger, Senior Fellow, Foreign Military Studies Office, Fort Leavenworth, “Kazakhstan: Countering nuclear proliferation, Action to develop a nuclear and terrorist-free world,” in Kazakhstan 2011: Twenty Years of Peace and Creation, *First: The Forum for Global Decision Makers*, 2011, <http://www.firstmagazine.com/Publishing/SpecialReportsDetail.aspx?RegionId=4&SpecialReportId=96>)

Kazakhstan’s ambitions are likely to be realized if **uranium prices stay high** and Kazatomprom is successful in further expanding its international partnerships. Kazatomprom’s most immediate task is to secure customers for its final nuclear fuel product--fuel assemblies, an extra fuel fabrication stage which Kazatomprom plans to start carrying out domestically. Having a nearly complete nuclear fuel cycle, save for enrichment, will ensure a stable cash flow for Kazatomprom and limit its dependence on the fluctuating market price of raw uranium. In the meantime, increased **uranium sales** will help alleviate the country’s overdependence on oil exports and help modernize its nuclear sector. If Kazakhstan does become the world’s leading uranium and nuclear fuel supplier, the ramifications for the country both in terms of increased **gross domestic product** and status on the world stage will be profound.

#### Prevents diversification of Kazakhstan’s economy

**Pleitgen 12** (Frederick, CNN, “Kazakhstan hopes uranium, oil and gas will fuel its future,” 7-18-12,

<http://articles.cnn.com/2012-07-18/asia/world_asia_kazakhstan-natural-resources-economy_1_vladimir-shkolnik-kazakhstan-uranium>)

Kazakhstan's mineral wealth will be a **major source of income** for decades to come, but it won't last forever. The country is trying to use it wisely to transition to a broader economic base while developing the natural resources industries to the maximum. Last year Kazakhstan was the world's top producer of **uranium**, accounting for over a third of global production. The industry's rapid expansion, plus the good quality of the uranium and the comparatively cheap method of mining it have combined to give Kazakhstan an advantage over other big exporters like Australia and Canada. With continued investment, Vladimir Shkolnik, the head of Kazakhstan's national atomic energy company, Kazatomprom, is keen to maintain that position. "We are hoping to keep our leadership position in the uranium field," he says. "We have dozens of facilities and **hundreds of mines** and we think we will remain a world leader in the uranium sector." Kazakhstan's government is also trying to encourage more foreign investment. Since independence in 1991, around $150 billion of foreign investment has flowed into the country; $18 billion dollars last year alone, according to the government. Companies like GE and Eurocopter have been attracted to the country, entering partnerships with national companies that have helped bring training and new skills to the local workforce. While money is flowing from the country's natural resources industry, the government is using some of its revenue to boost other sectors, like IT and engineering. The aim is to make the economy **more resilient** when **commodities prices fall** and better prepared for the day when the gush of oil and gas reduce to a trickle. "Of course revenues from raw materials are still by far the largest share of the country's budget," says energy analyst, Murat Karymsakov. "But in recent years the president (of Kazakhstan) has announced and put into place a plan for industrial and technological development to diversify the economy."

#### Destroys stability

**Hamm 12** (Nathan, founder and Principal Analyst for Registan, MA in Central Asian Studies from the University of Washington, “Kazakhstan’s Stability, Central Asia’s Stability,” 1-31-12, <http://registan.net/2012/01/31/kazakhstans-stability-central-asias-stability/>)

I’m paraphrasing, but on the first two items, Dr. Roberts argues that the thoroughly Soviet education and background of Kazakhstan’s leadership leaves it out of touch and unable to adequately respond to the public. The government’s response to labor strikes, including the violence in Zhanaozen, he says, show that the government was not prepared to deal with dissatisfaction over unmet **economic expectations**. Dr. Roberts says that these challenges are not extreme nor likely to cause widespread unrest in the near term, but that the stagnancy of the political system means that the government lacks mechanisms to deal with large socio-economic changes. [Note: Alima wrote about the crisis of unmet expectations at length recently.] This is good, succinct analysis of the situation that puts risks to Kazakhstan’s stability in good context. The risks are there, the government is ill-prepared to deal with them at present, but it’s unlikely that it will be overwhelmed by them soon. These risks, however, aren’t present only in Kazakhstan. They exist in similar forms and combinations throughout Central Asia. Growing segments of society throughout the region are bringing (or attempting to…) Islam into the public square, where it is responded to with shock and terror by secular officials. National economies are failing to meet the expectations, and in many areas, even the basic needs, of the public. And though nationalism is not so clearly a problem the way it is Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in the rest of Central Asia, there are small signs that society is challenging the state’s monopoly on defining what it means to be Uzbek, Tajik, Kyrgyz, etc. In talking about risks to stability, there is often a tendency to focus on presidential succession, the specter of fundamentalism and political Islam, and a more recent tendency to talk about replication of the Arab Spring. Recent history should make it abundantly clear though, that analysts, experts, and observers are taken by surprise in the region. Game-planning what happens after Karimov dies or a resurgence of the IMU activity in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan might be worthless because they assume state and society lack the mechanisms to respond to and manage succession or terrorist groups. The greatest risks to stability **throughout the region** are medium- to long-term risks arising from the three aforementioned factors and the oppositional relationship between state and society. Devising a list of indicators and warnings based on the three factors Dr. Roberts identifies — rising public religiosity, increasing nationalism, and under-performance in the economy — are more likely not only to lead to better anticipation of the trajectory of stability in Central Asia but also to provide a better idea of when serious risks to stability are likely to arise.

#### Spreads throughout the region

**Assenova 8** (Margarita Assenova, IND Director; Natalie Zajicova, Program Officer (IND); Janusz Bugajski, CSIS NEDP Director; Ilona Teleki, Deputy Director and Fellow (CSIS); Besian Bocka, Program Coordinator and Research Assistant (CSIS), “Kazakhstan’s Strategic Significance,” 2008, CSIS-IND Taskforce Policy Brief team, European Dialogue, <http://eurodialogue.org/Kazakhstan-Strategic-Significance>)

The decision by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to award Kazakhstan the chairmanship of the organization for 2010 underscores a growing recognition of the country’s regional and continental importance. Kazakhstan is a **strategic linchpin** in the vast Central Asian-Caspian Basin zone, a region rich in energy resources and a potential gateway for commerce and communications between Europe and Asia. However, it is also an area that faces an assortment of troubling security challenges. Ensuring a **stable and secure Central Asia** is important for the international interests of the United States and its European allies for several prescient reasons: • Asian Security: Because of its proximity to **Russia,** **China**, Iran, and the South Asian sub-continent, Kazakhstan’s security and stability is an increasingly **vital interes**t to all major powers. Kazakhstan’s tenure as chair of the OSCE will become an opportunity for greater multilateral cooperation in achieving this objective while strengthening the role and prestige of the OSCE throughout Central Asia.

#### -- Nuclear war

**Ahrari 1** (M. Ehsan, Professor of National Security and Strategy of the Joint and Combined Warfighting School at the Armed Forces Staff College, August 2001, “Jihadi Groups, Nuclear Pakistan and the New Great Game,” http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub112.pdf)

South and **Central Asia** constitute a part of the world where a well-designed American strategy might well help avoid crises or catastrophe. The U.S. military would provide only one component of such a strategy, and a secondary one at that, but has an important role to play through engagement activities and regional confidence building. Insecurity has led the states of the region to seek **weapons of mass destruction**, missiles and conventional arms. It has also led them toward policies which undercut the security of their neighbors. If such activities continue, the result could be increased terrorism, humanitarian disasters, continued low-level conflict and potentially even major regional war or a **thermonuclear exchange**. A shift away from this pattern could allow the states of the region to become solid economic and political partners for the United States, thus representing a gain for all concerned.

### 1NC – DA

#### Immigration reform will pass --- it’s a top priority.

**Foley and Stein**, **1/2**/2013 (Elise and Sam, Obama’s Immigration Reform To Begin This Month, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>)

Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda. An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit. With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished. "The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill." It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push. Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

#### Plan costs capital – it’ll ignite fierce political debates

Travers, 11 (Andrew, “Natural gas industry drilling for people’s hearts and minds”, August 20, Aspen Daily News, <http://www.aspendailynews.com/section/home/148663>)

Schuller said the biggest remaining challenge is political, and in convincing people that drilling technologies and hydraulic fracturing — known commonly as “fracking” — in their communities is safe. “You can be a passionate environmentalist and a devoted humanist and like natural gas,” she said, “because I am one of those people.” She compared the widespread worries about fracking — well-known to residents of the gas-rich Western Slope — to the concerns that climate change is a hoax. “In the same way that the climate movement has to deal with this unimaginable conflict about people not believing in science, we have to do that in the conversation about hydraulic fracturing,” she said. “And the nature of the conversation is as important as the information ... The public must be willing to hear that it’s safe when it’s demonstrated.” Julander then did his best to make an attractive natural gas pitch to AREDay’s renewable energy-friendly crowd. “With natural gas, combined with renewables and efficiency, we win,” he argued. “We get sustainable, reasonably-priced energy throughout the world, we take away the colonialism of the oil industry, we create an economy that prospers throughout the world in an environmentally-friendly fashion and we beat climate change.” The challenge, he agreed, is to get government leaders to stand with COGA and the oil industry in support of natural gas. “We don’t need nuclear, we don’t need coal, we don’t need anything else,” he said. “We just need the political power.” Pickens interjected a story about meeting the Saudi Arabian ambassador to the U.S. in 2008, shortly after Pickens had announced his plan to use wind and natural gas to supplant imported oil for energy generation in America. He said he told the ambassador his goal was to get the U.S. entirely off of Saudi oil. Friday he told the AREDay crowd that natural gas could do that. “It’s gonna give the United States an opportunity to sit at the big table for energy,” Pickens said. “For the last 20 years we have had no seat at the big table. When OPEC met, they met and we sat in the hall ... Now you can sit at the table and say, ‘Look, we have a resource that can compete with your oil.” That said, Pickens characterized the domestic fight to change the energy consumption and delivery paradigm toward natural gas as “a battle royale.” Wirth said getting different factions of the energy world to collaborate would prove equally difficult. “The coalition has to be a natural gas, solar, wind, efficiency, renewable coalition,” he said. “This is going to be a brutal political battle.” Ritter added that his experience as governor from 2007 to this past January proved both the difficulty and necessity of politicking for natural gas. Ritter said during his time in office he had to balance updating drilling regulations for new technology with promoting clean energy. Hearing local environmental concerns about impacts on ecology and wildlife also is a must, he argued, reminiscent of the ongoing battle over natural gas drilling in the Thompson Divide, located outside of Carbondale. “You have to be engaged in the politics of this, because there are politics involved in waging the clean energy future and making natural gas a part of it,” he said.

#### Capital is key --- it bridges support from both parties.

Dallas Morning News, **1/2**/2012 (Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge, p. <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece>)

The president’s words to NBC’s David Gregory are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task this year. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill, either. And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans. In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But the leadership that matters most will come from the White House. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count. HE SAID IT … “I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. I will introduce legislation in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.” President Barack Obama, in an interview on Meet the Press Sunday

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

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

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

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war.

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 1NC – Economy

#### Aff doesn’t solve manufacturing – Trade deficit

Atkinson 12 (Robert D. Atkinson, “Worse Than the Great Depression: What Experts Are Missing About American Manufacturing Decline,” http://www2.itif.org/2012-american-manufacturing-decline.pdf

In the 2000s, U.S. manufacturing suffered its worst performance in American history in terms of jobs. Not only did America lose 5.7 million manufacturing jobs, but the decline as a share of total manufacturing jobs (33 percent) exceeded the rate of loss in the Great Depression. 1 Despite this unprecedented negative performance, most economists, pundits and elected officials are remarkably blasé about what has transpired. Manufacturing, they argue, has simply become incredibly productive. While tough on workers who are laid off, job losses indicate superior performance. All that is needed, if anything, are better programs to help laid-off workers. This report argues that this dominant view on the loss of manufacturing jobs is fundamentally mistaken. Manufacturing lost jobs because manufacturing lost output, and it lost output because its ability to compete in global markets—some manipulated by egregious foreign mercantilist policies, others supported by better national competiveness policies, like lower corporate tax rates—declined significantly. In 2010, 13 of the 19 U.S. manufacturing sectors (employing 55 percent of manufacturing workers) were producing less than they there were in 2000 in terms of inflation-adjusted output. 2 Moreover, we assert that the government’s official calculation of manufacturing output growth, and by definition productivity, is significantly overstated. Overall, U.S. manufacturing output actually fell by 11 percent during a period when GDP increased by 17 percent. 3 The alarm bells are largely silent for two reasons: government statistics significantly overstate the change in U.S. manufacturing output, and most economists and pundits do not extend their analysis beyond one macro-level number (change in real manufacturing value added relative to GDP). But the conventional wisdom that U.S. manufacturing job loss is simply a result of productivity-driven restructuring (akin to how U.S. agriculture lost jobs but is still healthy) is wrong, or at least not the whole story. This report contends that the loss of U.S. manufacturing jobs is a function of slow growth in output (and, in most sectors, actual loss of output) caused by a steep increase in the manufactured goods trade deficit.

#### Turn – EPA regulations increase manufacturing industry

**Gowrishankar 12** (Vignesh, PhD in solar cells from Stanford, “EPA's regulations would not be a burden on the natural gas industry, says Bloomberg Government,” 8-1-12, National Resources Defense Council,

<http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/vgowrishankar/epas_regulations_would_not_be.html>)

The report also identifies an important market opportunity in the natural gas industry, which is of immense significance in our stagnant economy. Increased spending on pollution control services would especially be a boon for smaller regional service companies that offer green completions, such as privately held Hughes Specialty Services, a 90-employee company that serves western Oklahoma and eastern Texas, and privately held Cimarron Energy, of Norman, Oklahoma, which serves areas in Pennsylvania, Texas, Colorado and North Dakota. Increased expenditure on green completion (and other) equipment would also drive business for equipment manufacturers, such as privately-owned Process Equipment and Service Co. Inc., of Farmington, New Mexico. Putting aside all this talk of business implications for a moment, let’s not forget the main purpose behind EPA’s regulations – to start to clean up the operations of the natural gas industry. Actually, we really need to be focusing on renewable energy and energy efficiency as central pillars of a sustainable **energy economy**. However, natural gas can be a transitory step towards a truly sustainable energy mix. If produced in an environmentally-responsible manner, natural gas can be cleaner than other fossil fuels due to the fact that it burns cleaner than these other fuels. It may also offer some advantages in this stagnant economy, such as an inexpensive fuel and an avenue for job-creation. But at the very least we need to get it right – there’s no justification for sacrificing our environment and harming our health in our quest for natural gas. The EPA’s regulations begin to ensure protection for these priceless assets. Nonetheless, natural gas is a fossil fuel, and we, as a community, really need to be looking much further towards truly clean energy resources such as renewables and energy efficiency.

#### Manufacturing not key to the economy

Wessel 12 (David Wessel, economics editor of The Wall Street, “Manufacturing Industry Gained Momentum In 2011,” 1-19-12, <http://www.npr.org/2012/01/19/145437593/are-more-u-s-manufacturing-jobs-being-created>)

WESSEL: Well, that's a good question. So basically, factories have added more than 300,000 jobs in the past two years, and that's pretty good news - certainly better than losing jobs. But it would take two million more jobs to get manufacturing back to where it was in 2007 before the recession. Factories are managing to produce more without hiring a lot more workers, because they're getting more productive; technology, reorganization, making people work harder, making them work smarter. It's all made for a remarkable surge of productivity. Factories get 40 percent more output out of every out of work today, compared to what they got 10 years ago. MONTAGNE: Still though, if sales keep growing, would factories not hire more? Maybe not as many workers as they had before, but more, and couldn't that be one part of the answer, at least, to the jobs problem? WESSEL: Well, it would definitely be one part, but it's a small part. For all the romance about manufacturing, we are no longer a manufacturing economy when it comes to jobs. Only nine percent of the jobs in America today are in manufacturing. It just isn't big enough to put Americans back to work. Even if factory employment doubled, which isn't going to happen, that wouldn't be enough new jobs to put all the 13 million unemployed people back to work. So yes, it's a plus. But no, it's not enough to solve our unemployment problem.

#### No timeframe --- manufacturing decline is slow, takes decades to have an impact --- disads come first

#### 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), Ofir]

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).

#### Competitiveness high

JP 9 (Jakarta Post, “Impact of President-Elect Obama on US Competitiveness”, 1-14, Lexis)

The United States, **still in the leading position** in IMD's World Competitiveness Yearbook (for the 14th consecutive year), is currently in dire straits. What could be the impact of Obama's campaign promises on U.S. competitiveness? Firstly, he will have to deal with Priority No. 1 - the consequences of the financial crisis on the American economy. President-elect Obama is supporting an important fiscal stimulus to jumpstart the economy in parallel with the monetary easing of the Fed (interest rates are approaching zero). This fiscal boost would encompass tax breaks to the middle 20% of taxpayers and roll back the tax cuts implemented under the Bush administration for families earning more than $250,000.

### 1NC – Oil

#### Can’t solve oil dependence – natural gas can’t power transportation which means we’ll still be dependent

#### Double bind – Sufficient independence now – solves the advantage

**Miller et al 12** (Rich Asjylyn Loder and Jim Polson, “Americans Gaining Energy Independence With U.S. as Top Producer,” Bloomberg, 2-6, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-07/americans-gaining-energy-independence-with-u-s-as-top-producer.html>)

The U.S. is the closest it has been in almost 20 years to achieving energy **self-sufficiency**, a goal the nation has been pursuing since the 1973 Arab oil embargo triggered a recession and led to lines at gasoline stations. Domestic **oil output** is the highest in eight years. The U.S. is **producing so much natural gas** that, where the government warned four years ago of a critical need to boost imports, it now may approve an export terminal. Methanex Corp. (MX), the world’s biggest methanol maker, said it will dismantle a factory in Chile and reassemble it in Louisiana to take advantage of low natural gas prices. And higher mileage standards and federally mandated ethanol use, along with slow economic growth, have **curbed demand**. The result: The U.S. has reversed a two-decade-long decline in energy independence, increasing the proportion of demand met from domestic sources over the last six years to an estimated 81 percent through the first 10 months of 2011, according to data compiled by Bloomberg from the U.S. Department of Energy. That would be the highest level since 1992. “For 40 years, only politicians and the occasional author in Popular Mechanics magazine talked about achieving energy independence,” said Adam Sieminski, who has been nominated by President Barack Obama to head the U.S. Energy Information Administration. “Now it doesn’t seem such an outlandish idea.” The transformation, which could see the country become the world’s top energy producer by 2020, has implications for the economy and national security -- boosting household incomes, jobs and government revenue; cutting the trade deficit; enhancing manufacturers’ competitiveness; and allowing greater flexibility in dealing with unrest in the Middle East. Output Rising U.S. energy self-sufficiency has been steadily rising since 2005, when it hit a low of 70 percent, the data compiled by Bloomberg show. Domestic crude oil production rose 3.6 percent last year to an average 5.7 million barrels a day, the highest since 2003, according to the Energy Department. Natural gas output climbed to **22.4 trillion** cubic feet in 2010 from 20.2 trillion in 2007, when the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission warned of the need for more imports. Prices have fallen more than 80 percent since 2008. At the same time, the efficiency of the average U.S. passenger vehicle has helped limit demand. It increased to 29.6 miles per gallon in 2011 from 19.9 mpg in 1978, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The last time the U.S. achieved energy independence was in 1952. While it still imported some petroleum, the country’s exports, including of coal, more than offset its imports.

#### B. Energy independence is impossible

**Levi 12** [Michael Levi, senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change, “Think Again: The American Energy Boom”, July 2012, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think_again_the_american_energy_boom?page=0,0>]

In any case, energy independence requires more than impressive arithmetic. As long as the United States is fully integrated into the world oil market, U.S. fuel prices will rise and fall along with events on the other side of the globe -- say, a war with Iran. Greater domestic production will blunt the economic shock of rapidly rising prices -- better to suddenly be sending massive sums to North Dakota than to Saudi Arabia -- but because oil producers everywhere are relatively slow to spend their windfalls, skyrocketing prices could still knock the economy on its back.

#### Lots of factors prevent great power conflict without hegemony

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.

#### Primacy spurs proliferation among non-state and rogue state actors.

**Weber et al 7** [Steven - Professor of Political Science and Director of the Institute for International Studies at the University of California-Berkeley, et al., with Naazneen Barma, Matthew Kroenig, and Ely Ratner, Ph.D. Candidates at the University of California-Berkeley and Research Fellows at its New Era Foreign Policy Center, 2007 [“How Globalization Went Bad,” Foreign Policy, Issue 158, January/February, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Premiere, p. 51-52]

The world is paying a heavy price for the instability created by the combination of globalization and unipolarity, and the United States is bearing most of the burden. Consider the case of nuclear proliferation. There’s effectively a market out there for proliferation, with its own supply (states willing to share nuclear technology) and demand (states that badly want a nuclear weapon). The overlap of unipolarity with globalization ratchets up both the supply and demand, to the detriment of U.S. national security. It has become fashionable, in the wake of the Iraq war, to comment on the limits of conventional military force. But much of this analysis is overblown. The United States may not be able to stabilize and rebuild Iraq. But that doesn’t matter much from the perspective of a government that thinks the Pentagon has it in its sights. In Tehran, Pyongyang, and many other capitals, including Beijing, the bottom line is simple: The U.S. military could, with conventional force, end those regimes tomorrow if it chose to do so. No country in the world can dream of challenging U.S. conventional military power. But they can certainly hope to deter America from using it. And the best deterrent yet invented is the threat of nuclear retaliation. Before 1989, states that felt threatened by the United States could turn to the Soviet Union’s nuclear umbrella for protection. Now, they turn to people like A.Q. Khan. Having your own nuclear weapon used to be a luxury. Today, it is fast becoming a necessity. North Korea is the clearest example. Few countries had it worse during the Cold War. North Korea was surrounded by feuding, nuclear-armed communist neighbors, it was officially at war with its southern neighbor, and it stared continuously at tens of thousands of U.S. troops on its border. But, for 40 years, North Korea didn’t seek nuclear weapons. It didn’t need to, because it had the Soviet nuclear umbrella. Within five years of the Soviet collapse, however, Pyongyang was pushing ahead full steam on plutonium reprocessing facilities. North Korea’s founder, Kim Il Sung, barely flinched when former U.S. President Bill Clinton’s administration readied war plans to strike his nuclear installations preemptively. That brinkmanship paid off. Today North Korea is likely a nuclear power, and Kim’s son rules the country with an iron fist. America’s conventional military strength means a lot less to a nuclear North Korea. Saddam Hussein’s great strategic blunder was that he took too long to get to the same place. How would things be different in a multipolar world? For starters, great powers could split the job of policing proliferation, and even collaborate on some particularly hard cases. It’s often forgotten now that, during the Cold War, the only state with a tougher nonproliferation policy than the United States was the Soviet Union. Not a single country that had a formal alliance with Moscow ever became a nuclear power. The Eastern bloc was full of countries with advanced technological capabilities in every area except one—nuclear weapons. Moscow simply wouldn’t permit it. But today we see the uneven and inadequate level of effort that non-superpowers devote to stopping proliferation. The Europeans dangle carrots at Iran, but they are unwilling to consider serious sticks. The Chinese refuse to admit that there is a problem. And the Russians are aiding Iran’s nuclear ambitions. When push comes to shove, nonproliferation today is almost entirely America’s burden.

#### Extinction

Utgoff 2 (Victor, Deputy Director for Strategy, Forces and Resources at the Institute for Defense Analyses, Survival, “Proliferation, Missile Defense and American Ambitions”, Volume 44, Number 2, Summer, p. 87-90)

Escalation of violence is also basic human nature. Once the violence starts, retaliatory exchanges of violent acts can escalate to levels unimagined by the participants before hand. Intense and blinding anger is a common response to fear or humiliation or abuse. And such anger can lead us to impose on our opponents whatever levels of violence are readily accessible. In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear ‘six-shooters’ on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### EPA Regulations are key to stop air pollution and methane release, impact is extinction

Doniger 12 (David, Policy Director, Climate and Clean Air Program, National Resources Defense Council, “Separating Fracked From Fiction: The Truth About the American Petroleum Institute's Attacks on EPA's New Air Pollution Standards For Natural Gas Fracking,” 4-9-12, <http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ddoniger/separating_fracked_from_fictio.html>)

These important public health safeguards are now under final review by the White House Office of Management and Budget and must be issued by April 17th under a court-ordered deadline obtained by two western environmental groups, WildEarth Guardians and the San Juan Citizens Alliance. NRDC has been working hard, along with partner organizations, for the strongest protections from the soup of dangerous air pollutants coming from these wells and associated oil and gas production operations. But the standards are under attack from the American Petroleum Institute and other powerful industry lobbyists. Fracking produces a lot of natural gas, but also a host of air and water contaminants. Millions of Americans are exposed, and they need national standards to protect their health and their surroundings. These standards are an important start on delivering the air pollution safeguards they deserve. Fracked wells and other oil and gas production and processing sources release millions of tons of air pollution – including benzene that causes cancer, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that form the ozone smog that triggers asthma attacks, and **methane** that contributes to climate change. These air pollutants are a clear and present **danger to our** children, our communities and our **planet**. The EPA standards will be an **important start** – cutting the sector’s VOCs and methane pollution by about 25 percent and air toxics emissions by about 30 percent.

#### No increase in cost or significant drop in production from EPA rules

**Heidorn 12** (Richard, analyst for Bloomberg Government, MBA at Temple University - Fox School of Business and Management, “Fracking Emissions Rules: Re-estimating the Costs,” 7-19-12, <http://about.bgov.com/2012/07/19/fracking-emissions-rules-re-estimating-the-costs/>)

The **E**nvironmental **P**rotection **A**gency on April 17 issued regulations on natural gas drilling that it says will not only improve air quality but also increase producer profits. The regulations, which will take full **effect in 2015**, require producers to capture about 90 percent of the volatile organic compounds and methane that can escape into the air as a result of natural gas production using hydraulic fracturing, or fracking. EPA says the rule will cost producers about $170 million a year, but that cost will be more than offset by the sales of the captured methane and natural gas liquids, resulting in a **net gain** of about $15 million a year. The industry, on the other hand, projects net annual compliance cost at more than $2.5 billion. The Bloomberg Government Study, titled “Fracking Emission Rules: EPA, Industry Miss Mark On Costs, Consequences” (subscription required) analyzes available data on the number of wells affected by the rule, compliance costs per well, the volume of fuel captured and the price for which it can be sold. The study finds that the regulation is neither the profit driver EPA claims nor the billion-dollar burden industry has portrayed. The study finds: • The regulations will increase producer costs by $316 million to $511 million a year, or **less than 1 percent** of producer revenues. • Drillers are **already capturing emissions** in geological formations where the volume of methane and liquids makes the capture cost effective. For some wells covered by the new rules, the cost of capture may exceed the incremental revenue from captured fuel. • Producers voluntarily capturing emissions or operating in states that already require capture will face little or **no change** to their operations aside from reporting requirements. Other producers may reduce drilling for new wells as they divert capital now spent on production to complying with the regulations. • The regulations may generate annual revenue of about $383 million for well service providers and more than $125 million in sales for equipment manufacturers.

#### All their evidence describes the proposed rule, not the actual rule it gives companies more than enough time

**AP 12** (Associated Press, “EPA to slash air pollution from natural gas wells,” 4-18-12, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/04/18/ap-newsbreak-epa-to-reduce-gas-drilling-pollution/>)

WASHINGTON – The Obama administration on Wednesday set the first-ever national standards to control air pollution from gas wells that are drilled using a method called hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, but not without making **concessions to the** oil and gas **industry.** President Barack Obama in his State of the Union address strongly backed natural gas drilling as a clean energy source, and recently announced an executive order calling for coordination of federal regulation to ease burdens on producers. But he has come under criticism by the industry and Republicans for policies they say discourage energy development. Top EPA officials said Wednesday that the new regulations would ensure pollution is controlled without slowing natural gas production. "By ensuring the capture of gases that were previously released to pollute our air and threaten our climate, these updated standards will protect our health, but also lead to more product for fuel suppliers to bring to market," said EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson in a statement. Much of the air pollution from fracked gas wells is vented when the well transitions from drilling to actual production, a three- to 10-day process which is referred to as "completion." An **earlier version** of the rule limiting air pollution from gas wells would have required companies to install pollution-reducing equipment **immediately** after the rule was finalized. Drillers now will be given **more than two years** to employ technology to reduce emissions of smog- and soot-forming pollutants during that stage. The Environmental Protection Agency will require drillers to burn off gas in the meantime, an alternative that can release smog-forming nitrogen oxides, but will still slash overall emissions. Industry groups had pushed hard for the delay, saying the equipment to reduce pollution at the wellhead during completion was not readily available. About 25,000 wells a year are being fracked, a process where water, chemicals and sand are injected at high pressure underground to release trapped natural gas. Besides the new standards for oil and gas wells, the EPA also on Wednesday updated existing rules for natural gas processing plants, storage tanks and transmission lines that will reduce amounts of cancer-causing air pollution, such as benzene, and also reduce methane — the main ingredient in natural gas, but also one of the most potent global warming gases. There were other changes made since the EPA proposed the rule last July under a court order that stemmed from a lawsuit brought by environmental groups. Wells drilled in low-pressure areas, such as coalbed methane reserves, would be exempt because they release less pollution during completion. And companies that choose to re-fracture wells using the pollution-reducing equipment prior to the January 2015 deadline would not be covered by other parts of the regulation. Since companies could capture the natural gas and sell it, the EPA estimates that they would save about $11-$19 million a year starting in 2015. The American Petroleum Institute, the main lobbying group for the oil and gas industry, said that much of the industry was **already doing that**. "We don't need (the EPA) to come and tell our members we will save you money," said Howard Feldman, the institute's director of regulatory and scientific affairs. "Their business is natural gas. They get it that they are trying to capture as much gas as they can."

#### 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.**

## 2NC

### 2NC Overview

#### Low prices adv turns their heg and advs because it’s about supply

#### 1.) Gas Glut --

#### A. Market Overshoot – glut causes low prices, kills industry investment and development, devastating long-term supply. That’s Hutchinson.

#### B. Long-Term Effect – low prices devastate future supply of gas, glut now – starve later

Shackouls 3 (Bobby S., Chair of the National Petroleum Council, “Balancing Natural Gas Policy,” September 2003,

<http://www.npc.org/reports/dtg-final.pdf>)

Both the NGPA and PIFUA were repealed because they produced unintended consequences that distorted the market and created inefficiencies. The legacy of these experiments is that regulated prices will rarely work to keep markets balanced because they will invariably send the wrong price signals to producers and consumers, and result in supply shortages or surpluses. An initial regulatory act often leads to a series of regulatory acts to correct the adverse consequences of the previous actions. For example, the low controlled prices of the 1960s to 1970s decreased exploration and drilling activity to the point of causing a supply shortage. Instead of lifting price controls and allowing the free market forces to balance the market, the federal government instead set policy that would decrease demand to match the lower supplies. This action reduced drilling activity, requiring an additional regulation to fix that problem.

#### C. Exploration – drilling in restricted areas is prohibitively expensive, and a drop in the bucket

Brown 10 (Stephen P.A. Brown, Steven A. Gabriel, and Ruud Egging, Resources for the Future, National Energy Policy Institute, “Abundant Shale Gas Resources: Some Implications for Energy Policy,” April 2010,

<http://nepinstitute.org/get/RFF_Reports/Background-Papers/RFF-NEPI-Brownetal-ShaleGas.pdf>)

For the United States, current estimates of recoverable natural gas resources are 1,760– 2,100 trillion cubic feet. Of this amount, about 162 trillion cubic feet is beneath federal lands on which drilling has been restricted or off limits. These restricted areas are found in Alaska, the Rocky Mountains, the Gulf Coast, and Appalachia. In addition, another 92 trillion cubic feet of offshore natural gas resources are unavailable for development, including 86 trillion cubic feet in the federal outer continental shelf (OCS) moratoria regions. The OCS numbers are subject to considerable uncertainty because estimates for some of the areas were made 25–40 years ago (NPC 2007). The estimates could be increased with new exploration and assessments taking into account modern drilling and extraction techniques. In general, one would expect that increased access to these areas formerly excluded from exploration and development would boost U.S. natural gas supplies. Such an effect is likely to be stronger in the scenarios with higher natural gas prices because exploration and production costs are generally higher in the moratoria lands. Consequently, one might expect that increased access to moratoria lands would reduce some of the uncertainty about U.S. natural gas supplies.

#### 2. Destroys manufacturing

PEL 10 (Pennsylvania Economy League, “The Economic Impact of the Coal Industry in Pennsylvania,” April 2010,

<http://www.alleghenyconference.org/PDFs/PELMisc/EconomicImpactOfCoalIndustryInPa0410.pdf>)

In May 2009, Alpha Natural Resources announced plans to merge with Foundation Coal. The merger was completed at the end of July 2009. The combined company retains the Alpha name and headquarters in Abingdon, VA. With affiliate coal production capacity of more than 90 million tons a year, Alpha is the nation's leading supplier and exporter of metallurgical coal used in the steel-making process and is a major supplier of thermal coal to electric utilities and manufacturing industries across the country. The company, through its affiliates, employs approximately 6,200 people and operates more than 60 mines and 14 coal preparation facilities in the regions of Northern and Central Appalachia and the Powder River Basin.

#### 3. Low Prices decrease production

Seigel 12 (John R., president of J.J. Richardson, a registered investment advisor that manages a hedge fund in Bethesda, MD, “The World's Largest LNG Supplier?,” 4-7-12, <http://online.barrons.com/article/SB50001424052748704759704577267370939083182.html>)

Energy's decision-making process balances the extent to which exporting LNG drives up prices with the economic benefits of increased production and energy exports. The price assessment comes at a time when U.S. gas fetches the same price in constant dollars as it did in 1975. Producers are now shutting down production and lowering exploration budgets. The shale-gas "job machine" is now in reverse. Energy's price study, released in January, found that exporting six BCF per day would increase wellhead prices by 50 to 60 cents per million BTU by 2026. The study has a myriad of assumptions and scenarios, the most fundamental of which is future gas production. In 2007, Energy predicted the U.S. would be importing 12.3 BCF a day of LNG by 2030 due to falling gas production. But primarily because of the shale-technology phenomenon, wellhead prices have tumbled from $6.25 six years ago, even as demand increased by eight BCF per day. That demand figure is larger than the six BCF assumption of the Energy study. The Energy Department is not particularly to blame, as most forecasters got it just as wrong on gas production.

### Uniq - Prices

#### Natural gas prices rising – industrial and electricity demand

Lackey 12 (Mark, energy analyst with CHF Investor Relations, “This Is Your Energy Entry Point: Mark Lackey,” 8-30-12, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/14243>)

Natural gas has been somewhat weaker, but it bounced off the $2/thousand cubic feet (Mcf) price a few months ago up to the $2.85–3/Mcf range in North America. With more industrial demand coming back, particularly in the auto sector, and stronger demand from electric utilities, gas should move back up closer to $3.25–3.30/Mcf in the next year. By way of comparison, prices in Europe can be anywhere from $4–8/Mcf, and in China they're as high as $15/Mcf.

#### Steady rise in prices coming now

Conti 12 (John J., Assistant Administrator of Energy Analysis, United States Energy Information Administration, “Annual Energy Outlook 2012,” June 2012, <http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/pdf/0383(2012).pdf)>

U.S. natural gas prices are determined largely by supply and demand conditions in North American markets. At current (2012) price levels, natural gas prices are below average replacement cost. However, over time natural gas prices rise with the cost of developing incremental production capacity (Figure 103). After 2017, natural gas prices rise in the AEO2012 Reference case more rapidly than crude oil prices, but oil prices remain at least three times higher than natural gas prices through the end of the projection (Figure 104). As of January 1, 2010, total proved and unproved natural gas resources are estimated at 2,203 trillion cubic feet. Development costs for natural gas wells are expected to grow slowly. Henry Hub spot prices for natural gas rise by 2.1 percent per year from 2010 through 2035 in the Reference case, to an annual average of $7.37 per million Btu (2010 dollars) in 2035.

### Link to Prices

#### EXTEND EPA rules will increase gas prices

ARI 12 (Advanced Resources International Inc. For the American Petroleum Institute, February 2012

“Estimate of Impacts of EPA Proposals to Reduce Air Emissions from Hydraulic Fracturing Operations,”

<http://www.api.org/~/media/Files/Policy/Hydraulic_Fracturing/NSPS-OG-ARI-Impacts-of-EPA-Air-Rules-Final-Report.ashx>)

For this assessment, the Reference Case crude oil and natural gas price forecasts from the Energy Information Administration’s (EIA) Annual Energy Outlook 2011 (AEO 2011) were assumed. In these forecasts, crude oil prices are forecast to rise from $86.23 per barrel in 2012 to $115.15 per barrel by 2025 (2009 dollars). Average wellhead natural gas prices are forecast to rise from $4.09 per Mcf in 2012 to $5.43 per Mcf in 2025. The price forecasts assumed in this assessment are summarized in Table 2. However, it is important to note that EIA’s price forecasts are used throughout this analysis even if REC equipment availability limits unconventional resource development and production, which might impact natural gas prices. Also important to note is that this analysis only assessed the impact on unconventional resource development (tight gas, CBM and shale wells). To the extent a REC requirement also 11 applies to “conventional” wells that are hydraulically fractured, the phase-in requirement and impacts are underestimated.

### Kintyre: 2NC

#### Low Uranium prices prevent Kintyre development

Stewart 12 (Robb M., “BHP Sells Uranium Deposit for $430 Million,” 8-27-12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444327204577614163455837308.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>)

Mr. Kloppers said a weaker outlook for uranium prices in the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster was factored into the decision to shelve expansion plans for Olympic Dam, although the main reason was cost escalation that had made the project BHP was engineering unviable. Dean Dalla Valle, president of BHP's uranium division, said that Cameco, one of the world's biggest listed uranium producers, was well placed to develop Yeelirrie. Located about 400 miles northeast of Perth and 470 miles south of Cameco's Kintyre exploration project, Yeelirrie is estimated to have a total resource of 139 million pounds of uranium. "Yeelirrie represents an attractive deposit that fits well with Cameco's vision and corporate strategy," said Tim Gitzel, the Canadian company's president and CEO. Separately, Cameco's Australian managing director, Brian Reilly, said the acquisition demonstrates "confidence in the long-term future of the uranium industry." "We think there are better days ahead," he said in an interview. Cameco plans to establish a mineral-resource estimate for Yeelirrie before starting a detailed environmental-review process with the Western Australian government. Based on preliminary economic evaluation, the break-even uranium price for developing Yeelirrie is expected to be "lower" than that of Cameco's smaller Kintyre project, also in Western Australia, Mr. Reilly said. Cameco said last month that the economics of Kintyre are "challenging" at current uranium prices.

#### Stops effective water management of the Great Artesian Basin

IAEA 2000 (International Atomic Energy Agency, “The Uranium Production Cycle and the Environment,” International Symposium held in Vienna, 2-6 October 2000)

2.5. Prospective uranium mines In addition to Ranger, Jabiluka, Olympic Dam, Beverley and Honeymoon projects there are many other significant uranium deposits with prospects for development. These include Koongarra andAngela (Northern Territory) Maureen, Ben Lomond and Westmoreland (Queensland) Manyingee, Turee Creek, Kintyre, Lake Maitland, Yeelirrie, Lake Way, Mulga Rock and Oobagooma (Western Australia).3. ISSUES Whilst every project has factors that are unique, there are some general themes that are common to the environmental assessments of uranium mines in Australia. Details of the assessments can be found in the references to this paper and the Environment Australia Website. Some of these issues are discussed in detail in other papers being presented at this Symposium and it is not intended to duplicate that work here. In particular, the impact of uranium mining on the aboriginal people and World Heritage values in the Alligator Rivers Region is addressed elsewhere. Some key issues that rose in recent assessments and which may be relevant to international considerations are set out below. 3.1. Management of overseas impacts The environmental assessments require that all impacts that might arise from the projects are assessed. Because all the uranium oxide produced in Australia is exported, potential impacts from transport, use of fuel in reactors and long term storage and disposal of nuclear waste had to be taken into account in the assessment. As detailed consideration of many of these downstream matters is beyond the legal responsibility individual mining companies, Environment Australia requested the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade to prepare a report on these overseas impacts in co-operation with the relevant industry Department. The report focussed on the management regime for the peaceful use of Australian uranium established under the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The report also noted that Australia has entered into bilateral agreements with countries which purchase Australian uranium to reinforce control over the peaceful use of this material. Whilst there was a high degree of confidence in the management regimes for use of the uranium, there remained a concern with the long term storage and disposal of nuclear waste. The issue of nuclear waste was central to much of the public comment. Nevertheless Commonwealth Ministers accepted that progress was being made and that technological solutions were likely in the forseeable future. The issue remains a major concern for the community and will no doubt be a major consideration of future projects.3.2. Tailings management The long-term management of tailings is a major concern with uranium mines. Although there is a legacy of poorly managed tailings from most of the earlier uranium mines, recent mines generally manage tailings in an environmentally acceptable manner. The tailings from Ranger and Nabarlek are being disposed into the mine pits at Ranger. Eventually these pits will be covered and rehabilitated to a standard that will enable the area to be incorporated into Kakadu National Park. The Ranger Mill Alternative for the Jabiluka project also proposed that the tailings would be disposed of in the Rangerpits. With the rejection of this option by the traditional owners, ERA proposed to mill the ore at Jabiluka and place the tailings in cement paste in two specially constructed pits. The environmental assessment highlighted concerns with this option because of the untried technology in a tropical climate and the potential for seepage into groundwater. Although the risk was low, this option was rejected by the Commonwealth because of the concerns of perceived risk to traditional hunting and gathering and the ecological risk to the downstream wetlands. In the final stages of the assessment, ERA agreed to the option of disposal of tailings into specially constructed deep underground cavities. Whilst many modern mines, including Olympic Dam, use some tailings to fill underground stopes the Jabiluka project will be the first in Australia where all tailings will have to disposed of in this manner. Barren rock will be brought to the surface and used in the eventual rehabilitation of the site.3.3. Radiation management Radiation exposure in underground mines was a significant issue during the assessments of both the Olympic Dam expansion and Jabiluka although actual experience with the Olympic Dam operation provided valuable information on which to make initial judgements. As part of the assessments, expert reviews were conducted by the Supervising Scientist and the Australian Radiation Laboratory of the modelling forecasts of radiation exposure. Whilst there were differing views between experts on some of the assumptions used in the modelling of exposure, sufficient information was available on which to make judgements about the radiation management regime that would apply for these underground mines. The expert reviews confirmed that it was not possible to predict exposure any better than the estimates provided by the project proponents. The validity of the modelling forecasts would nevertheless have to be confirmed through comprehensive investigation into the actual radiation environment during development and operation of the mines. Final approvals for these underground mines required a radiation management regime that included measures to establish baseline radiation levels, finalization of the modelling and development of ongoing monitoring programs. Other management requirements affected the design of ventilation systems, shielding of surfaces and enclosure of workers in mobile equipment. 3.4. Water management The high environmental sensitivity of the Jabiluka area required detailed consideration of the water management regime. High monsoonal rainfall and proximity of the mine to the wetlands required the development of a total containment zone to ensure that runoff from any catchment containing material with more than 0.02% uranium was stored in a retention pond for recycling or evaporation. Other areas on the mine lease were also managed to minimize impact on streams and the wetlands. At Olympic Dam which is located in an arid region, water management was focussed on water supply and impact on groundwater rather than runoff. Modelling was undertaken to enable predictions to be made of the impact of the mine on groundwater. Subsequent operation of the mine confirmed the modeling predictions on the acceptability of groundwater impacts. Of greater significant was the requirement for mine operators to source water for their operations from the Great Artesian Basin some 200 km north of the mine. The borefields developed for Olympic Dam and the ongoing monitoring regime have lead to a far greater understanding of the artesian basin and improved management of the water resource. The mine operator has been able to reduce their water usage per ton of ore over the life of the mine and made a number of voluntary contributions to improve management of groundwater by pastoralists in the region.

#### **Collapses the Basin**

Truss 2000 (Warren, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Commonwealth of Australia, Great Artesian Basin Consultative Council, “Great Artesian Basin: Strategic Management Plan,” September 2000, <http://www.gabcc.org.au/tools/getFile.aspx?tbl=tblContentItem&id=50>)

In the early 1900s it was recognised that control over groundwater extraction in the Basin was inadequate. By 1918, more than 1,500 bores had been drilled into the Basin to provide artesian ﬂows. It soon became evident that a reduction in water volume and pressure was emerging across the Basin. In 1912, the ﬁrst Interstate Conference on Artesian Water was held to address legislative control of groundwater use. Between 1912 and 1928, ﬁve Interstate Conferences on Artesian Waters were held. The 1939 Conference recognised water wastage from free-ﬂowing bores was a major problem. The 1939 Conference commissioned a report to investigate the nature and structure of the Basin. This report was completed in 1945 but it was not until 1954 that the Artesian Waters Investigations Committee provided a published report which was addressed separately in each State. Although some gains were made over the ﬁrst half of the twentieth century, pressures in many regions continued to diminish and many bores stopped ﬂowing. Poor understanding of Basin characteristics, too little legislative control over water extraction and ineffective infrastructure technology and management practices meant valuable water resources continued to be wasted. Since then, improvements in technology, management practice and legislation, together with bore rehabilitation and bore drain replacement programs, have brought some incremental improvements. Lasting solutions to Basin-wide problems have proven difﬁcult to achieve. Despite previous efforts the Basin’s core problem of declining artesian pressure brought about by uncontrolled discharge and related degradation of dependent economic, social and environmental values persists. Inefﬁcient distribution of water through bore drains has led to unacceptable consequences for a number of values associated with the groundwater resource. Much of the waste relates to ageing and inadequate infrastructure and poor water management practices, reinforced by insufﬁcient investment and little recognition of the value of water resources or the principles of sound environmental management. Failure to address water waste, even at current rates of infrastructure renewal, will continue the decline in artesian pressures in most regions, ultimately leading to the detriment of many existing water users and lost opportunities for new water use. There will also be continuing negative impacts on natural discharge points such as mound springs, the spread of woody weeds and feral animals and ongoing harsh environmental impacts from the use of bore drains.

**Global Biodiversity**

**Garrett 9** (Peter Garrett AM MP, Australian Government Minister For The Environment, Heritage And The Arts, Australia’s National Heritage, Commonwealth of Australia, 2009

<http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/publications/about/pubs/national-heritage.rtf>.)

Australia is home to the largest artesian system in the world. The **Great Artesian Basin**, which covers more than 20 per cent of the Australian continent, has around 600 artesian spring complexes in 12 major groups. Artesian springs are the natural outlets of the extensive aquifer from which the groundwater of the basin flows to the surface. Springs can range in size from only a few metres across to large clusters of freshwater pools known as ‘supergroups’. Witjira-Dalhousie Springs is a supergroup that contains around 60 springs, extending over an area of more than 50 000 hectares. Situated about 250 kilometres south-east of Alice Springs, Witjira-Dalhousie is the most northerly group of springs in South Australia. It is a complex of ‘mound’ springs, which means the groundwater flow deposits calcium and other salts from the mineral-rich waters. These deposits, combined with wind-blown sand, mud and accumulated plant debris, settle around the spring outflow forming mounds that resemble small volcanos. Great Artesian Basin groundwater movement rates are slow, between one to five metres per year. As a result some water in the centre of the basin is more that one million years old. Dating techniques that measure groundwater flow reveal that the Witjira-Dalhousie Springs appears to be recharged by thousands of years old water that has percolated down through the beds of the Finke River—and adjacent arid zone rivers—where they overlie outcrops of the Great Artesian Basin aquifer. As a geological feature the Witjira-Dalhousie Springs complex is unique in Australia. It illustrates on a huge scale an artesian spring’s system, with faults, impermeable confining beds, aquifer outcrops, mound spring deposits, and the large pools and rivulets of artesian water. Great Artesian Basin springs have been significant in providing reliable water and habitat as the Australian continent progressively dried out over the last 1.8 million years. As the only permanent source of water for 150 kilometres, Witjira-Dalhousie provides a significant refuge for a number of plants and animals. Due to the springs’ isolation many of these plants and animals have evolved into **distinct species** not found anywhere else in the world. Witjira-Dalhousie Springs is an integral part of Aboriginal tradition and life in northern South Australia. It is a place that is associated with many traditional stories and songs. Evidence of the spring’s significance to Aboriginal people can be seen in the large camp sites found at the springs—some are thousands of square metres in size—and the vast number of stone artefacts found scattered around the area. National Heritage List: 4 August 2009 Porongurup National Park Western Australia Porongurup National Park has one of the richest varieties of plants in Australia with more than 700 native species within the park’s 2621 hectares. With its diverse wildlife, tall karri and open jarrah forests, and massive granite domes, the park is a haven for birdwatchers, photographers and wildflower enthusiasts who are drawn by the sheer beauty of this place. Porongurup National Park is also significant for a number of invertebrates that have a link to the Gondwanan supercontinent, when Australia was joined to present day Africa, South America and Antarctica, before they broke apart some 150 million years ago. Isolated several times by higher sea levels, most recently around 55 million years ago, the cool mountain gullies within Porongurup National Park serve as a haven for insects, primitive spiders and land snails. Many of the relict species in the Porongurup Range, and in neighboring Stirling Range, are more closely related to invertebrate species found in mountainous areas of eastern Australia or on other Gondwanan continents such as South Africa, than to the drier, low-lying areas surrounding the range. Porongurup National Park, within the traditional lands of the Minang group of the Nyungar people, is a unique living landscape of exceptional biological and ecological significance. As part of an internationally recognised ‘**biodiversity hotspot’** in the south-west region of Western Australia, Porongurup National Park contains an exceptionally high concentration of plants and animals in a relatively small area. Examples of plant groups which contribute to this outstanding richness include: flame-peas (Chorizema), rice flowers (Pimelea), native myrtles (Myrtaceae), kangaroo paws (Haemodorales) and banksias (Proteales).

**Extinction**

**Mmom 8** (Dr. Prince Chinedu, University of Port Harcourt (Nigeria), “Rapid Decline in Biodiversity: A Threat to Survival of Humankind”, Earthwork Times, 12-8, http://www.environmental-expert.com/resultEachArticle.aspx?ci d=0&codi=51543)

From the foregoing, it becomes obvious that the **survival** of Humankind **depends on** the continuous existence and conservation of **biodiversity**. In other words, a threat to biodiversity is a serious threat to the survival of Human Race. To this end, biological diversity must be treated more seriously as a **global resource**, to be indexed, used, and above all, preserved. Three circumstances conspire to give this matter an unprecedented urgency. First, exploding human populations are degrading the environment at an accelerating rate, especially in tropical countries. Second, science is discovering new uses for biological diversity in ways that can relieve both human suffering and environmental destruction. Third, much of the diversity is being irreversibly lost through extinction caused by the destruction of natural habitats due to development pressure and oil spillage, especially in the Niger Delta. In fact, Loss of biodiversity is significant in several respects. First, breaking of **critical links** in the biological chain can disrupt the functioning of an **entire ecosystem** and its **biogeochemical cycles**. This disruption may have significant effects on larger scale processes. Second, loss of species can have impacts on the organism pool from which medicines and pharmaceuticals can be derived. Third, loss of species can result in loss of genetic material, which is needed to replenish the genetic diversity of domesticated plants that are the **basis of world agriculture** (Convention on Biological Diversity). Overall, we are locked into a race. We must hurry to acquire the knowledge on which a wise policy of conservation and development can be based for centuries to come.

### Uniq – Uranium Prices

#### Uranium prices going up – will get to $70

Pistilli 12 (Melissa, Managing Editor of the Resource Investing Network, “Central Asia Spotlight: Kazakhstan — Maintaining Stability Key to Untapped Natural Resources,” 2-14-12, Resource Investing News, <http://resourceinvestingnews.com/31254-central-asia-spotlight-kazakhstan-maintaining-stability-key-to-untapped-natural-resources.html>)

Unchanged from last week, TradeTech is reporting a uranium spot price of $49 per pound. However, the consulting firm says “[a]ctivity … is on the upswing, with four transactions reported for this week, signaling that prices have dipped low enough to attract buying interest.” David Talbot, senior mining analyst at Dundee Securities, believes we’re now witnessing the bottom of the market. In an interview with The Energy Report, Talbot said he expects prices to firm up later this year and into next year as Japanese reactors come back to life and the Megatons to Megawatts program expires. “The supply/demand balance in the mid-to-near-term may impact pricing,” Talbot said. “The current supply deficit should put upward pressure on prices, eventually making projects … more feasible. We’ll be lucky if annual uranium production reaches 180 Mlb by 2020. And that would require sustained spot prices of $70-80/lb. Our current forecasts for next year and 2014 are $70/lb and $67/lb, with a long-term forecast [of] $65/lb.”

#### Uranium prices are rebounding – Japan, China, Olympic Dam

Canna 12 (Xavier La Canna, “ERA boss talks up uranium prices,” 9-13-12,

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/breaking-news/era-boss-talks-up-uranium-prices/story-e6frf7kf-1226473498628>)

ENERGY Resources of Australia Ltd (ERA) says the shelving of the Olympic Dam expansion and the high costs for Japan to dump nuclear power should see uranium prices rebound strongly. With uranium spot prices hovering around $US48/lb, well down from highs of around $US140/lb a few years ago, ERA made a net loss in the first half of 2012 of $59.9 million. The price of uranium has sunk partly in response to Japan's plans to reduce dependency on nuclear power in the wake of the Fukushima disaster last year. Local producers including ERA have also been hit by a relatively strong Australian dollar, which has reduced earnings. But ERA chief executive Rob Atkinson said the growing Chinese market will help support demand. "China is going to be a lot bigger than Japan ever was with nuclear power," he said. "I also think it is premature to suggest that Japan is going to be able to survive or afford moving forward without nuclear power. "There is a difference between wanting to do something and being able to afford it," he added. He said the decision by mining giant BHP Billiton Ltd to shelve its $US30 billion ($A28.8 billion) expansion plans for the Olympic Dam copper/uranium mine should also support higher prices. "With that not going ahead where is the uranium ore going to come from?" Mr Atkinson said. "Over the next three to four years we are expecting to see some substantial increase in uranium prices," he said.

### 2NC Case – Manufacturing Not Key

#### Manufacturing not key to the economy- Factories are managing to produce more without hiring a lot more workers

Only nine percent of the jobs in America today are in manufacturing.

Wessel 12

#### No timeframe --- manufacturing decline is slow, takes decades to have an impact --- disads come first

**US economy not reliant on manufacturing – innovation economy**

**Hassett 10** (Kevin, director of economic-policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute, “Obama's Obsession Drives Progress in Reverse: Kevin Hassett,” 8-15-10, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-08-16/obama-s-obsession-drives-progress-in-reverse-commentary-by-kevin-hassett.html>)

Manufacturing has been on a more-or-less-steady **decline** as a share of national output for decades, part of the **natural evolution** of the U.S. economy. It’s time politicians stop calling this a national crisis. Lots of firms went bankrupt during the recession without the federal government sweeping in to save them. Big manufacturing firms had to be rescued because of their symbolic power. Massive government intervention, it seems, is advisable to save the auto industry because manufacturing output is somehow more valuable than other types of output. Like the rest of Obama’s economic policy, the foundation for this idea is nonexistent. Small wonder his economists are quitting. Plan Power Later in his talk at GM, Obama pledged “to insist that management, workers, creditors, suppliers, dealers, shareholders, everybody get together and come up with a plan so that we can start building for the future.” I guess that means the problem with the American auto industry was not that the automakers were swamped by insanely high labor costs after years of unwise concessions to unions; the problem was that we never had a presidential orator brilliant enough to urge everyone to get together and craft a plan to save manufacturing. Truth is, we already know Obama’s plan: to tax you to keep the rust-laden, union-heavy industrial sector afloat. Sadly, similar thinking seems to be catching like a plague. Two days before the president’s speech, the House voted 379 to 38 to pass H.R. 4692, which recommends establishing a presidential task force to create a National Manufacturing Strategy to revive U.S. industries. Special Treatment You might ask, what’s the harm in yet another government study? Here’s what. One provision in the bill would require the president to include, in each year’s federal budget, information on how the spending plan advances the manufacturing strategy. That would give manufacturing special treatment in every budget. Manufacturing has been declining as a share of U.S. gross domestic product for some time, from about 28 percent in 1950 to about 11 percent in 2009. Any economist can tell you that this decline is not necessarily a cause for concern. Over the past few decades, our economy has **transformed dramatically**, and the importance of innovation has increased sharply. A 2006 study by the Federal Reserve found that investment in **intangible capital** is more important today, in the aggregate, than investment in tangible capital. We have become an **ideas economy**. That’s not a problem. It’s economic evolution, a natural and positive force. The agricultural sector has seen a similar decline in the last 60 years, falling to 1 percent of GDP from roughly 7 percent.

**Manufacturing not key to competitiveness – innovation, education**

**Summers 10** (Larry, former Secretary of the Treasury, “Farewell Address at the Economic Policy Institute,” 12-13-10,

<http://delong.typepad.com/sdj/2010/12/lawrence-h-summers-farewell-address-at-the-economic-policy-institute.html>)

In a demand constrained economy like the one we have today and will have for several years, economics is turned topsy-turvy. As Keynes pointed out in his celebrated Paradox of Thrift, individual efforts to save more lead to less total saving. More educated workers get jobs but with demand constraints those job opportunities come at the expense of their less educated neighbors. With demand constraints, increases in productivity may act to exacerbate deflationary pressures and increases in efficiency may result in more unemployment rather than more output. That is why we have to drive recovery and remove the **demand constraint** on the economy. At the same time, it is essential that we recognize that fiscal and monetary policy or increases in demand never made a society prosperous, fair, or strong. We need to renew the American economy for a century that will be very different from its predecessor. A key lesson that management strategists have distilled for businesses is this: you don't succeed by producing exactly the same thing that other people are producing in the same way just at a lower cost. You succeed, by establishing your own uniqueness and excellence. Think of the distinctiveness of products like Google's search engine; the iPad or a Harley-Davidson. Think of the distinctive way that Southwest or Nucor or even Walmart deliver their products and services. The United States has led the global economy by building on its **unique capacities**. By building on our distinctive strengths, we can continue to lead in the next century. There is no going back to the past. **Technology is accelerating** productivity in mass production to the point where even China has seen manufacturing employment decline by more than ten million jobs over the most recent decade for which data is available. We are moving towards a **knowledge and service economy**. Another inescapable truth is that the world is shrinking. When I worked in Jakarta just 30 years ago I tried to follow the Red Sox. When the Red Sox played on Tuesday night, I learned how they did on Friday because I had to wait until the Herald Tribune arrived days later. It is a different: a smaller world. What does it mean to adapt to this? Just as the American North prospered even as the southern part of the United States caught up, even as we drew strength in the generation after World War II as Europe and Japan's economies converged towards our own, we will need to find ways to prosper as the emerging markets of the world take their place on the global stage. What should our approach be? Some suggest that we have no alternative but to compete with the world on price even if it means striving to win races to the bottom. They would have workers sacrifice wages, benefits, and bargaining rights to hold onto their jobs. They would slash taxes on businesses even as their profits rise in order to lure them to stay in the United States. They would shred social safety nets in the name of self-reliance. Such Social Darwinism was bad morality and bad economics in the 19th century and it is no better in the 21st. Consider this: The flatness of the world notwithstanding, by far the largest part of the activities Americans engage in and the goods they buy remain quite local. It is health care and retail services, recreation and education, haircuts and insurance policies, hotels and houses and I could go on. Moreover, where we compete with other countries, our strength is collective. Few of us can hope to succeed as individuals in a global economy where any particular task or skill can be purchased at very low prices in much of Asia and beyond. Rather, our strength must come from establishing uniqueness, establishing that which is difficult to replicate, that which comes from more collective action. Any idea or machine or even individual capacity can be transplanted. Far harder to transplant, imitate, or emulate are our great institutions – the national laboratories and the national parks and the national highway system, great universities and great cities and great technology clusters, a diverse culture, deep capital markets, and a tremendous ethic. Where competition is concerned, the lesson for us as a nation is the same as the lesson for business: far better to compete by **innovating**, leading, and competing on strength, than by standing still, and reducing prices. Let me highlight what I see in this regard as the three essential priorities for the years ahead. President Clinton used to say that in a world where ideas can move, capital can move, a nation's distinctive strength lay in its people. Our biggest failing as a nation over the last 50 years has been with respect to education. We were once the envy of the world; now we struggle to get into the top half of OECD nations. The Duke of Wellington famously observed that the Battle of Waterloo had been won on the playing fields of Eton, and I would suggest that in this less elitist age, the battle for America's future will be won or lost in its public schools. For too long we have been caught in a sterile debate between those who believe in more accountability and those who see the need for more resources. In truth, no one who has seen the conditions in our urban schools can deny the need for more resources, and no one who believes in incentives can deny the need for more accountability. Through Race to the Top the Administration has sought to reform elementary and secondary education both by providing resources and by increasing accountability. These kinds of efforts will need to be magnified in the future.

### 2NC Case – No Impact

#### No impact to economic decline – our Tir evidence indicates that not only is there no empirical evidence for that, but a bad economy would create incentives for leaders to avoid war and focus on fixing the economy. Prefer our evidence it cites a host of economic scholars.

#### AND - even if wars occur, they won’t escalate.

Bennett & Nordstrom 2k [Department of Political Science Professors @ Penn state U, D. Scott and Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic problems in Enduring Rivalries” Journal of Conflict Resolution, Feb., p33-61]

When engaging in diversionary actions in response to economic problems, leaders will be most interested in a cheap, quick victory that gives them the benefit of a rally effect without suffering the long-term costs (in both economic and popularity terms) of an extended confrontation or war. This makes weak states particularly inviting targets for diversionary action since they may be less likely to respond than strong states and because any response they make will be less costly to the initiator. Following Blainey (1973), a state facing poor economic conditions may in fact be the target of an attack rather than the initiator. This may be even more likely in the context of a rivalry because rival states are likely to be looking for any advantage over their rivals. Leaders may hope to catch an economically challenged rival looking inward in response to a slowing economy. Following the strategic application of diversionary conflict theory and states’ desire to engage in only cheap conflicts for diversionary purposes, states should avoid conflict initiation against target states experiencing economic problems.

#### 93 examples are on our side

Miller 2k [Morris Miller, Winter 2K. economist and adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration and former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank. Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, 25.4]

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### Their chain of causation is backwards

Ferguson 6 (Niall, prof. of history, Foreign Affairs, “The Next War of the World”, lexis)

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

### 2NC Case – Oil Adv

#### Can’t solve oil dependence – natural gas can’t power transportation which means we’ll still be dependent

#### Double bind – Sufficient independence now – solves the advantage

**Miller et al 12** (Rich Asjylyn Loder and Jim Polson, “Americans Gaining Energy Independence With U.S. as Top Producer,” Bloomberg, 2-6, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-07/americans-gaining-energy-independence-with-u-s-as-top-producer.html>)

The U.S. is the closest it has been in almost 20 years to achieving energy **self-sufficiency**, a goal the nation has been pursuing since the 1973 Arab oil embargo triggered a recession and led to lines at gasoline stations. Domestic **oil output** is the highest in eight years. The U.S. is **producing so much natural gas** that, where the government warned four years ago of a critical need to boost imports, it now may approve an export terminal. Methanex Corp. (MX), the world’s biggest methanol maker, said it will dismantle a factory in Chile and reassemble it in Louisiana to take advantage of low natural gas prices. And higher mileage standards and federally mandated ethanol use, along with slow economic growth, have **curbed demand**. The result: The U.S. has reversed a two-decade-long decline in energy independence, increasing the proportion of demand met from domestic sources over the last six years to an estimated 81 percent through the first 10 months of 2011, according to data compiled by Bloomberg from the U.S. Department of Energy. That would be the highest level since 1992. “For 40 years, only politicians and the occasional author in Popular Mechanics magazine talked about achieving energy independence,” said Adam Sieminski, who has been nominated by President Barack Obama to head the U.S. Energy Information Administration. “Now it doesn’t seem such an outlandish idea.” The transformation, which could see the country become the world’s top energy producer by 2020, has implications for the economy and national security -- boosting household incomes, jobs and government revenue; cutting the trade deficit; enhancing manufacturers’ competitiveness; and allowing greater flexibility in dealing with unrest in the Middle East. Output Rising U.S. energy self-sufficiency has been steadily rising since 2005, when it hit a low of 70 percent, the data compiled by Bloomberg show. Domestic crude oil production rose 3.6 percent last year to an average 5.7 million barrels a day, the highest since 2003, according to the Energy Department. Natural gas output climbed to **22.4 trillion** cubic feet in 2010 from 20.2 trillion in 2007, when the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission warned of the need for more imports. Prices have fallen more than 80 percent since 2008. At the same time, the efficiency of the average U.S. passenger vehicle has helped limit demand. It increased to 29.6 miles per gallon in 2011 from 19.9 mpg in 1978, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The last time the U.S. achieved energy independence was in 1952. While it still imported some petroleum, the country’s exports, including of coal, more than offset its imports.

#### B. Energy independence is impossible

**Levi 12** [Michael Levi, senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change, “Think Again: The American Energy Boom”, July 2012, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think_again_the_american_energy_boom?page=0,0>]

In any case, energy independence requires more than impressive arithmetic. As long as the United States is fully integrated into the world oil market, U.S. fuel prices will rise and fall along with events on the other side of the globe -- say, a war with Iran. Greater domestic production will blunt the economic shock of rapidly rising prices -- better to suddenly be sending massive sums to North Dakota than to Saudi Arabia -- but because oil producers everywhere are relatively slow to spend their windfalls, skyrocketing prices could still knock the economy on its back.

### **2NC Case – Energy Independence Impossible**

#### **Independence is impossible -Short term Oil Dependence is key to long term diversification which prevents shocks**

**Hudson 12**

[John Hudson, The Atlantic, “Energy Independence is a Farce”, 6/30/12, <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/06/energy-independence-is-a-farce/259253/>]

The article suggested dramatic ramifications for U.S. diplomacy as the change "achieves a long-sought goal of U.S. policy-making: to draw more oil from nearby, stable sources and less from a volatile region half a world away." However, while depending less on unsavory regimes like Saudi Arabia is a satisfying concept, it doesn't dissolve America's fealty to global crude prices. (Theoretically, even if all of U.S. oil came from North America, disruptions in Iraq or Iran would still ramp up global prices and damage the U.S. economy.) That means U.S. energy security is still very tied to the Middle East regardless of where the U.S. is getting its oil--an undesirable reality that will keep the U.S. militarily invested in the Middle East for decades to come. But besides the limitations on foreign policy, there's also the question of whether energy independence is a worthwhile goal in the first place -- a query expanded on during a panel discussion at the Aspen Ideas Festival in Colorado Saturday. "We're not moving towards a world of energy independence, nor should we," said Peter Orszag, President Obama's former budget director and vice chairman of global banking at Citigroup. "It doesn't make any sense." Orszag admitted that the fact that the U.S. became a net exporter of refined crude oil for the first time in 60 years in December was "shocking" but emphasized that rather than energy independence, the U.S. should be focusing on a "diversification of sources" (i.e. natural gas and renewables) so the economy can withstand shocks in energy prices. If the U.S. were to reduce its sources of energy based on where it comes from, he argued, it would make the U.S. economy less secure. At the panel, attendees such as Mitch Landrieu, the Democratic mayor of New Orleans and a major booster of natural gas, nodded vigorously. Given the vested interests in alternative energies, it won't be surprising if the national mantra of "energy independence" morphs into something along the lines of "energy security," which endorses an everything-but-the-kitchen-sink approach.

#### Can’t solve independence and multiple barriers prevent solvency

**Savage 12**

[Luiza, Writer for Maclean’s, “Bye-Bye, Sheiks”, 2/20/2012, Vol. 125 Issue 6, p30-33]

Environmentalists also argue that reducing supply is a more "secure" form of energy independence. The price of oil is set by global markets regardless of whether oil is produced in the U.S. or imported from Canada, so instability in the Middle East that leads to price hikes will still be felt by North American consumers. "Should OPEC or any other major exporter choose to cut off supplies to any country, supply shortages and a price spike are likely to affect every major importing country regardless of where they get their oil," says Swift. The National Defense University's Sullivan, though, says that energy security is greater when supply is guaranteed, even if prices are high: it's the difference between paying more at the pump--and a scenario under which no oil can be had at any price. Still, the maximalist North American production scenario is unlikely to happen in the kind of time frame contemplated by the oil industry, or ever, given environmental concerns, political opposition and infrastructure challenges. Witness the years of delay and impediments to building the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, which would have helped move not only Alberta crude but also domestic U.S. shale oil. Or take the mounting opposition to the hydraulic fracking that underpins so much of new domestic production--a major concern for environmentalists as well as local communities concerned about the possibility that the aquifers that supply their drinking water could be contaminated by chemicals.

### 2NC Case – Heg

#### 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**.

### 2NC Solvency – No Impact to Regs

#### EXT No increase in cost or significant drop in production from EPA rules

**Heidorn 12** (Richard, analyst for Bloomberg Government, MBA at Temple University - Fox School of Business and Management, “Fracking Emissions Rules: Re-estimating the Costs,” 7-19-12, <http://about.bgov.com/2012/07/19/fracking-emissions-rules-re-estimating-the-costs/>)

The **E**nvironmental **P**rotection **A**gency on April 17 issued regulations on natural gas drilling that it says will not only improve air quality but also increase producer profits. The regulations, which will take full **effect in 2015**, require producers to capture about 90 percent of the volatile organic compounds and methane that can escape into the air as a result of natural gas production using hydraulic fracturing, or fracking. EPA says the rule will cost producers about $170 million a year, but that cost will be more than offset by the sales of the captured methane and natural gas liquids, resulting in a **net gain** of about $15 million a year. The industry, on the other hand, projects net annual compliance cost at more than $2.5 billion. The Bloomberg Government Study, titled “Fracking Emission Rules: EPA, Industry Miss Mark On Costs, Consequences” (subscription required) analyzes available data on the number of wells affected by the rule, compliance costs per well, the volume of fuel captured and the price for which it can be sold. The study finds that the regulation is neither the profit driver EPA claims nor the billion-dollar burden industry has portrayed. The study finds: • The regulations will increase producer costs by $316 million to $511 million a year, or **less than 1 percent** of producer revenues. • Drillers are **already capturing emissions** in geological formations where the volume of methane and liquids makes the capture cost effective. For some wells covered by the new rules, the cost of capture may exceed the incremental revenue from captured fuel. • Producers voluntarily capturing emissions or operating in states that already require capture will face little or **no change** to their operations aside from reporting requirements. Other producers may reduce drilling for new wells as they divert capital now spent on production to complying with the regulations. • The regulations may generate annual revenue of about $383 million for well service providers and more than $125 million in sales for equipment manufacturers.

### AT: Not enough time

**EXT All their evidence describes the proposed rule, not the actual rule it gives companies more than enough time**

**AP 12** (Associated Press, “EPA to slash air pollution from natural gas wells,” 4-18-12, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/04/18/ap-newsbreak-epa-to-reduce-gas-drilling-pollution/>)

WASHINGTON – The Obama administration on Wednesday set the first-ever national standards to control air pollution from gas wells that are drilled using a method called hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, but not without making **concessions to the** oil and gas **industry.** President Barack Obama in his State of the Union address strongly backed natural gas drilling as a clean energy source, and recently announced an executive order calling for coordination of federal regulation to ease burdens on producers. But he has come under criticism by the industry and Republicans for policies they say discourage energy development. Top EPA officials said Wednesday that the new regulations would ensure pollution is controlled without slowing natural gas production. "By ensuring the capture of gases that were previously released to pollute our air and threaten our climate, these updated standards will protect our health, but also lead to more product for fuel suppliers to bring to market," said EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson in a statement. Much of the air pollution from fracked gas wells is vented when the well transitions from drilling to actual production, a three- to 10-day process which is referred to as "completion." An **earlier version** of the rule limiting air pollution from gas wells would have required companies to install pollution-reducing equipment **immediately** after the rule was finalized. Drillers now will be given **more than two years** to employ technology to reduce emissions of smog- and soot-forming pollutants during that stage. The Environmental Protection Agency will require drillers to burn off gas in the meantime, an alternative that can release smog-forming nitrogen oxides, but will still slash overall emissions. Industry groups had pushed hard for the delay, saying the equipment to reduce pollution at the wellhead during completion was not readily available. About 25,000 wells a year are being fracked, a process where water, chemicals and sand are injected at high pressure underground to release trapped natural gas. Besides the new standards for oil and gas wells, the EPA also on Wednesday updated existing rules for natural gas processing plants, storage tanks and transmission lines that will reduce amounts of cancer-causing air pollution, such as benzene, and also reduce methane — the main ingredient in natural gas, but also one of the most potent global warming gases. There were other changes made since the EPA proposed the rule last July under a court order that stemmed from a lawsuit brought by environmental groups. Wells drilled in low-pressure areas, such as coalbed methane reserves, would be exempt because they release less pollution during completion. And companies that choose to re-fracture wells using the pollution-reducing equipment prior to the January 2015 deadline would not be covered by other parts of the regulation. Since companies could capture the natural gas and sell it, the EPA estimates that they would save about $11-$19 million a year starting in 2015. The American Petroleum Institute, the main lobbying group for the oil and gas industry, said that much of the industry was **already doing that**. "We don't need (the EPA) to come and tell our members we will save you money," said Howard Feldman, the institute's director of regulatory and scientific affairs. "Their business is natural gas. They get

**Even the American Petroleum Institute agrees that is enough time – no risk of production loss**

**Bloomberg 12** (Jim Efstathiou Jr., “Drillers Say Costs Manageable From Pending Gas Emissions Rule,” 4-17-12,

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-04-17/drillers-say-costs-manageable-from-pending-gas-emissions-rule.html>)

The rule would take effect about 60 days after it is issued. The **A**merican **P**etroleum **I**nstitute says it will take up to **three years** to manufacture equipment needed to comply and train people to use it. Benjamin Salisbury, a senior energy policy analyst at FBR Capital Markets Corp. in Arlington, Virginia, said he expects the EPA to **delay the effective date** of the rule to prevent any “short-term dislocations.” “We have every reason to believe that the Obama administration wants to ensure that they maintain a vibrant natural gas industry,” Salisbury said in an interview. “Assuming that EPA grants adequate phase-in time, then our read is that this is something that should be **manageable for the industry**.” An Obama administration plan to cut air pollution from natural-gas wells that was delayed after a flurry of last-minute comments won’t slow the gas boom sweeping the U.S., some drillers and industry analysts said. Southwestern Energy Co. (SWN) and Devon Energy Corp. (DVN) say they already use systems to capture methane and other fumes at wells, the key requirement of a rule that may be issued as early as today. **Drilling hasn’t slowed** in Colorado or Wyoming where technology to capture emissions has been required by the state since 2009 and 2010, Christine Tezak, senior policy analyst at Robert W. Baird & Co. in McLean, Virginia, wrote in a March 16 research note.

### AT: No Equipment

**Compliance easy and cheap – no impact on production**

**Gowrishankar 12** (Vignesh, PhD in solar cells from Stanford, “EPA's regulations would not be a burden on the natural gas industry, says Bloomberg Government,” 8-1-12, National Resources Defense Council,

<http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/vgowrishankar/epas_regulations_would_not_be.html>)

Southwestern Energy, the eighth largest natural gas producer in the US, can perform green completions at an additional cost of precisely $0. That’s right, with their deep experience and honed business practices, they need to spend no more on undertaking green completions than just venting the gas into the atmosphere. Of course, they reap all the additional revenue from the captured methane. In an informal setting, a Southwestern representative remarked that if a company cannot make money off green completions, it is not doing it right. Southwestern’s Mark Boling has been quoted as saying, “API’s experience has not been our experience”. Taking a step back: The capital cost of green completion equipment set is about $500,000 (API estimates it to be about $467,000), and the equipment lasts at least 5 years. It strains credulity to think that a level-headed market participant would pay as much as $80,000 every 15 days to lease equipment, when it could very well buy or build its own equipment for just six times as much and operate it for five years. The difference between the former and the latter could add up to several million dollars wasted on leasing equipment. Moreover, there have been no reports of firms actually paying green completion costs approaching $80,000. Most reports are closer to or under EPA’s $33,000 per green completion. And if Southwestern’s experiences are anything to go by, even these reported costs may go down over time. Accordingly, we think that the cost of green completions would be closer to EPA’s estimates than those provided by BGov. As such, we continue to believe that compliance with EPA regulations will be cost-effective and **likely profitable**. Notwithstanding this discord, NRDC does strongly agree with some of the overarching conclusions of the BGov report. The BGov report acknowledges that the estimated net compliance costs would not be a burden on industry. While it could affect natural gas drilling, the report is quick to point out that the net compliance costs would be about 0.5 – 0.7 percent of total industry revenue. Our recent publication titled “Leaking Profits”, actually provided numerous examples of how some of the measures required in the EPA regulations could be profitable, not a net cost. Regardless, NRDC agrees that, at the very least, the regulations would not be a burden on industry. The report further acknowledges that the price of natural gas and natural gas liquids is the dominant driver affecting production. As such, the report recognizes that it is difficult to parse out the impact of any potential small increase in compliance costs on natural gas production. In fact, the report notes that in Colorado and Wyoming **drilling permits increased** even after green completions were made mandatory in 2009 and 2010.

**No equipment shortage – REC equipment easy to construct**

**McCabe 12** (David, Clean Air Task Force, and Meleah Geertsma, Natural Resources Defense Council 3-30-12, “New Source Performance Standards for the Oil and Natural Gas Sector, Docket No. EPA‐HQ‐OAR‐2010‐0505,” http://catf.us/resources/filings/oil\_and\_gas/201203-CATF\_et\_al\_Oil\_and\_Gas\_Rule\_comments.pdf)

III. REC Equipment Will Be Available for Compliance in the Near‐Term. In the ARI February Report, ARI projects that U.S. production of natural gas and oil will be substantially reduced if US EPA finalizes the proposed NSPS, without a substantial phase‐in time for the NSPS requirement that reduced emissions completion (REC) be used at most unconventional gas wells. According to **ARI,** this reduction in both oil and gas production would arise due to a shortage of available REC equipment, a claim it bases on API figures. ARI derives these projections by modeling the domestic energy market, working from two flawed assumptions that are critical to their results, as set forth below. As ARI’s assumptions are flawed, its projections are not credible. a. Not all **unconventional oil wells** are covered by the NSPS. Flawed Assumption 1. ARI assumes without question that all unconventional oil wells are subject to the REC equipment. ARI notes that unconventional oil wells produce gas (which by and large they do) and uses this to justify assuming that EPA is requiring REC on all fracked oil wells: For purposes of this assessment, we have assumed that [REC] will apply to all unconventional resources producing at least some natural gas, even if the primary product is liquids [i.e., crude oil]. 20 However, the proposal is unclear as to the application of the REC requirement to unconventional oil wells. EPA’s proposed REC rules (40 C.F.R. §60.5375) define a gas well subject to the REC requirement as: Gas well means a well, the principal production of which at the mouth of the well is gas. 76 Fed. Reg. 52,738, 52,809 (August 23, 2011) (emphasis added). As commenters have pointed out to EPA, this definition is unclear as to its scope, as most wells produce both oil and gas and the term “principal” does not clearly delineate whether any individual well would be considered a “gas” well, oil, condensate, or hybrid well. 21 Thus, ARI’s stated assumption that the proposed NSPS covers all unconventional oil wells, in the face of this definition, **is incorrect** and as a result their conclusions for oil production are meaningless. We note that we do not support exempting unconventional oil wells from the REC requirement. 22 Even if the primary product of the well is oil, most or all such wells produce significant gas, as reported by ARI, and emissions of VOC and natural gas during flowback will be significant if REC is not used. 23 If flaring is used, and we note that associated gas from unconventional wells is often flared continuously for months until pipelines are built to the well, the pollutants from these flares will be very significant. 24 As the current hydrocarbon boom switches from unconventional natural gas to unconventional oil, the emissions from unconventional oil well completions will increase, and EPA must address these emissions. Further, as we note below, the oil and gas industry has proven quite capable of **deploying enormous infrastructure** in the past few years, and the claim that adequate equipment for REC for unconventional oil wells would take years to fabricate is not credible in light of this recent build‐up. If EPA clarifies the proposed definition of natural gas wells to include all wells that produce significant amounts of natural gas, as the agency must if the rule is to truly protect human health and the environment, the industry could readily accommodate the inclusion, as we next discuss. Finally, we note that ARI’s false assumption that the proposed NSPS covers all unconventional oil wells also falsely exaggerates the shortage in REC equipment that they predict for unconventional natural gas wells (see below), since the same equipment can be used for gas or oil wells.

## 1NR

**Violation: 2NC**

#### Topical affirmatives must remove a restriction on production on current energy sources which means it is not being produced now, the affirmative doesn’t reduce a direct limitation on production it is an indirect regulation, that’s Viterbo. If you look at their 1AC Banerjee evidence which is their inherency argument that the EPA regs will stop 95% of operations it says that “IIndustry groups

complained that the rules were still too onerous - the EPA could stunt the growth of natural gas development”

**-- Regulations and restrictions are distinct – the aff reduces regulations, not restrictions**

**Shackleford 17** (Florida SC Justice Opinion in ATLANTIC COAST LINE RAILROAD COMPANY, A CORPORATION, et al., Plaintiff in Error, v. THE STATE OF FLORIDA, Defendant in Error~[NO DOCKET NUMBER~]SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA73 Fla. 609; 74 So. 595; 1917 Fla. LEXIS 487March 12, 1917; Petition for Rehearing Denied March 17, 1917)

There would seem to be no occasion to discuss whether or not the Railroad Commissioners had the power and authority to make the order, requiring the three specified railroads running into the City of Tampa to erect a union passenger station in such city, which is set out in the declaration in the instant case and which we have copied above. [\*\*\*29] It is sufficient to say that under the reasoning and the authorities cited in State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., 67 Fla. 441, 458, 63 South. Rep. 729, 65 South. Rep. 654, and State v. Jacksonville Terminal [\*631] Co., supra, it would seem that HN14the Commissioners had power and authority. The point which we are required to determine is whether or not the Commissioners were given the authority to impose the fine or penalty upon the three railroads for the recovery of which this action is brought. In order to decide this question we must examine Section 2908 of the General Statutes of 1906, which we have copied above, in the light of the authorities which we have cited and from some of which we have quoted. It will be observed that the declaration alleges that the penalty imposed upon the three railroads was for the violation of what is designated as "Order No. 282," which is set out and which required such railroads to erect and complete a union depot at Tampa within a certain specified time. If the Commissioners had the authority to make such order, it necessarily follows that they could enforce a compliance with the same by appropriate proceedings in the courts, but [\*\*\*30] it does not necessarily follow that they had the power and authority to penalize the roads for a failure to comply therewith. That is a different matter. HN15Section 2908 of the General Statutes of 1906, which originally formed Section 12 of Chapter 4700 of the Laws of Florida, (Acts of 1899, p. 86), expressly authorizes the imposition of a penalty by the Commissioners upon "any railroad, railroad company or other common carrier doing business in this State," for "a violation or disregard of any rate, schedule, rule or regulation, provided or prescribed by said commission," or for failure "to make any report required to be made under the provisions of this Chapter," or for the violation of "any provision of this Chapter." It will be observed that the word "Order" is not mentioned in such section. Are the other words used therein sufficiently comprehensive to embrace an order made by the Commissioners, such as the one now under consideration? [\*632] It could not successfully be contended, nor is such contention attempted, that this order is covered by or embraced within the words "rate," "schedule" or "any report,' therefore we may dismiss these terms from our consideration and [\*\*\*31] direct our attention to the words "rule or regulation." As is frankly stated in the brief filed by the defendant in error: "It is admitted that an order for the erection of a depot is not a 'rate' or 'schedule' and if it is not a 'rule' or 'regulation' then there is no power in the Commissioners to enforce it by the imposition of a penalty." It is earnestly insisted that the words "rule or regulation" are sufficiently comprehensive to embrace such an order and to authorize the penalty imposed, and in support of this contention the following authorities are cited: Black's Law Dictionary, defining regulation and order; Rapalje & Lawrence's Law Dictionary, defining rule; Abbott's Law Dictionary, defining rule; Bouvier's Law Dictionary, defining order and rule [\*\*602] of court; Webster's New International Dictionary, defining regulation; Curry v. Marvin, 2 Fla. 411, text 515; In re Leasing of State Lands, 18 Colo. 359, 32 Pac. Rep. 986; Betts v. Commissioners of the Land Office, 27 Okl. 64, 110 Pac. Rep. 766; Carter V. Louisiana Purchase Exposition Co., 124 Mo. App. 530, 102 S.W. Rep. 6, text 9; 34 Cyc. 1031. We have examined all of these authorities, as well as those cited by the [\*\*\*32] plaintiffs in error and a number of others, but shall not undertake an analysis and discussion of all of them. While it is undoubtedly true that the words, rule, regulation and order are frequently used as synonyms, as the dictionaries, both English and law, and the dictionaries of synonyms, such as Soule's show, it does not follow that these words always mean the same thing or are interchangeable at will. It is well known that the same word used in different contexts may mean a different thing by virtue of the coloring which the word [\*633] takes on both from what precedes it in the context and what follows after. Thus in discussing the proper constructions to be placed upon the words "restrictions and regulations" as used in the Constitution of this State, then in force, Chap. 4, Sec. 2, No. 1, of Thompson's Digest, page 50, this court in Curry v. Marvin, 2 Fla. 411, text 415, which case is cited to us and relied upon by both the parties litigant, makes the following statement: "The **word restriction** is defined by the best lexicographers to mean **limitation**, confinement within bounds, and would seem, as used in the constitution, to apply to the **amount** and to the time [\*\*\*33] within which an appeal might to be taken, or a writ of error sued out. The **word regulation** has a different signification -- it means method, and is defined by Webster in his Dictionary, folio 31, page 929, to be 'a rule or order prescribed by a superior for the management of some business, or for the government of a company or society.' This more properly perhaps applies to the **mode and form** of proceeding in taking and prosecuting appeals and writs of error. By the use of both of those terms, we think that something more was intended than merely regulating the mode and form of proceedings in such cases." Thus, in Carter v. Louisiana Purchase Exposition Co., 124 Mo. App. 530, text 538, 102 S.W. Rep. 6, text 9, it is said, "The definition of a rule or order, which are synonymous terms, include commands to lower courts or court officials to do ministerial acts." In support of this proposition is cited 24 Amer. & Eng. Ency. of Law 1016, which is evidently an erroneous citation, whether the first or second edition is meant. See the definition of regulate and rule, 24 amer. & Eng. Ency. of Law (2nd Ed.) pages 243 to 246 and 1010, and it will be seen that the two words are not always [\*\*\*34] synonymous, much necessarily depending upon the context and the sense in which the words are used. Also see the discussion [\*634] of the word regulation in 34 Cyc. 1031. We would call especial attention to Morris v. Board of Pilot Commissioners, 7 Del. chan. 136, 30 Atl. Rep. 667, text 669, wherein the following statement is made by the court: "These words 'rule' and the 'order,' when used in a statute, have a definite signification. They are different in their nature and extent. A rule, to be valid, must be general in its scope, and undiscriminating in its application; an order is specific and not limited in its application. The function of an order relates more particularly to the execution or enforcement of a rule previously made." Also see 7 Words & Phrases 6271 and 6272, and 4 Words & Phrases (2nd Ser.) 419, 420. As we held in City of Los Angeles v. Gager, 10 Cal. App. 378, 102 Pac. Rep. 17, "The meaning of the word 'rules' is of wide and varied significance, depending upon the context; in a legal sense it is synonymous with 'laws.'" If Section 2908 had contained the word order, or had authorized the Commissioners to impose a penalty for the violation of any order [\*\*\*35] made by them, there would be no room for construction. The Georgia statute, Acts of 1905, p. 120, generally known as the "Steed Bill," entitled "An act to further extend the powers of the Railroad Commission of this State, and to confer upon the commission the power to regulate the time and manner within which the several railroads in this State shall receive, receipt for, forward and deliver to its destination all freight of every character, which may be tendered or received by them for transportation; to provide a penalty for non-compliance with any and all reasonable rules, regulations and orders prescribed by the said commission in the execution of these powers, and for other purposes," expressly authorized the Railroad Commissioners "to provide a penalty for non-compliance with any and all reasonable rules, regulations and orders prescribed by the said Commision." [\*635] See Pennington v. Douglas, A. & G. Ry. Co., 3 Ga. App. 665, 60 S.E. Rep. 485, which we cited with approval in State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., 56 fla. 617, text 651, 47 South. Rep. 969, 32 L.R.A. (N.S.) 639. Under the reasoning in the cited authorities, especially State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., [\*\*\*36] supra, and Morris v. Board of Pilot Commissioners, we are constrained to hold that the fourth and eighth grounds of the demurrer are well founded and that HN16the Railroad Commissioners were not empowered or authorized to impose a penalty upon the three railroads for failure to comply with the order for the erection of a union depot.

**-- Indirect effects are not restrictions**

**Viterbo 12** (Annamaria, Assistant Professor in International Law – University of Torino, PhD in International Economic Law – Bocconi University and Jean Monnet Fellow – European University Institute, International Economic Law and Monetary Measures: Limitations to States' Sovereignty and Dispute, p. 167)

49 Measures having the **indirect effect** of limiting the ease of acquiring **foreign exchange do not amount to restrictions** (forms or applications to be filled in). The limitation may consist for instance in compulsory waiting periods for exchange.

**Counter-Interp: 2NC**

**-- Restriction means a prohibition – not permitted under any circumstances**

**Northglenn 11** (City of Northglenn Zoning Ordinance, “Rules of Construction – Definitions”, http://www.northglenn.org/municode/ch11/content\_11-5.html)

Section 11-5-3. Restrictions. As used in this Chapter 11 of the Municipal Code, the **term "restriction**" shall mean a prohibitive regulation. Any use, activity, operation, building, structure or thing which is the subject of a restriction is prohibited, and no such use, activity, operation, building, structure or thing shall be **authorized by any permit or license**.

**Their interp kills the topic ---**

**-- Including regulations like the aff is a limits disaster**

**Doub 76 (**Mr. Doub is a principal in the law firm of Doub and Muntzing, which he formed in 1977. Previously he was a partner in the law firm of LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae. He was a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission in 1971 – 1974, “Energy Regulation: A Quagmire for Energy Policy, Annual Review of Energy,” Vol. 1: 715-725, November 1976), DOI: 10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435 <http://0-www.annualreviews.org.library.lausys.georgetown.edu/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.eg.01.110176.003435>)

FERS began with the recognition that federal energy policy must result from concerted efforts in all areas dealing with energy, not the least of which was the manner in which energy is regulated by the federal government. Energy selfsufficiency is improbable, if not impossible, without sensible regulatory processes, and effective regulation is necessary for public confidence. Thus, the President directed that "a comprehensive study be undertaken, in full consultation with Congress, to determine the best way to organize all energy-related regulatory activities of the government." An interagency task force was formed to study this question. **With 19 different federal** departments and **agencies contributing**, the task force spent **seven months** deciphering the present organizational makeup of the federal energy regulatory system, studying the need for organizational improvement, and evaluating alternatives. **More than 40 agencies were found to be involved** with making regulatory decisions on energy. Although only a few deal exclusively with energy, **most of the 40 could significantly affect** the availability and/or cost of **energy.** For example, in the field of gas transmission, there are five federal agencies that must act on siting and land-use issues, seven on emission and effluent issues, five on public safety issues, and one on worker health and safety issues-all before an onshore gas pipeline can be built. The complexity of energy regulation is also illustrated by the case of Standard Oil Company (Indiana), which reportedly **must file about 1000 reports a year with 35 different federal agencies.** Unfortunately, this example is the rule rather than the exception.

**-- Precision: Only direct prohibition is a restriction – key to predictability**

**Sinha 6** (Supreme Court of India Union Of India & Ors vs M/S. Asian Food Industries on 7 November, 2006 Author: S.B. Sinha Bench: S Sinha, Mark, E Katju CASE NO.: Writ Petition (civil) 4695 of 2006 PETITIONER: Union of India & Ors. RESPONDENT: M/s. Asian Food Industries DATE OF JUDGMENT: 07/11/2006 BENCH: S.B. Sinha & Markandey Katju JUDGMENT: J U D G M E N T [Arising out of S.L.P. (Civil) No. 17008 of 2006] WITH CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4696 OF 2006 [Arising out of S.L.P. (Civil) No. 17558 of 2006] S.B. SINHA, J : <http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/437310/>)

We may, however, notice that this Court in State of U.P. and Others v. M/s. Hindustan Aluminium Corpn. and others [AIR 1979 SC 1459] stated the law thus: "It appears that a **distinction between regulation and restriction** or prohibition has **always been drawn**, ever since Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto v. Virgo. Regulation promotes the freedom or the facility which is required to be regulated in the interest of all concerned, whereas prohibition obstructs or shuts off, or denies it to those to whom it is applied. The Oxford English Dictionary does not define regulate to include prohibition so that if it had been the intention to prohibit the supply, distribution, consumption or use of energy, the legislature would not have contented itself with the use of the word regulatingwithout using the word prohibiting or some such word, to bring out that effect."

**-- It promotes multi-directionality, destroying topic coherence**

**McKie 84 (**Professor James W. McKie, distinguished member of the economics department at The University of Texas at Austin for many years, Annual Review of Environment and Resource , Volume 9 (1), Annual Reviews, – Nov 1, 1984)

THE MULTIPLE PURPOSES OF ENERGY REGULATION AND PROMOTION Federal energy policy since World War II has developed into a **vast and multidirectional program** of controls, incentives, restraints, and promotions. This development accelerated greatly during the critical decade after 1973, and has become a pervasive and sometimes controlling influence in the energy economy. Its purposes, responding to a multitude of interests and aims in the economy, have frequently been inconsistent, if not obscure, and the results have often been confusing or disappointing.

### K

#### Root cause – Enframing is a pre-requisite to macropolitical violence

Burke 7 (Anthony, Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at UNSW, Sydney, “Ontologies of War: Violence, Existence and Reason”, Theory and Event, 10.2, Muse)

My argument here, whilst normatively sympathetic to Kant's moral demand for the eventual abolition of war, militates against excessive optimism.86 Even as I am arguing that war is not an enduring historical or anthropological feature, or a neutral and rational instrument of policy -- that it is rather the product of hegemonic forms of knowledge about political action and community -- my analysis does suggest some sobering conclusions about its power as an idea and formation. Neither the progressive flow of history nor the pacific tendencies of an international society of republican states will save us. The violent ontologies I have described here in fact dominate the conceptual and policy frameworks of modern republican states and have come, against everything Kant hoped for, to stand in for progress, modernity and reason. Indeed what Heidegger argues, I think with some credibility, is that the enframing world view has come to stand in for being itself. Enframing, argues Heidegger, 'does not simply endanger man in his relationship to himself and to everything that is...it drives out every other possibility of revealing...the rule of Enframing threatens man with the possibility that it could be denied to him to enter into a more original revealing and hence to experience the call of a more primal truth.'87 What I take from Heidegger's argument -- one that I have sought to extend by analysing the militaristic power of modern ontologies of political existence and security -- is a view that the challenge is posed not merely by a few varieties of weapon, government, technology or policy, but by an overarching system of thinking and understanding that lays claim to our entire space of truth and existence. Many of the most destructive features of contemporary modernity -- militarism, repression, coercive diplomacy, covert intervention, geopolitics, economic exploitation and ecological destruction -- derive not merely from particular choices by policymakers based on their particular interests, but from calculative, 'empirical' discourses of scientific and political truth rooted in powerful enlightenment images of being. Confined within such an epistemological and cultural universe, policymakers' choices become necessities, their actions become inevitabilities, and humans suffer and die. Viewed in this light, 'rationality' is the name we give the chain of reasoning which builds one structure of truth on another until a course of action, however violent or dangerous, becomes preordained through that reasoning's very operation and existence. It creates both discursive constraints -- available choices may simply not be seen as credible or legitimate -- and material constraints that derive from the mutually reinforcing cascade of discourses and events which then preordain militarism and violence as necessary policy responses, however ineffective, dysfunctional or chaotic. The force of my own and Heidegger's analysis does, admittedly, tend towards a deterministic fatalism. On my part this is quite deliberate; it is important to allow this possible conclusion to weigh on us. Large sections of modern societies -- especially parts of the media, political leaderships and national security institutions -- are utterly trapped within the Clausewitzian paradigm, within the instrumental utilitarianism of 'enframing' and the stark ontology of the friend and enemy. They are certainly tremendously aggressive and energetic in continually stating and reinstating its force. But is there a way out? Is there no possibility of agency and choice? Is this not the key normative problem I raised at the outset, of how the modern ontologies of war efface agency, causality and responsibility from decision making; the responsibility that comes with having choices and making decisions, with exercising power? (In this I am much closer to Connolly than Foucault, in Connolly's insistence that, even in the face of the anonymous power of discourse to produce and limit subjects, selves remain capable of agency and thus incur responsibilities.88) There seems no point in following Heidegger in seeking a more 'primal truth' of being -- that is to reinstate ontology and obscure its worldly manifestations and consequences from critique. However we can, while refusing Heidegger's unworldly89 nostalgia, appreciate that he was searching for a way out of the modern system of calculation; that he was searching for a 'questioning', 'free relationship' to technology that would not be immediately recaptured by the strategic, calculating vision of enframing. Yet his path out is somewhat chimerical -- his faith in 'art' and the older Greek attitudes of 'responsibility and indebtedness' offer us valuable clues to the kind of sensibility needed, but little more. When we consider the problem of policy, the force of this analysis suggests that choice and agency can be all too often limited; they can remain confined (sometimes quite wilfully) within the overarching strategic and security paradigms. Or, more hopefully, policy choices could aim to bring into being a more enduringly inclusive, cosmopolitan and peaceful logic of the political. But this cannot be done without seizing alternatives from outside the space of enframing and utilitarian strategic thought, by being aware of its presence and weight and activating a very different concept of existence, security and action.90 This would seem to hinge upon 'questioning' as such -- on the questions we put to the real and our efforts to create and act into it. Do security and strategic policies seek to exploit and direct humans as material, as energy, or do they seek to protect and enlarge human dignity and autonomy? Do they seek to impose by force an unjust status quo (as in Palestine), or to remove one injustice only to replace it with others (the U.S. in Iraq or Afghanistan), or do so at an unacceptable human, economic, and environmental price? Do we see our actions within an instrumental, amoral framework (of 'interests') and a linear chain of causes and effects (the idea of force), or do we see them as folding into a complex interplay of languages, norms, events and consequences which are less predictable and controllable?91 And most fundamentally: Are we seeking to coerce or persuade? Are less violent and more sustainable choices available? Will our actions perpetuate or help to end the global rule of insecurity and violence? Will our thought?

#### Even if there are obstacles to the alt’, our thought excercise is more productive than their stable production of the present – the alternative enables a different conception of security that can overcome inevitable conflict

Burke 7 (Anthony, Senior Lecturer – School of Politics and Professor of International Relations – University of New South Wales, Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence, p. 68-69)

This chapter is thus an exercise in thinking, which challenges the continuing power of political ontologies (forms of truth and being) that connect security, sovereignty, belonging, otherness and violence in ways that for many **appear like enduring political facts**, inevitable and irrefutable. Conflict, violence and alienation then arise not merely from individual or collective acts whose conditions might be understood and policed; they **condition politics** as such, forming a permanent ground, a dark substrata underpinning the very **possibility of the present**. Conflict and alienation seem inevitable because of the way in which the modem political imagination **has conceived and thought security**, sovereignty and ethics. Israel/ Palestine is chosen here as a particularly urgent and complex example of this problem, but it is a problem with much wider significance. While I hold out the hope that security can be re-visioned away from a permanent dependence on insecurity, exclusion and violence, and I believe it retains normative promise, this analysis takes a deliberate step backward to examine the very real barriers faced by such a project. Security cannot properly be rethought without a deeper understanding of, and challenge to, the political forms and structures it claims to enable and protect. If Ken Booth argues that the state should be a means rather than an end of security, my objective here is to place the continuing power and depth of its status as an end of security, and a fundamental source for political identity, under critical interrogation.' If the state is to become a means of security (one among many) it will have to be fundamentally transformed. The chapter pursues this inquiry in two stages. The first outlines the historic strength and effective redundancy of such an exciusivist vision of security in Israel, wherein Israel not only confronts military and political antagonists with an 'iron wall' of armed force but maps this onto a profound clash of existential narratives, a problem with resonances in the West's confrontation with radical Islamism in the war on terror. The second, taking up the remainder of the chapter, then explores a series of potential resources in continental philosophy and political theory that might help us to think our way out of a security grounded in violence and alienation. Through a critical engagement with this thought, I aim to construct a political ethics based not in relations between insecure and separated identities mapped solely onto nation-states, but in relations of responsibility and interconnection that can negotiate and recognise both distinct and intertwined histories, identities and needs; an ethics that might underpin a vision of interdependent (national and non-national) existence proper to an integrated world traversed by endless flows of people, commerce, ideas, violence and future potential

# Round 4 vs. UT Austin ChMa

## 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. Predictability – debate games open up dialogue which fosters information processing – they open up infinite frameworks making the game impossible

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)

Debate games are often based on pre-designed scenarios that include descriptions of issues to be debated, educational goals, game goals, roles, rules, time frames etc. In this way, debate games differ from textbooks and everyday classroom instruction as debate scenarios allow teachers and students to actively imagine, interact and communicate within a domain-specific game space. However, instead of mystifying debate games as a “magic circle” (Huizinga, 1950), I will try to overcome the epistemological dichotomy between “gaming” and “teaching” that tends to dominate discussions of educational games. In short, educational gaming is a form of teaching. As mentioned, education and games represent two different semiotic domains that both embody the three faces of knowledge: assertions, modes of representation and social forms of organisation (Gee, 2003; Barth, 2002; cf. chapter 2). In order to understand the interplay between these different domains and their interrelated knowledge forms, I will draw attention to a central assumption in Bakhtin’s dialogical philosophy. According to Bakhtin, all forms of communication and culture are subject to centripetal and centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981). A centripetal force is the drive to impose one version of the truth, while a centrifugal force involves a range of possible truths and interpretations. This means that any form of expression involves a duality of centripetal and centrifugal forces: “Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear” (Bakhtin, 1981: 272). If we take teaching as an example, it is always affected by centripetal and centrifugal forces in the on-going negotiation of “truths” between teachers and students. In the words of Bakhtin: “Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction” (Bakhtin, 1984a: 110). Similarly, the dialogical space of debate games also embodies centrifugal and centripetal forces. Thus, the election scenario of The Power Game involves centripetal elements that are mainly determined by the rules and outcomes of the game, i.e. the election is based on a limited time frame and a fixed voting procedure. Similarly, the open-ended goals, roles and resources represent centrifugal elements and create virtually endless possibilities for researching, preparing, 51 presenting, debating and evaluating a variety of key political issues. Consequently, the actual process of enacting a game scenario involves a complex negotiation between these centrifugal/centripetal forces that are inextricably linked with the teachers and students’ game activities. In this way, the enactment of The Power Game is a form of teaching that combines different pedagogical practices (i.e. group work, web quests, student presentations) and learning resources (i.e. websites, handouts, spoken language) within the interpretive frame of the election scenario. Obviously, tensions may arise if there is too much divergence between educational goals and game goals. This means that game facilitation requires a balance between focusing too narrowly on the rules or “facts” of a game (centripetal orientation) and a focusing too broadly on the contingent possibilities and interpretations of the game scenario (centrifugal orientation). For Bakhtin, the duality of centripetal/centrifugal forces often manifests itself as a dynamic between “monological” and “dialogical” forms of discourse. Bakhtin illustrates this point with the monological discourse of the Socrates/Plato dialogues in which the teacher never learns anything new from the students, despite Socrates’ ideological claims to the contrary (Bakhtin, 1984a). Thus, discourse becomes monologised when “someone who knows and possesses the truth instructs someone who is ignorant of it and in error”, where “a thought is either affirmed or repudiated” by the authority of the teacher (Bakhtin, 1984a: 81). In contrast to this, dialogical pedagogy fosters inclusive learning environments that are able to expand upon students’ existing knowledge and collaborative construction of “truths” (Dysthe, 1996). At this point, I should clarify that Bakhtin’s term “dialogic” is both a descriptive term (all utterances are per definition dialogic as they address other utterances as parts of a chain of communication) and a normative term as dialogue is an ideal to be worked for against the forces of “monologism” (Lillis, 2003: 197-8). In this project, I am mainly interested in describing the dialogical space of debate games. At the same time, I agree with Wegerif that “one of the goals of education, perhaps the most important goal, should be dialogue as an end in itself” (Wegerif, 2006: 61).

#### 2. Ground – the resolution exists to create balanced difficulty, creating a topic that is supposed to be moral and controversial – games requires acceptance of rules whose purpose is to forbid the easiest means to a goal – this makes the game meaningful

Hurka 6 – philosopher who serves as the Jackman Distinguished Chair in Philosophical Studies at the University of Toronto (Thomas, 2006, "Games and the Good," Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume 80, http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~thurka/docs/pass\_games.pdf)

I take this admiration to rest on the judgement that excellence in games is good in itself, apart from any pleasure it may give the player or other people but just for the properties that make it excellent. The admiration, in other words, rests on the perfectionist judgement that skill in games is worth pursuing for its own sake and can add value to one’s life. This skill is not the only thing we value in this way; we give similar honours to achievements in the arts, science, and business. But one thing we admire, and to a significant degree, is excellence in athletic and nonathletic games. Unless we dismiss this view, one task for philosophy is to explain why such excellence is good. But few philosophers have attempted this, for a well-known reason. A unified explanation of why excellence in games is good requires a unified account of what games are, and many doubt that this is possible. After all, Wittgenstein famously gave the concept of a game as his primary example of one for which necessary and sufficient conditions cannot be given but whose instances are linked only by looser “family resemblances.”2 If Wittgenstein was right about this, 2 there can be no single explanation of why skill in games is good, just a series of distinct explanations of the value of skill in hockey, skill in chess, and so on. But Wittgenstein was not right, as is shown in a little-known book that is nonetheless a classic of twentieth-century philosophy, Bernard Suits’s The Grasshopper: Games, Life and Utopia. Suits gives a perfectly persuasive analysis of playing a game as, to quote his summary statement, “the voluntary attempt to overcome unnecessary obstacles.”3 And in this paper I will use his analysis to explain the value of playing games. More specifically, I will argue that the different elements of Suits’s analysis give game-playing two distinct but related grounds of value, so it instantiates two related intrinsic goods. I will also argue that game-playing is an important intrinsic good, which gives the clearest possible expression of what can be called a modern as against a classical, or more specifically Aristotelian, view of value. But first Suits’s analysis. It says that a game has three main elements, which he calls the prelusory goal, the constitutive rules, and the lusory attitude. To begin with the first, in playing a game one always aims at a goal that can be described independently of the game. In golf, this is that a ball enter a hole in the ground; in mountain-climbing, that one stand on top of a mountain; in Olympic sprinting, that one cross a line on the track before one’s competitors. Suits calls this goal “prelusory” because it can be understood and achieved apart from the game, and he argues that every game has such a goal. Of course, in playing a game one also aims at a goal internal to it, such as winning the race, climbing the mountain, or breaking par on the golf course. But on Suits’s view this “lusory” goal is derivative, since achieving it involves achieving the prior prelusory goal in a specified way. This way is identified by the second element, the game’s constitutive rules. According to 3 Suits, the function of these rules is to forbid the most efficient means to the prelusory goal. Thus, in golf one may not carry the ball down the fairway and drop it in the hole by hand; one must advance it using clubs, play it where it lies, and so on. In mountain-climbing one may not ride a gondola to the top of the mountain or charter a helicopter; in 200-metre sprinting, one may not cut across the infield. Once these rules are in place, success in the game typically requires achieving the prelusory goal as efficiently as they allow, such as getting the ball into the hole in the fewest possible strokes or choosing the best way up the mountain. But this is efficiency within the rules, whose larger function is to forbid the easiest means to the game’s initial goal. These first two elements involve pursuing a goal by less than the most efficient means, but they are not sufficient for playing a game. This is because someone can be forced to use these means by circumstances he regrets and wishes were different. If this is the case – if, for example, a farmer harvests his field by hand because he cannot afford the mechanical harvester he would much rather use – he is not playing a game. Hence the need for the third element in Suits’s analysis, the lusory attitude, which involves a person’s willingly accepting the constitutive rules, or accepting them because they make the game possible. Thus, a golfer accepts that he may not carry the ball by hand or improve his lie because he wants to play golf, and obeying those rules is necessary for him to do so; the mountaineer accepts that he may not take a helicopter to the summit because he wants to climb. The restrictions the rules impose are adhered to not reluctantly but willingly, because they are essential to the game. Adding this third element gives Suits’s full definition: “To play a game is to attempt to achieve a specific state of affairs [prelusory goal], using only means permitted by the rules ..., where the rules prohibit the use of more efficient in favour of less efficient means [constitutive rules], and where the rules are 4 accepted just because they make possible such activity [lusory attitude].” Or, in the summary statement quoted above, “playing a game is the voluntary attempt to overcome unnecessary obstacles.”4 This analysis will doubtless meet with objections, in the form of attempted counterexamples. But Suits considers a whole series of these in his book, showing repeatedly that his analysis handles them correctly, and not by some ad hoc addition but once its elements are properly understood. Nor would it matter terribly if there were a few counterexamples. Some minor lack of fit between his analysis and the English use of “game” would not be important if the analysis picks out a phenomenon that is unified, close to what is meant by “game,” and philosophically interesting. But the analysis is interesting if, as I will now argue, it allows a persuasive explanation of the value of excellence in games. Suits himself addresses this issue of value. In fact, a central aim of his book is to give a defence of the grasshopper in Aesop’s fable, who played all summer, against the ant, who worked. But in doing so he argues for the strong thesis that playing games is not just an intrinsic good but the supreme such good, since in the ideal conditions of utopia, where all instrumental goods are provided, it would be everyone’s primary pursuit. The grasshopper’s game-playing, therefore, while it had the unfortunate effect of leaving him without food for the winter, involved him in the intrinsically finest actvity. Now, I do not accept Suits’s strong thesis that gameplaying is the supreme good – I think many other states and activities have comparable value – and I do not find his arguments for it persuasive. But I will connect the weaker thesis that playing games is one intrinsic good to the details of his analysis more explicitly than he ever does.

#### 3. 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.”

#### 4. 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 – CP

#### Text: Anushka and I Resolve Crude Oil Into a Material Agent of the Resolution

#### Solves the aff – we defend the entirety of plan action, EXCEPT their reliance and roleplaying as the USFG as a mechanism

#### Net benefit-

#### Role playing as authoritative institutions underrates the responsibility we have within our daily lives preventing change. The Aff plan text demands we be spectators to world events which makes all impacts inevitable.

Kappeler 95

(Susanne, Associate Professor at Al-Akhawayn University, The Will to Violence: The politics of personal behavior, Pg.10-11)

Yet **our insight that** indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgment, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls ‘organized irresponsibility’, upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally, and also individually organized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major power mongers. For we tend to think that we cannot ‘do’ anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of ‘what would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defense?’ Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as ‘virtually no possibilities’: what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN – finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like ‘I want to stop this war’, ‘I want military intervention’, ‘I want to stop this backlash’, or ‘I want a moral revolution. ‘We are this war’, however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in co-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we ‘are’ the war in our ‘unconscious cruelty towards you’, our tolerance of the ‘fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don’t’- our readiness, in other words, to build identities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the ‘others.’ We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape ‘our feelings, our relationships, our values’ according to the structures and the values of war and violence.

### 1NC – K

#### The affirmative’s policy emerges from self-interested motivations, which are at the root of suffering --- intentions must be considered alongside consequences.

Jay L Garfield, no date Smith College, The University of Melbourne, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies. “Buddhist Ethics,” Work unpublished, available for citation at his website, <http://www.smith.edu/philosophy/documents/BMT.pdf>.

Thinking about the good from a Buddhist perspective begins from the first principle of Buddhist metaphysics—the fact of thoroughgoing interdependence. Every event and every phenomenon is causally and constitutively dependent upon countless other events and phenomena and in turn is part of the causal ancestries and constitutive bases of countless other phenomena. Moral reflection on action must take all of these dimensions of dependence into account. To focus merely on motivation, or on character, or on the action itself, or on its consequences for others, would be to ignore much that is important. Interdependence is relevant when thinking about identity and interest as well. Many Western moral theorists begin by taking a kind of ontological and axiological individualism for granted in several respects. First, agency is taken to reside in individual actors, with an attendant focus on responsibility as a central area of moral concern. Second, interest is taken to be au fond an individual matter, and even when the self is consciously deconstructed, as it is by Parfit, interest is taken to attach to individual stages of selves. Third, and consequent on these, a conflict between egoistic and altruistic interests and motivations is regarded as at least prima facie rational, if not morally defensible or ultimately rational. Buddhist accounts of identity reflect the commitment to interdependence. The boundary between self and other are regarded as at best conventional and relatively insignificant, and at worst deeply illusory. Agency is not taken as a primary moral category, at least if taken to indicate a unique point of origin of action in an individual self, and so moral responsibility is not foregrounded in moral reflection. Interest is hence also seen as a shared phenomenon, and egoism as fundamentally and obviously irrational. We will work out the ramifications of these views as we proceed. Någårjuna argues persuasively that to understand dependent origination is to understand the four noble truths. The truth of suffering sets the problem that Buddhism sets out to solve. The universe is pervaded by suffering and the causes of suffering. The Buddha did not set out to prove this at Sarnath. He took it as a datum, one that is obvious to anyone on serious reflection, though one that escapes most of us most of the time precisely because of our evasion of serious reflection in order not to face this fact. The Buddha also assumed that suffering is a bad thing. If one disagrees with this assessment, moral discourse has on basis. There is no problem to be solved. If you just love headaches, don’t bother taking aspirin. If you don’t, you might consider how to obtain relief. The Buddha then argued that suffering does not just happen. It arises as a consequence of actions conditioned by attachment and aversion, each of which in turn is engendered by confusion regarding the nature of reality. This triune root of suffering is represented in the familiar Buddhist representation of the Wheel of Life with the pig, snake and rooster at the hub, the six realms of transmigration (or aspects of the phenomenology of suffering as we might understand them less cosmologically) turning around them, structured by the twelve links of dependent origination (a detailed psychology of perception and action), all of which is depicted as resting in the jaws of death, the great fear of which propels so much of our maladaptive psychology and moral failure. Attention to the second noble truth allows us to begin to see how very different Buddhist moral thought is from most Western moral thought: the three roots of suffering are each regarded as moral defilements, and are not seen as especially heterogeneous in character. None of them is seen is especially problematic in most Western moral theory, and indeed each of the first two—attachment and aversion— is valourised in at least some contexts in some systems, particularly that of Aristotle. The third, confusion, is rarely seen in the West as a moral matter, unless it is because one has a duty to be clear about things. But this is far from the issue in Buddhist moral theory. Buddhism is about solving a problem; the problem is suffering; the three root vices are vices because they engender the problem. The moral theory here is not meant to articulate a set of imperatives, nor to establish a calculus of utility through which to assess actions, nor to assign responsibility, praise or blame, but rather to solve a problem. The problem is that the world is pervaded by unwanted suffering. The diagnosis of the cause of the problem sets the agenda for its solution. The third truth articulated at Sarnath is that, because suffering depends upon confusion, attraction and aversion, it can be eliminated by eliminating these causes. And the fourth, which starts getting the ethics spelled out in a more determinate form, presents the path to that solution. The eightfold path is central to an articulation of the moral domain as it is seen in Buddhist theory, and careful attention to reveals additional respects in which Buddhists develop ethics in a different way than do Western moral theorists. The eightfold path comprises correct view, correct intention, correct speech, correct propriety, correct livelihood, correct effort, correct mindfulness and correct meditation. While many, following the traditional Tibetan classification of three trainings, focus specifically on correct speech, action and livelihood as the specifically ethical content of the path, this is in fact too narrow, and misses the role of the path in Buddhist practice and in the overall moral framework through which Buddhism recommends engagement with the world. The eightfold path identifies not a set of rights or duties, nor a set of virtues, but a set of areas of concern or of dimensions of conduct. The path indicates the complexity of human moral life and the complexity of the sources of suffering. To lead a life conducive to the solution of the problem of suffering is to pay close heed to these many dimensions of conduct. Our views matter morally. It is not simply an epistemic fault to think that material goods guarantee happiness, that narrow self-interest is the most rational motivation, that torture is a reasonable instrument of national policy or that women are incapable of rational thought. Such views are morally problematic. To hold such views is not to commit a morally neutral cognitive error, like thinking that Florida is south of Hawai’i. It is to be involved in a way of taking up with the world that is at the very root of the suffering we all wish to alleviate. It is not only what we do that matters, but what we intend. Intention grounds action, and even when it misfires, it matters to who we are and to what we become what we intend to do. The eightfold path, which represents the earliest foundation of Buddhist ethical thought, must always be thought of as a path, and not as a set of prescriptions. That is, it comprises a set of areas of concern, domains of life on which to reflect, respects in which one can improve one’s life, and in sum, a way of moving cognitively, behaviorally and affectively from a state in which one is bound by and causative of suffering to one in which one is immune from suffering and in which one’s thought, speech and action tends to alleviate it. The eightfold path may be represented as broadly consequentialist, but it is certainly not utilitarian, and it is consequentialist only in a thin sense—that is, what makes it a path worth following is that things work out better to the extent that we follow it. By following this path, by attending to these areas of concern in which our actions and thought determine the quality of life for ourselves and others, we achieve greater individual perfection, facilitate that achievement for those around us, and reduce suffering. There is no boundary drawn here that circumscribes the ethical dimensions of life; there is no distinction between the obligatory, the permissible and the forbidden; there is no distinction drawn between the moral and the prudential; the public and the private; the self-regarding and the other-regarding. Instead, there is a broad indication of the complexity of the solution to the problem of suffering. 2. Action Theory and Karma The term “karma” plays a central role in any Buddhist moral discussion. It is a term of great semantic complexity and must be handled with care, particularly given its intrusion into English with a new range of central meanings. Most centrally, “karma” means action. Derivatively, it means the consequences of action. Given the Buddhist commitment to the universality of dependent origination, all action arises from the karmic consequences of past actions, and all action has karmic consequences. Karma is not a cosmic bank account on this view, but rather the natural causal sequellae of actions. Karma accrues to any action, simply in virtue of interdependence, and karmic consequences include those for oneself and for others, as well as both individual and collective karma.

#### 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 blinded, 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.

#### 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.

#### Our ontological orientation towards the world must be evaluated before substantive claims.

Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, 2010. Associate Professor of International Relations in the School of International Service at the American University in Washington, DC “The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics,” p 41-2

Ontological commitments, whether philosophical or scientific, logically precede substantive claims, and serve as the often-unacknowledged basis on which empirical claims are founded. In this sense, ontological commitments are “foundational”—not in the sense that they provide unshakable grounds that universally guarantee the validity of the claims that are founded on them, but “foundational” in the sense that they provide the conditions of intelligibility for those claims. In that way, ontological commitments are world-disclosing, since they make a particular kind of tangible world available to a researcher (Habermas 1990, 321). A claim such as “democratic states do not go to war with one another” implicitly makes a number of ontological presuppositions. The claim makes scientific-ontological presuppositions that a state’s “democracy-ness” is a conceptually separable attribute of that state and most likely also presupposes that a state’s standing as a democracy is something that is visible to external scholarly observers and specifiable in an abstract fashion.1 The claim also makes philosophical-ontological presuppositions, although these are somewhat further removed from the individual claim and pertain more to the overall intellectual context within which the claim make sense; hence one needs to know something about the broader body of scholarly literature within which a claim has standing in order to explicate the philosophical-ontological commitments that it tacitly presumes. The academic study of the democratic peace has been almost completely dominated by a *neopositivist* methodology. Neopositivism, although neutral with respect to the truth-value of specific empirical propositions, sets the contours of the research design within which claims about the democratic peace—and, quite frankly, claims about many of the other empirical phenomena regularly studied within academic IR—are evaluated. Before scholars can engage in debates about whether democratic peace is best measured and assessed as a dyadic of as a monadic phenomenon (for example, Rousseau et al. 1996), it is first necessary for those scholars to agree on some basic methodological principles, such as the notion that a causal connection shows itself in systematic cross-case correlations between specific factors (in this case, variable attributes such as “being a democracy” and “going to war with another democracy”), and the notion that knowledge is constructed through the successive proposing and testing of hypothetical guesses about the character of the world. The fact that these assumptions are so widely shared, both within the democratic peace research community and within the field of IR more generally, does not make them any less philosophical—or any less philosophically contentious. Hypothesis testing and covariation-causality2 are more or less direct consequences of the pair of philosophical-ontological commitments on which neopositivism stands: mind-world dualism and phenomenalism. Mind-world dualism enables hypothesis testing, inasmuch as testing a hypothetical guess to see whether it corresponds to the world makes little sense in the absence of a mind-independent world against which to test the hypothesis. Phenomenalism enables covariation-causality, since the limitation of knowledge to those aspects of the world that can be empirically grasped and directly experienced implies that the only confidence that observers can have about a causal relationship—which must be inferred rather than abduced or counterfactually ideal-typified—must be founded on its systematicity.3 In the absence of these philosophical-ontological commitments, testing hypotheses in order to arrive at reliable statements about robust correlations would make little sense, and if we were interested in knowing about how democracy was connected to questions of war and peace, we would have to engage in some other kinds of knowledge-production procedures.

### 1NC – Case

#### 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**.

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

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

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

#### Environmental pragmatism is a better strategy than their alternative for several reasons. First, it opens space for a wider array of potential solutions. Second, it ensures that all voices are accepted and the bargaining process is inclusive. Third, it is the only hope of solving real problems – a reliance on dogmatic theory ensures deadlock.

Hirokawa 2 [Keith Hirokawa, J.D. from the UConn and LL.M. from the Northwestern School of Law, "Some Pragmatic Observations About Radical Critique In Environmental Law," Stanford Environmental Law Journal, Volume 21, June 2002, Chetan]

By rejecting commitments to theory, pragmatists are denied the benefit of having a justifying principle (such as free will, equality, utility, ecocentrism, etc.) under which they can rally support. However, what pragmatists lose by rejecting meta-theory they replace by widening the field of potential solutions. Avoiding commitment to a substantive meta-theory frees the environmental thinker from worry about whether the solutions proposed for a given problem are consistent with an ultimate theoretical grounding; that is, the pragmatist is not bound by deductive reasoning within the confines of any particular analytic scheme. Visionary reasoning becomes an eclectic array of possibilities, limited only by those contextual needs that make the inquiry important in the first place. The turn to pragmatism thus symbolizes a rejection of the alleged [\*251] relationship between theory and answers to practical questions. To the pragmatist, this rejection comes for very good reason. Competing conclusions can often be derived from the same incomplete set of premises, and divergent theories can often produce the same conclusions. Pragmatists redirect human inquiry to avoid the indeterminacy of theory, since the "knowledge of obstacles is not itself an obstacle unless it leads to defeatism; for pragmatists it serves as a spur to seek a way to overcome those obstacles." n118 In the final analysis, although theories are important, the pragmatist warns against theory commitments, because theories provide "no more than commentary on practice, based on premises drawn from that practice itself." n119 Accordingly, the pragmatic position against theory is not a broad, sweeping dismissal of every idea derived from a theoretical framework. n120 Rather, the pragmatist is free to consider a variety of ideas, approaches and solutions without committing to particular theoretical foundations. The method and strength of problem solving, n121 if not the purpose, is to ensure conversation participants [\*252] that their theories are duly considered. n122 The resulting formation of policy is "inclusive, treating current theories as perspectives, each of which can add to the understanding of law." n123 Pragmatism, then, is a helpful tool (especially to environmental debate) because of its freedom from any particular method of inquiry and any particular metaphysical "good" of society. For the pragmatist, theories "are not Euclidean axioms or Kantian categorical imperatives, but graffiti, practical guidelines to be noticed by the alertly street-wise when context makes them applicable." n124 When unbounded by consistency with or loyalty to any particular theory, all relevant ideas become useful to the resolution of a dilemma. The lesson from pragmatism is that to see the law as something more than a refined, yet interminably eclectic conglomerate of ideas, taken from all forms of social and cultural practices, would be to give too much credit to our insight into the nature of justice. The resulting amalgam - the plurality of perspectives arranged for inclusive discourse - is not mandated by pragmatism. n125 Nonetheless, since pragmatism is in its most useful capacity when put to the task of dispute resolution, pragmatism inevitably finds itself confronted with opposing and incompatible perspectives. A pragmatic conclusion is one in which those opposing and incompatible perspectives are represented. To this end, some pragmatists have tried to surmount the foundationalists' problem of theory-hope (that the right theory will supply the right solutions) by proposing pluralist perspectives to bridge the gaps between competing paradigms. Pluralism serves as a helpful model for pragmatism's [\*253] application. n126 In summary, pragmatic inquiry illustrates three main themes. First, pragmatism embodies "anti-foundationalism" in that it is not loyal to any particular substantive theory. Second, pragmatism allows negotiation between purportedly uncompromising positions for the purpose of solving real problems, due in large part to its lack of dependency on any "truths" claimed in these positions. Finally, pragmatism disputes whether the adoption of any particular theory determines the right answers to difficult questions. The pragmatist uses these tools to transcend barriers between alternative perceptions by critically examining such perspectives to determine how each of them can be applied in a helpful, non-exclusive manner. These tools can be applied to debates over environmental protection, which were above portrayed as deadlocked dialogues between deeply held beliefs. Below, the problems of frustrated belief are contrasted to examples of pragmatic environmentalism, verifying the potential benefits of legal pragmatism for advocates and judges engaged in environmental disputes.

#### Apocalyptic rhetoric shocks the public into environmentalism

Killingsworth and Palmer 96 (Jimmie, Professor of English – Southwest Educational Development, and Jacqueline, Researcher – Southwest Educational Development, “Millenial Ecology”, Green Culture)

At least partly, the new millennialism represents a radical attempt to replace the ideology of progress and to dislodge from power its primary perpetuators and beneficiaries in big business, big government, and big science-to overturn the technocapitalist enterprise that fuels the economy of the developed world. In this essay, however, we argue that, contrary to initial impressions, literal readings, and the assumptions of antienvironmentalists, the most influential apocalyptic narratives do not undertake a wholesale attack on the ideology of progress or its attendant faith in science, technology, and liberal democracy. These texts appear not as the rhetorical equivalent of total war but as shock tactics to win the hearts and minds of the general public at crucial historical periods in which the need is perceived to extend and broaden commitments to the environmental movement. One such historical watershed formed in the 1960s, when the environmental movement enjoyed its first surge of public support under the inspiration of Rachel Carson's visionary polemic Silent Spring. By charting the responses and reactions to Carson's influential use of apocalyptic narrative in the literature of environmental advocacy, we argue that millennial rhetoric bears a dialectical relation to public support for the environmental movement. It alternately reflects and builds a growing public awareness. It aims to transform the consciousness that a problem exists into acceptance of action toward a solution by prefacing the solution with a future scenario of what could happen if action is not taken, if the problem goes untreated.

#### B) Multiple examples prove

--Silent Spring --Quit Crisis --Nader --Population Bomb --Science and Survival

Coglianese 1 (Cary, Associate Professor of Public Policy – JFK School, 150 U. Pa. L. Rev. 85, November)

In the 1960s, the American environmental movement reawakened. Controversies in the midcentury had erupted over public dams in the West and the dangers of nuclear conflict, but the movement's renaissance fully blossomed in the 1960s. In 1962, Rachel Carson published Silent Spring, dramatically warning of the long-term dangers of pesticide use. n18 In succeeding years, Carson's book was joined by others that warned of environmental and social decay precipitated by unregulated industrial activity, including Stewart Udall's The Quiet Crisis, n19 Ralph Nader's Unsafe at Any Speed, n20 Paul Ehrlich's The Population Bomb, n21 and Barry Commoner's Science and Survival. n22 These popular books of the time not only warned of dangers from industrial activities, but also provided the public with a new conceptual apparatus for understanding ecological relationships and for constructing a broad-scale political movement. n23 Moreover, messages of ecological alarm and activism found a receptive audience during the sixties, when there was broader social unrest over civil rights and the Vietnam War. This sense of alarm was further fueled by several highly visible environmental disasters, including a major oil spill in Santa Barbara in 1969, and the infamous burning of the Cuyahoga River in Ohio. n24

#### High prices oil cause a shift to renewable energy – the plan lowers prices through financial incentives

**Yetiv 6** (Steven A., Professor of political science and international studies at Old Dominion University, *America benefits from high oil prices*, February 6th,

http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20060206/news\_mz1e6yetiv.html)

From Wall Street to Main Street, people hate high oil prices because they cause economic pain. But like coffee, red wine, and perhaps even chocolate, high oil prices can do some good too. Current energy legislation, which was passed by Congress and signed by President Bush in August 2005, moved America in the right direction, but it has a core weakness. This legislation, like President Bush's vision of oil independence laid out in his recent State of the Union speech, fails to do what higher oil prices can accomplish: decrease oil consumption in the transportation sector where 70 percent of oil is used and diminish our dependence on foreign oil. Current energy legislation, and President Bush's vision, does encourage power sources such as nuclear, coal, solar and wind. But, with the potential partial exception of solar power, they can't run vehicles. Astonishingly, less than one-eighth of that $14.6 billion in energy legislation actually decreased oil use in transportation. In particular, what can high oil prices do that America's energy policy fails to do? First, sooner or later, high oil prices spur the development of alternative energy resources because they make it more profitable to produce them. The higher prices go, the more entrepreneurs and companies around the world work to move us beyond the hazardous petroleum era. Second, the higher oil prices go, the more likely automakers will mass-produce more efficient, less pricey vehicles. That is precisely what we need to shift the current oil-guzzling paradigm. A joint report by the Transportation Research Institute's Office for the Study of Automotive Transportation at the University of Michigan and the Natural Resources Defense Council shows that higher oil prices will hurt America's top automakers by decreasing sales of SUVs and pickup trucks. The report calls on them to make fuel efficient vehicles their top priority to better the country and their bottom line. Most automakers are experimenting with fuel cell vehicles that run on hydrogen rather than oil. They are also selling 2005 hybrid vehicles that run on an internal combustion engine, as do conventional cars, plus an electric motor. Depending on the car, they yield between 10 percent and 50 percent better gas mileage than regular vehicles, and far better mileage than the ubiquitous SUV. But hybrids represent a drop in the market bucket, because automakers have so far made their profits by mass-producing less efficient, money-making vehicles. And fuel cell vehicles aren't expected to reach the market until 2010. High oil prices are an incentive for making efficient vehicles on a mass, affordable scale, and sooner rather than later. Third, high oil prices make consumers less likely to waste gas and more likely to buy hybrids. In Europe, high gas prices – roughly double that in the United States – have led to mass adoption of hybrids. Investment banking firm Goldman Sachs predicts that gas prices would have to hit $4.30 a gallon in the United States to change the gas-guzzling culture. But it is better to see the impact as relative to price. Fourth, high oil prices benefit the environment. Indeed, one study has shown that a broad energy tax on carbon content in fuels would reduce oil use and carbon emissions by over 10 percent. For that matter, vehicles that run on fuel cells emit only water and heat as waste, and hybrids emit more limited emissions than conventional vehicles. Since carbon emissions cause global warming – a scientific fact rather than science fiction – we should tip our hats to high oil prices, in this respect. Fifth, high oil prices are raising consciousness about the hazards of the oil era. Ninety-three percent of Americans believe that oil dependence is a serious problem. Although they still act like oil is an entitlement, pricey oil may lead them eventually to put pressure on politicians to move toward greater oil independence, as reflected perhaps in President Bush's speech. Of course, higher oil prices are painful. But, over time they can serve the environment, decrease our dependence on Middle East oil, especially from countries like Iran which uses oil money to build nuclear capability and force us to take actions that make us less vulnerable when oil starts to dwindle in the future.

#### Renewables avoid extinction from global warming

**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.

#### Fear spurs compassion and mobilizing action

Greenspan 3 (Miriam Greenspan – Pioneer in the Area of Women’s Psychology – 2003 (“An Excerpt from Healing through the Dark Emotions: The Wisdom of Grief, Fear, and Despair by Miriam Greenspan,” www.spiritualityhealth.com/newsh/excerpts/bookreview/excp\_5513.html)

"Fear is a very powerful emotion. When you feel fear in your body, it's helpful to relate to it as an energy that can be mobilized for life. It may feel like a constriction in your chest, throat, or abdomen. Breathe through it without judgment and allow yourself to feel it as a very strong force. If you pray for help, you can begin to expand this energy we call 'fear' and use it for healing and transformation. "In this regard, we can take our model from the heroes of Flight 93 who. realizing that they were bound for death, stormed the plane and brought it down without hitting a civilian target. One cannot even imagine being able to do this without fear. Fear for the lives of others was the energy that mobilized them to do something meaningful with their last moments of life. Some of these people said good-bye to their husbands and wives and wished them happiness before they left this earth. They had found some peace in their last moments, peace in the midst of turbulence. And they found it through their last wish, which they heroically put into action: to help others live. "Perhaps there is nothing that can redeem the dead but our own actions for the good. This is a time to find out what we want to do for the world and do it. And, as every trauma survivor knows, this is the way to make meaning out of pain, perhaps the most effective way: to draw something good out of evil. The heroes of September 11 point us to the choice we each have: to help create a state of global peace and justice that we, like they, will not see before we die. It is in giving ourselves to this vision, out of love for this world that we inhabit together, that we stand a chance of transcending the human proclivity to damage life. And that we honor those we have brought into this world and who must inherit it. . . . "Our only protection is in our interconnectedness. This has always been the message of the dark emotions when they are experienced most deeply and widely. Grief is not just "my" grief; it is the grief of every motherless child, every witness to horror in the world. Despair is not just "my" despair; it is everyone's despair about life in the twentyfirst century. Fear is not just 'my' fear; it is everyone's fear — of anthrax, of nuclear war, of truck bombs, of airplane hijackings, of things falling apart, blowing up, sickening and dying. "If fear is only telling you to save your own skin, there's not much hope for us. But the fact is that in conscious fear, there is a potentially revolutionary power of compassion and connection that can be mobilized en masse. This is the power of fear. Our collective fear, which is intelligent, is telling us now: Find new ways to keep this global village safe. Find new forms of international cooperation that will root out evil in ways that don't create more victims and more evil. Leap out of the confines of national egos. Learn the ways of peace. Find a ceremony of safety so that not just you and I but all of us can live together without fear."

## 2NC

### Impact Overview

#### Prefer our disjunctive scenarios to their short-term conjunctive scenarios.

Eliezer **Yudkowsky**, 8/31/**2006**. Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence Palo Alto, CA. “Cognitive biases potentially affecting judgment of global risks,” Forthcoming in Global Catastrophic Risks, eds. Nick Bostrom and Milan Cirkovic, singinst.org/upload/cognitive-biases.pdf.

The conjunction fallacy similarly applies to futurological forecasts. Two independent sets of professional analysts at the Second International Congress on Forecasting were asked to rate, respectively, the probability of "A complete suspension of diplomatic relations between the USA and the Soviet Union, sometime in 1983" or "A Russian invasion of Poland, and a complete suspension of diplomatic relations between the USA and the Soviet Union, sometime in 1983". The second set of analysts responded with significantly higher probabilities. (Tversky and Kahneman 1983.) In Johnson et. al. (1993), MBA students at Wharton were scheduled to travel to Bangkok as part of their degree program. Several groups of students were asked how much they - 6 - were willing to pay for terrorism insurance. One group of subjects was asked how much they were willing to pay for terrorism insurance covering the flight from Thailand to the US. A second group of subjects was asked how much they were willing to pay for terrorism insurance covering the round-trip flight. A third group was asked how much they were willing to pay for terrorism insurance that covered the complete trip to Thailand. These three groups responded with average willingness to pay of $17.19, $13.90, and $7.44 respectively. According to probability theory, **adding additional detail onto a story must render the story less probable**. It is less probable that Linda is a feminist bank teller than that she is a bank teller, since all feminist bank tellers are necessarily bank tellers. Yet human psychology seems to follow the rule that adding an additional detail can make the story more plausible. People might pay more for international diplomacy intended to prevent nanotechnological warfare by China, than for an engineering project to defend against nanotechnological attack from any source. The second threat scenario is less vivid and alarming, but the defense is more useful because it is more vague. More valuable still would be strategies which make humanity harder to extinguish without being specific to nanotechnologic threats - such as colonizing space, or see Yudkowsky (this volume) on AI. Security expert Bruce Schneier observed (both before and after the 2005 hurricane in New Orleans) that the U.S. government was guarding specific domestic targets against "movie-plot scenarios" of terrorism, at the cost of taking away resources from emergency-response capabilities that could respond to any disaster. (Schneier 2005.) Overly detailed reassurances can also create false perceptions of safety: "X is not an existential risk and you don't need to worry about it, because A, B, C, D, and E"; where the failure of any one of propositions A, B, C, D, or E potentially extinguishes the human species. "We don't need to worry about nanotechnologic war, because a UN commission will initially develop the technology and prevent its proliferation until such time as an active shield is developed, capable of defending against all accidental and malicious outbreaks that contemporary nanotechnology is capable of producing, and this condition will persist indefinitely." **Vivid, specific scenarios can inflate our probability estimates of security**, as well as misdirecting defensive investments into needlessly narrow or implausibly detailed risk scenarios. More generally, people tend to overestimate conjunctive probabilities and underestimate disjunctive probabilities. (Tversky and Kahneman 1974.) That is, **people tend to overestimate the probability that**, e.g., **seven events of 90% probability will all occur**. Conversely, **people tend to underestimate the probability that at least one of seven events of 10% probability will occur**. Someone judging whether to, e.g., incorporate a new startup, must evaluate the probability that many individual events will all go right (there will be sufficient funding, competent employees, customers will want the product) while also considering the likelihood that at least one critical failure will occur (the bank refuses - 7 - a loan, the biggest project fails, the lead scientist dies). This may help explain why only 44% of entrepreneurial ventures3 survive after 4 years. (Knaup 2005.) Dawes (1988) observes: 'In their summations lawyers avoid arguing from disjunctions ("either this or that or the other could have occurred, all of which would lead to the same conclusion") in favor of conjunctions. Rationally, of course, disjunctions are much more probable than are conjunctions.' The scenario of humanity going extinct in the next century is a disjunctive event. It could happen as a result of any of the existential risks discussed in this book - or some other cause which none of us foresaw. Yet for a futurist, disjunctions make for an awkward and unpoetic-sounding prophecy.

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

Khisty 7 (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).

### Link

#### The only ethical focus is on the eradication of suffering.

Ken Jones, 1995. Founding member of the Buddhist Peace Fellowship in Britain. “Buddhism and Social Action,” <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/jones/wheel285.html>.

In modern Western society, humanistic social action, in its bewildering variety of forms, is seen both as the characteristic way of relieving suffering and enhancing human well-being and, at the same time, as a noble ideal of service, of self-sacrifice, by humanists of all faiths. Buddhism, however, is a humanism in that it rejoices in the possibility of a true freedom as something inherent in human nature. For Buddhism, the ultimate freedom is to achieve full release from the root causes of all suffering: greed, hatred and delusion, which clearly are also the root causes of all social evils. Their grossest forms are those which are harmful to others. To weaken, and finally eliminate them in oneself, and, as far as possible, in society, is the basis of Buddhist ethics. And here Buddhist social action has its place. The experience of suffering is the starting point of Buddhist teaching and of any attempt to define a distinctively *Buddhist* social action. However, misunderstanding can arise at the start, because the Pali word *dukkha,* which is commonly translated simply as "suffering," has a much wider and more subtle meaning. There is, of course, much gross, objective suffering in the world *(dukkha-dukkha),* and much of this arises from poverty, war, oppression and other social conditions. We cling to our good fortune and struggle at all costs to escape from our bad fortune. This struggle may not be so desperate in certain countries which enjoy a high material standard of living spread relatively evenly throughout the population. Nevertheless, the material achievements of such societies appear somehow to have been "bought" by social conditions which breed a profound sense of insecurity and anxiety, of restlessness and inner confusion, in contrast to the relatively stable and ordered society in which the Buddha taught. Lonely, alienated industrial man has unprecedented opportunities for living life "in the context of equipment," as the philosopher Martin Heidegger so aptly put it. He has a highly valued freedom to make meaning of his life from a huge variety of more or less readily available forms of consumption or achievement — whether career building, home making, shopping around for different world ideologies (such as Buddhism), or dedicated social service. When material acquisition palls, there is the collection of new experiences and the clocking up of new achievements. Indeed, for many their vibrating busyness becomes itself a more important self-confirmation that the goals to which it is ostensibly directed. In developing countries to live thus, "in the context of equipment," has become the great goal for increasing numbers of people. They are watched sadly by Westerners who have accumulated more experience of the disillusion and frustration of perpetual non-arrival. Thus, from the experience of social conditions there arises both physical and psychological suffering. But more fundamental still is that profound sense of unease, of anxiety or angst, which arises from the very transience *(anicca)* of life *(viparinama-dukkha).* This angst, however conscious of it we may or may not be, drives the restless search to establish a meaningful self-identity in the face of a disturbing awareness of our insubstantiality *(anatta).* Ultimately, life is commonly a struggle to give meaning to life — and to death. This is so much the essence of the ordinary human condition and we are so very much *inside* it, that for much of the time we are scarcely aware of it. This *existential* suffering is the distillation of all the various conditions to which we have referred above — it is the human condition itself. Buddhism offers to the individual human being a religious practice, a Way, leading to the transcendence of suffering. Buddhist social action arises from this practice and contributes to it. From suffering arises desire to end suffering. The secular humanistic activist sets himself the endless task of *satisfying* that desire, and perhaps hopes to end social suffering by constructing utopias. The Buddhist, on the other hand, is concerned *ultimately* with the *transformation* of desire. Hence he contemplates and experiences social action in a fundamentally different way from the secular activist. This way will not be readily comprehensible to the latter, and has helped give rise to the erroneous belief that Buddhism is indifferent to human suffering. One reason why the subject of this pamphlet is so important to Buddhists is that they will have to start here if they are to begin to communicate effectively with non-Buddhist social activists. We should add, however, that although such communication may not be easy on the intellectual plane, at the level of feelings shared in compassionate social action experience together, there may be little difficulty.

#### Nuclear energy is an example – reacting with fear and anxiety produces a destructive emotional response that makes inner peace impossible --- focusing on our internal orientation is a pre-requisite to global nuclear peace.

Lama Thubten Yeshe, 1983. “Anxiety in the Nuclear Age,” <http://www.lamayeshe.com/index.php?sect=article&id=128>.

I’ve been asked to say a few words on the topic of anxiety in the nuclear age. The first thing to observe is that the people who created nuclear energy are now afraid that it will destroy them. Is this realistic or not? First we create a situation; then we’re scared of it. We know that nuclear energy exists and is destructive by nature but that it can also be beneficial and enhance human pleasure. Nevertheless, we’re still anxious and afraid of the harm it might do to us and the following generations. However, there’s no need for fear, worry or anxiety because, first of all, nuclear energy is a reality and secondly, our opinion of what’s going happening is just that—an opinion. It’s not yet a reality; it’s simply a presumption. Perhaps you’ll argue that even though it’s only a presumption, we should still worry. If that’s the case, we should worry about everything. We should be anxious today about what might happen tomorrow. Every day since the world began, somewhere on earth, there has been some kind of natural disaster—flood, electrical storm, forest fire, earthquake, volcanic eruption and death and destruction in general. It’s natural. Nature itself is destructive by nature and has the capacity to do violence. Still, I don’t think you should lose sleep over it; there’s no need for fear, worry or anxiety. I’m not saying that people who are against nuclear energy are bad guys. I, too, feel it is dangerous. But **we** **have to educate the world about its dangers in a peaceful way—one that doesn’t produce emotional reaction and hatred**. I’ve seen many people demonstrating peacefully on TV. Even though they felt strongly about the issues, they were very easygoing. I thought that was wonderful; they understood the importance of getting their message about nuclear danger across peacefully. I was very impressed. But I’m still concerned. My concern is that if we allow ourselves to be anxious and afraid, emotionally disturbed, we’ll only produce more confusion within ourselves. When we’re confused, we spread confused energy to others and the environment. Bringing peace to the world is no small task. We have to take upon ourselves universal responsibility. As individuals, our first responsibility is to guarantee that we ourselves will never harm anybody else’s life, to generate the indestructible resolve that irrespective of the circumstances, “I’m never going touch weapons or kill other human beings.” We must have that kind of determination. If you don’t feel that way yourself, how can you make a big show if telling others to be like that. It’s not realistic. In order to educate others about how harmful and cruel nuclear energy can be, we first have to educate ourselves. So, we shouldn’t worry about the nuclear age because it’s already here. We’re human beings; we created this situation. We lit this fire a long time ago. Of course, the earth has contained nuclear energy since it began, but has taken human intelligence to make it as dangerous as it has become. In Buddhism, we call this karma. Once a situation has manifested, the best thing to do is to accept the fact and deal with it.

### 2NC Framework

#### knowledge should not just be technical but must be connected to internal self-awareness in order for education to retain transformative power.

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>.

The Ghandhian perspective is not foreign to Western philosophy and education. It was the dominant paradigm of Ancient philosophy. For the Greeks and Romans, philosophy did not primarily concern the construction of abstract theoretical systems; philosophy was conceived as a choice of a way of life, a justification for that choice, and the articulation of the path or curriculum leading to the realization of the ideals of that way of life. The focus of philosophy and education was the transformation of one’s life as a mode of Being. As a path, philosophy included sets of spiritual exercises necessary for the transformation of one’s being in accordance with the spiritual vision of the philosophy. Schools were formed out of the chosen way of life of the philosophy and those attracted to the philosophy. In these schools, the way of life defined by the philosophy and the understandings and exercises necessary to live that life were developed, taught, and experienced. Philosophy and inner transformation are linked in such a way that the discovery of the true and the good is contingent upon the transformation of the truth seeker’s being. Education is thus devoted to the internal transformation of the consciousness of the student (Foucault, 2005; Hadot, 1993, 2002; Hadot & Davidson, 1995; Hadot & Marcus, 1998). The necessity of internal transformation was not only pertinent to the search for truth; it had great relevance for morality as well. The moral response to others was thought to be contingent upon the quality of the moral agent’s character. Character was understood as a structure of virtues or capacities that enabled one to morally respond to others. The care of the self was thus thought to be interconnected and interdependent with care for others. However, as Michel Foucault demonstrates, at the beginning of modernity (referred to as the “Cartesian” moment), modern epistemology divorces the true and the good from the subject, resulting in the separation of knowledge and wisdom. Knowledge becomes merely the technical discovery of truth divorced from the subjectivity of the knower; education in turn becomes the transmission of technical knowledge with little or no concern for the internal subjectivity of the student. In addition, care of the self is disconnected from care of others. **In this separation, modern knowledge, ethics, and education lose their transformative power** (Foucault, 2005). The cosmopolitan perspective calls for a reclamation of the ontological perspective of Gandhi and Ancient Western philosophy. If we are to be capable of responding to the inherent value and dignity of all human beings, **we must undergo an internal self-transformation**. The following developmental hypotheses elaborate further the interconnection between a universal duty of moral consideration and internal transformation: 1. “Self-transformation” (i.e., decreased egoic attachment, increased pre-discursive, nonpositional self-awareness, and the realization of the Unity of Being) increases the capacity for empathy and, in turn, compassion. The more self-aware I am, the more I can be aware of the subjectivity of others, and thus, the more empathetic and compassionate I can be. 2. “Self-transformation” increases one’s capacity for tolerance. As egoic attachment decreases, holding on to one’s own truth decreases; openness to falsification and dialogue increases; hearing and understanding the other’s truth increases. One becomes less rigid, decreasing the tendency to impose and thereby increasing one’s capacity for tolerance. 3. “Self-transformation” increases one’s capacity for restraint from doing harm. One gains a more heightened awareness of internal contradiction and disharmony. This awareness prevents one from doing harm and/or withholding charity to others. 4. “Self-transformation” decreases fear. Fear is born of duality, and it drives violence. If valid, these hypotheses can be translated into educational aims focused on internal selftransformation. These aims define the core of a **cosmopolitan education grounded in internal self-transformation**.

## 1NR

### 1NR – CP

#### Institutions like debate are implicated in the violence of ordering. We must reject their conception of federal action in order to understand our role in violence.

Nayar 99

NAYER, 1999 [Jayan, SYMPOSIUM: RE-FRAMING INTERNATIONAL LAW FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: Orders of Inhumanity” Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems Fall, lexis///Ferguson]

Despite the fixation of the beneficiaries of ordered worlds, even the ordered "critic," with the prescribed languages, visions and possibilities of human socialities, other realities of humanity nevertheless persist. Notwithstanding the globalization of social concern and the transnationalization of professionalized critique and reformatory action, struggles against violence remain energized, persistent and located. They are waged through the bodies of lives lived in experiential locations against real instruments of terror, functioning within embodied sites of violence. Non-information and non-representation of the existence of such struggles, and non-learning of the wisdoms thus generated do not negate their truths or the vibrancy of their socialities. n51 "We" are participants in ordered worlds, not merely observers. The choice is whether we wish to recognize our own locations of ordered violence and participate in the struggle to resist their orderings, or whether we wish merely to observe violence in far-off worlds in order that our interventionary participation "out there" never destabilizes the ground upon which we stand. I suggest that we betray the spirit of transformatory struggle, despite all our expressions of support and even actions of professionalized expertise, if our own locations, within which are ordered and from which we ourselves order, remain unscrutinized.

### 1NR - Framework

#### Difficulty outweighs – process is more important that product– multiple philosophical perspectives conclude value is not gained by external goals

Hurka 6 – philosopher who serves as the Jackman Distinguished Chair in Philosophical Studies at the University of Toronto (Thomas, 2006, "Games and the Good," Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume 80, http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~thurka/docs/pass\_games.pdf)

But a good that is not fundamental can nonetheless be paradigmatic, because it gives the clearest possible expression of a certain type of value. If difficult activities are as such good, they 14 must aim at a goal: it is achieving that which is challenging. But their value does not derive from properties of that goal considered in itself, depending instead on features of the process of achieving it. Yet this can be obscured if the goal is independently good, since then the activity, if successful, will be instrumentally good, and this can seem the most important thing about it. If the farmer who works by hand successfully harvests a crop, his work contributes to the vital good of feeding his family, and this can distract us from the value it has in itself. But there is no such danger if the goal is intrinsically valueless, as it most clearly is in games. Since a game’s prelusory goal – getting a ball into a hole in the ground or standing atop a mountain – is intrinsically trivial, the value of playing the game can depend only on facts about the process of achieving that goal. And this point is further emphasized by the lusory attitude, which chooses that process just as a process, since it willingly accepts rules that make achieving the goal harder. Game-playing must have some external goal one aims at, but the specific features of this goal are irrelevant to the activity’s value, which is entirely one of process rather than product, journey rather than destination. This is why playing in games gives the clearest expression of a modern as against an Aristotelian view of value: because modern values are precisely ones of process or journey rather than of the end-state they lead to. The contrary Aristotelian view, which denigrates these values, was expressed most clearly in Aristotle’s division of all activities into the two categories of kinesis and energeia and his subsequent judgements about them.13 An Aristotelian kinesis – often translated as “movement” – is an activity aimed at a goal external to it, as driving to Toronto is aimed at being in Toronto. It is therefore brought to an end by the achievement of that goal, which means that a kinesis can be identified by a grammatical test: if the fact that one has X-ed implies that one is no 15 longer X-ing, as the fact that one has driven to Toronto implies that one is no longer driving there, then X-ing is a kinesis. But the main point is that a kinesis aims at an end-state separate from it. By contrast, an energeia – translated variously as “actuality,” “activity,” or “action” – is not directed at an external goal but has its end internal to it. Contemplation is an energeia, because it does not aim to produce anything beyond itself, as is the state of feeling pleased. And energeiai do not pass the above grammatical test and therefore, unlike kineseis, can be carried on indefinitely: that one has contemplated does not imply that one is not contemplating now or will not continue to do so. Contemplation, like driving to Toronto, is an activity, but it does not aim to produce anything apart from itself. Now, Aristotle held that energeiai are more valuable than kineseis, so the best human activities must be ones that can be carried on continuously, such as contemplation. This is because he assumed that the value of a kinesis must derive from that of its goal, so its value is subordinate and even just instrumental to that of the goal. As he said at the start of the Nicomachean Ethics, “Where there are ends apart from the actions, it is the nature of the products to be better than the activities.”14 But it is characteristic of what I am calling modern values to deny this assumption, and to hold that there are activities that necessarily aim at an external goal but whose value is internal to them in the sense that it depends entirely on features of the process of achieving that goal. Suits cites expressions of this modern view by Kierkegaard, Kant, Schiller, and Georg Simmel,15 but for an especially clear one consider Marx’s view that a central human good is transforming nature through productive labour. This activity necessarily has an external goal – one cannot produce without producing some thing – and in conditions of scarcity this goal will be something vital for humans’ survival or comfort. But Marx held that 16 when scarcity is overcome and humans enter the “realm of freedom” they will still have work as their “prime want,” so they will engage in the process of production for its own sake without any interest in its goal as such. Or consider Nietzsche’s account of human greatness. In an early work he said the one thing “needful” is to “give style to one’s character,” so its elements are unified by “a single taste,” and that it matters less whether this taste is good or bad than whether it is a single taste.16 Later he said the will to power involves not the “multitude and disgregation” of one’s impulses but their coordination under a single predominant impulse.17 In both discussions he deemed activities good if they involve organizing one’s aims around a single goal whatever that goal is. So for both Marx and Nietzsche a central human good was activity that on the one side is necessarily directed to a goal but on the other derives its value entirely from aspects of the process of achieving it. This is why the type of value they affirm is paradigmatically illustrated by playing in games; when one’s goal is trivial, the only value can be that of process. Marx and Nietzsche would never put it this way, but what each valued is in effect playing in games, in Marx’s case the game of material production when there is no longer any instrumental need for it, in Nietzsche’s the game of exercising power just for the sake of doing so.

#### 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

# Round 6 vs. Kansas HM

## 1NC

### **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 –

#### A. 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.

#### B. Neg ground – procurement moves the debate away from “how to motivate action” to just “doing the action” – this guts negative arguments about solvency, DA links, and CP competition based off private sector inducement. The procurement CP should be neg ground

### 1NC - CP

#### The Department of Energy should create a blue ribbon commission to conduct a thorough and transparent cost-benefit analysis of increasing procurement contracts for small modular nuclear reactors deployed in the United States. The commission should include a range of stakeholders and experts. The commission should recommend that the United States federal government implement procurement contracts for small modular nuclear reactors deployed in the United States

#### The CP solves and is a prerequisite to the plan

Parthemore and Rogers, 10 – Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), where she directed the Natural Security Program; and Bacevich Fellow at CNAS (Christine and Will, 5/20 “PARTHEMORE & ROGERS: NUCLEAR REACTORS ON MILITARY BASES MAY BE RISKY.” http://www.cnas.org/node/4502)

Any legislation to consider the option of small nuclear reactors on military bases must include examination of these important concerns. We recommend that this examination should be initially led by a blue ribbon commission, led by the Department of Energy and including relevant DOD officials who have been examining this option. A blue ribbon commission, by conducting a thorough and transparent cost-benefit analysis and examining the interests of all key stakeholders, is a **necessary first step** in determining the viability of small nuclear reactors for federal facilities, and especially for military bases. This commission would need to include a range of stakeholders and experts qualified — and trusted by the public — to design national policies that will address and balance these concerns (even if that entails not going down the path of installing nuclear reactors on military bases at a large scale). Academics, regulators, nuclear scientists, proliferation and waste safety experts, state officials, and the governmental and nongovernmental policy communities should all be represented. It should seek to consider the full expanse of relevant concerns, including what technologies or models are most appropriate, what locations would be ideal or off-limits, where the energy security needs are the highest (for example, at combatant command locations), and along what timeline nuclear generation would even come online. The question of a proper policy approach to the issue of locating small nuclear reactors on bases is heating up, especially as energy and climate change are increasingly important topics of public debate. It is time to set the stage for a national conversation on the most appropriate path for this technology. Ensuring national security interests and a cleaner energy future demands no less.

#### CP avoids politics

Rogers, 10 – the Bacevich Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (Will, 7/29. “DOE and DOD to Explore Nuclear Power on Military Bases Question.” http://www.cnas.org/blogs/naturalsecurity/2010/07/doe-and-dod-explore-nuclear-power-military-bases-question.html)

In an op-ed to Roll Call, Christine and I recommended that the Department of Energy lead a blue ribbon commission charged with conducting a thorough and transparent assessment of integrating nuclear reactors on military bases. The commission, we advocated, would have to include relevant representatives from DOD, academics, regulators, nuclear scientists, proliferation and waste safety experts, state officials, and the governmental and nongovernmental policy communities. And while it’s unclear to what extent the senior-level Executive Committee will examine the issue of siting nuclear reactors on bases, it’s worth repeating that siting nuclear reactors on base is a sensitive issue, one worth approaching cautiously and including all relevant stakeholders from across government –including the federal, state and local level – public utilities commissions, academe, the scientific community and the private sector.

### 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.

#### Expansion of nuclear power directly trades-off with investment in renewables and energy efficiency

**Porritt et al, 12** – founder director of Forum for the Future Forum for the future, chairman of the UK Sustainable Development Commission and author of Capitalism as if the World Matters (Jonathon, 4/27, with Tom Burke, Tony Juniper, Charles Secrett. “Climate Change and Energy Security.” http://www.jonathonporritt.com/sites/default/files/users/BRIEFING%205%20-%20Climate\_and%20energy%20security\_27\_April%202012.pdf)

The costs of nuclear new build are extremely high. UK governments, both Labour and the Coalition Government, have made it clear that money for new nuclear must come from the private sector, and yet, despite promising not to, have then gone on to attract private sector investment, thus committing large amounts of public money not available for other energy supply or demand management options. The scale of both the financial and the political investment required are such that they will crowd out equivalent investment in renewables and energy efficiency. The cost of the new nuclear build that Coalition Governments hopes for is in the region of £50 billion. Since private investors money is to be channelled through energy utilities (either as equity borrowing or simple bank lending), it will come from the same funding pools that other types of energy generation investment would access; part of the opportunity cost of nuclear power is that it will inevitably draw investment away from alternatives. But it’s not just the scale of the investment needed that undermines other possibilities. The massive timescales for bringing nuclear power online are also important - once investment has begun in nuclear, the entirety of the investment must remain in nuclear or be lost. Renewables are much nimbler – if problems occur, the project can be scaled down and still provide some generated energy. Lastly, there is a substantial political opportunity cost. When governments throw their weight behind a particular course of action, they divert resources from all others. In the past decade, UK governments of both parties have established over three dozen taxpayer-funded quangos and agencies to support the nuclear industry. It is inevitable that the pronuclear perspective of these bodies will pervade the thinking of the Civil Service, and of politicians and business investors too. Speaking about Finland’s experience with the disastrous Olkiluoto reactor, Oras Tynkynnen, a former climate policy advisor to the Office of the Finnish Prime Minister, said: “We concentrated so much on nuclear that we lost sight of everything else ... And nuclear has failed to deliver. It has turned out to be a costly gamble for Finland, and for the planet”.

#### Renewables key to solve extinction from warming.

**Jagger, 8** – Chair of the World Future Council (Bianca, 3/6. CQ Congressional Testimony, “RENEWABLE ENERGY,” Lexis.)

"If we go beyond the point where human intervention can no longer stabilise the system, then we precipitate unstoppable runaway climate change. That will set in motion a major extinction event comparable to the five other extinction crises that the earth has previously experienced." I find it deeply mystifying that the vast majority of the media are still not adequately expressing the scale of the danger we face. Professor John Holdren, President of the AAAS, said in August, "We have already passed the stage of dangerous climate change. The task now is to avoid catastrophic climate change." And as George Monbiot, in an article he wrote for the Guardian in July, said: "Unaware of the causes of our good fortune, blissfully detached from their likely termination, we drift into catastrophe." This clearly demonstrates what the World Future Council, the organisation I chair, is advocating. If we are serious about averting climate change catastrophe, we must think in revolutionary terms, and transform our way of life, restoring rather than destroying life on earth. We must embark upon a global renewable energy revolution: if we are to achieve the necessary carbon reduction by 2020, we must replace our carbon- driven economy with a renewable energy economy."

### 1NC – DA

#### Immigration reform will pass --- it’s a top priority.

**Foley and Stein**, **1/2**/2013 (Elise and Sam, Obama’s Immigration Reform To Begin This Month, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>)

Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda. An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit. With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished. "The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill." It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push. Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

#### DoD clean energy policies 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.**

#### Capital is key --- it bridges support from both parties.

Dallas Morning News, **1/2**/2012 (Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge, p. <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece>)

The president’s words to NBC’s David Gregory are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task this year. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill, either. And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans. In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But the leadership that matters most will come from the White House. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count. HE SAID IT … “I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. I will introduce legislation in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.” President Barack Obama, in an interview on Meet the Press Sunday

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

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

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

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 1NC – DA

#### Electricity prices are declining in the status quo

**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.

#### But, 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

Perry 7/31/12 (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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Forward presence doesn’t change the calculation for war

**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.

Heg causes terrorism – US presence in the Middle East and 9/11 proves

**Layne 9** (Christopher, 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, literary and national editor of the Atlantic, Review of International Studies (2009), 5/25/9, “America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq: the moment for offshore balancing has arrived”, Cambridge Journals)

Terrorist organisations like Al-Qaeda are non-state actors, and as such, they are not, strictly speaking, engaged in ‘balancing’ the US (because balancing is a form of state behaviour). Yet, at the same time, the actions of groups like Al-Qaeda reflect some of the key attributes of balancing. After all, beyond connoting the idea of counterweight, balancing also signifies opposition, or resistance, to a hegemon. Terrorists may not be able to balance against the US, but they can engage in a related form of activity aimed at undermining American primacy by raising its costs. Organisations like Al-Qaeda may be non-state actors, but their actions are of a kind frequently found in international politics: the use of violence against a state(s) to attain clearly defined political objectives. Indeed the use of violence for such purposes is the hallmark of terrorism. As Bruce Hoffman says, terrorism is ‘about power: the pursuit of power, the acquisition of power, and the use of power to achieve political change’.38 Terrorism, moreover, is fundamentally an asymmetric form of conflict, because it is an instrument that the weak use against the strong.39 From this perspective, the 9/11 assault on the US was not a random, senseless, ‘irrational’ act of violence. In fact, the 9/11 attack was in keeping with the Clausewitzian paradigm of war: force was used against the US by its adversaries to advance their political objectives. As German military strategist Carl von Clausewitz himself observed, ‘War is not an act of senseless passion but is controlled by its political object’.40 Here, President Bush’s endlessly reiterated claim that the US was attacked because Islamic radicals ‘hate us because of our freedom’ betrayed a complete misunderstanding of the dynamics that underpin the clash between the US and Middle Eastern terrorists. For sure, there are Islamic radicals who, indeed, do hate the US for cultural, religious, and ideological reasons. But that is not why the US is a target for Islamic terrorists. 9/11 represented a violent counterreaction to America’s policies in the Middle East – especially its drive to dominate the region both geopolitically and culturally. As Michael Schuerer – who headed the CIA analytical team monitoring Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda – says, it is dangerous for the US to base its strategy for combating terrorism on the belief ‘that Muslims hate and attack us for what we are and think rather than for what we do’.41 In a similar vein, Richard K. Betts observed following the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center that, ‘It is hardly likely that Middle Eastern radicals would be hatching schemes like the destruction of the World Trade Center if the US had not been identified so long as the mainstay of Israel, the Shah of Iran, and conservative Arab regimes and the source of a cultural assault on Islam’.42 It is the US’ attempt to impose its primacy and preferences on the Middle East that fuels groups like Al-Qaeda and fans Islamic fundamental- ism. Terrorism is a form of ‘blowback’ against America’s preponderant role in international affairs. Despicable and brutal though it was, the 9/11 attack was undertaken with cool calculation to achieve well-defined geopolitical objectives. Underscoring this point, Scheurer observes that, ‘In the context of ideas bin Laden shares with his brethren, the military actions of Al-Qaeda and its allies are acts of war, not terrorism . . . meant to advance bin Laden’s clear, focused, limited, and widely popular foreign policy goals . . .’.43 Specifically, Al-Qaeda wants to compel the US to remove its military presence from the Persian Gulf, and force Washington to alter its stance on the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.44 Al-Qaeda’s leaders also apparently hoped that the September 11 attacks would provoke a US overreaction, and thereby trigger an upsurge of popular discontent in the Islamic world that would lead to the overthrow of the Saudi monarchy and other pro-American regimes in the Middle East (Egypt, Pakistan, and Jordan, for example) and their replacement by fundamentalist Islamic governments.45 In other words, Al-Qaeda seeks to undermine US primacy, and thereby compel changes in America’s Middle Eastern grand strategy. The US presence on the ground in the Middle East also incites terrorists to attack American interests. In his study of suicide terrorist groups, Pape has found that ‘what nearly all suicide terrorist attacks have in common is a specific secular and strategic goal: to compel modern democracies to withdraw military forces from territory that the terrorists consider to be their homeland’.46 Al-Qaeda fits this pattern, and one of its principal objectives ‘is the expulsion of American troops from the Persian Gulf and the reduction of Washington’s power in the region’.47 Here, the Bush adminis- tration’s inflexible determination to maintain a long-term American military presence in Iraq is exactly the wrong policy to reduce terrorism. The Bush administration, of course, claimed that the US is fighting terrorism in Iraq. To make this point, it has grossly exaggerated the links between the insurgent group Al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) and Osama Bin Laden’s Al-Qaeda organisation and, hence – in a blatant prevarication – tied AQI and the war in Iraq to 9/11.48 Bush repeatedly asserted that, in Iraq the US is fighting the same terrorists who attacked the US on 9/11. Of course, this claim overlooked the fact that AQI came into existence only after the March 2003 US invasion of Iraq, and that its links with Bin Laden’s Al-Qaeda are, at best, tenuous. The Bush administration’s deliberate fabrications were designed to win Congressional and public support for a prolonged ‘surge’.49 When it first announced the surge, the administration said it would last through 2007. Instead it lasted well into 2008, and it is likely that there will be more US forces in Iraq in January 2009 than there were prior to the surge. And, even when the surge itself has ended, any draw-down of US forces will take place gradually.50 General David Petraeus, who served as senior American commander in Iraq during the surge and now heads CENTCOM (the US military command with overall responsibility for the Middle East) has repeatedly emphasised that the US commit- ment to Iraq is long-term in nature, and American military planners are preparing for a long-lasting ‘post-occupation’ US presence there.51 In fact, it is clear that the Bush administration never intended to withdraw from Iraq militarily and aimed for the US to retain permanent US military bases there. President Bush all but confirmed this in May 2007 when he said that he wanted the US to play the same kind of role in Iraq that it has in South Korea since the end of the Korean War.52 What will happen under the new US administration is unclear. During 2008, the government of Iraqi Nouri al-Maliki indicated that Baghdad wanted to set a timeline for US troop withdrawals. The Iraqi government refused to accede to the Bush administration’s desire to negotiate a long-term security agreement that would allow the US to maintain permanent bases in Iraq. Although the Bush administration had strongly opposed any suggestions that there should be a fixed timetable for US withdrawal from Iraq in July 2008, Bush’s position seemed to soften and the administration said the US would support a ‘time horizon’ for US troop withdrawals from Iraq as an ‘aspirational goal’.53 What the new US admin- istration will do about the US presence in Iraq is an open question, but based on the positions taken by Senator Barak Obama (D. Ill.) and Senator John McCain (R. Ariz.) during the 2008 US presidential campaign, it seems certain that there will be a significant American military presence in Iraq for some time to come. Instead of reducing American vulnerability to terrorism, the presence of US troops in Iraq and the Middle East increases it by reinforcing the widespread perception in the Islamic world that the US is pursuing a neo-colonial policy in the Middle East in furtherance of its own imperial ambitions. The huge US politico-military footprint in the Middle East region – including Iraq – is, along with America’s policy on the Israel/Palestinian issue, the primary driver of Middle Eastern terrorism. The admin- istration’s overall policy in the Middle East has inflamed anti-American sentiment, and turned the entire region into a source of recruits for various radical terrorist groups. Instead of solving this problem, staying in Iraq will exacerbate it.

Global nuclear war

**Ayson 10 (**Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 (Robert,“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a **massive exchange** of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a **catalytic nuclear war** **between the superpowers** started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) **suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors.** Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and **confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack,** the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, **on a higher stage of alert.** In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response.

### 1NC – Prolif

#### 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

#### Nuclear’s not inevitable –

#### A. Fukushima

**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.)

The total meltdown in March 2011 of three units of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station placed international energy policy at a crossroads and will have a paradigm-shifting impact on the future of nuclear energy. We have seen that planned global expansion of nuclear energy remains considerably slower than its own targets and expectations. The reasons why a renaissance of nuclear power has not materialized include not only lack of industrial and production capacities and shortages of technical experts in the nuclear power industry, but above all constantly rising costs for the construction of nuclear power plants and associated financing problems. The assertion that nuclear power plants help combat climate change also turns out to be spurious upon examining the life cycle of nuclear power plants. In weighing the pros and cons, it must always be kept in mind that military and civil use of nuclear power are intrinsically linked to one another like Siamese twins. This is why the danger of proliferation and vulnerability to terrorist attacks has taken on a greater importance as an argument against civilian nuclear energy in democratic societies. The global renaissance of nuclear energy hailed for decades has failed to materialise and following the nuclear disaster in Japan it has become even more unlikely that nuclear energy will play an important role in global energy production over the long term. On the contrary: since Fukushima there have been more or less clear signs of rethinking on the parts of governments in a number of countries—including Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, China and now even Japan—indicating that they are considering accelerating fundamental changes in energy policy. Especially the phase-out of nuclear power chosen by the influential EU member state Germany could have an impact on Europe as a whole, as EU Energy Commissioner Oettinger expects: the nuclear disaster in Japan faces us with the challenge of deciding “how Europe is to secure its energy needs in the foreseeable future without nuclear power”. Other countries like Russia, the Czech Republic or France, on the other hand, have announced that they intend to carry on expanding nuclear power. This raises the question as to what impact the events in Japan will have on civil use of atomic power and the future energy matrix over the medium term. Because Japan and Germany—the third and fourth largest economies in the world—have decided to phase out nuclear energy and increasingly base future growth on renewable energies and energy efficiency, this inevitably poses a question to the rest of the world: If Japan and Germany don't need nuclear power, why does anyone?

#### B. Natural gas prices

**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."

#### 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.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### 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.

#### DoD won’t apply for NRC exemptions – that guts solvency and delays the project by 10 years

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)

The most basic licensing issue relates to whether NRC will have jurisdiction over potential nuclear reactor sites or whether DoD could be self-regulating. Our conversations with NRC indicate it is the only possible licensing authority for reactors that supply power to the commercial grid. However, DOE and DoD are authorized to regulate mission critical nuclear facilities under Section 91b of the Atomic Energy Act. There is some historical precedent for DoD exercising this authority. For example, the Army Nuclear Program was granted exception under this rule with regard to the reactor that operated aboard the Sturgis barge in the 1960s and 1970s [44]. It seems unlikely that DoD would pursue exemption under Section 91b in the future. 10 Regulating power plants is a function that lies beyond DoD's core mission. The Department and the military services are unlikely to have personnel with sufficient expertise to act as regulators for nuclear power plants, and it could take considerable time and resources to develop such expertise. Without NRC oversight DoD would bear all associated risks. The time required to obtain design certification, license, and build the next generation of nuclear plants is about 9 to 10 years. After the first plants are built it may be possible to reduce the time required for licensing and construction to approximately 6 years [45]. The timeline for certification, licensing, and construction projected by DOE for a small nuclear power plant based on an SMR is shown in figure 5 [46].

#### **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

#### SMR’s overstretch the NRC

Rysavy 9 (Charles F., Partner with K&L Gates LLP, Practiced for 20 years, “Small Modular Reactors”)

Regulatory resources present one of the greatest challenges to a robust SMR program in the U.S. The NRC Office of New Reactors, which is already working on the licensing of a number of large-scale reactors, is already over-burdened and will need to make resource adjustments to handle SMR applications. See, NRC Public Meeting, Meeting Slides–NRC (discussing the resource priorities of the Office of New Reactors). The NRC has already begun pre-application discussions with a number of SMR companies, but it is likely that SMRs will take a back seat to large-scale plants for the time being. Id. The Department of Energy has a unique and possibly essential role in overcoming this challenge. Encouragingly, DOE has stated that it intends to support the industry’s efforts to bring SMRs to domestic markets (NRC Public Meeting, Meeting Slides–DOE). Included among DOE’s proposed programs is a cost-share partnership for first-of- a-kind SMR design and licensing that may be initiated as early as 2011 (NRC Public Meeting, Meeting Slides–DOE). DOE also intends to work with NRC and the industry to evaluate unique licensing issues for SMRs, and to work on enhancing the regulatory framework and licensing process with the NRC (NRC Public Meeting, Meeting Slides–DOE).

#### takes out the case – causes interminable licensing delays

Weaver 7 (Lynn, President Emirtus of Florida Intsitute of Technology, “Fund NRC Nuclear Power Licensing” )

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has alerted several utilities that license reviews would be delayed at least a year. With all the concern in Congress over global warming, one might think that an increase in the number of nuclear power plants in the United States is inevitable, both to satisfy energy demands and to counter greenhouse-gas emissions. But that, of course, would be wrong. There are about 100 nuclear plants in the United States and they account for about 75 percent of our country's emission-free electricity. Utilities are preparing to build another 33 plants, including two in Florida. These would be the first reactors to be built in this country in many years, and federal and state energy officials agree that it won't be possible to reduce U.S. greenhouse emissions without them. But it now appears that electric utilities might not be able to obtain licenses anytime soon to build new nuclear plants. The reason for the licensing delay is simple-and-straightforward: a critical shortage of manpower at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission - which is expected to become acute within a year. The NRC knows that it needs to expand its workforce, because it's facing a flood of regulatory reviews for new nuclear plants and existing plants that are seeking a renewal of their operating licenses. But it doesn't have the money.

## 2NC

### XT – Avoids Politics

#### Using a Blue Ribbon Commission forges political consensus

Bingaman, 12 – U.S. Senator from New Mexico (Jeff, 2/2. “Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future.” http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/democratic-news?ID=f9af4c4c-18f3-4882-a6da-b7de39bad2d4)

“The Committee meets this morning to hear about the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on nuclear waste. We’re very honored that Congressman Lee Hamilton and General Brent Scowcroft, the co-chairs, are here, as well as our friend and former chairman, Senator Domenici. “The two chairmen—and indeed, the entire 15-member Commission—are to be commended for their work. They were asked to look into a problem that has resisted solution, that remains highly controversial, and that everyone agrees must be solved. They did their job openly and thoroughly, they stayed focused on the tasks that were assigned to them, and they produced a solid and eminently sensible report. They have presented us with eight clear, concise and straightforward recommendations. “Now comes the difficult part. Implementing the Commission’s recommendations obviously will require legislation. It will be up to Congress to absorb these Commission recommendations, to translate them into legislation and to forge the political consensus needed to enact a bill into law.

#### Commissions result in the plan and shield political blame

Tama 11 (Jordan, Assistant Professor of International Relations – American University, “In Defense of Blue-Ribbon Commissions,” Democracy: A Journal of Ideas, 4-20, http://www.democracyjournal.org/arguments/2011/04/in-defense-of-blue-ribbon-commissions.php)

Progressive opposition to Bowles-Simpson is part of a long tradition of skepticism about the very idea of blue-ribbon commissions. Ironically, commissions first became widely used in American politics during the Progressive Era a century ago, when presidents like Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson saw them as useful devices for figuring out how to regulate the economy and address social problems. But in modern politics the common response among progressives is the derisive snort. The conventional wisdom about commissions is quite cynical: They are little more than tools for elected officials to deflect political pressure, and they do not lead to reform. But my research on over 50 blue-ribbon commissions that have examined national security issues reveals that commissions actually have a record of results. To give just a few examples, the reports of commissions hastened President Reagan’s decision to withdraw U.S. troops from Lebanon in 1983, spurred the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the most important intelligence reform of recent decades, and provided the blueprint for then-presidential candidate Barack Obama’s plan for winding down the Iraq war. Contrary to the prevailing view, blue-ribbon commissions are a valuable tool for forging the kind of bipartisan agreements necessary to preserve and improve cherished government programs, while addressing serious problems like our out-of-control debt. The changes proposed by commissions will rarely leave progressives fully satisfied, but they typically represent the best available deal and advance important progressive goals. For instance, if the Bowles-Simpson commission proposals were enacted into law, military spending would be cut sharply, new money would be devoted to research and development and boosting college graduation rates, taxes would be raised with the greatest new burden falling on the wealthy, and the Social Security tax and benefit formulas would become more progressive. These would be major achievements, and they can be accomplished only with the help of a bipartisan plan that also includes elements, such as overall spending cuts, that appeal to some Republicans. Commissions can have this large impact because of their distinct political credibility, which stems from their independence from the permanent institutions of government, the stature of their members, and—in particular—their bipartisanship. Commissions are almost always politically diverse, yet their members, unlike most elected Republicans and Democrats, often manage to reach agreement by engaging in real deliberation and finding common ground, rather than scoring political points. (Two-thirds of the commissions I researched issued unanimous final reports.) The resulting compromises are rarely fully satisfactory to any one group, but they frequently represent the most politically realistic set of solutions, and their credibility on both sides of the aisle often makes them the focal point for legislative efforts. Progressives do not have—and are unlikely to have in the foreseeable future—enough votes in Congress to pass legislation simply by sticking to our guns. We need support from centrist Democrats and Republicans to achieve any progressive legislative goals, and commissions can be allies, rather than enemies, in this effort. In his speech last week, Obama, like a majority on the Bowles-Simpson commission, called for a combination of spending cuts and tax increases to shrink the debt over the next decade—an acknowledgement of our fiscal reality. In times of divided government, like now, it is difficult to enact presidential priorities, and compromise with members of the opposing party is essential to get anything done. This is why blue-ribbon commissions can be so valuable. Progressives should see commissions as tools for effective governance, especially in a time when many conservatives seem intent on not governing at all. We still need to govern, and any institutions that reinforce the idea of responsible, sober governance need our support. Commissions cannot reverse the dismal trends of government bashing and severe ideological polarization, but they can help mitigate them—and move our country forward by facilitating bipartisan agreement on pressing challenges.

### A2: BRC Recommendations Won’t Be Implemented

#### First – the aff’s solvency evidence is a reason the recommendations would be implemented – if it’s actually a good idea, concerns will be resolved

#### Congress and Obama support BRC recommendations

Helman, 12 – Forbes staff (Christopher, 1/26. “Obama's Nuclear Commission Issues Final Report, Urges Immediate Action On Atomic Waste.” http://www.forbes.com/sites/christopherhelman/2012/01/26/obamas-nuclear-commission-issues-final-report-urges-immediate-action-on-atomic-waste/)

These recommendations, along with others from the Blue Ribbon Commission that address energy and research, outline an optimistic path forward for an essential industry that will be a significant part of our energy mix well into the future. Congress and the Administration should support them. From rumblings on the Hill, it sounds like that support will grow on both sides of the aisle.

#### BRC recommendations result in implementing legislation

Inside EPA Weekly Report, 12 (9/21, “KEY SENATE PANELS FACE TURF BATTLE OVER NUCLEAR WASTE LEGISLATION NEXT YEAR.” Vol. 33 No. 38, Lexis.)

Bingaman Aug. 1 introduced S. 3469, which seeks to implement the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) on America's Nuclear Future, formed at the request of President Obama in the wake of his decision to cancel moving forward with Yucca Mountain, NV, as a permanent repository for spent nuclear fuel. The bill is available on InsideEPA.com. (Doc. ID: 2410156) The bill generally tracks with the BRC's recommendations, with the legislation proposing to establish an independent federal agency to manage nuclear waste disposal, create a consensus process for siting nuclear waste facilities and ensure sufficient funding for managing nuclear waste, according to Bingaman.

### 2NC A2: Perm – Do CP

#### Specifically severs “should” which means – “create a binding requirement for” – the CP doesn’t do that

Summer, ’94 (Justice, Oklahoma Supreme Court, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14)

[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn13) "*Should*" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with *ought* but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, [802 P.2d 813](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=802&box2=P.2D&box3=813) (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) *In praesenti* means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is *presently* or *immediately effective*, as opposed to something that *will* or *would* become effective *in the future [in futurol*]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

### Grid Safe Now 2NC

#### Grids resilient – backup solves

Wood 12 -- Senior Communications Advisor at Business Roundtable (Carter, 8/2/12, "The grid: After India, America? No, but still…" http://businessroundtable.org/blog/the-grid-after-india-america-no-but-still/)

A blackout of such scale could not happen in the United States. For one thing, we don't have 600 million people. And America's electrical grid is certainly much more resilient than the one in India, a still-developing country with ineffective governments. Still, as The Washington Post reports today, "Aging power grid on overload as U.S. demands more electricity." At CNBC, Jim Cramer asked Thomas F. Farrell II, Chairman, President & CEO of Dominion Resources, about India. Could the same thing happen in the United States? Farrell responded: Our system has a lot more rigor to it and partly because we have reserve margins, meaning we have more power stations than we need to run at any particular moment in time, so that if a power station goes out, there's a back-up to help keep the grid stable. They don't have that much excess power in India, and when they get to the root cause, they'll probably find that was somewhere in there.

#### New tech solves

Lamonica 12 -- senior writer covering green tech and cutting-edge technologies, contributor @ Technology Review (Martin, 8/2/12, "Outage in India Could Be a Harbinger for the Rest of the World," http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428685/outage-in-india-could-be-a-harbinger-for-the-rest/)

The primary function of grid operators is to anticipate load and to maintain a steady balance between power supply and demand. The grid signal operates at a set frequency—60 hertz in the U.S. and 50 hertz in India—and when supply and demand fall out of sync, the frequency will either dip or rise. In the U.S., grid operators have "hot" generators on standby to ramp up power in order to keep a close-to-steady frequency, but that's not the case when generators are routinely maxed out. "In a developing world country, it's tough to keep 10 percent of the generation capacity on contingency when you may use it once in a lifetime," Mansoor says. "You're not using the generator, but you still pay for it. That's tough to do." More technologies to keep that frequency steady are emerging. Sensors called phasor measurement units are designed for real-time measurement of grid frequency, and can flag potential problems. Grid operators in the United States are increasingly using automation to manage demand-response programs that lower consumption at big power users at peak times. These types of technologies as well as microgrids (see "Microgrids Keeps the Power Local, Cheap, and Reliable") stand to make electricity grids more reliable as more renewable resources come online and weather-related events, such as heat waves, strain generating resources.

#### Microgrid Funding Now

SNL 12 (Sandia National Labs, Sandia National Laboratories is a multi-program laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Lockheed Martin company, for the U.S. Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration, “SPIDERS microgrid project secures military installations,” 2-22-12,

https://share.sandia.gov/news/resources/news\_releases/spiders/)

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. – When the lights go out, most of us find flashlights, dig out board games and wait for the power to come back. But that’s not an option for hospitals and military installations, where lives are on the line. Power outages can have disastrous consequences for such critical organizations, and it’s especially unsettling that they rely on the nation’s aging, fragile and fossil-fuel dependent grid.

A three-phase, $30 million, multi-agency project known as SPIDERS, or the Smart Power Infrastructure Demonstration for Energy Reliability and Security, is focused on lessening those risks by building smarter, more secure and robust microgrids that incorporate renewable energy sources. Sandia was selected as the lead designer for SPIDERS, the first major project under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Department of Defense (DoD) to accelerate joint innovations in clean energy and national energy security. The effort builds on Sandia’s decade of experience with microgrids – localized, closed-circuit grids that both generate and consume power – that can be run connected to or independent of the larger utility grid. The goal for SPIDERS microgrid technology is to provide secure control of on-base generation.

### AT: Intervention Inevitable

#### 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 United States 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 United States 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 – Heg defense

#### 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.

## 1NR

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### A. Time frame - Indo-Pak war is coming now – takes out their impact defense

Hussain 11 [Dr. Akmal Hussain 11, The Express Tribune, “Pakistan’s water crisis”, 8-25, <http://tribune.com.pk/story/231905/pakistans-water-crisis/>]

A water crisis is emerging which could have major implications for Pakistan’s economy and society. Effective management of this crisis first requires urgent mitigation and adaptation measures with close cooperation amongst Pakistan’s provinces of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, Punjab and Sindh on the one hand and then between Pakistan and India on the other. If the necessary collaboration for cooperative management of the Indus basin water resources is not undertaken expeditiously, the resultant economic crisis could lead to a war with India.¶ The problem of water scarcity in the Indus basin is predicated partly on the inherent limitations of water supply in the Indus River System and partly on the growing water demand associated with inefficient water use in the process of economic and population growth. Unsustainable development practices have exacerbated the problem with intrusion of salinity into the ground water, contamination of aquifers with harmful chemicals such as fluoride and arsenic and pollution of surface water due to lack of an institutional framework for environmentally safe disposal of urban and industrial waste. An important dimension of the water issue in the years ahead is the phenomenon of climate change, which could take the crisis to a critical level.¶ Water scarcity can be measured by the availability of water compared with the generally accepted minimum per capita requirement of 1,700 cubic metres per person per year. In their book, Freshwater Under Threat: South Asia, Mukand S Babel and Shahriar M Wahid have estimated that the per capita availability of water in the Indus basin is 1,329 cubic metres per capita per year. This is significantly below the threshold requirement. Another interesting indicator of the water problem is the measure of development pressure on water resources, which is the percentage of available water supply relative to the total water resources. This ratio is as high as 89 per cent for the Indus basin compared to only 15 per cent for the Ganges-Brahmaputra-Meghna (GBM) basin. This indicates the relatively greater development pressure on the Indus basin.¶ Worse, the utilisation of water for production is also highly inefficient by global standards. Water use efficiency is measured in terms of the GDP per unit of water used. In the case of the five top food producers in the world (Brazil, China, France, Mexico and the US) the water use efficiency is $23.8 per cubic metre. The figure is as low as $3.34 for the Indus basin.¶ The problem of water scarcity is expected to become more acute in the future due to the adverse impact of climate change. Dr Leena Srivastava, in a recent research paper, provides evidence to show that some of the Himalayan glaciers are melting more rapidly than the global average and this could increase the frequency of floods in the short run and increase water shortages in the long term by reducing river flows in South Asia. Furthermore, according to the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report, given the sensitivity of existing seeds to heat, global warming could result in a 30 per cent reduction in the yield per acre of food crops in South Asia.¶ Science and empirical evidence make clear that existing water scarcity, when combined with the impact of climate change, could place critical stress on the economy and society of Pakistan in particular and South Asia in general: major food shortages, increased frequency of natural disasters, large scale dislocations of population and destabilising contention between upper and lower riparian regions.¶ Effective management of this crisis in Pakistan requires close cooperation with India in joint watershed management, increasing the efficiency of irrigation and water use, joint development of technologies, sustainable agriculture practices and institutional arrangements to manage food shortages as well as natural disasters. When faced with a common threat, ideology must be replaced by rationality in the conduct of governance. If we fail to do so, natural disasters could trigger the man-made catastrophe of war.

#### B. Magnitude – it’s an existential risk

Chaffin 11 [Greg Chaffin 11, Research Assistant at Foreign Policy in Focus, July 8, 2011, “Reorienting U.S. Security Strategy in South Asia,” online: <http://www.fpif.org/articles/reorienting_us_security_strategy_in_south_asia>]

The greatest threat to regional security (although curiously not at the top of most lists of U.S. regional concerns) is the possibility that increased India-Pakistan tension will erupt into all-out war that could quickly escalate into a nuclear exchange. Indeed, in just the past two decades, the two neighbors have come perilously close to war on several occasions. India and Pakistan remain the most likely belligerents in the world to engage in nuclear war. ¶ Due to an Indian preponderance of conventional forces, Pakistan would have a strong incentive to use its nuclear arsenal very early on before a routing of its military installations and weaker conventional forces. In the event of conflict, Pakistan’s only chance of survival would be the early use of its nuclear arsenal to inflict unacceptable damage to Indian military and (much more likely) civilian targets. By raising the stakes to unacceptable levels, Pakistan would hope that India would step away from the brink. However, it is equally likely that India would respond in kind, with escalation ensuing. Neither state possesses tactical nuclear weapons, but both possess scores of city-sized bombs like those used on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. ¶ Furthermore, as more damage was inflicted (or as the result of a decapitating strike), command and control elements would be disabled, leaving individual commanders to respond in an environment increasingly clouded by the fog of war and decreasing the likelihood that either government (what would be left of them) would be able to guarantee that their forces would follow a negotiated settlement or phased reduction in hostilities. As a result any such conflict would likely continue to escalate until one side incurred an unacceptable or wholly debilitating level of injury or exhausted its nuclear arsenal. ¶ A nuclear conflict in the subcontinent would have disastrous effects on the world as a whole. In a January 2010 paper published in Scientific American, climatology professors Alan Robock and Owen Brian Toon forecast the global repercussions of a regional nuclear war. Their results are strikingly similar to those of studies conducted in 1980 that conclude that a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union would result in a catastrophic and prolonged nuclear winter, which could very well place the survival of the human race in jeopardy. In their study, Robock and Toon use computer models to simulate the effect of a nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan in which each were to use roughly half their existing arsenals (50 apiece). Since Indian and Pakistani nuclear devices are strategic rather than tactical, the likely targets would be major population centers. Owing to the population densities of urban centers in both nations, the number of direct casualties could climb as high as 20 million. ¶ The fallout of such an exchange would not merely be limited to the immediate area. First, the detonation of a large number of nuclear devices would propel as much as seven million metric tons of ash, soot, smoke, and debris as high as the lower stratosphere. Owing to their small size (less than a tenth of a micron) and a lack of precipitation at this altitude, ash particles would remain aloft for as long as a decade, during which time the world would remain perpetually overcast. Furthermore, these particles would soak up heat from the sun, generating intense heat in the upper atmosphere that would severely damage the earth’s ozone layer. The inability of sunlight to penetrate through the smoke and dust would lead to global cooling by as much as 2.3 degrees Fahrenheit. This shift in global temperature would lead to more drought, worldwide food shortages, and widespread political upheaval.¶ Although the likelihood of this doomsday scenario remains relatively low, the consequences are dire enough to warrant greater U.S. and international attention. Furthermore, due to the ongoing conflict over Kashmir and the deep animus held between India and Pakistan, it might not take much to set them off. Indeed, following the successful U.S. raid on bin Laden’s compound, several members of India’s security apparatus along with conservative politicians have argued that India should emulate the SEAL Team Six raid and launch their own cross-border incursions to nab or kill anti-Indian terrorists, either preemptively or after the fact. Such provocative action could very well lead to all-out war between the two that could quickly escalate.

#### Immigration reform has momentum and a compromise is likely.

**Grant**, **12/28**/2012 (David, Immigration reform: Is 'amnesty' a possibility now?, Christian Science Monitor, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/1228/Immigration-reform-Is-amnesty-a-possibility-now>)

The momentum of President Obama's resounding victory in November's election – with a big push from Latinos and other minority groups – has catapulted immigration policy to the top of Washington's 2013 agenda, making reform not only possible but also likely. The shift in the political conversation has been so dramatic that even a pathway to citizenship for some of the estimated 12 million undocumented immigrants in the United States – long rejected out of hand by most Republicans and some Democrats – could be part of the deal. The task is momentous. It involves weighing the wishes of industries from agriculture to high-tech, as well as the sensitivities of opening the door to immigrant workers at a time when unemployment remains high. The past only reinforces the potential difficulties ahead. In 1986, Republicans felt betrayed when Democrats stripped the enforcement provisions from a bill that offered citizenship to some 3 million illegal immigrants. By 2005, the issue had become so politically toxic to conservatives that they blocked President George W. Bush's push for a new round of immigration reform. Yet with Election 2012 highlighting the electoral consequences of America's changing demographics, the next year appears to be ripe for compromise. How reforms might take shape could be a major point of contention between the parties, but lawmakers on both sides suddenly see an opportunity for what could be their most expansive achievement of 2013.

#### It will pass --- capital is key.

Financial Times, **1/2**/2013 (Fiscal fights threaten US policy goals, p. <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/8f8ef804-5501-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html?ftcamp=published_links%2Frss%2Fworld%2Ffeed%2F%2Fproduct#axzz2GrNoEPIS>)

Of all the issues crowding Mr Obama’s agenda, immigration has the best hope of passing in some form, as the disastrous vote recorded by Republicans among minorities in 2012 gives them a huge incentive to address the issue. But on everything else, with the Republicans remaining in control of the House, Mr Obama needs all the skills of cajoling, seducing and manipulating Congress that he has so far shown no signs of developing. “I find it remarkable that the president apparently continues to believe that he will not have to deal with people that he does not agree with,” said Mr Galston. “A president who is not disdainful of the art of legislating can get things done.”

#### GOP support ensures passage, takes out their tea party uniq argument

Financial Times, **1/2**/2013 (White House builds immigration pact, p. <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/e6b2805c-4ac9-11e2-929d-00144feab49a.html#axzz2GrNoEPIS>)

As they try to avoid further alienating the US’s fastest growing demographic, Republicans are eager to deal with the issue of immigration reform and get it off the table before the 2014 midterm elections. That could help its passage through Congress and help repair relations following Mr Romney’s presidential bid. “This was a big mistake from the start of the Republican primaries, when the candidates had very ugly positions and antagonised Latinos,” said Alfonso Aguilar, executive director of the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles and an influential Republican voice on immigration. “Now we’ve got to get back to the principles of George W. Bush and reclaim this issue,” he said, referring to the former president’s relatively open approach to immigration. In a Latino Decisions poll taken on the eve of the election, 31 per cent said they would be more likely to vote Republican if the Republican party took a leadership role in supporting comprehensive immigration reform with an eventual pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

#### Prominent tea party members and conservatives provide cover for support.

**Grant**, **12/28**/2012 (David, Immigration reform: Is 'amnesty' a possibility now?, Christian Science Monitor, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/1228/Immigration-reform-Is-amnesty-a-possibility-now>)

Two tea party superstars – Senators Rubio and Lee, both of whom knocked out establishment Republican figures to win their seats – are going to be key players in any reform. In the House, the involvement of House Judiciary chairman Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R) of Virginia and Representative Labrador of Idaho can provide cover to conservative lawmakers from the party's right flank. "The fact that you're going to have strong conservative voices helping lead this debate is going to be critical to solving it instead of using it as a political wedge," says Rep. Steve Scalise (R) of Louisiana, incoming chairman of the Republican Study Committee, the largest and most conservative caucus in the House.

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.

#### Immigration reform is at the top of the docket.

**Estes**, **1/2**/2013 (Adam Clark, Obama’s Push for Immigration Reform Starts Now, p. http://www.theatlanticwire.com/politics/2013/01/obamas-push-immigration-reform-starts-now/60525/)

Everybody knew that Obama was going to tackle immigration reform in his second term. We just didn't know how soon. Well, the word is out, and it's good news for anybody eager for lawmakers to tackle an issue that's troubled the country for years. Obama will take on immigration reform this month. A fresh report from The Huffington Post's Elise Foley and Sam Stein quotes anonymous administration officials and Democratic aides in explaining that the president is going to move fast on immigration reform, as well as gun control, and advocates couldn't be happier. None of this is a tremendous surprise, though the expedited timeline is sort of curious. Obama's been talking about sweeping immigration since he took office and, at least until 2009, has left many guessing if and when that's going to happen. He made progress last year when he kept 800,000 young people who had been brought to the United States illegally as children from being deported, making a DREAM Act-like policy initiative as the DREAM Act itself floundered in Congress. Immigration remained an issue through the election, and almost as soon as Obama won his second term, whispers of a renewed push for immigration reform started, though the White House vowed to deal with the fiscal cliff first. Obama then reiterated his commitment to tackle immigration soon on his Meet the Press appearance last weekend. With a fiscal cliff deal (sort of) sealed, it would appear it's immigration time, and details about how the president will handle the challenge are trickling out. Stein and Foley say that California congresswoman Zoe Lofgren will lead the Democratic effort in the House and pushes back at the idea that House Speaker John Boehner will be able to stonewall the effort. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker Boehner wants to do it or not," she said. Democrats will inevitably have to navigate more than Boehner's will, but some say that the challenge of the fiscal cliff has Capitol Hill ready for some easier negotiations. Or as one pro-immigration reform executive told HuffPost, "The chance to legislate through regular order on immigration reform might have leaders in both parties working together and singing 'Kumbaya.'"

#### Immigration is before economic issues.

**York**, **1/2**/2013 (Byron, For Obama, the Economy Never Comes First, Town Hall, p. http://townhall.com/columnists/byronyork/2013/01/02/for-obama-the-economy-never-comes-first-n1477781)

Many Republicans have accused Barack Obama of ignoring the economy. That's not true. The problem with Obama is not that he has ignored the economy, but that it was never his top priority in his first term as president, even as millions of Americans suffered the consequences of a devastating economic downturn. Now, with many still struggling, we know the economy won't be Obama's top concern in his second term, either. On “Meet the Press” on Sunday, when the president was asked to name his top priority for the next four years, he first listed immigration reform. “That's something we should get done,” Obama said. The economy came after that, as the president continued: “The second thing that we've got to do is to stabilize the economy and make sure it's growing.” Obama's third priority for his new term is to manage the explosion in U.S. energy production “in a way that also deals with some of the environmental challenges that we have.” Given that the energy revolution -- fracking and the discovery of huge new sources of gas and oil -- is a key driver of economic growth, Obama's third priority is, in effect, to put the brakes on his second priority. During Obama's first term, when economic conditions bordered on desperate, Republicans often criticized him for putting the economy behind other concerns, most notably national health care. Indeed, the president and Democrats sometimes conceded the criticism when they talked about making a “pivot” to the issue of jobs and the economy from whatever policy pursuit Obama felt was more important at the time. When the time came to run for re-election, Obama finally started talking about the economy -- a lot. He talked about it, and why his economic plan was superior to Mitt Romney's, so much that audiences might well have come away with the impression that economic recovery was the president's top second-term priority. Turns out they would have been wrong. At the same time, even though Obama has long said he wants to pursue immigration reform, he didn't talk about it much in his standard stump speech. In fact, in the speech he used in the final days of the campaign, Obama didn't talk about immigration reform at all, unless one counts his accusation that Republicans want to “turn back the clock 50 years for women, and for immigrants, and for gays.” But now, it's immigration reform first, the economy second.
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#### 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 –

#### A. 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.

#### B. Neg ground – procurement moves the debate away from “how to motivate action” to just “doing the action” – this guts negative arguments about solvency, DA links, and CP competition based off private sector inducement.

### DA

#### Immigration reform will pass --- it’s a top priority.

**Foley and Stein**, **1/2**/2013 (Elise and Sam, Obama’s Immigration Reform To Begin This Month, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>)

Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda. An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit. With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished. "The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill." It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push. Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

#### Military clean energy procurement causes massive budget fights

Snider 12 -- environmental reporter @ E&E publishing (Annie, 2/23/12, "Military's alt energy programs draw Republicans' ire," http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/02/23/2)

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

#### Capital is key --- it bridges support from both parties.

Dallas Morning News, **1/2**/2012 (Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge, p. <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece>)

The president’s words to NBC’s David Gregory are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task this year. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill, either. And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans. In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But the leadership that matters most will come from the White House. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count. HE SAID IT … “I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. I will introduce legislation in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.” President Barack Obama, in an interview on Meet the Press Sunday

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

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

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

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### K

#### Their Carse evidence says we need an ethic of care to overcome human blindness, but 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.

### 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 white supremacy 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.

#### Violence and extinction are inevitable absent this transformation.

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 blinded, 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.

#### 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.

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.

### Racism/Debate

#### Extinction outweighs

Bok 88 (Sissela, Professor of Philosophy at Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Rosenthal and Shehadi, Ed.)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical Imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences. Acknowledging such a rift would post a strong challenge to the unity and simplicity of Kant’s moral theory.

#### RACISM isn’t a monolithic root cause -- their position shuts off productive debate about more proximate causes

SHELBY 07Professor of African and African American Studies and of Philosophy at Harvard

Tommie Shelby, 2007, We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity

Others might challenge the distinction between ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage, on the grounds that we are rarely, if ever, able to so neatly separate these factors, an epistemic situation that is only made worse by the fact that these causes interact in complex ways with behavioral factors. These distinctions, while perhaps straightforward in the abstract, are difficult to employ in practice. For example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the members of a poor black community to determine with any accuracy whether their impoverished condition is due primarily to institutional racism, the impact of past racial injustice, the increasing technological basis of the economy, shrinking state budgets, the vicissitudes of world trade, the ascendancy of conservative ideology, poorly funded schools, lack of personal initiative, a violent drug trade that deters business investment, some combination of these factors, or some other explanation altogether. Moreover, it is notoriously difficult to determine when the formulation of putatively race-neutral policies has been motivated by racism or when such policies are unfairly applied by racially biased public officials. There are very real empirical difficulties in determining the specific causal significance of the factors that create and perpetuate black disadvantage; nonetheless, it is clear that these factors exist and that justice will demand different practical remedies according to each factor's relative impact on blacks' life chances. We must acknowledge that our social world is complicated and not immediately transparent to common sense, and thus that systematic empirical inquiry, historical studies, and rigorous social analysis are required to reveal its systemic structure and sociocultural dynamics. There is, moreover, no mechanical or infallible procedure for determining which analyses are the soundest ones. In addition, given the inevitable bias that attends social inquiry, legislators and those they represent cannot simply defer to social-scientific experts. We must instead rely on open public debate—among politicians, scholars, policy makers, intellectuals, and ordinary citizens—with the aim of garnering rationally motivated and informed consensus. And even if our practical decision procedures rest on critical deliberative discourse and thus live up to our highest democratic ideals, some trial and error through actual practice is unavoidable. These difficulties and complications notwithstanding, a general recognition of the distinctions among the ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage could help blacks refocus their political energies and self-help strategies. Attention to these distinctions might help expose the superficiality of theories that seek to reduce all the social obstacles that blacks face to contemporary forms of racism or white supremacy. A more penetrating, subtle, and empirically grounded analysisis needed to comprehend the causes of racial inequality and black disadvantage. Indeed, these distinctions highlight the necessity to probe deeper to find the causes of contemporary forms of racism, as some racial conflict may be a symptom of broader problems or recent social developments (**such as immigration policy** or reduced federal funding for higher education).

#### 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.

### Disaster Relief

#### Investors won't participate – too much uncertainty

Bartis & Bibber 11 -- senior policy researchers at the RAND Corporation (James T. and Lawrence Van, "Alternative Fuels for Military Applications," http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2011/RAND\_MG969.pdf)

The investment climate for military alternative fuel production is highly uncertain. Although the Navy has announced a program that will involve large fuel purchases, it has not yet provided sufficient detail to encourage investment of private funds. Other DoD components have not announced that they will pay a premium price for alternative fuels for use in their tactical systems. This situation means that the private sector will look to the civilian fuel market for signals as to whether to invest in alternative fuels. For civilian applications, the prospects for alternative fuels also remain highly uncertain. At current world market oil prices, the only military alternative fuel that might be competitive without subsidy is an FT jet or FT Navy distillate derived from natural gas, coal, or a mix of coal and a small amount of biomass. But even for these leading technologies, there remains uncertainty regarding investment and production costs, especially for the first production facilities that would be built in the United States. With the $1.00 federal subsidy that has supported biodiesel production, some amount of biodiesel from crops cultivated on farmlands appears to be competitive with petroleum-derived diesel so long as world oil prices are above $50 per barrel (2009 dollars, West Texas Intermediate).1 But for renewable oils that are produced with lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions that are less than those from petroleum products, greater subsidies or higher crude oil prices may be required. As discussed in Chapter Three, there is little information available on the costs of producing hydrotreated renewable oils from jatropha, camelina, or other nontraditional crops, and even less on the economics of algae-derived fuels. Another factor impeding investment in alternative fuels is uncertainty regarding the prospects and details of legislation and regulations aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. Legislation that assigns costs to emitting greenhouse gases will modify the relative competitiveness of different alternative fuels vis-à-vis petroleum-derived fuels. For example, for each $10 per ton charged for emitting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, the price of conventional JP-8 would increase by about $0.13 per gallon.

#### Solar ineffective for military operations

Bartis & Bibber 11 -- senior policy researchers at the RAND Corporation (James T. and Lawrence Van, "Alternative Fuels for Military Applications," http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2011/RAND\_MG969.pdf)

Wind and Solar Thermal. Wind and solar thermal power systems operate at much lower utilization rates than nuclear power plants. If these systems were to be built as dedicated hydrogen suppliers to a gasification-based alternative fuel plant, the required generating capacity would be much greater than that in the nuclear case above. Each 100,000 bpd of alternative fuel production would require roughly between 13,000 and 16,000 megawatts of installed wind capacity and between 21,000 and 25,000 megawatts of installed solar thermal (see Appendix B). For comparison, total installed wind capacity in the United States at the end of 2008 was estimated at about 24,000 megawatts. Total installed solar generating capacity, including photovoltaic and thermal, is about 500 megawatts (Energy Information Administration, 2009c). As of 2009, the installed costs (per kilowatt) for wind turbines were much lower than nuclear plants. Because intermittency of supply is less of a concern for hydrogen production than for delivery to the grid, wind appears to compete favorably with nuclear for hydrogen production.19 Moreover, as was the case for nuclear power, producing hydrogen for FT biomass-to-liquids fuel and combined coal/biomass-to-liquids fuel facilities provides a means of productively using wind-derived electricity when grid-based demand is low. As wind turbine generating capacity in the United States grows, coupling wind capacity to a few combined coal/biomass-to-liquids fuel production facilities may be a competitive alternative for the lower-value power output. For example, a single alternative fuel production plant could consume the low-value output of about 8,000 megawatts of installed wind turbine generating capacity.20 Considering current and emerging technologies, it is highly unlikely that solar thermal power systems can compete with either wind or nuclear as a source of hydrogen for gasification-based alternative fuel production.

#### Military has no need for clean energy – adoption fails

O'Keefe 12 -- CEO, George C. Marshall Institute (William, 5/22/12, "DOD’s ‘Clean Energy’ Is a Trojan Horse," http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php)

The purpose of the military is to defend the United States and our interests by deterring aggression and applying military force when needed. It is not to shape industrial policy. As we’ve learned from history, energy is essential for military success, independent of whether it is so called “clean energy” or traditional energy, which continues to get cleaner with time. There are three reasons for the Department of Defense (DOD) to be interested in biofuels—to reduce costs, improve efficiency, and reduce vulnerability. These are legitimate goals and should be pursued through a well thought out and rational Research-and-Development (R&D) program. But it’s not appropriate to use military needs to push a clean energy agenda that has failed in the civilian sector. Packaging the issue as a national security rationale is a Trojan Horse that hides another attempt to promote a specific energy industrial policy. Over the past four decades such initiatives have demonstrated a record of failure and waste. As part of the military’s push for green initiatives, both the Navy and Air Force have set goals to obtain up to 50 percent of their fuel needs from alternative sources. The underlying rationale is to reduce US dependence on foreign oil. But the Rand Corporation, the preeminent military think tank in the nation, recently conducted a study, Alternative Fuels for Military Applications; it concludes, "The use of alternative fuels offers the armed services no direct military benefit." It also concludes that biofuels made from plant waste or animal fats could supply no more than 25,000 barrels daily. That’s a drop in the bucket considering the military is the nation’s largest fuel consumer. Additionally, there is no evidence that commercial technology will likely to be available in the near future to produce large quantities of biofuels at lower costs than conventional fuels. The flipside of that argument is that the cost of conventional fuels is uncertain because of dependence on imports from unstable sources. While that is true, it misses the point. For example, our reliance on imports from the Persian Gulf is declining and could be less if we expanded our own domestic production. Until alternatives that are cost competitive can be developed, DOD should look at alternative ways to reduce price volatility, just as large commercial users do. The second reason for pursuing alternative fuels is related to the first. Greater efficiency reduces costs by reducing the amount of fuel used. The military has been pursuing this goal for some time, as has the private sector. DOD total energy consumption declined by more than 60% between 1985 and 2006, according to Science 2.0. Improvements will continue because of continued investments in new technologies, especially in the private sector, which has market-driven incentives to reduce the cost of fuel consumption. Finally, there is the argument that somehow replacing conventional fuels with bio-fuels will reduce supply chain vulnerability and save lives. Rand also addressed this issue from both the perspective on naval and ground based forces. It concluded that there is no evidence that a floating bio-fuels plant “would be less expensive than using either Navy oilers or commercial tankers to deliver finished fuel products.” It also dismissed the concept of small scale production units that would be co-located with tactical units. It concluded, “any concepts that require delivery of a carbon containing feedstock appear to place a logistical and operational burden on forward-based tactical units that would be well beyond that associated with the delivery of finished fuels.” Future military needs are met by a robust R&D program carried out by the services and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). Letting that agency and the services invest in future technologies to meet their specific service needs and maintain our military strength without political meddling is in the nation’s best interest. Advances in military technology that has civilian applications eventually enters the market place. Take for example the DARPA’s research into improved military communication that eventually developed into internet technology that revolutionized how we communicate and obtain and use information. If DOD pursues research focused on lower costs, greater efficiency, and more secure fuel supplies, the civilian economy will eventually benefit. At a time when the military if faced with substantial budget cuts, allocating scarce resources to pursue so called “clean energy” objectives is worse than wasteful. It borders on a dereliction of duty.

#### Nat gas prevents solar development

Dumaine 12 -- senior editor-at-large @ CNNMoney (Brian, 4/17/12, "Will gas crowd out wind and solar?" http://tech.fortune.cnn.com/2012/04/17/yergin-gas-solar-wind/?iid=HP\_LN)

Fracking technology has given the U.S. a 100-year supply of cheap natural gas. What's its impact on coal, nuclear, wind, and solar power? Inexpensive natural gas is transforming the competitive economics of electric power generation in the U.S. Coal plants today generate more than 40% of our electricity. Yet coal plant construction is grinding to a halt: first, because of environmental reasons and second, because the economics of natural gas are so compelling. It is being championed by many environmentalists as a good substitute for coal because it is cleaner and emits about 50% less carbon dioxide. Nuclear power now generates 20% of our electricity, but the plants are getting old and will need to be replaced. What will replace them? Only a few nuclear plants are being built in the U.S. right now. The economics of building nuclear are challenging -- it's much more expensive than natural gas. Isn't the worry now that cheap natural gas might also crowd out wind and solar? Yes. The debate is over whether natural gas is a bridge fuel to buy time while renewables develop or whether it will itself be a permanent, major source of electricity. What do you think? Over the past year the debate has moved beyond the idea of gas as a bridge fuel to what gas means to U.S. manufacturing and job creation and how it will make the U.S. more globally competitive as an energy exporter. The President's State of the Union speech was remarkable in the way it wrapped the shale gas boom into his economic policies and job creation. I believe natural gas in the years ahead is going to be the default fuel for new electrical generation. Power demand is going to go up 15% to 20% in the U.S. over this decade because of the increasing electrification of our society -- everything from iPads to electric Nissan Leafs. Utilities will need a predictable source of fuel in volume to meet that demand, and natural gas best fits that description. And that won't make the environmental community happy? Well, natural gas may be a relatively clean hydrocarbon, but it's still a hydrocarbon. So wind and solar will have a hard time competing? Remember that wind and solar account for only 3% of our electric power, whereas natural gas is 23%, and its share will go up fast. Most of that 3% is wind. Natural gas has a new role as the partner of renewables, providing power when the wind is not blowing and the sun is not shining. Will solar scale? Solar is still under 1% of U.S. electric generation, and even though its costs have come down dramatically, they must come down a lot more. Solar is generally much more expensive than coal and natural gas. You have to remember that energy is a huge, capital-intensive business, and it takes a very long time for new technologies to scale. The euphoria that comes out of Silicon Valley when you see how quickly a Twitter or a YouTube can emerge doesn't apply to the energy industry.

## 2NC

### Link

#### Specifically, dualistic thinking is the root cause of white supremacy and racism. Attempts to challenge white supremacy with dualistic means of resistance only invert and maintain domination.

Senauke 97 (Rev. Alan Senauke, 8/23/1997. National Coordinator Buddhist Peace Fellowship. “On Race & Buddhism,” From a talk at the Berkeley Zen Center, http://www.purifymind.com/OnRace.htm.)

Zen Master Dogen wrote "Gourd with its tendrils is entwined with gourd." This means we are all intimately bound up, wound up with each other. Truly inseparable. So this morning I would like to speak about the complexities of diversity, race, zen practice, and our community. Something we've been talking about at Buddhist Peace Fellowship, San Francisco Zen Center, here, and more and more around sanghas and centers in the United States. This is not just about "political correctness," it is about practice and awareness. I must confess that my own thoughts are not entirely clear, but I will try my best not to mislead you. If I sound critical, it is a voice of self-criticism. My own efforts have fallen short and I think we need to work on this together. So I will leave some time for discussion at the end. After six years of practice, homeless among householders, wayseekers, and teachers, the Buddha sat under the Bodhi Tree with the firm intention of awakening. After seven days of zazen he perceived the true nature of birth and death, the chain of causation and awakened to realization with the morning star. At that moment he spoke these words: "Wondrous! I now see that all beings everywhere have the wisdom and virtues of the enlightened ones, but because of misunderstandings and attachments they do not realize it." Allowing his understanding to ripen, allowing Bodhicitta, the mind of compassion to ripen, he took up the responsibilities of teaching, sharing his experience in a way that unlocked the mystery of our own experience. As the Buddha came to express it, "I simply teach about the nature of suffering and the end of suffering." This is a radical teaching, true to the meaning of radical, getting to the root. And his understanding that all beings everywhere have the wisdom and virtues of the enlightened ones leaves us with a great responsibility. As the wheel of Mahayana Dharma turned , our own Zen vehicle, that responsibility was further clarified by the Bodhisattva vow to save all beings. We constantly affirm this vow. And yet this vow was there from the beginning. Why else did the Buddha rise from the comfort and joy of enlightenment and freedom to teach? Why else did he offer teachings like the Metta Sutta, where he says: May all beings be happy. May they be joyous and live in safety. All living beings, whether weak or strong, in high or middle or low realms of existence, small or great, visible or invisible, near or far, born or to be born, Let no one deceive another, nor despise any being in any state; Let none by anger or hatred wish harm to another. Even as a mother at the risk of her life watches over and protects her only child, so with a boundless mind should one cherish all living things, suffusing love over the entire world, above, below, and all around, without limit; so let one cultivate an infinite good will toward the whole world. And true to that teaching, he offered refuge to everyone he met on the path. Kings and paupers, ascetics and householders, people of all castes, brahmins , outcasts, and criminals. After some strenuous convincing, he even offered refuge to women. That's a long story in itself, not unrelated to the issue at hand today, suggesting that patriarchy has deep roots running through many if not most cultures. Taking refuge means committing your life to waking up, to taking on the problem of suffering and the end of suffering for all beings and ourselves. This is what zazen is about. Sitting upright in stillness to see oneself in complete interdependence with all beings, with the rocks and trees and ocean and sky. The emptiness we so often talk about is not some kind of negative space. It is total interdependence. "Gourd with its tendrils entwined with gourd." True reality is empty of any one thing, empty of self because all things, **all people co-create each other**. Seeing through and beyond dualistic thinking is the direct experience of zazen. I undescore the word experience, because if it we are just caught by an idea or an idle wish, we slip back into the tide of duality. All of us have such experiences from moment to moment, time to time. A moment of merging with someone or something we love, a moment of doing something completely, a moment of losing oneself in just sitting. And at times in zazen we settle fully into the realm of nonduality and recognize that this is our true mind, our true state of being. All the great spiritual traditions express an understanding of this natural way of life. But the way we often live, by habit we see a world thoroughly conditioned by duality. Driven by doubt and fear, by a lack of trust in our true Mind, we see things as self and objects, as us and them, as other. It seems so hard to recognize the truth that Tibetan Buddhists preach: that every being was at one time my own mother. **The root of racism is denial of this truth.** It is about seeing people as other in a systematic way that is such an entrenched habit we are not usually aware of. I would underscore the word systematic, because as ideas like a virus in society they have a power that goes beyond individual like and dislike. Racism is a system of domination that is economic and political as well as personal. It runs deep in the oppressor and the oppressed alike, though the damage caused is different. Even though I have the privilege of a good education, middle class male upbringing, white skin, I find in myself deeply ingrained and systematic survival responses as someone born Jewish. Several years ago at a meeting of international Buddhist activists in Thailand I realized that in the first day I had figured out who (among the westerners) was Jewish. And even stranger I realizedthat all the Jews were doing the same thing and had "signified" to each other. We knew who each other was, and we were more comfortable for it. This, I am sure, is a pattern that goes back through centuries of being ghetto-ized, of being the other. It's not a genetic thing. I can remember my mother telling me how to watch out for myself. That some people would exclude and threaten me just for being Jewish. It's so deep that sometimes I find myself looking around the zendo and counting those I think are Jewish. Some of you may find yourself making a similar census. From talking with them, I know that people of color do this. And yet, let's where our Buddhism come from. Our ancestors come from India, China, and Japan. In June I visited Suzuki-Roshi's temple, Rinso-in and I walked in the graveyard where the old priests of the temple were buried. How amazing it is for Zen to leap oceans and cultures and be so generously offered to us. We should accept it humbly, recognizing the price of suffering paid to plant the Dharma seed here. And we owe it to our teachers and ourselves to share this practice with the same generosity and openmindedness. Keeping in mind that most Buddhists even in America don't look like me. They are Chinese, Japanese, Thai, Vietnamese, and so on. I come to Buddhism out of suffering. They come to Buddhism as a birthright. So how does it feel to come to Zen practice as a person of color? And they will come; they do come. My friend Sala Steinbach says an African-American woman at SFZC says, "If it is about liberation, people of color will be interested." They are. The Dalai Lama draws stadiums full of people in Mexico. In South America there are Zen and Tibetan teachers with very strong lay sanghas. So I ask my Asian, and Latino, and African-American friends about how it feels to come here, to San Francisco Zen Center or Spirit Rock. And I ask myself what feelings come up. Dogen suggests we take a step back to turn one's light inward and illuminate oneself. What I see there in myself is then reflected back into the world. The answer to how it feels to anyone largely depends on two further inter-related questions. First, does one feel safe and seen in the community? Are the conditions of your life acknowedged, welcomed, explored in the sangha? I suspect that this is sometimes yes, sometimes no. Thoughtless words can turn people from the temple and from the practice. I have seen this happen here and elsewhere. An offhand comment is made about the white, middle class makeup of the community with people of color sitting right there. Again, through the unintended eye of white supremacy (hard words, I know) people are made to feel invisible and uncounted. Maybe I should say something about white supremacy. It is a building block of racism, part of my blindness to my own privilege as a white man. It is at once personal and systematic. If one wants to see it, the practice of individual mindfulness, of turning our light inward needs to be blended dialogue with friends and sangha members who don't carry this very particular privilege. The same kinds of painful things happen if you are homosexual, or if because of injury or fact of birth you can't get up the steps of the temple. These blindnesses hurt and turn people away. That's what it might feel like from one side. On the other side, the Buddha's understanding is "all beings have the wisdom and virtues of the enlightened ones, but because of misunderstandings and attachments they do not realize it." This understanding is so precious that we are obligated to share it. I don't mean proselytizing, but keep in mind, the Buddha never stopped preaching Dharma. But now we have centers and institutions. To make zazen and Dharma available, we need to tell people they are welcome and invite them to practice with us. Already we are taking practice to jails and hospitals, to people who might not be able to come to us. The next obvious step is to find ways to open our doors to those who can come to us. I hear that some San Francisco churches have created a kind of covenant of "open congregation." This means that in their literature and at their services, classes, and events they make it known that they welcome people of color, gays and lesbians, and so on. Being pro-active rather than passive on questions of diversity and inclusion. This is necessary because in America, passivity means white supremacy. It's subtle and pervasive, conditioned by and conditioning our magazines, movies, tv, our clothing, all the things we buy. It is a virus infecting my mind as a person with so-called privilieges, and the mind of someone who might not have such privileges. Last week I was invited to talk about Buddhism and race to a diverse group of teenagers doing an interfaith social action internship in San Francisco. Now maybe I did a good job talking to them, but I was the first Buddhist choice that came to mind for the organizers. There is some irony in that. Buddhism in America gets defined as and by people like me. I have to watch myself carefully not to buy into this. But the wondeful thing about what the Buddha taught, what we can experience in zazen, is that each of us can go beyond duality. It can't be done just by reason and talk. We have to get the reality of the world deep in our bones and then bring it back out again into the world. We must make a lot of mistakes. Maybe like this talk. Suzuki Roshi said giving a talk is making a mistake on purpose. Make our mistakes, learn the lessons and go back at it. bell hooks, the African American scholar/practitioner writes about this in "Buddhist Women on the Edge": In a culture of domination, preoccupation with victimhood and identity is inevitable. I once believed that progressive people could analyze the dualities and dissolve them through a process of dialectical critical exchange. **Yet globally the resurgence of notions of ethnic purity, white supremacy, have led marginalized groups to cling to dualisms as a means of resistance**....The willingness to surrender to attachment to duality is present in such thinking. **It merely inverts the dualistic thinking that supports and maintains domination. Dualities serve their own interests**. What's alarming to me is to see so many Americans returning to those simplistic choices. People of all persuasions are feeling that if they don't have dualism, they don't have anything to hold on to. If we are concerned with dissolving these apparent dualities we have to identify anchors to hold on to in the midst of fragmentation, in the midst of a loss of grounding. My anchor is love.... I like to think that love and compassion are anchors of my practice. But they depend on mindfulness too. Zazen is rooted in mindfulness, breath after breath, thought after thought. This kind of training carries over into life outside the zendo. I try to uncover my own thought patterns. This is sometimes painful and embarrassing, but it is the essence of saving myself and all sentient beings. It is amazing to see the stories one can make up about other people, and how these stories are conditioned by race, or class, or privilege. Check it out for yourself. When you meet someone you consider different from yourself, do you think you know something about them? Would you think you know the same kinds of things about another white person or someone more like you? This is mindfulness practice, watching one's thoughts about race, or any kind of difference. And it is for our own sake. Not for the sake of political correctness. I think that this is where our personal practice begins. Then we can take it further into our extended communities. Ask your friends of color how they experience the practice and the community. This is entering the realm of not knowing, a little risky, but ultimately necessary. In the wider Buddhist community, it might mean making some excursions and visits to Asian Buddhist temples. They are friendly places. The same Dharma resides there, though it may take some different forms. We think nothing of going to restaurants featuring Asian cuisine. This is just another form of basic nourishment. Maybe when we have closely examined ourselves, and begun to look around and share our thoughts with others, then we have created the conditions for change. If our American society could take such steps, it would be the start of a wonderful, hopeful era. Could there be racial peace for the first time in history? This is no pipe dream. It is the Bodhisattva Vow, the working of our Way Seeking Mind. If each of us and the sanghas we cherish could nurture this process of mindfulness, the change could come much quicker. Compassion and peace could blossom in very surprising ways. And zazen would be a golden wind blowing across a meadow of wildflowers. How can we take up this work together. I welcome your thoughts.

#### Technocratic Managerialism: The affirmative enframes disaster preparedness as an issue of *technology* and *bureaucratic management*—this ensures serial policy failure and collective victim blaming—*turns the case*.

Bankoff 1 — Gregory Bankoff, Senior Lecturer at the University of Auckland and Research Fellow in Disaster Studies at Wageningen University, 2001 (“Rendering the World Unsafe: ‘Vulnerability’ as Western Discourse,” *Disasters*, Volume 25, Issue 1, Available Online at http://www.geo.mtu.edu/volcanoes/06upgrade/Social-KateG/Attachments%20Used/Vulnerability.WesternDiscourse.pdf, Accessed 08-02-2011, p. 24-25)

More recently these qualities have come to be increasingly expressed in terms of a society’s vulnerability to hazard. The concept of vulnerability, however, denotes much more than an area’s, nation’s or region’s geographic or climatic predisposition to hazard and forms part of an ongoing debate about the nature of disasters and their causes. In the 1970s, some Western and Western-trained social scientists began to question the hitherto unchallenged assumption that the greater incidence of disasters was due to a rising number of purely natural physical phenomena. Attributing disasters to natural forces, representing them as a departure from a state of normalcy to which a society returns to on recovery, denies the wider historical and social dimensions of hazard and focuses attention largely on technocratic solutions.

It also establishes a conviction that societies are able to take steps to avoid or ameliorate disasters through the application of the appropriate technocratic measures properly carried out by bureaucratically organised and centrally controlled institutions. Disaster prevention, therefore, is seen as largely a matter of improving scientific prediction, engineering preparedness and the administrative management of hazard. Kenneth Hewitt argues that this technocratic approach has permitted hazard to be treated as a specialised problem for the advanced research of scientists, engineers and bureaucrats, and so be appropriated within a discourse of expertise that quarantines disaster in thought as well as in practice (1983: 9–12, 1995: 118–21). It also renders [end page 24] culpable such populations (or at least their governments) which are blamed for their lack of adequate knowledge and preparedness, that had the opportunity to reduce risk but failed to do so (Varley, 1994: 3).

### AT: Perm

#### And, the permutation links to our *Preparedness DA*—focusing on individual preparedness trades off with structural solutions, *flipping the case*.

Sturken 6 — Marita Sturken, Professor of Media, Culture, and Communication at New York University, 2006 (“Weather Media and Homeland Security: Selling Preparedness in a Volatile World,” *Understanding Katrina: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*, June 11th, Available Online at http://understandingkatrina.ssrc.org/Sturken/, Accessed 08-02-2011)

Government campaigns that sell the idea of individual preparedness operate to reassure citizens that the government is doing everything it can to keep the country safe. Thus, the emphasis in the DHS campaigns on how individuals should respond to a crisis elides the fact that individuals and families can do little to affect the most important security decisions of the country, such as the securing of borders and cargo. The ready.gov campaigns take place in what is largely understood to be a security vacuum on the part of the U.S. government, with DHS threat advisories mere political ploys and DHS funding distributed like political pork to government cronies. The disaster of Katrina has dramatically exposed the way that resources have been drained away from the “homeland” by the war in Iraq. The homeland, we learned from Katrina, is primarily at risk not from the weather or from foreign terrorists, but from its own failed infrastructure and its callous disregard for the rights of all citizens to the most basic of human needs.

## 1NR

### Ableism

#### 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).

#### Projects to combat racism, sexism and classism have historically relied on metaphors of visibility and voice

**Valdes and Culp 02** (Francisco, Professor of Law, Duke University, Durham, and Jerome, teacher, social activist, and lawyer, is pursuing a doctoral degree at Columbia University Law School, “Crossroads, directions, and a new critical race theory”, GAL)

**As with racism, sexism, classism**, and homophobia, **we** began increasingly to **notice how our everyday experiences are rife with examples of ableism**. In particular, we started noting with more critical awareness the recurrent, and often inadvertent, exam­ples of ableism in the very language of crit­ical discourse: **Think of "the ways in which the terms 'visible' and 'invisible' are used as metaphors** in much outsider cuJture and jurisprudence]. Notice how **these metaphors privilege *seeing****.* [**Notice, too, the' metaphors of'voice' and 'silence**.' "l9 **The critique of dis­ability** theorises thus **raises a broad range of matters pertinent to outsider jurisprudence as antisubordination method**; disability the­ories, from many different vantage poinrs, **enhance social-justice scholarship and prac­tice**. The addition of Disability Theory to the expanding universe of outsider scholarship has enriched both our work and our lives.

#### 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.

#### Their 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.

#### Discourse shapes policymaking – empirics prove

Schmidt & Radaelli 5 (Vivien A. & Claudio M., , Professor of International Relations @ Boston University, PhD in Political Science, Policy Change and Discourse in Europe, p. 188–189, JM)

These four mediating factors tend to be the main ones considered by social scientists in both first and second generation studies of policy change in Europe. As such, they miss out on the final, fifth factor, which we believe essential to understanding the dynamics of policy change: discourse. Discourse helps create an opening to policy change by altering actors’ perceptions of the policy problems, policy legacies and ‘fit’, influencing their preferences, and, thereby, enhancing their political institutional capacity to change. Most notable among the cases in this volume are Prime Minister Blair’s discourse, which unblocked a policy area that had seen little movement throughout the post–war period, when Blair argued that a new European security and defence initiative was necessary in light of changing US defence priorities with regard to NATO, (Howorth, in this volume). Also significant was Commission officials’ discourse that produced a major shift in trade policy priorities from trade liberalisation to development (Van den Hoven, in this volume) and in agricultural policy from production support schemes to sustainable development (Fouilleux, in this volume). EU policy, moreover, has itself also often been used in the discourse to promote policy change. For example, German and French capacity to reform in telecommunications policy was enhanced by discourses that directly referred to EU institutional requirements and competitive pressures (Thatcher, in this volume). By contrast, French capacity to transform national immigration policy was enhanced by a discourse that described the changes in purely French terms, without reference to the EU (Geddes and Guiraudon, in this volume). By the same token, however, French leaders’ inability to come up with a purely French discourse that would serve to alter views of the obligations of the Republican state in the ‘service publique’ (general interest utilities and infrastructural) services stymied reform in areas other than telecoms, such as electricity, as noted above. Discourse, in sum, is one among several factors involved in policy change. When considered in the context of the process of Europeanisation, it can be seen as contributing to ‘policy learning’, to use the concept most often employed by social scientists concerned with explaining policy adjustment in the face of crisis–inducing problems and the failure of past policy solutions (see Hemerijck and Schludi 2000).

#### The discursive context of politics determines policy implementation and the policies passed

Sheperd 10 (Laura J., ., Lecturer in International Relations at the University ofBirmingham,UK, *International Review of the Red Cross*, Volume 92: 877, March, p. 148–149, http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/irrc–877–shepherd.pdf, JM)

Third, and finally, this approach draws attention to the process of implementing policy. It is not the overall aim of this approach to juxtapose different readings of various policies with a view to dismissing one or another of the readings as ‘untrue’, nor to suggest that one set or another of the meanings read in the documents is somehow ‘better’. All words carry meaning and have value; the process of writing value into policy documents is therefore inescapable, but it has profound implications for the interpretation and therefore implementation of that document. Meaning cannot be fixed; the sense we make of a policy document or strategic plan is conditioned by our own discursive context and the productive context of the document or plan in question. The challenges in implementing UNSCR 1325 – or, more recently, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1820 that seeks to eliminate all forms of sexual violence as weapons of war – will vary from place to place, and over time. This variation does not inhere in the inaccurate representation of specific cultural and historical contexts; rather, it is a function of language itself, according to poststructural philosophy. Therefore, looking for the origin or root of meaning, the reality to which a representation purports to relate, is an irrelevance. ‘Truth is a thing of this world. […] Each society has its regime of truth […], the type of discourses which it accepts and makes function as true’.19 This has profound implications for political research, in that a search for the ‘truth’ of the matter/‘reality’ becomes in this mode of investigation a search for the ‘systems of power which produce and sustain it [truth], and the effects of power which it induces and which extend it’.20 It is hoped that this article will encourage critical interpretations of and reflections on the policy documents that order the lives of individuals everywhere, employing as they do concepts that, like all concepts, are inherently value–laden. As Dvora Yanow points out, ‘[i]nterpretations […] are more powerful than “facts”. That makes the policy process, in all its phases, a struggle for the determination of meanings’.21

#### Discourse shapes social reality – it is relied on for change

Fairclough 92 (Norman, Professor of Linguistics at Lancaster University, PhD, Discourse and Social Change, p. 6–7, JM)

What is open to question is whether such theory and research recognizes an importance that language has always had in social life but which has previously not been sufficiently acknowledged, or actually reflects an increase in the social importance of lan­guage. Although both may be true, I believe that there has been a significant shift in the social functioning of language, a shift reflected in the salience of language in the major social changes which have been taking place over the last few decades. Many of these social changes do not just involve language, but are con­stituted to a significant extent by changes in language practices; and it is perhaps one indication of the growing importance of language in social and cultural change that attempts to engineer the direction of change increasingly include attempts to change language practices. Let me give some examples. Firstly, in many countries there has recently been an upsurge in the extension of the market to new areas of social life: sectors such as education, health care and the arts have been required to restructure and reconceptualize their activities as the production and marketing of commodities for consumers (Urry 1987). These changes have profoundly affected the activities, social relations, and social and professional identities of people working in such sectors. A major part of their impact comprises changes in dis­course practices, that is, changes in language. In education, for example, people find themselves under pressure to engage in new activities which are largely defined by new discourse practices (such as marketing), and to adopt new discourse practices within existing activities (such as teaching). This includes 'rewordings' of activities and relationships, for example rewording learners as 'consumers' or 'clients', courses as 'packages' or 'products'. It also includes a more subtle restructuring of the discourse prac­tices of education – the types of discourse (genres, styles, etc.) which are used in it – and a 'colonization' of education by types of discourse from outside, including those of advertising, manage­ment, and counselling. Again, industry is moving towards what is being called post–Fordist' production (Bagguley and Lash 1988; Bagguley 1990), in which workers no longer function as individuals performing re­petitive routines within an invariant production process, but as teams in a flexible relation to a fast–changing process. Moreover, traditional employee–firm relations have been seen by manage­ments as dysfunctional in this context; they have therefore attempted to transform workplace culture, for example by setting up institutions which place employees in a more participatory relation with management, such as 'quality circles'. To describe these changes as 'cultural' is not just rhetoric: the aim is new cultural values, workers who are 'enterprising', self–motivating and, as Rose (MS) has put it, 'self–steering'. These changes in organization and culture are to a significant extent changes in discourse practices. Language use is assuming greater importance as a means of production and social control in the workplace. More specifically, workers are now being expected to engage in face–to–face and group interaction as speakers and listeners. Almost all job descriptions in white–collar work, even at the lowest levels, now stress communication skills. One result is that people's social identities as workers arc coming to be defined in terms that have traditionally been seen not as occupational, but as teams in a flexible relation to a fast–changing process. One striking feature of changes of this sort is that they are transnational. New styles of management and devices such as 'quality circles' are imported from more economically successful countries like Japan, so that changes in the discourse practices of workplaces come to have a partly international character. The new global order of discourse is thus characterized by widespread tensions between increasingly international imported practices and local traditions.

#### Still a Voting Issue – apologies only confirm the link and the critical lack of awareness by one team in a competitive activity that rewards critical thinking. Vote for the team that has done the research and is doing the better debating.

Anna ‘9 [self–indentified disabled woman, [http://www.amptoons.com/blog/archives/2009/06/16/why–not–to–use–the–word–lame–i–think–im–starting–to–get–it/](http://www.amptoons.com/blog/archives/2009/06/16/why-not-to-use-the-word-lame-i-think-im-starting-to-get-it/)]

As I said before in this thread, I raise **issues of ablist language** because it **reminds people that we exist**. That **there are people with disabilities** who read thisblog, and other blogs, who read the newspapers, who watch t.v., **who are part of the various movements that people here will identify as belonging to.** There are blogs I do not bother reading partly because they consistently act as though there are no people with disabilities on the internet, and I have better things to do with my time than deal with that level of self–absorption. No, going off to Wheelchair Dancer or Miss Crip Chick or Accessibility\_Fail or No\_Pity and asking them to please explain various rules around ablist language to you isn’t really what I’m suggesting. I’m suggesting that reading those blogs will give one a sense of a variety of **things disability rights advocates and people with disabilities are saying**. It **will**, I would think, give one food for thought. In my hopes, it would **lead someone who had never considered how disability and ablism and dismissive language affects other people to a better understanding** if they read those blogs for a while, or went through the archives of Blogging Against Disabilism Day. **It would give lie to the idea that ablist language is suddenly some new concept that folks are railing against. I get so frustrated when our entire history is dismissed with “I’ve never heard of this before”. There have been discussions about language used to describe people with disabilities dating back to at least the 1850s,** and certainly Deaf people have been advocating for their rights since the residential school systems were started. **There is a whole history here that’s being missed by some, if not outright ignored.**

#### Apologies must be coupled with a loss – simply permitting them to displace blame is insufficient

Tavuchis 91 (Nicholas, Senior Scholar in the Department of Sociology @ University of Manitoba Mea Culpa: A Sociology of Apology and Reconciliation pg. 17)

This brief review reveals an interesting connotative displacement and transformation. In earlier times, an apology referred to a defense, justification, or excuse. Its modern meaning and usage have shifted so that now an apology begins where these former rhetorical and essentially self–serving forms leave off. The implications of this semantic divergence for our purposes are not insignificant. To apologize is to declare voluntarily that one has no excuse, defense, justification, or explanation for an action (or inaction) that has "insulted, failed, injured, or wronged another." On the other hand, one who offers an account, for example, an excuse or defense, asks the offended party, in effect, to be reasonable by giving explanations that are intended to (partially or fully) release him or her. So it is that such placatory or evasive attempts, no matter how sincere, always seek to divert attention from the agent of action to conventional categories of causality such as incapacity, accident, ignorance, or coercion. In sharp contrast, one who apologizes seeks forgiveness and redemption for what is unreasonable, unjustified, undeserving, and inequitable.
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### 1NC – DA

#### Immigration reform will pass --- it’s a top priority.

**Foley and Stein**, **1/2**/2013 (Elise and Sam, Obama’s Immigration Reform To Begin This Month, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html>)

Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda. An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit. With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished. "The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill." It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push. Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

#### Plan Unpopular

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.

#### Capital is key --- it bridges support from both parties.

Dallas Morning News, **1/2**/2012 (Editorial: Actions must match Obama’s immigration pledge, p. <http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/20130102-editorial-actions-must-match-obamas-immigration-pledge.ece>)

The president’s words to NBC’s David Gregory are only that — words. What will really matter is whether he puts his muscle into the task this year. We suggest that Obama start by looking at the example of former President George W. Bush. Back in 2006 and 2007, the Republican and his administration constantly worked Capitol Hill to pass a comprehensive plan. They failed, largely because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn’t stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn’t want a bill, either. And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans. In short, the nation doesn’t need a repeat of the process through which the 2010 health care legislation was passed. Very few Republicans bought into the president’s plan, leaving the Affordable Care Act open to partisan sniping throughout last year’s election. If the nation is going to create a saner immigration system, both parties need to support substantial parts of an answer. The new system must include a guest worker program for future immigrants and a way for illegal immigrants already living here to legalize their status over time. Some House Republicans will object to one or both of those reforms, so Speaker John Boehner must be persuasive about the need for a wholesale change. But the leadership that matters most will come from the White House. The president has staked out the right position. Now he needs to present a bill and fight this year for a comprehensive solution. Nothing but action will count. HE SAID IT … “I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. I will introduce legislation in the first year [of the second term] to get that done. I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.” President Barack Obama, in an interview on Meet the Press Sunday

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

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

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

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

**Schaffer**, Spring **2002** (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 1NC - CP

#### The United States federal government should

* Empower the private sector to manage used nuclear fuel
* Empower a private entity that is representative of, but independent from nuclear operators, to commoditize geologic storage of nuclear waste
* abolish the Nuclear Waste Fund allowing nuclear operators to fold the costs of waste management into the price of nuclear powered electricity
* Limit its role in nuclear waste management to providing oversight, basic research and development, and taking title of spent fuel upon repository decommissioning

#### Privatizing the used fuel management process is key to nuclear success – gives stakeholders a strong interest in developing a sustainable solution

Spencer, 12 – Research Fellow in Nuclear Energy in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies (Jack, 6/21. “A Free Market Approach to Managing Used Nuclear Fuel.” http://cybercemetery.unt.edu/archive/brc/20120621015155/http://brc.gov/sites/default/files/meetings/attachments/brc\_summary\_jack\_spencer.pdf)

Transforming how the United States manages used nuclear fuel is critical to the long-term success of nuclear power. Private sector nuclear operators produce used nuclear fuel, are technically adept at working with it, and depend on its successful disposition for future operations. However, the private sector’s strong interest in used fuel management is undermined by the current system, which places the responsibility for waste management in the hands of the federal government. Unfortunately, the federal government has been unable to fulfill its waste management obligations. Giving the private sector responsibility to manage used nuclear fuel would align those with the strongest interest in developing a sustainable used fuel strategy with the authority and motivation to do something about it. Although the privatization will remove the federal government from the responsibility of managing used fuel, its role as a regulator to protect public health and safety, ensuring that national security requirements are met, and taking title of any permanent storage facilities after decommissioning would endure. Such a transformation will not be easy. It will require a commitment by the Administration to willfully give up control of the process, Congress will have to significantly amend important pieces of legislation and the private sector will have to be willing to take on the responsibility of waste management. But it can be done. And the first step will be to empower nuclear operators (waste producers) to manage their own used nuclear fuel and authorize them to manage Yucca Mountain. This would place the responsibility of waste management with those with the greatest interest in a sustainable waste management strategy. It would also allow them to manage the one scarce resource (geologic storage space) that is common to all waste management strategies.

### 1NC - K

#### The affirmative’s assumption of the necessity for technological advancement is rooted in mind-world dualism --- challenging this ontological orientation is a pre-requisite to effective use of technology and the creation of a sustainable relationship to the environment.

David R. Loy, 2010. Former professor of philosophy and religion @ Bunkyo University, Tokyo, Japan, and in the Theology Department at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, and an authorized teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan lineage of Zen Buddhism where he completed formal koan training under Zen Master Yamada Koun Roshi, M.A. in Asian philosophy from the University of Hawaii in 1975, and Ph.D. in philosophy in 1984 from the National University of Singapore. “Healing Ecology,” Journal of Buddhist Ethics Vol 17, <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/files/2010/05/Loy-Healing-Ecology1.pdf>.

So what does Buddhism have to offer us today, as we struggle to respond to the eco-crisis? What the Buddha did know about was dukkha, the term usually translated as “suffering” yet to be understood in the broadest sense: dissatisfaction, discontent, anxiety—basically, our ma-nifest inability to be happy. Śākyamuni Buddha declared that all he had to teach was dukkha and how to end it, which does not mean that life is always miserable but that even those who are wealthy and healthy expe-rience a dis-ease that keeps gnawing. That we find life frustrating, one damn problem after another, is not accidental, because it is the nature of an unawakened mind to be bothered about something. What, if anything, does that imply about the ecological crisis? I believe that there are precise and profound parallels between our usual individual predicament, according to Buddhism, and the present situa-tion of human civilization. This suggests that the eco-crisis is as much a spiritual challenge as a technological and economic one. Does this mean that there is also a parallel between the two solutions? Does the Buddhist response to our personal predicament also point the way to resolving our collective one? The Individual Predicament The Four Noble (or ennobling) Truths of the Buddha are all about dukkha and how to end it. To put an end to my dukkha, however, I need to expe-rience anatta—not-self—which from the other side is also my interde-pendence with all other beings, both living and inanimate. As far as I know, no other philosophy or religious tradition focuses so clearly on the intrinsic connection between dukkha and our delusive sense of self. It’s no exaggeration to say that for Buddhism the self is dukkha. Although Buddhist teachings explain it in various ways, funda-mentally anatta denies our separation from other people and, yes, from the (rest of) the natural world. Of course, each of us has a sense of self, but in contemporary terms that sense of self is a psychological and social construction, without any self-existence (svabhāva) or reality of its own. It is composed of mostly habitual ways of perceiving, feeling, thinking, acting, reacting, remembering, intending, and so forth. The basic prob-lem with this self is its delusive sense of duality. The construction of a separate self inside is also the construction of an “other” outside—an ob-jective world that is different from me. What is special about the Budd-hist perspective is its emphasis on the dukkha built into this situation. One way to describe this problem is that, since the sense of self is a mental construct, it is by definition ungrounded and ungroundable, and therefore always insecure. It can never secure itself because there’s nothing substantial or real there that could be secured. The constructed self is better understood as a work in progress, because it is never com-pleted—more precisely, always unhealed. Another way to say it is that the sense of self is always shadowed or haunted by a sense of lack. Processes are temporal, necessarily impermanent, but we don’t want to be something that’s changing all the time, vulnerable to illness, old age and death. So we keep trying to secure ourselves, often in ways that just make our situation worse. This is the core of the ignorance that Buddhism emphasizes. We often try to secure ourselves by identifying with things “outside” us that (we think) can provide the grounding we crave: money, material posses-sions, reputation, power, physical attractiveness, and so forth. That is because we misunderstand our sense of lack as due to lack of such things. Since none of them can actually ground or secure my sense-of-self, it means that no matter how much money, and so forth, I may accumulate, I never seem to have enough. The tragedy, from a Buddhist perspective, is that such attempts to solve the problem so often end up reinforcing the actual problem—the sense that there is a “me” that’s separate from others. The Buddhist solution to this predicament is not to get rid of the self. That cannot be done, and does not need to be done, because there is no separate self. There never was such a self. It is the sense of self that needs to be deconstructed (for example, in meditation) and recon-structed (for example, replacing the “three poisons” of greed, ill will and delusion with their more positive counterparts: generosity, loving-kindness, and wisdom). We need to “wake up” and see through the illu-sion of self: I am not inside, peering out at the objective world out there. Rather, “I” am one of the ways in which all the causes and conditions of the world come together—what the whole world is doing—right here and now. This realization does not automatically solve all my personal prob-lems, but it reveals how my sense of self can be reconstructed, so that my way of experiencing the world is more “permeable” and I relate to others in a less dualistic fashion. That brings us to the bodhisattva path. In Buddhism that path is often presented as a personal sacrifice: a bodhisattva is someone who is enlightened and could choose to leave this world of dukkha, yet he or she sticks around to help the rest of us. But there’s another way to under-stand it. If I’m not separate from everyone else, can my well-being really be distinguished from the well-being of “others”? How can I be fully en-lightened, then, unless everyone else is as well? In that case, following the bodhisattva path is better understood as a more advanced stage of Buddhist practice: learning to live in ways that apply this insight to our daily lives. Taking care of “others,” then, becomes as natural as taking care of my own leg. To summarize: for Buddhism the sense of self is not something self-existing and real but a psychological construction, which involves a sense of separation from others. Our deepest dukkha is that we feel dis-connected from the rest of the world, and this feeling is always uncom-fortable, because insecure. We do many things that (we hope) will make us feel more real, yet they often have the opposite effect: they reinforce that sense of separation. No matter what we have or what we do, it’s never enough. While we cannot get rid of a self that does not exist, we can “wake up” and realize it is delusive. This also addresses the existen-tial question about the meaning of one’s life: realizing my nonduality with the world frees me to live as I choose, but that will naturally be in a way that contributes to the well-being of the whole, because I don’t feel apart from that whole. This Buddhist account of our individual predicament corresponds precisely to our collective ecological predicament today. Our Collective Situation We not only have individual senses of self, we also have group selves. I’m not only David Loy; I am male, Caucasian, a U.S. citizen, and so forth. And just as one’s individual sense of self tends to be problematic, so collective senses of self are often problematical, because they too distinguish those of us inside from those who are outside: men from women, white from black, Americans from Chinese, and so forth. Those of us who are inside are not only different from those outside; we like to think that we are better than them. Obviously, a lot of the world’s problems occur because of competition between group selves. The issue here is whether “separate self = dukkha” also holds true for our biggest collective sense of self: the duality between us as a spe-cies, Homo sapiens sapiens, and the rest of the biosphere. For such a parallel between the individual sense of self and hu-manity’s collective sense of self, the following must be true: 1. Like the personal sense of self, human civilization is a con-struct. 2. This construct has led to a collective sense of separation (alienation) from the natural world, which causes dukkha. 3. This dukkha involves anxiety about what it means to be hu-man—in this case, a fundamental confusion about what we as a species should be doing. 4. Our response to that alienation and anxiety—the collective at-tempt to secure or “self-ground” ourselves technologically and economically—is making things worse. 5. We cannot “return to nature” because we have never left it, but we need to realize our nonduality with the rest of the bi-osphere, and what that implies. 6. This will resolve our collective existential/spiritual problem about what it means to be human. With us the biosphere be-comes self-conscious. Our role today is to heal it, and thereby ourselves. The first claim, that human civilization is something constructed, seems obvious to us today; we are familiar with revolutions and reform move-ments, and the democratic process of passing new laws, and so forth. Nevertheless, this claim is not something most ancient societies unders-tood. The West owes that insight to classical Greece, which as far as I know was the first to distinguish nomos—the conventions of human so-ciety (including culture, technology, and so forth.)—from phusis, the nat-ural patterns of the physical world. The Greeks realized that, unlike the natural world, whatever is social convention can be reconstructed: we can re-organize our own societies and in that way (attempt to) determine our own destiny. Plato, for example, offered detailed plans to restructure the city-state in two of his dialogues, the Republic and the Laws. When we study his Republic we are reading something that was quite revolutio-nary in its time. Today it is difficult for us to understand that traditional societies did not realize this distinction between nature and social convention. Without our sense of historical development, and therefore different possibilities in the future, most premodern peoples accepted their own social conventions as inevitable and just as natural as their local ecosys-tems. Rulers might be overthrown, but new rulers took their place at the top of the social pyramid, which was also a religious pyramid: kings were gods or godlike because they had a special role to play in relating to the transcendent powers that supervised the created world. Often human societies served an important function in keeping the cosmos going: the Aztecs, for example, required mass human sacrifice because blood was what kept the sun-god on his correct course through the heavens. In short, the distinctions we now make between the natural world, the so-cial order, and religion did not exist for such cultures. Of course, understanding one’s own society as natural justified social arrangements that we would not tolerate today. Needless to say, the Aztecs did not have a democratic government or an independent le-gal system to defend one’s human rights. But there was nevertheless an important psychological benefit in thinking the way they did: people in such cultures share a collective sense of meaning that we have lost today. For them, the meaning of their lives is built into the cosmos and revealed by their religion, both of which are taken for granted. For us, in contrast, the meaning of our lives and our societies has become something that we have to determine for ourselves in a universe whose meaningfulness (if any) is no longer obvious. Even if we choose to be religious, we must de-cide between various possibilities, which diminishes the spiritual securi-ty that exclusive affiliation traditionally provides. While we enjoy many freedoms that pre-modern societies did not provide, the price of that freedom is losing their kind of “social security”: the basic psychological comfort that comes from “knowing” one’s place and role in society and in the world. In other words, part of the rich cultural legacy that the Greeks bequeathed to the West—for better and worse—is an increasing anxiety about who we are and what it means to be human. Loss (or reduction) of faith in God has left us rudderless, collectively as well as individually. Thanks to ever more powerful technologies, it seems like we can accom-plish almost anything we want to do—yet we don’t know what our role is, what we should do. What sort of world do we want to live in? What kind of society should we have? If we cannot depend on God or godlike rulers to tell us, we are thrown back upon ourselves, and the lack of any grounding greater than ourselves is a profound source of dukkha, collec-tive as well as individual. To sum up, our modern sense of separation from the natural world has become an ongoing source of alienation and frustration. (This corresponds to points one through three, above.) What has been our col-lective response to this predicament? Remember how we usually react to our individual predicament. I try to make my anxious sense of self “inside” more real by becoming at-tached to (identifying with) things in the “outside” world, such as mon-ey, fame, and power. No matter how much of them I may acquire, however, I never seem to have enough, because they cannot allay the basic anxiety, which stems from the inherent insecurity of my con-structed sense of self. Believing that something outside myself is the so-lution to my sense of lack is the fundamental delusion. Such “solutions” actually reinforce the problem, which is the sense of separation or dis-tance between myself and others. Is there a collective parallel to these sorts of compulsions? When we ask the question in this way, I believe that the answer becomes apparent: it’s our obsession with never-ending “progress” and growth. What motivates our attitude towards economic and technologi-cal development? When will our Gross National Product be large enough? When will we collectively consume enough? When will we have all the technology we need? Why is more always better if it can never be enough? My point is that technology and economic growth in themselves cannot resolve the basic human problem about what it means to be hu-man. They may be a good means to accomplish something but they are not good as ends-in-themselves. Since we are not sure how else to solve that problem, however, they have become a collective substitute, in ef-fect: forms of secular salvation that we seek but never quite attain. Since we don’t really know where we want to go, or what we should value, we have become demonically obsessed with ever-increasing power and con-trol. Notice the parallel with one’s individual predicament: lacking the security that comes from knowing our place and role in the cosmos, we have been trying to create our own security. Modern technology, in par-ticular, has become our collective attempt to fully control the conditions of our existence on this planet. In effect, we have been trying to remold the earth so that it is completely adapted to serve our purposes, until everything becomes subject to our will, a “resource” we can use. This is despite the fact, or rather because of the fact, that we do not know what those purposes should be. Ironically, if predictably, this has not been providing the sense of security and meaning that we seek. We have be-come more anxious and confused, not less. If these parallels are valid—if they are an accurate description of our collective situation—something like the ecological crisis is inevita-ble. Sooner or later (now?) we must bump up against the limits of this compulsive project of endless growth and never-enough control. And if our increasing reliance on technology as the solution to such problems is itself a symptom of this larger problem, the ecological crisis requires more than a technological response (although technological develop-ments are certainly necessary, of course—for example, more efficient solar panels). Increasing dependence on sophisticated, ever more power-ful technologies tends to aggravate our sense of separation from the natural world, whereas any successful solution (if the parallel still holds) must involve recognizing that we are an integral part of the natural world. That also means embracing our responsibility for the welfare of the biosphere, because its well-being ultimately cannot be distinguished from our own well-being. Understood properly, then, humanity’s taking care of the earth’s rainforests is like me taking care of my own leg. (Sound familiar?) Does this solution involve “returning to nature”? That would be like getting rid of the self: something neither desirable nor possible. We cannot return to nature because we have never left it. Look around your-self: even if you’re inside a windowless room, everything you see is de-rived from nature: not only wood from trees, but plastic from oil and concrete from sand and stone. The environment is not merely an “envi-ronment”—that is, not only the place where we happen to be located. Rather, the biosphere is the ground from which and within which we arise. The earth is not only our home, it is our mother. In fact, our rela-tionship is even more intimate, because we can never cut the umbilical cord. The air in my lungs, like the water and food that enter my mouth and pass through my digestive system, is part of a greater holistic system that circulates through me. My life is a dissipative process that depends upon and contributes to that never-ending circulation. The same is true collectively. Our waste products do not disappear when we find some-where else to dump them. The world is big enough that we may be able to ignore such problems for a while, but what goes around eventually comes around. If we befoul our own nest, there is nowhere else to go. According to this understanding, the problem is not technology itself but the obsessive ways that we have been motivated to exploit it. Without those motivations, we would be able to evaluate our technolo-gies better, in light of the ecological problems to which they have con-tributed, as well as the ecological solutions to which they might contribute. Given all the long-term risks associated with nuclear power, for example, I cannot see that as anything but a short-sighted solution to our energy needs. In place of fossil fuels, the answer will have to be re-newable sources of natural power (solar, wind, and so forth), along with a reduced need for energy. As long as we assume the necessity of conti-nuous economic and technological expansion, the prospect of a steep reduction in our energy needs is impossible, but a new understanding of our basic situation opens up other possibilities. This points to a very simple (although not necessarily easy) solution to our energy problems: instead of asking “how can we get all the energy we need?” I propose that we turn that around by determining how much renewable energy is available and restructuring human civilization accordingly.

#### 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 blinded, 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.

#### 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.

### 1NC – DA

#### Electricity prices are declining in the status quo

**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.

#### But, 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

Perry 7/31/12 (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.

### 1NC – No War

#### Great power war is likely now –

#### A. Self-interest

Coker 11 [Christopher Coker is Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science, “Review: Why Nations Fight, Richard Ned Lebow”, Ethics & International Affairs, 25, no. 3 (2011), pp. 385–391, Chetan]

Why Nations Fight has Richard Ned Lebow’s familiar stamp: it is meticulously researched, trenchantly argued, grounded in extraordinarily wide reading, and informed by a healthy dose of common sense. He has no truck with authors, such as John Mueller, who argue that war is now in terminal decline, especially among the great powers. According to Lebow, **four** generic **motives have** historically **led to war: fear, interest, status, and revenge**—**and all of them are still likely to lead to future conﬂict**. None of these motives can be effectively addressed by war, but what we perceive to be objectively true does not always accord with objective reality. As for Mueller’s claim that war will go the way of dueling and slavery in the nineteenth century, I would go as far as to say that neither slavery nor dueling has disappeared. According to the United Nations there are 29 million slaves in the world today (in absolute terms, the highest number in history). Nor have we given up dueling: we simply have moved the practice to the courts, where we sue our enemies for defamation. As for war, it is positively protean in its ability to be re-branded. **Yesterday’s foot soldiers have been joined by “cyber-warriors”** and “cubicle warriors” (the drone pilots who remotely deal in death and destruction over the skies of Pakistan and now Yemen). Precisely because we have removed much of the risk to our own personnel, **we have given war a renewed lease on life**, even if at the same time we have rendered it post-heroic. “I hope that many more computer chips will lay down their lives for their country,” remarked an American colonel after the downing of a drone in Bosnia in the 1900s. Lebow is famous for challenging the inherent philistinism of neopositivism in American social science. He has read the Greeks and knows his Thucydides, the very ﬁrst military historian (the man who invented the genre) and who called war “the human thing.” It is humanity that the neopositivists largely ignore. As in Lebow’s last book, A Cultural Theory of International Relations, he challenges the realist emphasis on material factors, stressing instead **motives deriving from the need of states for reputation, status, and standing. States, like people, need to be esteemed: they need to be accorded a ranking among other states, and they need to be honored. And they are willing to avenge themselves for any slight they feel has been inﬂicted upon them**

#### B. Nuclear taboo is eroding

**Potter 10** [Dr. William Potter is Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar Professor of Nonproliferation Studies and Director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS). “In Search of the Nuclear Taboo: Past, Present, and Future” Proliferation Papers, No. 31, Winter 2010, Chetan]

**Less positive indicators of the vitality and durability of any non-use norm**, however, also **are in evidence**. A short list of bad news items includes: **the rise in the threat of** high consequence **nuclear terrorism** involving both improvised nuclear devices and intact nuclear weapons, **the failure of the CTBT to enter into force**, **the growing reliance on nuclear weapons** by some nuclear weapons possessors **to compensate for shortcomings in manpower and**/or **conventional weapons** (e.g., the Russian Federation and Pakistan), the disavowal by the United States during the Bush administration and, more recently by the Russian Federation, of a number of the “13 Practical Steps on Disarmament” adopted at the 2000 NPT Review Conference,12 stalled negotiations between the United States and the Russian Federation over the extension of several key nuclear arms control treaties that will soon expire, the barren results of the 2005 NPT Review Conference and less than encouraging indications for the next Review Conference in 2010, and **the erosion of the perceived benefits of non-nuclear weapon status** accentuated by the U.S.-India deal and the associated exemption granted to India by the Nuclear Suppliers Group in 2008. Perhaps most troubling is the potential for rapid escalation from conventional to nuclear weapons use in several regions, especially in South Asia. Space does not allow a discussion of all of the aforementioned positive and negative indicators, their impact on the probability that past **restraint with** respect to **nuclear weapons use will** either persist or **lapse**, or the likelihood of occurrence of specific breach scenarios. An examination of **several trends**, however, may **provide some clues as to** the durability of non-use and the conditions that might trigger at least **a departure from the current norm/tradition/taboo.**

#### Most recent evidence proves nuclear winter causes extinction

**Starr 12**  [Steven Starr - Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program at the University of Missouri-Columbia, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, has been published by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, his writings appear on the websites of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology Center for Arms Control, Energy and Environmental Studies, Scientists for Global Responsibility, and the International Network of Scientists Against Proliferation, “What is nuclear darkness?,” <http://www.nucleardarkness.org/web/whatisnucleardarkness/>]

In a nuclear war, burning cities would create millions of tons of thick, black smoke. This smoke would rise above cloud level, into the stratosphere, where it would quickly spread around the planet. A large nuclear war would produce enough smoke to block most sunlight from reaching the Earth's surface. Massive absorption of warming sunlight by a global stratospheric smoke layer would rapidly create Ice Age temperatures on Earth . The cold would last a long time; NASA computer models predict 40% of the smoke would still remain in the stratosphere ten years after a nuclear war. Half of 1% of the explosive power of US-Russian nuclear weapons can create enough nuclear darkness to impact global climate. 100 Hiroshima-size weapons exploded in the cities of India and Pakistan would put up to 5 million tons of smoke in the stratosphere . The smoke would destroy much of the Earth's protective ozone layer and drop temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere to levels last seen in the Little Ice Age. Shortened growing seasons could cause up to 1 billion people to starve to death. A large nuclear war could put 150 million tons of smoke in the stratosphere and make global temperatures colder than they were 18,000 years ago during the coldest part of the last Ice Age. Killing frosts would occur every day for 1-3 years in the large agricultural regions of the Northern Hemisphere. Average global precipitation would be reduced by 45%. Earth's ozone layer would be decimated. Growing seasons would be eliminated. A large nuclear war would utterly devastate the environment and cause most people to starve to death . Deadly climate change, radioactive fallout and toxic pollution would cause already stressed ecosystems to collapse. The result would be a mass extinction event that would wipe out many animals living at the top of the food chains - including human beings.

**Any risk of war outweighs- the mere possibility of extinction means you should avoid it**

**Kateb 92**

(George, Professor at Princeton, The Inner Ocean: Individualism and Democratic Culture, p. 110-112)

The highest worth of Schell’s book lies in his insistence that we should all contemplate the nuclear situation from the perspective of possible human extinction and be overcome by the obligation no matter what to try to avoid human extinction. Yet as Schell says, human extinction (as well as the extinction of most species in nature) is not the intention of anyone in power. What must be seen is that the absolute end can come about even though no one intends it. “We can do it,” he says, “only if we don’t quite know what we’re doing.” Schell’s work attempts to force on us an acknowledgement that sounds far-fetched and even ludicrous, an acknowledgement that the possibility of extinction is carried by any use of nuclear weapons no matter how limited or how seemingly rational or seemingly morally justified. He himself acknowledges that there is a difference between possibility and certainty. But in a matter that is more than a matter, more than one practical matter in a vast series of practical matters, in the “matter” or extinction, we are obliged to treat a possibility – a genuine possibility – as a certainty. Humanity is not to take any step that contains even the slightest risk of extinction. The doctrine of no-use us based on the possibility of extinction. Schell’s perspective transforms the subject. He takes us away from the arid stretches of strategy and asks us to feel continuously, if we can, and feel keenly if only for an instant now and then, how utterly distinct the nuclear world is. Nuclear discourse must vividly register that distinctiveness. It is of no moral account that extinction may be only a slight possibility. No one can say how great the possibility is, but no one has yet credibly denied that by some sequence or other a particular use of nuclear weapons may lead to human and natural extinction. If it is not impossible it must be treated as certain; the loss signified by extinction nullifies all calculations of probability as it nullifies all calculations of costs and benefits. Abstractly put, the connections between any use of nuclear weapons and human and natural extinction are several. Most obviously, a sizeable exchange of strategic nuclear weapons can, by a chain of events in nature, lead to the earth’s uninhabitability, to “nuclear winter”, or to Schell’s “republic of insects and grass.” But the consideration of extinction cannot rest with the possibility of a sizeable exchange of strategic weapons. It cannot rest with the imperative that a sizeable exchange must not take place. A so-called tactical or “theater” use, or a so-called limited use, is also prohibited absolutely because of the possibility of immediate escalation into a sizable exchange or because, even if there were not an immediate escalation, the possibility of extinction would reside in the precedent for future use set by any use whatever in a world in which more than one power possesses nuclear weapons. Add other consequences; the contagious effect on nonnuclear powers who may feel compelled by a mixture of fear and vanity to try to acquire their own weapons, this increasing the possibility of use by increasing the number of nuclear powers; and the unleashed emotions of indignation, retribution, and revenge which, if not acted on immediately in the form of escalation, can be counted on to seek expression later. Other than full strategic uses are not confined no matter how small the explosive power each would be a cancerous transformation of the world. All nuclear roads lead to the possibility of extinction. It is true by definition, but let us make it explicit: the doctrine of no-use excludes any first or retaliatory or later use, whether sizable or not. No-use is the imperative derived from the possibility of extinction. By containing the possibility of extinction, any use is tantamount to a declaration of war against humanity. It is not merely a war crime or a single crime against humanity. Such a war is waged by the user of nuclear weapons against every human individual as individual present and future, not as citizen of this or that country. It is not only a war against the country that is the target. To respond with nuclear weapons, where possible, only increases the chances of extinction and can never, therefore, be allowed. The use of nuclear weapons establishes the right of any person or group, acting officially or not, violently or not, to try to punish those responsible for the use. The aim of the punishment is to deter later uses and thus to try to reduce the possibility of extinction, if, by chance, the particular use in question did not directly lead to extinction. The form of the punishment cannot be specified. Of course the chaos ensuing from a sizable exchange could make punishment irrelevant. The important point, however, is to see that those who use nuclear weapons are qualitatively worse than criminals, and at the least forfeit their offices.

### 1NC – 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.

#### Nuclear power can’t solve warming -- electricity sector emissions are too small, and inevitable demand increases mean the impact is negligible at best.

Green, ‘6

[Jim, national nuclear campaigner with Friends of the Earth, has an honours degree in public health and a PhD in science and technology studies for his doctoral thesis on the Lucas Heights research reactor debates, energyscience.org.au, “Nuclear power and climate change,” November, <http://www.energyscience.org.au/FS03%20Nucl%20Power%20Clmt%20Chng.pdf>]

It is widely accepted that anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions must be sharply reduced to avert climate change. However, nuclear power is at best a very partial, problematic and unnecessary response to climate change: • A doubling of nuclear power would reduce global greenhouse emissions by about 5%. A much larger nuclear expansion program would pose enormous proliferation and security risks, and it would run up against the problem of limited known conventional uranium reserves. • The serious hazards of civil nuclear programs - the repeatedly demonstrated contribution of civil nuclear programs to weapons proliferation, intractable waste management problems, and the risk of serious accidents. • The availability of a plethora of clean energy options - renewable energy sources plus energy efficiency - which, combined, can meet energy demand and sharply reduce greenhouse emissions. (See for example the reports produced by the Clean Energy Future Group).1 This information paper addresses the first of those arguments - the limitations of nuclear power as a climate change abatement strategy. A limited response Nuclear power is used almost exclusively for electricity generation. (A very small number of reactors are used for heat co-generation and desalination.) Electricity is responsible for less than one third of global greenhouse gas emissions. According to the Uranium Institute, the figure is “about 30%”.2 That fact alone puts pay to the simplistic view that nuclear power alone can ‘solve’ climate change. According to a senior energy analyst with the International Atomic Energy Agency, Alan McDonald: “Saying that nuclear power can solve global warming by itself is way over the top”.3 Ian Hore-Lacy from the Uranium Information Centre (UIC) claims that a doubling of nuclear power would reduce greenhouse emissions in the power sector by 25%.4 That figure is reduced to a 7.5% reduction if considering the impact on overall emissions rather than just the power sector. The figure needs to be further reduced because the UIC makes no allowance for the considerable time that would be required to double nuclear output. Electricity generation is projected to increase over the coming decades so the contribution of a fixed additional input of nuclear power has a relatively smaller impact. Overall, it is highly unlikely that a doubling of global nuclear power would reduce emissions by more than 5%.

#### Tripling current global capacity by 2050 is necessary for nuclear power to solve warming -- multiple constraints prevent that.

Squassoni, ‘8

[Sharon, Senior Associate, Nonproliferation Program -- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3-12, “The Realities of Nuclear Expansion” Congressional Testimony: House Select Committee for Energy Independence and Global Warming, Washington, DC]

In 2004, Princeton scientists Stephen Pacala and Robert Socolow published a “wedge analysis” for stabilizing global climate change.3 Since fossil fuels currently emit seven billion tons of carbon/year and are projected to double that level through 2050 in the business-as-usual scenario, Pacala and Socolow considered what technologies and/or approaches might help stabilize those emissions at current levels (about 375 ppm). Seven wedges of reduced emissions (a cumulative effect of 25 billion tons through 2050, or one billion tons of carbon/year reduction at the end of that period) were postulated. One “wedge” would ultimately achieve a reduction of one billion tons per year (or 25 billion cumulative tons) by 2050. For nuclear energy to “solve” just one-seventh of the problem – lowering emissions by one billion tons per year – an additional 700 GWe of capacity would have to be built, assuming the reactors replaced 700 GWe of modern coal-electric plants.4 Because virtually all operating reactors will have to be retired in that time, this means building approximately 1070 reactors in 42 years, or about 25 reactors per year. Current global reactor capacity is 373 GWe or 439 reactors worldwide. In short, one “nuclear wedge” would require almost tripling current capacity. Mapping A “Realistic Growth” Scenario Nuclear Expansion5 The attached maps (see slide 1) depict estimates of reactor capacity growth for 2030 and 2050, according to three scenarios. The first is a “realistic growth” scenario, based on the U.S. Energy Information Administration figures for 2030.6 The second is what states have planned for 2030, or a “wildly optimistic” scenario. The third is roughly based on the high-end projections for 2050 done by MIT in their 2003 study entitled “The Future of Nuclear Power.” This 1500 GWe scenario lies between the Pacala-Socolow wedge and the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change estimates that nuclear energy could reduce carbon emissions between two billion and six billion tons/year (or 1800 GWe – 4500 GWe).7 A few caveats with respect to projecting nuclear energy expansion are necessary. Nuclear energy is undoubtedly safer and more efficient now than when it began fifty years ago, but it still faces four fundamental challenges: waste, cost, proliferation, and safety. It is an inherently risky business. Most industry executives will admit that it will only take one significant accident to plunge the “renaissance” back into the nuclear Dark Ages. Because of this, estimates are highly uncertain. For example, the U.S. Energy Information Administration does not use its computer model to estimate nuclear energy growth because, among other things, key variables such as public attitudes and government policy are difficult to quantify and project. That said, estimates tend to extrapolate electricity consumption and demand from gross domestic product (GDP) growth, make assumptions about nuclear energy’s share of electricity production, and then estimate nuclear reactor capacity. The United States, France, and Japan constitute more than half of total world nuclear reactor capacity (see slide 1). Yet half of the 34 reactors now under construction are in Asia.8 Under any scenario, nuclear power is expected to grow most in Asia, because of high Chinese and Indian growth and electricity demand. Under the realistic growth scenario, the U.S. Energy Information Administration estimates 2030 reactor capacity at 481 GWe. The International Energy Agency (IEA) envisions greater potential for expansion, projecting a range from 414 to 679 GWe in 2030, but the higher number would require significant policy support. With electricity consumption expected to double by 2030, nuclear energy will have a difficult time just keeping its market share – currently 16 percent of global production.9 According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, with no change in energy policies, “the energy mix supplied to run the global economy in the 2025-2030 time-frame will essentially remain unchanged with about 80% of the energy supply based on fossil fuels.”10 Coal now provides 59% of electricity production, followed by hydroelectric power at 39% and oil and gas together provide 25%. Renewables are just 1-2% of total electricity production. Moreover, regions that have coal tend to use it, particularly for electricity generation, which increases greenhouse gas emissions. The IPCC has noted that “in recent years, intensified coal use has been observed for a variety of reasons in developing Asian countries, the USA and some European countries. In a number of countries, the changing relative prices of coal to natural gas have changed the dispatch order in power generation in favor of coal.” Many fear that states such as China and India – both of which are not subject to Kyoto Protocol targets because they are developing states – will meet their increased demand with cheap coal. Without further policy changes, according to the International Energy Agency, the share of nuclear energy could drop to 10% of global electricity production. “Wildly Optimistic” Growth Scenario Although some states, such as Germany and Sweden, plan to phase out nuclear power, the trend line is moving in the opposite direction. This growth scenario does not contain projections based on electricity demand, but instead takes at face value what states have projected for themselves. The result is a total of 700 GWe global capacity (see slide 2) – two-thirds of what one nuclear wedge to affect global climate change would require. The reason these estimates are wildly optimistic is that over 20 nations have announced intentions to install nuclear reactors. Several of these – Turkey, Egypt, and Philippines – had planned for nuclear power in the past, but abandoned such plans for various reasons. Some of these new nuclear plans are more credible than others and can be differentiated into those that have approved or funded construction, those that have clear proposals but without formal commitments, and those that are exploring nuclear energy (see slide 3). In the Middle East, these include Iran, Israel, Jordan and Yemen, with potential interest expressed by Syria, Kuwait, and the Gulf Cooperation Council states of Saudi Arabia, Oman, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Bahrain. In Europe, Belarus, Turkey and Azerbaijan have announced plans, as well as Kazakhstan. In Asia, Bangladesh, Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Indonesia have announced plans, and the Philippines has also expressed interest. Venezuela has also declared it will develop nuclear power. In Africa, Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, and Nigeria have announced plans to develop nuclear power, and Algeria and Ghana have expressed interest.11 More than half of all those states are in the Middle East. Although this could result in reduced carbon emissions, because Middle Eastern states use more oil for electricity production (34%) than elsewhere, this is not where the real electricity demand is coming from. “Climate Change” Growth Scenario A rough approximation of where reactor capacity would expand in a climate change scenario is based on the high scenario of the 2003 MIT Study, “The Future of Nuclear Power.” For 1500 GW capacity, MIT estimated that 54 countries (an additional 23) would have commercial nuclear power programs. This essentially means a five-fold increase in the numbers of reactors worldwide and an annual build rate of 35 per year. In the event that smaller-sized reactors are deployed in developing countries – which makes eminent sense – the numbers could be much higher.12 If nuclear energy were assumed to be able to contribute a reduction of between two and six billion tons of carbon per year as outlined in the Stern Report, the resulting reactor capacity would range between 1800 GWe and 4500 GWe – increases ranging from six to ten times the current capacity.13 This would require building between 42 and 107 reactors per year through 2050. Impact on Uranium Enrichment Such increases in reactor capacity would certainly have repercussions for the front and back ends of the fuel cycle. Almost 90 percent of current operating reactors use lowenriched uranium (LEU). Presently, eleven countries have commercial uranium enrichment capacity and produce between 40 and 50 million SWU. A capacity of 1070 GWe – the one “wedge” scenario – could mean tripling enrichment capacity, requiring anywhere from 11 to 22 additional enrichment plants.14 A capacity of 1500 GWe would require quadrupling enrichment capacity (see slide 4).15 Further, if Stern Report nuclear expansion levels are achieved, enrichment capacity would have to increase ten-fold. In assessing where new uranium enrichment capacity might develop, the MIT study assumed that 18 states would have 10 GWe reactor capacity – the point at which domestic uranium enrichment becomes competitive with LEU sold on the international market – and thus might enrich uranium. (See slide 4 for a more modest approach, with nine additional countries enriching uranium).16 Impact on Spent Fuel Reprocessing A key question is whether an expansion of nuclear reactors would result in an expansion of spent fuel reprocessing. This is not necessarily the case, because decisions about whether to store fuel or reprocess it depend on several factors: existing storage capacities; fuel cycle approaches (once-through, one recycle, fast reactors) and new technologies; and cost. A shift to fast reactors that can burn or breed plutonium implies an increase in recycling, whether this is traditional reprocessing that separates out plutonium, or options under consideration now that would not separate out the plutonium. France and Japan now commercially reprocess their spent fuel and recycle the plutonium once in mixed oxide-fuelled reactors. Russia also reprocesses a small percentage of its spent fuel. A troubling development in the last two years from a nonproliferation perspective has been the U.S. embrace of recycling spent fuel under the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, after a policy of 30 years of not encouraging the use of plutonium in the civil nuclear fuel cycle. Whether or not the United States ultimately reprocesses or recycles fuel, other states are now more likely to view reprocessing as necessary for an advanced fuel cycle. Constraints on Nuclear Expansion17 There are significant questions about whether nuclear expansion that could affect global climate change is even possible. In the United States, as the chief operating officer of Exelon recently told an industry conference, constraints include: the lack of any recent U.S. nuclear construction experience; the atrophy of U.S. nuclear manufacturing infrastructure; production bottlenecks created by an increase in worldwide demand; and an aging labor force.

#### Robust analysis proves nuclear power can’t mitigate climate change -- climactic effects hinder reactor effectiveness -- their authors rely on a simplistic understanding of nuclear power.

Kopytko & Perkins, ‘11

[Natalie, PhD Researcher in the Environment Department, University of York, John, former chief economist at a major international consulting firm, advised the World Bank, United Nations, IMF, U.S. Treasury Department, Fortune 500 corporations, and countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East, his books on economics and geo-politics have sold more than 1 million copies, spent many months on the New York Times and other bestseller lists, and are published in over 30 languages, “Climate Change, Nuclear Power, and the Adaptation-Mitigation Dilemma,” Energy Policy, [Volume 39, Issue 1](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/03014215/39/1), January 2011, Pages 318–333, Science Direct]

Numerous analysts from industry, commerce, government, academia, andnon-profits have promoted nuclear power as an appropriate mitigation for climate change. In essentially all cases the logic of the proposal is simple and appealing: • climate change results primarily from burning fossil fuels, which releases carbon dioxide to the atmosphere; • nuclear power yields no carbon emissions as electricity is generated; • therefore nuclear power is an appropriate, indeed perhaps ideal, mitigation for climate change. Appealing as this logic model appears, it unfortunately ignores a wide range of other issues, each of which impinges upon the quest for reduced carbon emissions. Thus it is too simplistic and seriously misleads. The argument leads to easy conclusions about the suitability of nuclear power to temper climate change when in fact a more robust analysis suggests the opposite conclusion. Perhaps the single most important factor undermining the simple logic model stems from the fact that nuclear reactors require enormous amounts of water to cool or condense the coolant which transfers heat from the core to the turbines and cools the reactor core. This is why nuclear power plants are located near substantial amounts of water: the ocean, large lakes, and big rivers. If climate change affects the temperature, quality, or quantity of water, then existing nuclear power plants may be adversely affected. This paper examines several ways in which climate change has already affected water in ways that create problems for existing nuclear power plants. Specifically it examines the effects of sea level rise on nine existing coastal sites in the USA and the consequences of changes in water for inland reactors in France. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) models of sea level rise and a review of existing reports and published literature suggest that numerous existing plants have been or may be adversely affected by climate change. We call the set of interactions among climate change, water, and nuclear power the “adaptation-mitigation dilemma.” This term signals that existing and projected climate change threatens the operations and safety of existing plants and poses other challenges to efforts to adapt to climate change. Thus existing nuclear power plants may not represent a good technology for mitigation of climate change. A separate question concerns the potential of new nuclear power plants to avoid the problems with water we identify in this paper. Maybe it’s possible to build new plants that don’t suffer the syndrome of problems in the adaptation-mitigation dilemma. For reasons explained in the conclusion of this paper, however, we believe that it may be quite difficult to fully avoid the dilemmas identified here. At the very least, avoiding these challenges will add costs and possibly increase the risks of nuclear power, both of which are already severe handicaps for this technology. This paper acknowledges that sharply differing opinions abound on what, if any, role is appropriate for nuclear power in the debates about climate change. It seeks, however, to shift the analysis and debates about nuclear power away from “Is it a good, safe, cost-effective way to reduce carbon emissions?” to “What can we learn about current nuclear power plants and how they have been or probably will be affected by the climate change that has already occurred?” With this shift comes the potential for analysis that is less fought with ideological baggage that hinders a clear understanding of nuclear power.

#### Global warming won’t cause species extinction – most evidence suggests warmer climates increase extinction resistance

Carter et al 11 [Dr. Robert M. Carter is a stratigrapher and marine geologist with degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England)., Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. S. Fred Singer is one of the most distinguished atmospheric physicists in the U.S. He established and served as the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, now part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and earned a U.S. Department of Commerce Gold Medal Award for his technical leadership. “Climate Change Reconsidered – 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change” http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf, Chetan]

Results of other studies also suggest the model-based species extinction hypothesis is unlikely to occur. In a review paper published in Current Biology, for example, Erwin (2009) explored past epochs and the myriad nooks and crannies of contemporary Earth, all in a search for the primary trigger of speciation. His conclusion? Warmth is the fire that fuels the process by which species originate, whereas cold tends to destroy what warmth produced. Headquartered in the Department of Paleobiology at the National Museum of Natural History in Washington, DC (USA), Erwin writes, ―some of the best evidence for a link between biodiversity and climate comes from latitudinal gradients in diversity, which provide an avenue to explore the more general relationship between climate and evolution.‖ In reviewing that evidence, he indicates ―among the wide range of biotic hypotheses, those with the greatest empirical support indicate that warmer climates [1] have provided the energetic foundation for increased biodiversity by fostering greater population size and thus increased extinction resistance, [2] have increased metabolic scope, [3] have allowed more species to exploit specialized niches as a result of greater available energy, and [4] have generated faster speciation and/or lower extinction rates.‖ He states ―in combination with geologic evidence for carbon dioxide levels and changing areas of tropical seas, these observations provide the basis for a simple, first-order model of the relationship between climate through the Phanerozoic and evolutionary patterns and diversity,‖ and he adds ―such a model suggests that we should expect greatest marine diversity during globally warm intervals,‖ as is typically also found to be the case for terrestrial diversity. Erwin notes ―the three best-studied mass extinction events are associated with sharp changes in climate and support the contention that rapid shifts in climate can reduce global diversity,‖ which sounds much like the mantra of the IPCC with respect to global warming. However, the climate shifts Erwin cites consist mostly of cooling, and it is not only the shift to cooling but stagnating in a cool state that bodes badly for Earth‘s biodiversity. As Erwin describes it, ―the long interval of stagnant evolution during the Permo-Carboniferous glaciation is consistent with studies of modern-day latitudinal diversity that [indicate] rates of evolutionary innovation and diversification are higher in highenergy climates than in low-energy climates.‖ In further explanation of this conceptual framework, Erwin notes ―contemporary studies suggest a positive relationship between high-energy climates and [1] increased diversification rates, [2] increased number of niches because of increased metabolic scope, and [3] more specialized niches, and possibly because of [4] niche construction.‖ Indeed, he states ―studies showing that the tropics are a cradle of diversity, pumping clade representatives into higher latitudes, as well as evidence of increased ordinal level originations in the tropics, and of the sudden appearance of several mammalian groups during the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum suggest an asymmetric pattern of innovations associated with high-energy climate regimes.‖ Erwin‘s parting comment in this regard is his statement, ―there is an intriguing possibility that diversity does not track climate, but rather builds up during warm intervals but without falling by proportional amounts when climates turn cooler,‖ with the result that ―warmer climates may serve as an evolutionary diversification pump with higher diversity persisting [throughout following cooler periods], at least for a time.‖ Whatever the details may be, two generalizations clearly can be made: warmth typically begets speciation, whereas cold tends to lead to species extinctions.

#### Warming is irreversible

ANI 10 (“IPCC has underestimated climate-change impacts, say scientists”, 3-20, One India, http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html)

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green.

#### CO2 is not the one cause for climate change – solar radiation and ocean interactions are ignored

Patterson 11 [Norman Paterson is a Professional Engineer and Consulting Geophysicist with 60 years’ experience in Mineral and Environmental Geophysics. He obtained his Ph. D in Geophysics at the University of Toronto in 1955, and was elected Fellow, Royal Society of Canada in 1977. “Global Warming: A Critique of the Anthropogenic Model and its Consequences”, Geoscience Canada - Volume 38, Number 1, March 2011, Chetan]

WHAT CAUSES WARMING? It is likely that the cyclical warming and cooling of the earth results from a number of different causes, none of which, taken alone, is dominant enough to be entirely responsible. The more important ones are solar changes (including both irradiance and magnetic field effects), atmosphere–ocean interaction (including both multidecadal climatic oscillations and unforced internal variability), and greenhouse gases. All of these factors have been discussed by IPCC, but the first two have been dismissed as negligible in comparison with the greenhouse-gas effect and man’s contribution to it through anthropogenic CO2 . It is claimed (e.g. Revelle and Suess 1957) that the particular infrared absorption bands of CO2 provide it with a special ability to absorb and reradiate the sun’s longer wavelength radiation, causing warming of the troposphere and an increase in high-altitude (cirrus) cloud, further amplifying the heating process. Detailed arguments against this conclusion can be found in Spencer et al. (2007) and Gerlich and Tscheuschner (2009). These scientists point out (among other arguments, which include the logarithmic decrease in absorptive power of CO2 at increasing concentrations), that clouds have poor ability to emit radiation and that the transfer of heat from the atmosphere to a warmer body (the earth) defies the Second Law of Thermodynamics. They argue that the Plank and Stefan-Boltzman equations used in calculations of radiative heat transfer cannot be applied to gases in the atmosphere because of the highly complex multi-body nature of the problem. Veizer (2005) explains that, to play a significant role, CO2 requires an amplifier, in this case water vapour. He concludes that water vapour plays the dominant role in global warming and that solar effects are the driver, rather than CO2 . A comprehensive critique of the greenhouse gas theory is provided by Hutton (2009).

#### Impossible to prove disease spread is the result of global warming

Carter et al 11 [Dr. Robert M. Carter is a stratigrapher and marine geologist with degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England)., Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. S. Fred Singer is one of the most distinguished atmospheric physicists in the U.S. He established and served as the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, now part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and earned a U.S. Department of Commerce Gold Medal Award for his technical leadership. “Climate Change Reconsidered – 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change” <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf>, Chetan]

Another animal-related concern with respect to global warming is that rising temperatures will increase the prevalence of parasitic and vector-borne diseases, resulting in increasing mortality rates. To date, very little research has been published on this concern. Here, however, we cite two papers that have provided some understanding of the subject. Writing in Trends in Parasitology, Morgan and Wall (2009) state ―global climate change predictions suggest that far-ranging effects might occur in population dynamics and distributions of livestock parasites, provoking fears of widespread increases in disease incidence and production loss.‖ However, they indicate, ―just as development rates of many parasites of veterinary importance increase with temperature, so [too] do their mortality rates [increase].‖ They further note ―temperature will also affect mortality indirectly through the action of predators, parasitoids, pathogens and competitors, whose development and abundance are also potentially temperature sensitive,‖ so that, in the end, ―the net effect of climate change could be complex and far from easily predicted.‖ In perusing the subject in greater detail, as they elucidate some of the many complexities involved, the two U.K. researchers indicate ―several biological mechanisms (including increased parasite mortality and more rapid acquisition of immunity), in tandem with changes in husbandry practices (including reproduction, housing, nutrition, breed selection, grazing patterns and other management interventions), might act to mitigate increased parasite development rates, preventing dramatic rises in overall levels of diseases.‖ However, because ―optimum mitigation strategies will be highly system specific and depend on detailed understanding of interactions between climate, parasite abundance, host availability and the cues for and economics of farmer intervention,‖ as they characterize the situation, they conclude ―there is a need for research that considers likely effects of climate change and mitigation strategies in terms of the whole host-parasite system, including anthropogenic responses, and not just in terms of parasite population dynamics.‖ It likely will be some time before the temperature-related parasitic disease relationship for animals is resolved. Turning to a well-known vector-borne disease, Conte et al. (2009) note ―the midge Culicoides imicola is the principal vector of bluetongue virus (BTV) that causes an infectious disease of domestic and wild ruminants,‖ and ―over the last ten years, BTV has invaded Mediterranean countries and much of Northern Europe,‖ inducing several scientists and others to contend the BTV vector had expanded its range northward ―because of rising temperatures,‖ as suggested by the work of Mellor (2004), Purse et al. (2005), and Mellor et al. (2008). However, a careful examination of Culicoides population data in Italy prior to 2000 was made by Goffredo et al. (2003). They determined ―trapping conditions of previous collections would have had very little chance of catching C. imicola,‖ or detecting its presence, suggesting there was insufficient evidence to make the case for a warming-induced northward expansion of the BTV vector, because it may already have been present there but undetected. In response to even earlier fears of a potential BTV invasion, a national surveillance program for C. imicola had been established in Italy in the year 2000, where 70,000 light-trap collections were made at about 3,800 different sites. Using the first year of data obtained from this program, Conte et al. defined the spatial distributions of three different C. imicola infection zones: zone I (endemicity), zone II (transition), and zone III (absence). Then, using data from 2002–2007, they quantified how C. imicola populations evolved through time in these three zones, working under the logical assumption that ―a species that is undergoing geographical range expansion should have a population that remains stable over time in zone I and increases in zones II and III.‖ The three researchers state their results indicated ―no detectable range expansion of C. imicola population in Italy over the past six years.‖ In fact, they report ―a weak, but significant reduction was observed in the transition zone.‖ Conte et al. therefore conclude their data ―support the hypothesis that the spread of BTV in Italy is not because of the geographical expansion of its main vector, but due to a modification of the interaction between the virus, the vector and the environment, as may also have been the case in northern Europe.‖ As for the future, they write, their results indicate ―precautions should be taken when inferring range progression for species requiring highly targeted forms of sampling and for which a constant probability of detection over time should be established.‖ This demonstrates once again that it is easy to blame global warming for the poleward expansion of a vector-spread disease, but it is quite another thing to prove the case.

#### Our understanding of the ocean is too small to make any sweeping conclusions – the ocean acidification theory ignores ocean carbonation and is based on short term experiments

Idso et al 12 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “The Unsettled Science of Ocean Warming and Acidification ”, Volume 15, Number 19: 9 May 2012, http://www.co2science.org/articles/V15/N19/EDIT.php, Chetan]

All of these phenomena, many of which are nonlinear and extremely complicated, are interlinked; and Riebesell and his colleagues thus conclude, from their objective review of the pertinent scientific literature, that the magnitude and even the sign of the global ocean's carbon cycle feedback to climate change are, in their words, "yet unknown." They note, for example, that "our understanding of biological responses to ocean change is still in its infancy." With respect to ocean acidification, in particular, they write that the impact it will have on marine life "is still uncertain," and that the phenomenon itself is but "one side of the story," the other side being what they call "ocean carbonation," which, as they describe it, "will likely be beneficial to some groups of photosynthetic organisms." Thus, they write that "our present understanding of biologically driven feedback mechanisms is still rudimentary," and that with respect to many of their magnitudes, "our understanding is too immature to even make a guess." What is more, they imply that even what we do think we know could well be wrong, because, as they elucidate, "our present knowledge of pH/CO2 sensitivities of marine organisms is based almost entirely on short-term perturbation experiments, neglecting the possibility of evolutionary adaptation."

#### No warming biodiversity impact --- doesn’t cause extinction, biotic communities are resilient, and thrive in warmer climates

Idso et al 11—Former Professor in the Departments of Geology, Geography, and Botany and Microbiology @ Arizona State and PhD from UMinnesota and former research physicist for the Department of Agriculture—AND Keith Idso, PhD in Botany—AND Craig, PhD in Geography (Sherwood, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC,” Vol. 14, No. 10, 9 March 2011, <http://co2science.org/articles/V14/N10/EDIT.php>, DA: 6/23/2012)

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

#### Increased CO2 is key to crop fertilization that prevents famine and solves extinction

Idsos 10 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “Food Security: The Real Planetary Problem ”, Volume 13, Number 51: 22 December 2010, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N51/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

In a paper recently published in the Journal of Proteome Research, Sarkar et al. (2010) write that "increasing population and unsustainable exploitation of nature and natural resources have made 'food security' a burning issue in the 21st century," echoing sentiments much like those expressed by Farrell (2009), who has noted that "the alarming increase in biofuel production, the projected demand for livestock products, and the estimated food to feed the additional 700 million people who will arrive here by 2016, will have unprecedented consequences," among which are likely to be the unsavory facts that "arable land, the environment, water supply and sustainability of the agricultural system will all be affected," and not in a positive manner. Furthermore, when the human population of the globe reaches 8.7-11.3 billion by the year 2050 (Bengtsson et al., 2006), the situation will become truly intolerable, unless something is done, far in advance of that date, to dramatically mitigate the situation. Thus, as Sarkar et al. suggest, "a normal approach for any nation/region is to strengthen its agricultural production for meeting future demands and provide food security." But a major difficulty, which could well spoil mankind's ability to do so, is the ongoing rise in the atmosphere's ozone concentration, which is the subject of Sarkar et al.'s new paper. In a study designed to elucidate the many ways in which ozone (O3) is harmful to plants, the eight researchers grew two high-yielding cultivars (Sonalika and HUW 510) of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) out-of-doors at the Agriculture Research Farm of India's Banaras Hindu University. This was done within open-top chambers that they maintained at the ambient O3 concentration and at elevated O3 concentrations of 25% and 50% above ambient during the peak O3 period of the day (10:00 to 15:00 hours local time) for a total of fifty days, during which period they measured numerous responses of the plants to the two levels of ozone enrichment. So what did they find? Sarkar et al. determined, among several other things, that the moderate increases in the air's O3 concentration resulted in higher foliar injury, a reduction in photosynthetic efficiency, induced inhibition in photochemical efficacy of photosystem II, lowered concentrations of photosynthetic pigments and proteins, plus what they describe as "drastic reductions" in RuBisCO large and small subunits, while noting that major leaf photosynthetic proteins and important energy metabolism proteins were also "drastically reduced." In discussing the results of their study, the scientists from India, Japan and Nepal remark that anthropogenic activities have made ozone a "major environmental pollutant of our time," while noting that some are predicting it to be an even "greater problem for the future." And adding this dilemma to the problem of feeding the world over the next few decades and beyond, humanity's future is not looking good. In fact, it's incredibly bleak. So what can be done to help us weather this potentially devastating perfect storm? Sarkar et al. suggest that we focus on "engineering crops for future high O3," concentrating on maintaining "effective stomatal conductance of plants which can avoid O3 entry but not hamper their productivity." We agree. But not knowing to what extent we will be successful in this endeavor, we need to do something else that we know will work; and that is to allow the air's CO2 content to rise, unimpeded by the misguided efforts of climate alarmists who would curtail anthropogenic CO2 emissions in the guise of fighting what they claim is anthropogenic-induced global warming. This contention is largely theoretical and wholly unproven; but we know that atmospheric CO2 enrichment nearly always acts to increase both the productivity and water use efficiency of nearly all plants, as a result of literally hundreds, if not thousands, of real-world experiments, while it often more than compensates for the negative effects of O3 pollution. Clearly, we are going to need all of the help we can possibly get to make it unscathed through even the first half of the 21st century; and we cannot afford to throw away any of the means we have at our disposal to help us in this great effort. We have got to see carbon dioxide for what it truly is -- the elixir of life: one of the two raw materials (the other being water) that combine during the process of photosynthesis to produce the substances of plant tissues that provide the food for nearly all human and animal life on the planet, either directly, in the case of herbivores, or indirectly in the case of other life forms. And that makes carbon dioxide just the opposite of what the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently declared it to be -- a dangerous air pollutant. Shame on them! ... and on all those who demonize this life-giving molecule that we expel to the air every time we exhale.

#### Famine sparks World War 3

Calvin 98 (William H. Calvin, Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Washington, January 1998, “The Great Climate Flip-Flop,” The Atlantic Monthly, Ebsco Host]

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands – if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end : eliminating competitors for the remaining food.      This would be a worldwide problem – and could lead to a Third World War – but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

#### 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.

#### Nuclear power trades off with renewable investment

**Porritt et al, 12** – founder director of Forum for the Future Forum for the future, chairman of the UK Sustainable Development Commission and author of Capitalism as if the World Matters (Jonathon, 4/27, with Tom Burke, Tony Juniper, Charles Secrett. “Climate Change and Energy Security.” http://www.jonathonporritt.com/sites/default/files/users/BRIEFING%205%20-%20Climate\_and%20energy%20security\_27\_April%202012.pdf)

For an example of how this pro-nuclear bias can undermine alternative forms of electricity generation, one need look no further than news reports in March 2012 that the Coalition Government has begun lobbying the European Commission to give nuclear power full parity with renewables. At present, member states are obliged to source at least 20% of their energy from renewables by 2020. But the Coalition Government is arguing that instead of increasing this figure for the next target date, 2030, the obligation should be for ‘low-carbon’ electricity generation, a move that clearly sets nuclear and renewables in competition with each other for subsidy-led investment. This demonstrates that the Coalition Government’s obsession with the nuclear option has already begun to undermine a critically important Europe-wide renewables policy, with potentially huge consequences for extra GHG emissions in a large number of countries. Moreover, the implications of the policy do not end in Europe - they are inevitably global. Vijay Vaitheeswaran, The Economist’s environment and energy correspondent until 2006, says: ‘Decisions taken in the next few years about energy in rich countries like Britain and the United States will shape investments made in energy infrastructure around the world for a generation or more. After all, nuclear and coal plants and oil refineries last for decades – and that sunk investment displaces or discourages nimbler, cleaner, and more distributed options like micropower. If we want to shift to a clean, secure, low-carbon energy system during this century, the time to start is now’.

#### Strong domestic renewable industry averts trade war with China

Sklar, 12 – President, The Stella Group, Ltd & Adjunct Professor GWU (Scott, 10/9. “U.S. Should Be Careful To Avoid Trade War.” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/10/china-vs-the-us-whats-at-stake.php)

This is a hard and complex issue, even if it were not a Presidential election year. In October 7th's New York Times, reporter Keith Bradsher reported, "***China's*** biggest ***solar panel*** makers are losing as much as $1 for every $3 of sales" even with large federal and local government subsidies. The Chinese counter that the US federal 30% investment tax credit tied to State government renewable energy portfolio standards and system benefit trust funds are in the same ball park. China is also using solar at large scale with Forbes reporting last year "Feb 28, 2011 – According to internal***statistics***, ***Chinese*** solar energy consumption was up and they recently completed a 1.65 GW solar ***project*** in Hefei. But in the end, the Obama Administration is making the right move to insure that the entire US solar manufacturing base doesn't collapse to over-subsidized one-country competition. Romney swings in both directions on this issue and due to his adamant lack of support for the extension of the wind production tax credit -- it is not clear what direction he would go. Chinese energy policy is truly "all the options" including the entire portfolio of renewables. China is a leading driver in using renewable resources itself so as to position itself as a lead in dominating the global markets. The US should be careful not to drive a trade war with China, but rather be very selective and discriminating as a way to seek market accommodation. The world needs a diverse set of players in the solar, renewable energy, storage, and energy efficiency industries. By rapidly expanding and "scaling" manufacturing and deployment of these energy applications, global employment will rise, greenhouse gases will be lower, and most importantly, dramatic energy price swings will be mitigated stabilizing global economies over-reliant globalized energy commodities.

#### Trade war kills relations, free trade, and escalates to a shooting war

**Droke 10** (Clif, Editor – Momentum Strategies Report, “America and the Next Major War’, Green Faucet, 3-29, http://www.greenfaucet.com/technical-analysis/america-and-the-next-major-war/79314)

In the current phase of relative peace and stability we now enjoy, many are questioning when the next major war may occur and speculation is rampant as to major participants involved. Our concern here is strictly of a financial nature, however, and a discussion of the geopolitical and military variables involved in the escalation of war is beyond the scope of this commentary. But what we can divine from financial history is that "hot" wars in a military sense often emerge from trade wars. As we shall see, the elements for what could prove to be a trade war of epic proportions are already in place and the key figures are easily identifiable. Last Wednesday the lead headline in the Wall Street Journal stated, "Business Sours on China." It seems, according to WSJ, that Beijing is "reassessing China's long-standing emphasis on opening its economy to foreign business....and tilting toward promoting dominant state companies." Then there is Internet search giant Google's threat to pull out of China over concerns of censorship of its Internet search results in that country. The trouble started a few weeks ago Google announced that it no longer supports China's censoring of searches that take place on the Google platform. China has defended its extensive censorship after Google threatened to withdraw from the country. Additionally, the Obama Administration announced that it backs Google's decision to protest China's censorship efforts. In a Reuters report, Obama responded to a question as to whether the issue would cloud U.S.-China relations by saying that the human rights would not be "carved out" for certain countries. This marks at least the second time this year that the White House has taken a stand against China (the first conflict occurring over tire imports). Adding yet further fuel to the controversy, the U.S. Treasury Department is expected to issue a report in April that may formally label China as a "currency manipulator," according to the latest issue of Barron's. This would do nothing to ease tensions between the two nations and would probably lead one step closer to a trade war between China and the U.S. Then there was last week's Wall Street Journal report concerning authorities in a wealthy province near Shanghai criticizing the quality of luxury clothing brands from the West, including Hermes, Tommy Hilfiger and Versace. This represents quite a change from years past when the long-standing complaint from the U.S. over the inferior quality of Chinese made merchandise. On Monday the WSJ ran an article under the headline, "American Firms Feel Shut Out In China." The paper observed that so far there's little evidence that American companies are pulling out of China but adds a growing number of multinational firms are "starting to rethink their strategy." According to a poll conducted by the American Chamber of Commerce in China, 38% of U.S. companies reported feeling unwelcome in China compared to 26% in 2009 and 23% in 2008. As if to add insult to injury, the high profile trial of four Rio Tinto executives in China is another example of the tables being turned on the West. The executives are by Chinese authorities of stealing trade secrets and taking bribes. There's a touch of irony to this charge considering that much of China's technology was stolen from Western manufacturing firms which set up shop in that country. It seems China is flexing its economic and political muscle against the West in a show of bravado. Yet one can't help thinking that this is exactly the sort of arrogance that typically precedes a major downfall. As the Bible states, "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." In his book, "Jubilee on Wall Street," author David Knox Barker devotes a chapter to how trade wars tend to be common occurrences in the long wave economic cycle of developed nations. Barker explains his belief that the industrial nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China will play a major role in pulling the world of the long wave deflationary decline as their domestic economies begin to develop and grow. "They are and will demand more foreign goods produced in the United States and other markets," he writes. Barker believes this will help the U.S. rebalance from an over weighted consumption-oriented economy to a high-end producer economy. Barker adds a caveat, however: if protectionist policies are allowed to gain force in Washington, trade wars will almost certainly erupt and. If this happens, says Barker, "all bets are off." He adds, "The impact on global trade of increased protectionism and trade wars would be catastrophic, and what could prove to be a mild long wave [economic] winter season this time around could plunge into a global depression." Barker also observes that the storm clouds of trade wars are already forming on the horizon as we have moved further into the long wave economic "winter season." Writes Barker, "If trade wars are allowed to get under way in these final years of a long wave winter, this decline will be far deeper and darker than necessary, just as the Great Depression was far deeper and lengthier than it should have been, due to growing international trade isolationism. He further cautions that protectionism in Washington will certainly bring retaliation from the nations that bear the brunt of punitive U.S. trade policies. He observes that the reaction from one nation against the protectionist policies of another is typically far worse than the original action. He cites as an example the restriction by the U.S. of $55 million worth of cotton blouses from China in the 1980s. China retaliated by cancelling $500 million worth of orders for American rain. "As one nation blocks trade, the nation that is hurt will surely retaliate and the entire world will suffer," writes Barker.

## 2NC

### 2NC – Generic

#### Even a conventional war will inadvertently escalate to nuclear weapons

**Roth 7** [professor in IR at Goucher College 7 [Ariel Ilan Roth, “Nuclear Weapons in Neo-Realist Theory”, REFLECTION, EVALUATION, INTEGRATION, International Studies Review, pg 369-384]

Critical, though not explicit, in Waltz is the belief that **a war between nuclear powers will be hard to maintain at the conventional level**. Waltz (Waltz and Sagan 2003:9) allows that **such a sub-nuclear war may be fought but** considers **the risk of it escalating** to the nuclear level with its accompanying certain destruction **as too high for the risk tolerance of most** leaders. The strategic studies literature has played host to this debate for decades. Some, like Snyder (1965), have argued that nuclear weapons are, in a sense, mutually negating, creating what has been called the stability-instability paradox, wherein stability at the nuclear level breeds instability at the conventional level. It is, in this conception, as if two duelists stand with guns loaded and cocked at each other’s heads yet proceed to have their fight with daggers instead (Jervis 1989:19-20). Others, like Barry Posen (1982), have argued that **even though nuclear states may wish to limit their conflict to conventional weapons, actions that occur during wartime can lead to** what he calls “**inadvertent escalation.”** In his “Cold War Turned Hot” example, NATO attacks near Soviet ballistic submarine bases could draw a nuclear response even though the aim of NATO is not to harm the strategically stabilizing Soviet submarine-based missile arsenal (Posen 1982:29-30). Such an interaction would then escalate further as American targets were hit with nuclear weapons and a war that was supposed to be both limited and sub-nuclear is now an apocalyptic doomsday. The prospects for inadvertent escalation are recognized by Jervis (1989:21) as well who comments that “because **escalation can occur although no one wants it to**, mutual second-strike capability does not make the world safe for major provocations and limited wars.” This conclusion leads to the first of Jervis’ (1989:23-24) expected outcomes from what he calls the “nuclear revolution,” namely, that there will be peace among the great powers.

#### Turn – their argument increases the risk of war – failure to take security threats seriously causes destabilization, uncertainty, and conflict.

**Doran 99** (Charles F. Doran, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), 1999 (“The Structural Turbulance of International Affairs,” *Survival*, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer, p. 148-149)

One of the characteristics of future major wars is that they will not necessarily look exactly like previous wars. Certainly the results have to be the same in terms of devastation and loss of life; otherwise they cannot be called 'wars'. But major war in fact may not last very long. It may happen very quickly, and, although it may be very intense, it may not involve as many of the major powers – though it probably would involve some of them. What is frightening about this possibility, however, is that, as nuclear weapons proliferate, major wars may take place in areas where they would not previously have been expected: the Middle East for example. These new nuclear powers will possess relatively small nuclear forces for some time. They will still not have deterrent forces approaching second-strike capabilities. The populations and states in the region are relatively concentrated, and there is a history of surprise attack. Much of the proliferation is 'paired' between rivals, and it is very difficult for other states to control this dynamic, either in terms of the possible outbreak of war or in terms of the proliferation process itself. The conclusion, then, is that the probability of major war declines for some states, but increases for others. And it is very difficult to argue that it has disappeared in any significant or reliable or hopeful sense. Moreover, a problem with arguing a position that might be described as utopian is that such arguments have policy implications. It is worrying that as a thesis about the obsolescence of major war becomes more compelling to more people, including presumably governments, the tendency will be to forget about the underlying problem, which is not war per se, but security. And by neglecting the under- lying problem of security, the probability of war perversely increases: as governments fail to provide the kind of defence and security necessary to maintain deterrence, one opens up the possibility of new challenges. In this regard it is worth recalling one of Clauswitz's most important insights: A conqueror is always a lover of peace. He would like to make his entry into our state unopposed. That is the underlying dilemma when one argues that a major war is not likely to occur and, as a consequence, one need not necessarily be so concerned about providing the defences that underlie security itself. History [end page 148] shows that surprise threats emerge and rapid destabilising efforts are made to try to provide that missing defence, and all of this contributes to the spiral of uncertainty that leads in the end to war.

#### Overarching predictions about the future of international relations are usually wrong – the unpredictable nature of war means that you should err on the side of caution.

**Kagan 99** (Donald Kagan, Hillhouse Professor of History and Classics at Yale University, 1999 (“History Is Full Of Surprises,” *Survival*, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer, p. 142)

But I would go further and would want to say even that very important concession is not sufficient, because the one great truth of history is that there is always one other possibility besides all the ones that you imagine, no matter how clever you are. What usually happens in history is in the category called 'none of the above'. If one examines the predictions made in the area of international relations over the centuries, most of the time, most of the people get it wrong – even the most learned, experienced and intelligent people. Without going into a long dissertation on chaos theory, it suffices that it has generally happened that wars break out in places where they were never imagined and often for reasons that were not to be anticipated.

### 2NC – Yes Extinction

#### Multiple additional warrants –

#### A. Famine, disease and radiation

Choi 11 [Charles Q. Choi – National Geographic News, “Small Nuclear War Could Reverse Global Warming for Years”, February 22nd, 2011, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2011/02/110223-nuclear-war-winter-global-warming-environment-science-climate-change/>, Chetan]

Even a regional nuclear war could spark "unprecedented" global cooling and reduce rainfall for years, according to U.S. government computer models. Widespread famine and disease would likely follow, experts speculate. During the Cold War a nuclear exchange between superpowers—such as the one feared for years between the United States and the former Soviet Union—was predicted to cause a "nuclear winter." In that scenario hundreds of nuclear explosions spark huge fires, whose smoke, dust, and ash blot out the sun for weeks amid a backdrop of dangerous radiation levels. Much of humanity eventually dies of starvation and disease. Today, with the United States the only standing superpower, nuclear winter is little more than a nightmare. But nuclear war remains a very real threat—for instance, between developing-world nuclear powers, such as India and Pakistan. To see what climate effects such a regional nuclear conflict might have, scientists from NASA and other institutions modeled a war involving a hundred Hiroshima-level bombs, each packing the equivalent of 15,000 tons of TNT—just 0.03 percent of the world's current nuclear arsenal. (See a National Geographic magazine feature on weapons of mass destruction.) The researchers predicted the resulting fires would kick up roughly five million metric tons of black carbon into the upper part of the troposphere, the lowest layer of the Earth's atmosphere. In NASA climate models, this carbon then absorbed solar heat and, like a hot-air balloon, quickly lofted even higher, where the soot would take much longer to clear from the sky. (Related: "'Nuclear Archaeologists' Find World War II Plutonium.") Reversing Global Warming? The global cooling caused by these high carbon clouds wouldn't be as catastrophic as a superpower-versus-superpower nuclear winter, but "the effects would still be regarded as leading to unprecedented climate change," research physical scientist Luke Oman said during a press briefing Friday at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington, D.C. Earth is currently in a long-term warming trend. After a regional nuclear war, though, average global temperatures would drop by 2.25 degrees F (1.25 degrees C) for two to three years afterward, the models suggest. At the extreme, the tropics, Europe, Asia, and Alaska would cool by 5.4 to 7.2 degrees F (3 to 4 degrees C), according to the models. Parts of the Arctic and Antarctic would actually warm a bit, due to shifted wind and ocean-circulation patterns, the researchers said. After ten years, average global temperatures would still be 0.9 degree F (0.5 degree C) lower than before the nuclear war, the models predict. (Pictures: "Red Hot" Nuclear-Waste Train Glows in Infrared.) Years Without Summer For a time Earth would likely be a colder, hungrier planet. "Our results suggest that agriculture could be severely impacted, especially in areas that are susceptible to late-spring and early-fall frosts," said Oman, of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland. "Examples similar to the crop failures and famines experienced following the Mount Tambora eruption in 1815 could be widespread and last several years," he added. That Indonesian volcano ushered in "the year without summer," a time of famines and unrest. (See pictures of the Mount Tambora eruption.) All these changes would also alter circulation patterns in the tropical atmosphere, reducing precipitation by 10 percent globally for one to four years, the scientists said. Even after seven years, global average precipitation would be 5 percent lower than it was before the conflict, according to the model. In addition, researcher Michael Mills, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado, found large decreases in the protective ozone layer, leading to much more ultraviolet [uv] radiation reaching Earth's surface and harming the environment and people. "The main message from our work," NASA's Oman said, "would be that even a regional nuclear conflict would have global consequences."

#### B. Agriculture and global cooling

**Toon and Robock 10**, Toon: chair of the Dept of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and a member of the Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics at the University of Colorado @ Boulder. Robock is a Proff of atmospheric science at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey Local Nuclear War, Global Suffering; January 2010; Scientific American Magazine; 8 Page(s), <http://www.sciamdigital.com/index.cfm?fa=Products.ViewIssuePreview&ISSUEID_CHAR=944156A6-237D-9F22-E8E572150DCA8E65&ARTICLEID_CHAR=97CA0A88-237D-9F22-E861FD76EBEE2611>)

Twenty-five years ago international teams of scientists showed that a nuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union could produce a “nuclear winter.” The smoke from vast fires started by bombs dropped on cities and industrial areas would envelop the planet and absorb so much sunlight that the earth’s surface would get cold, dark and dry, killing plants worldwide and eliminating our food supply. Surface temperatures would reach winter values in the summer. International discussion about this prediction, fueled largely by astronomer Carl Sagan, forced the leaders of the two superpowers to confront the possibility that their arms race endangered not just themselves but the entire human race. Countries large and small demanded disarmament. Nuclear winter became an important factor in ending the nuclear arms race. Looking back later, in 2000, former Soviet Union leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev observed, “Models made by Russian and American scientists showed that a nuclear war would result in a nuclear winter that would be extremely destructive to all life on earth; the knowledge of that was a great stimulus to us, to people of honor and morality, to act.” Why discuss this topic now that the cold war has ended? Because as other nations continue to acquire nuclear weapons, smaller, regional nuclear wars could create a similar global catastrophe. New analyses reveal that a conflict between India and Pakistan, for example, in which 100 nuclear bombs were dropped on cities and industrial areas--only 0.4 percent of the world's more than 25,000 warheads--would produce enough smoke to cripple global agriculture. A regional war could cause widespread loss of life even in countries far away from the conflict. Regional War Threatens the World By deploying modern computers and modern climate models, the two of us and our colleagues have shown that not only were the ideas of the 1980s correct but the effects would last for at least 10 years, much longer than previously thought. And by doing calculations that assess decades of time, only now possible with fast, current computers, and by including in our calculations the oceans and the entire atmosphere--also only now possible--we have found that the smoke from even a regional war would be heated and lofted by the sun and remain suspended in the upper atmosphere for years, continuing to block sunlight and to cool the earth. India and Pakistan, which together have more than 100 nuclear weapons, may be the most worrisome adversaries capable of a regional nuclear conflict today. But other countries besides the U.S. and Russia (which have thousands) are well endowed: China, France and the U.K. have hundreds of nuclear warheads; Israel has more than 80, North Korea has about 10 and Iran may well be trying to make its own. In 2004 this situation prompted one of us (Toon) and later Rich Turco of the University of California, Los Angeles, both veterans of the 1980s investigations, to begin evaluating what the global environmental effects of a regional nuclear war would be and to take as our test case an engagement between India and Pakistan. The latest estimates by David Albright of the Institute for Science and International Security and by Robert S. Norris of the Natural Resources Defense Council are that India has 50 to 60 assembled weapons (with enough plutonium for 100) and that Pakistan has 60 weapons. Both countries continue to increase their arsenals. Indian and Pakistani nuclear weapons tests indicate that the yield of the warheads would be similar to the 15-kiloton explosive yield (equivalent to 15,000 tons of TNT) of the bomb the U.S. used on Hiroshima. Toon and Turco, along with Charles Bardeen, now at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, modeled what would happen if 50 Hiroshima-size bombs were dropped across the highest population-density targets in Pakistan and if 50 similar bombs were also dropped across India. Some people maintain that nuclear weapons would be used in only a measured way. But in the wake of chaos, fear and broken communications that would occur once a nuclear war began, we doubt leaders would limit attacks in any rational manner. This likelihood is particularly true for Pakistan, which is small and could be quickly overrun in a conventional conflict. Peter R. Lavoy of the Naval Postgraduate School, for example, has analyzed the ways in which a conflict between India and Pakistan might occur and argues that Pakistan could face a decision to use all its nuclear arsenal quickly before India swamps its military bases with traditional forces. Obviously, we hope the number of nuclear targets in any future war will be zero, but policy makers and voters should know what is possible. Toon and Turco found that more than 20 million people in the two countries could die from the blasts, fires and radioactivity--a horrible slaughter. But the investigators were shocked to discover that a tremendous amount of smoke would be generated, given the megacities in the two countries, assuming each fire would burn the same area that actually did burn in Hiroshima and assuming an amount of burnable material per person based on various studies. They calculated that the 50 bombs exploded in Pakistan would produce three teragrams of smoke, and the 50 bombs hitting India would generate four (one teragram equals a million metric tons). Satellite observations of actual forest fires have shown that smoke can be lofted up through the troposphere (the bottom layer of the atmosphere) and sometimes then into the lower stratosphere (the layer just above, extending to about 30 miles). Toon and Turco also did some "back of the envelope" calculations of the possible climate impact of the smoke should it enter the stratosphere. The large magnitude of such effects made them realize they needed help from a climate modeler. It turned out that one of us (Robock) was already working with Luke Oman, now at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, who was finishing his Ph.D. at Rutgers University on the climatic effects of volcanic eruptions, and with Georgiy L. Stenchikov, also at Rutgers and an author of the first Russian work on nuclear winter. They developed a climate model that could be used fairly easily for the nuclear blast calculations. Robock and his colleagues, being conservative, put five teragrams of smoke into their modeled upper troposphere over India and Pakistan on an imaginary May 15. The model calculated how winds would blow the smoke around the world and how the smoke particles would settle out from the atmosphere. The smoke covered all the continents within two weeks. The black, sooty smoke absorbed sunlight, warmed and rose into the stratosphere. Rain never falls there, so the air is never cleansed by precipitation; particles very slowly settle out by falling, with air resisting them. Soot particles are small, with an average diameter of only 0.1 micron (μm), and so drift down very slowly. They also rise during the daytime as they are heated by the sun, repeatedly delaying their elimination. The calculations showed that the smoke would reach far higher into the upper stratosphere than the sulfate particles that are produced by episodic volcanic eruptions. Sulfate particles are transparent and absorb much less sunlight than soot and are also bigger, typically 0.5 μm. The volcanic particles remain airborne for about two years, but smoke from nuclear fires would last a decade. Killing Frosts in Summer The climatic response to the smoke was surprising. Sunlight was immediately reduced, cooling the planet to temperatures lower than any experienced for the past 1,000 years. The global average cooling, of about 1.25 degrees Celsius (2.3 degrees Fahrenheit), lasted for several years, and even after 10 years the temperature was still 0.5 degree C colder than normal. The models also showed a 10 percent reduction in precipitation worldwide. Precipitation, river flow and soil moisture all decreased because blocking sunlight reduces evaporation and weakens the hydrologic cycle. Drought was largely concentrated in the lower latitudes, however, because global cooling would retard the Hadley air circulation pattern in the tropics, which produces a large fraction of global precipitation. In critical areas such as the Asian monsoon regions, rainfall dropped by as much as 40 percent. The cooling might not seem like much, but even a small dip can cause severe consequences. Cooling and diminished sunlight would, for example, shorten growing seasons in the midlatitudes. More insight into the effects of cooling came from analyses of the aftermaths of massive volcanic eruptions. Every once in a while such eruptions produce temporary cooling for a year or two. The largest of the past 500 years, the 1815 Tambora eruption in Indonesia, blotted the sun and produced global cooling of about 0.5 degree C for a year; 1816 became known as "The Year.”

#### C. Researchers confirm this conclusion

**Wickersham 10** (University of Missouri adjunct professor of Peace Studies and a member of The Missouri University Nuclear Disarmament Education Team, author book about nuclear disarmament education (Bill, 4/11/10, “Threat of ‘nuclear winter’ remains New START treaty is step in right direction.” <http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/2010/apr/11/threat-of-nuclear-winter-remains/>)

In addressing the environmental consequences of nuclear war, Columbian Steve Starr has written a summary of studies published by the Bulletin of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, which concludes: **“U.S. researchers have confirmed the scientific validity of the concept of ‘nuclear winter’** and have demonstrated that any conflict which targets even a tiny fraction of the global arsenal will cause catastrophic disruptions of the global climate.” In another statement on his Web site, Starr says: “If 1% of the nuclear weapons now ready for war were detonated in large cities, they would utterly devastate the environment, climate, ecosystems and inhabitants of Earth. A war fought with thousands of strategic nuclear weapons **would leave the Earth uninhabitable**.”

#### D. Peer review

**Star 9**, University of Sydney, 8/2/09, (Stephen Starr and Peter King, , “Nuclear suicide”, Sunday, 02 August 2009, <http://www.sciencealert.com.au/opinions/20090208-19496.html>)

But there is little evidence yet that either the government or the Commission is fully alert to the most momentous truth of the present era: Our best science now predicts that nuclear arsenals are fundamentally incompatible with continued human existence. It is imperative that the message coming from scientists in the US, Russia and elsewhere about the environmental consequences of nuclear war be included in the general debate about the control and abolition of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, the nuclear weapon states apparently remain oblivious to the climatic, ecological and biological consequences of nuclear war. No "environmental impact statement" has ever been created for the US or Russian nuclear weaponry, which is one of the reasons why there still are 22,000 intact nuclear weapons in their deployed and reserve arsenals. However, new peer-reviewed studies done at several US universities predict the detonation of even a tiny fraction of the global nuclear arsenal will result in major changes in the global climate and massive destruction of the stratospheric ozone layer (which protects the Earth from deadly UV light). Even a "regional" nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan, fought with 100 Hiroshima-size weapons, is predicted to loft five million tons of smoke above cloud level; there it would block about 10 per cent of warming sunlight from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere. This would produce average surface temperatures colder than any experienced for the last 1000 years. The smoke would remain in the stratosphere for more than a decade and seriously impact global climate. It would probably be too cold to grow wheat in Canada for several years; grain exports would likely cease from grain-exporting nations .and global nuclear famine would result, Within a few years, most of the already-hungry human populations could perish, and the populations of any nation dependent upon grain imports would be at risk.

### 2NC – Warming Defense

#### Global warming won’t cause species extinction – most evidence suggests warmer climates increase extinction resistance

Carter et al 11 [Dr. Robert M. Carter is a stratigrapher and marine geologist with degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England)., Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. S. Fred Singer is one of the most distinguished atmospheric physicists in the U.S. He established and served as the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, now part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and earned a U.S. Department of Commerce Gold Medal Award for his technical leadership. “Climate Change Reconsidered – 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change” http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf, Chetan]

Results of other studies also suggest the model-based species extinction hypothesis is unlikely to occur. In a review paper published in Current Biology, for example, Erwin (2009) explored past epochs and the myriad nooks and crannies of contemporary Earth, all in a search for the primary trigger of speciation. His conclusion? Warmth is the fire that fuels the process by which species originate, whereas cold tends to destroy what warmth produced. Headquartered in the Department of Paleobiology at the National Museum of Natural History in Washington, DC (USA), Erwin writes, ―some of the best evidence for a link between biodiversity and climate comes from latitudinal gradients in diversity, which provide an avenue to explore the more general relationship between climate and evolution.‖ In reviewing that evidence, he indicates ―among the wide range of biotic hypotheses, those with the greatest empirical support indicate that warmer climates [1] have provided the energetic foundation for increased biodiversity by fostering greater population size and thus increased extinction resistance, [2] have increased metabolic scope, [3] have allowed more species to exploit specialized niches as a result of greater available energy, and [4] have generated faster speciation and/or lower extinction rates.‖ He states ―in combination with geologic evidence for carbon dioxide levels and changing areas of tropical seas, these observations provide the basis for a simple, first-order model of the relationship between climate through the Phanerozoic and evolutionary patterns and diversity,‖ and he adds ―such a model suggests that we should expect greatest marine diversity during globally warm intervals,‖ as is typically also found to be the case for terrestrial diversity. Erwin notes ―the three best-studied mass extinction events are associated with sharp changes in climate and support the contention that rapid shifts in climate can reduce global diversity,‖ which sounds much like the mantra of the IPCC with respect to global warming. However, the climate shifts Erwin cites consist mostly of cooling, and it is not only the shift to cooling but stagnating in a cool state that bodes badly for Earth‘s biodiversity. As Erwin describes it, ―the long interval of stagnant evolution during the Permo-Carboniferous glaciation is consistent with studies of modern-day latitudinal diversity that [indicate] rates of evolutionary innovation and diversification are higher in highenergy climates than in low-energy climates.‖ In further explanation of this conceptual framework, Erwin notes ―contemporary studies suggest a positive relationship between high-energy climates and [1] increased diversification rates, [2] increased number of niches because of increased metabolic scope, and [3] more specialized niches, and possibly because of [4] niche construction.‖ Indeed, he states ―studies showing that the tropics are a cradle of diversity, pumping clade representatives into higher latitudes, as well as evidence of increased ordinal level originations in the tropics, and of the sudden appearance of several mammalian groups during the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum suggest an asymmetric pattern of innovations associated with high-energy climate regimes.‖ Erwin‘s parting comment in this regard is his statement, ―there is an intriguing possibility that diversity does not track climate, but rather builds up during warm intervals but without falling by proportional amounts when climates turn cooler,‖ with the result that ―warmer climates may serve as an evolutionary diversification pump with higher diversity persisting [throughout following cooler periods], at least for a time.‖ Whatever the details may be, two generalizations clearly can be made: warmth typically begets speciation, whereas cold tends to lead to species extinctions.

#### Impossible to prove disease spread is the result of global warming

Carter et al 11 [Dr. Robert M. Carter is a stratigrapher and marine geologist with degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England)., Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. S. Fred Singer is one of the most distinguished atmospheric physicists in the U.S. He established and served as the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, now part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and earned a U.S. Department of Commerce Gold Medal Award for his technical leadership. “Climate Change Reconsidered – 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change” <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf>, Chetan]

Another animal-related concern with respect to global warming is that rising temperatures will increase the prevalence of parasitic and vector-borne diseases, resulting in increasing mortality rates. To date, very little research has been published on this concern. Here, however, we cite two papers that have provided some understanding of the subject. Writing in Trends in Parasitology, Morgan and Wall (2009) state ―global climate change predictions suggest that far-ranging effects might occur in population dynamics and distributions of livestock parasites, provoking fears of widespread increases in disease incidence and production loss.‖ However, they indicate, ―just as development rates of many parasites of veterinary importance increase with temperature, so [too] do their mortality rates [increase].‖ They further note ―temperature will also affect mortality indirectly through the action of predators, parasitoids, pathogens and competitors, whose development and abundance are also potentially temperature sensitive,‖ so that, in the end, ―the net effect of climate change could be complex and far from easily predicted.‖ In perusing the subject in greater detail, as they elucidate some of the many complexities involved, the two U.K. researchers indicate ―several biological mechanisms (including increased parasite mortality and more rapid acquisition of immunity), in tandem with changes in husbandry practices (including reproduction, housing, nutrition, breed selection, grazing patterns and other management interventions), might act to mitigate increased parasite development rates, preventing dramatic rises in overall levels of diseases.‖ However, because ―optimum mitigation strategies will be highly system specific and depend on detailed understanding of interactions between climate, parasite abundance, host availability and the cues for and economics of farmer intervention,‖ as they characterize the situation, they conclude ―there is a need for research that considers likely effects of climate change and mitigation strategies in terms of the whole host-parasite system, including anthropogenic responses, and not just in terms of parasite population dynamics.‖ It likely will be some time before the temperature-related parasitic disease relationship for animals is resolved. Turning to a well-known vector-borne disease, Conte et al. (2009) note ―the midge Culicoides imicola is the principal vector of bluetongue virus (BTV) that causes an infectious disease of domestic and wild ruminants,‖ and ―over the last ten years, BTV has invaded Mediterranean countries and much of Northern Europe,‖ inducing several scientists and others to contend the BTV vector had expanded its range northward ―because of rising temperatures,‖ as suggested by the work of Mellor (2004), Purse et al. (2005), and Mellor et al. (2008). However, a careful examination of Culicoides population data in Italy prior to 2000 was made by Goffredo et al. (2003). They determined ―trapping conditions of previous collections would have had very little chance of catching C. imicola,‖ or detecting its presence, suggesting there was insufficient evidence to make the case for a warming-induced northward expansion of the BTV vector, because it may already have been present there but undetected. In response to even earlier fears of a potential BTV invasion, a national surveillance program for C. imicola had been established in Italy in the year 2000, where 70,000 light-trap collections were made at about 3,800 different sites. Using the first year of data obtained from this program, Conte et al. defined the spatial distributions of three different C. imicola infection zones: zone I (endemicity), zone II (transition), and zone III (absence). Then, using data from 2002–2007, they quantified how C. imicola populations evolved through time in these three zones, working under the logical assumption that ―a species that is undergoing geographical range expansion should have a population that remains stable over time in zone I and increases in zones II and III.‖ The three researchers state their results indicated ―no detectable range expansion of C. imicola population in Italy over the past six years.‖ In fact, they report ―a weak, but significant reduction was observed in the transition zone.‖ Conte et al. therefore conclude their data ―support the hypothesis that the spread of BTV in Italy is not because of the geographical expansion of its main vector, but due to a modification of the interaction between the virus, the vector and the environment, as may also have been the case in northern Europe.‖ As for the future, they write, their results indicate ―precautions should be taken when inferring range progression for species requiring highly targeted forms of sampling and for which a constant probability of detection over time should be established.‖ This demonstrates once again that it is easy to blame global warming for the poleward expansion of a vector-spread disease, but it is quite another thing to prove the case.

#### Our understanding of the ocean is too small to make any sweeping conclusions – the ocean acidification theory ignores ocean carbonation and is based on short term experiments

Idso et al 12 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “The Unsettled Science of Ocean Warming and Acidification ”, Volume 15, Number 19: 9 May 2012, http://www.co2science.org/articles/V15/N19/EDIT.php, Chetan]

All of these phenomena, many of which are nonlinear and extremely complicated, are interlinked; and Riebesell and his colleagues thus conclude, from their objective review of the pertinent scientific literature, that the magnitude and even the sign of the global ocean's carbon cycle feedback to climate change are, in their words, "yet unknown." They note, for example, that "our understanding of biological responses to ocean change is still in its infancy." With respect to ocean acidification, in particular, they write that the impact it will have on marine life "is still uncertain," and that the phenomenon itself is but "one side of the story," the other side being what they call "ocean carbonation," which, as they describe it, "will likely be beneficial to some groups of photosynthetic organisms." Thus, they write that "our present understanding of biologically driven feedback mechanisms is still rudimentary," and that with respect to many of their magnitudes, "our understanding is too immature to even make a guess." What is more, they imply that even what we do think we know could well be wrong, because, as they elucidate, "our present knowledge of pH/CO2 sensitivities of marine organisms is based almost entirely on short-term perturbation experiments, neglecting the possibility of evolutionary adaptation."

#### No warming biodiversity impact --- doesn’t cause extinction, biotic communities are resilient, and thrive in warmer climates

Idso et al 11—Former Professor in the Departments of Geology, Geography, and Botany and Microbiology @ Arizona State and PhD from UMinnesota and former research physicist for the Department of Agriculture—AND Keith Idso, PhD in Botany—AND Craig, PhD in Geography (Sherwood, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC,” Vol. 14, No. 10, 9 March 2011, <http://co2science.org/articles/V14/N10/EDIT.php>, DA: 6/23/2012)

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

### Carter Prodict

#### Carter is plenty qualified – private funding doesn’t mean he should be rejected

Sydney Morning Herald, 12 (“Letters; Climate Change”, Sydney Morning Herald (Australia), 2/17/12, <http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp1.lib.umn.edu/lnacui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T14997476999&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T14997478603&cisb=22_T14997478602&treeMax=true&treeWidth>=

0&csi=314237&docNo=2, //JPL)

Private funding of research need not equal bias So Professor Bob Carter receives some private funding from people who like his work and this is supposed to completely compromise his scientific objectivity ("Scientist denies he is mouthpiece of US climate-sceptic think tank", February 16)? This argument seems to imply that we should only listen to academics that are 100 per cent government funded. It also implies that government funding never has any ideological strings attached. It is a very convenient argument for mediocre academics that struggle to attract private funding of any kind. I call it Source Watch disease, it is a particularly modern ailment. Professor Bob Carter's analogy that his monthly retainer from a wealthy US-based climate sceptic think-tank is akin to the fees paid to architects for their services is a good one. Architects usually receive a brief from their client and produce something the client wants. Guy Thomson West Ryde As to whether Professor Bob Carter is indeed influenced in his views on global warming by the money he receives from the Heartland Institute, I will not comment. I will leave that up to the many fearless crusaders for truth to pursue this matter with all the vigour they did the climategate emails in 2009. I will say, however, that if I were Professor Carter, a trained geologist, I would be rather miffed that Anthony Watts, a former TV weatherman and blogger, was paid more by a mutual patron than I was, and would demand a raise forthwith. Hugh Sturgess Balmain I was shocked to learn that the climate change contrarian Professor Bob Carter was not being paid by the taxpayer. Most scientists working on climate-change-related matters in this country are employed by universities, the CSIRO or the Bureau of Meteorology. Most contrarian scientists have to provide their own funding. One scientist stated that to get funding for projects which did not appear to support the "conventional" position on global warming was like trying to get funding from the Chinese government to defend oneself against charges brought by the government. Evan Professor Carter is described as a geologist and marine researcher. This does not make him a climatologist any more than Lord Whatsisname who took a short class in climate while doing a Bertie Wooster-type classics degree. Can we ignore these tinklers and remember that all qualified climatologists agree that climate change is a major problem?

### Idso Prodict

#### Idso is definitely qualified and peer-reviewed

Hackney, 9 - Law Clerk to United States District Judge Sim Lake for the Southern District of Texas. J.D., University of Texas School of Law, 2009; A.B. and A.M., Harvard University, 1997 (Ryan, “ Flipping Daubert: Putting Climate Change Defendants in the Hot Seat,” Lewis & Clark Law School’s Environmental Law Online, 2009, http://www.elawreview.org/elaw/401/flipping\_daubert\_putting\_clima.html, //JPL)

Sherwood Idso would make a good test case of such an expert. Idso, who has served as a research physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and as an adjunct professor in Geology and Botany at Arizona State University, is the president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, an organization that promotes the view that heightened CO2 levels are a good thing because of their beneficial effects on plant growth.[143] Idso has energy industry connections: The Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change has been reported to have received funding from ExxonMobil,[144] and in 1991 Idso produced a video extolling the agricultural benefits of heightened CO2 for the Western Fuels Association, a coal industry association.[145] While Idso’s connections to energy interests have led some to question his work as biased,[146] his research on the effects of CO2 on plant growth has been published several times in peer-reviewed journals. His research on the effects of heightened CO2 in boosting growth in eldarica pine trees (Pinus eldarica), for example, was published in the Journal of Experimental Botany, an Oxford University Press publication.[147] He published peer-reviewed papers in 2001 and 2004 on the long-term effects of CO2 on growth of sour orange trees.[148] Since Idso is a published scientist who has publicly promoted the benefits of CO2 and has shown a willingness to accept money from energy companies, it is not unthinkable that climate change defendants could turn to him for expert testimony about his research. But would he be allowed to testify? It is likely that Idso would pass a Daubert reliability challenge. First, there is little question that Idso would qualify as an expert in some aspects of climate change: He is a published scientist who has worked specifically with the biological effects of heightened CO2.[149] Idso’s acceptance of energy company money is irrelevant to this question, as no part of Rule 702 or Daubert suggests that corporate funding diminishes an expert’s qualifications or the reliability of his or her work.[150] While some might argue that this is a blind spot in Daubert,[151] it would probably be unreasonable to institute a rule that prohibits scientists from testifying on behalf of their employees or sponsors. The Committee Notes to the Rule 702 amendments do allow judges to consider whether an expert is “proposing to testify about matters growing naturally and directly out of research they have conducted independent of the litigation, or whether they have developed their opinions expressly for purposes of testifying.”[152] This analysis would likely weigh in favor of admitting Idso’s testimony, since he began researching the effects of CO2 on plants years prior to any climate change litigation. And even if Idso is a paid shill of the energy industry in some aspects of his career, he has also published several papers in independent, peer-reviewed journals. To the extent that Idso’s testimony is based on the results of his peer-reviewed studies and other similar publications, it would be difficult to challenge his testimony on the Daubert five-factor reliability test. Testability can be established because the publications describe the tests that Idso conducted to advance his theories.[153] The fact that the papers were accepted for publication in respected journals suggests that the methodologies of the tests involved—including error rate and control standards—were sufficiently rigorous that other scientists would accept them as reliable for publication. While all of Idso’s conclusions may not be widespread in the scientific community, it is generally accepted among ecologists that heightened CO2 can promote plant growth.[154] If Idso’s testimony sticks to the information contained in his peer-reviewed publications, a Daubert challenge to his reliability would probably fail.

#### The Idsos are awesome—their authors are probably jealous

AVERY 2003 (Dennis, Director of the Center for Global Food Issues, Sept 14, http://www.cgfi.org/2003/09/14/will-global-warming-bring-mass-species-extinction/)

“The Specter of Species Extinction” report was done by a father-and-sons research team, led by climate physicist Dr. Sherwood Idso, and his PhD sons, Craig (a specialist in climate geography) and Keith (a botanist who studies how plants respond to CO2 changes). Dr. Sherwood Idso, formerly of the U.S. Water Conservation Laboratory in Phoenix, AZ, was a winner of the U.S. government’s prestigious Arthur S. Flemming research award in 1977, and has published more than 500 articles in peer-reviewed publications. Dr. Craig Idso studied urban CO2 concentrations under a National Science Foundation Grant to Arizona State’s Office of Climatology. Dr. Keith Idso is a member of the Arizona Advisory Council on Environmental Education. All are on the staff of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change in Tempe, AZ.

### 2NC Overview

#### Continued CO2 emissions are key to sustain all life on the planet and prevent the impending global famine. Increasing ozone concentrations is damaging crop production – only CO2 enrichment can offset it and provide enough food for ALL life on the planet

#### Absent CO2 – global famine will spark World War 3 – Calvin says plummeting crop yields would cause countries to invade different lands to take over resources – and these conflicts go nuclear

Klare 6 (Michael Klare, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, “The Coming Resource Wars,” 3/11/2006, <http://www.waterconserve.org/shared/reader/welcome.aspx?linkid=53710&keybold=water%20land%20conflict>)

"As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survival invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "In this world of warring states," the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable." As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security." Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict.

#### And, warming does not outweigh – global food demand will double by 2050 and absent a solution, all the geopolitical and environmental impacts of warming are inevitable because of the expansion of unsustainable agriculture – that’s Idso

#### Warming solves biodiversity – plant enrichment

CFACT 06 (Committee for a Conservative Tomorrow, 2006, “Dr. Sherwood Idso on enhancing biodiversity,” <http://www.cfact.org/a/894/Dr-Sherwood-Idso-on-enhancing-biodiversity>.)

Will global warming devastate the planet's biodiversity? While some of its proponents claim this to be the case, others like Dr. Sherwood Idso of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide recently released a report on this issue, and believes otherwise. Comments Dr. Idso: "Plants in a CO2-enriched atmosphere generally prefer warmer temperatures than they do when exposed to normal air and it is likely they will move both poleward in latitude and upward in altitude, which will enable them to expand the territory they inhabit and actually make them less likely to experience extinction. Global warming will actually result in an increase in plant and animal ranges, thus enhancing biodiversity, not threatening it."

### Disease

#### Turn - increased CO2 solves disease

NIPCC 10 Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change citing Stutte et al. 4 November 2010. Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment of a Pair of Medicinal Plants. http://nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/04nov2010a3.html

As background for their study, Stutte et al. write that "many Scutellaria species are rich in physiologically active flavonoids that have a wide spectrum of pharmacological activity," noting that leaf extracts of Scutellaria barbata "have been used in traditional Chinese medicine to treat liver and digestive disorders and cancers (Molony and Molony, 1998)," and that "recent research has shown extracts of S. barbata to be limiting to the growth of cell lines associated with lung, liver, prostate and brain tumors (Yin et al., 2004)." In conducting their analysis, Stutte et al. grew S. barbata and S. lateriflora plants from seed in large walk-in controlled environment chambers -- which were maintained at atmospheric CO2 concentrations of either 400, 1200 or 3000 ppm -- to the time of flowering (35 days after planting), as well as the time of seed drop (49 days after planting), after which the plants were harvested, their fresh and dry weights were determined, and the concentrations of a host of plant flavonoides within their tissues were measured. At 49 days after planting, the shoot dry weight of S. barbata was found to have increased by 54% at 1200 ppm CO2 and by 57% at 3000 ppm CO2, while that of S. lateriflora had increased by 44% and 70%, respectively, under the same CO2 concentrations. In addition, the average concentration of the six flavonoids the researchers measured was increased by 48% at 1200 ppm CO2 and by 81% at 3000 ppm CO2 in the vegetative tissues of S. barbata, while it was increased by more than 2.4-fold at 1200 and 4.9-fold at 3000 ppm CO2 in S. lateriflora. Therefore, Stutte et al. report that in the case of S. lateriflora, "there was a 4.2-fold increase in total flavonoid content when enriching from 400 to 1200 ppm CO2, and a 13.7-fold increase at 3000 ppm." And they state that "these results are generally consistent with those of B. Schmidt, W.D. Clark and S.B. Idso (unpublished data) who grewS. baicalensis at 700 ppm CO2," and who found that "total dry biomass was increased significantly" and that "the overall antioxidant capacity, based on the ferric reducing antioxidant power assay, was increased." The three researchers say that "these results clearly demonstrate the potential to use controlled environments to increase the production and quality ofScutellaria species ... because the practice has the potential to increase the value of the product by reducing the time to harvest, increasing yield per unit area, and increasing bioactivity per gram of dry matter." Likewise, the extremely positive results hint at the likelihood that the active ingredients of many other medicinal plants may be similarly enhanced by atmospheric CO2 enrichment, and that the historical rise in the air's CO2 content may have already done much the same thing for the plants that people include in their everyday diets, which in turn may well have played a role in promoting the dramatic increase in human life span that has occurred over the past two centuries.

### Link

#### Increased CO2 is key to crop fertilization that sustains biodiversity and prevents famine

Idso & Idso 07 (Craig D. Idso & Sherwood B. Idso, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, 2007, “Carbon Dioxide and Global Change: Separating Scientific Fact from Personal Opinion,” p. 17-19, CO2 Science, <http://co2science.org/education/reports/hansen/HansenTestimonyCritique.pdf>.)

How much land can ten billion people spare for nature? This provocative question was posed by Waggoner (1995) in an insightful essay wherein he explored the dynamic tension that exists between the need for land to support the agricultural enterprises that sustain mankind, and the need for land to support the natural ecosystems that sustain all other creatures. This challenge of meeting our future food needs – and not decimating the rest of the biosphere in the process – was stressed even more strongly by Huang et al. (2002), who wrote that humans “have encroached on almost all of the world's frontiers, leaving little new land that is cultivatable.” And in consequence of humanity's usurpation of this most basic of natural resources, Raven (2002) stated in his Presidential Address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science that “species-area relationships, taken worldwide in relation to habitat destruction, lead to projections of the loss of fully two-thirds of all species on earth by the end of this century.” In a more detailed analysis of the nature and implications of this impending “global land-grab” – which moved it closer to the present by a full half-century – Tilman et al. (2001) concluded that the task of meeting the doubled world food demand, which they calculated would exist in the year 2050, would likely exact a toll that “may rival climate change in environmental and societal impacts.” But how could something so catastrophic manifest itself so soon? Tilman and his nine collaborators shed some light on this question by noting that at the end of the 20th century mankind was already appropriating “more than a third of the production of terrestrial ecosystems and about half of usable freshwaters.” Now, think of doubling those figures, in order to meet the doubled global food demand that Tilman et al. predict for the year 2050. The results suggest that a mere 43 years from now mankind will be appropriating more than two thirds of terrestrial ecosystem production plus all of earth’s remaining usable freshwater, as has also been discussed by Wallace (2000). In terms of land devoted to agriculture, Tilman et al. calculate a much less ominous 18% increase by the year 2050. However, because most developed countries are projected to withdraw large areas of land from farming over the next fifty years, the loss of natural ecosystems to crops and pastures in developing countries will amount to about half of their remaining suitable land, which would, in the words of the Tilman team, “represent the worldwide loss of natural ecosystems larger than the United States.” What is more, they say that these land usurpations “could lead to the loss of about a third of remaining tropical and temperate forests, savannas, and grasslands.” And in a worrisome reflection upon the consequences of these land-use changes, they remind us that “species extinction is an irreversible impact of habitat destruction.” What can be done to avoid this horrific situation? In a subsequent analysis, Tilman et al. (2002) introduced a few more facts before suggesting some solutions. First of all, they noted that by 2050 the human population of the globe is projected to be 50% larger than it was just prior to the writing of their paper, and that global grain demand by 2050 could well double, due to expected increases in per capita real income and dietary shifts toward a higher proportion of meat. Hence, they but stated the obvious when they concluded that “raising yields on existing farmland is essential for ‘saving land for nature’.” So how can this readily-defined but Herculean task be accomplished? Tilman et al. proposed a strategy that focuses on three essential efforts: (1) increasing crop yield per unit of land area, (2) increasing crop yield per unit of nutrients applied, and (3) increasing crop yield per unit of water used. With respect to the first of these efforts – increasing crop yield per unit of land area – the researchers note that in many parts of the world the historical rate-of-increase in crop yield is declining, as the genetic ceiling for maximal yield potential is being approached. This observation, in their estimation, “highlights the need for efforts to steadily increase the yield potential ceiling.” With respect to the second effort – increasing crop yield per unit of nutrients applied – they note that “without the use of synthetic fertilizers, world food production could not have increased at the rate [that it did in the past] and more natural ecosystems would have been converted to agriculture.” Hence, they say that the ultimate solution “will require significant increases in nutrient use efficiency, that is, in cereal production per unit of added nitrogen.” Finally, with respect to the third effort – increasing crop yield per unit of water used – Tilman et al. note that “water is regionally scarce,” and that “many countries in a band from China through India and Pakistan, and the Middle East to North Africa either currently or will soon fail to have adequate water to maintain per capita food production from irrigated land.” Increasing crop water use efficiency, therefore, is also a must. Although the impending man vs. nature crisis and several important elements of its potential solution are thus well defined, Tilman and his first set of collaborators concluded that “even the best available technologies, fully deployed, cannot prevent many of the forecasted problems.” This was also the finding of Idso and Idso (2000), who concluded that although “expected advances in agricultural technology and expertise will significantly increase the food production potential of many countries and regions,” these advances “will not increase production fast enough to meet the demands of the even faster-growing human population of the planet.” How can we prevent this unthinkable catastrophe from occurring, especially when it has been concluded by highly-credentialed researchers that earth possesses insufficient land and freshwater resources to forestall it, while simultaneously retaining any semblance of the natural world and its myriad animate creations? Although the task may appear next to impossible to accomplish, it can be done; for we have a powerful ally in the ongoing rise in the atmosphere’s CO2 concentration that can provide what we can't. Since atmospheric CO2 is the basic “food” of nearly all plants, the more of it there is in the air, the better they function and the more productive they become. For a 300-ppm increase in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration above the planet’s current base level of slightly less than 400 ppm, for example, the productivity of earth's herbaceous plants rises by something on the order of 30% (Kimball, 1983; Idso and Idso, 1994), while the productivity of its woody plants rises by something on the order of 50% (Saxe et al., 1998; Idso and Kimball, 2001). Thus, as the air's CO2 content continues to rise, so too will the productive capacity or land-use efficiency of the planet continue to rise, as the aerial fertilization effect of the upward-trending atmospheric CO2 concentration boosts the growth rates and biomass production of nearly all plants in nearly all places. In addition, elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations typically increase plant nutrient-use efficiency in general – and nitrogen-use efficiency in particular – as well as plant water-use efficiency, as may be verified by perusing the many reviews of scientific journal articles we have produced on these topics and archived in the Subject Index of our website (www.co2science.org). Consequently, with respect to fostering all three of the plant physiological phenomena that Tilman et al. (2002) contend are needed to prevent the catastrophic consequences they foresee for the planet just a few short decades from now, a continuation of the current upward trend in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration would appear to be essential. In the case we are considering here, for example, the degree of crop yield enhancement likely to be provided by the increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration expected to occur between 2000 and 2050 has been calculated by Idso and Idso (2000) to be sufficient – but only by the slightest of margins – to compensate for the huge differential that is expected to otherwise prevail between the supply and demand for food earmarked for human consumption just 43 years from now. Consequently, letting the evolution of technology take its natural course, with respect to anthropogenic CO2 emissions, would appear to be the only way we will ever be able to produce sufficient agricultural commodities to support ourselves in the year 2050 without the taking of unconscionable amounts of land and freshwater resources from nature and decimating the biosphere in the process.

### Ozone

#### Ozone hole shrinking—Japanese research proves.

AP, 5/22/2006. Associated Press. “Study: Ozone Hole Will Contract, May Disappear by 2050,” <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,196417,00.html>.

TOKYO — The ozone hole over the Antarctic is likely to begin contracting in the future and may disappear by 2050 because of a reduction in the release of chlorofluorocarbons and other ozone-depleting gases, according to a team of Japanese scientists. The findings are based on a series of numerical simulations carried out by Eiji Akiyoshi of the National Institute for Environmental Studies, near Tokyo, using projected emissions of chlorofluorocarbons and other gases blamed for the ozone hole. According to a report posted Friday on the institute's Web site, the hole is at its largest now but is likely to gradually start contracting around 2020 and disappear by around 2050. The team's findings are in line with research by other scientists.

### AT: Weeds

#### CO­­2 doesn’t benefit weeds – it actually strengthens plant defenses against weeds

Idso et al 04 Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, and The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi [CO2 Science Magazine, Vol. 7, No. 23, 6-9]

Dukes (2002) grew model serpentine grasslands common to California, USA, in competition with the invasive forb Centaurea solstitialis at atmospheric CO2 concentrations of 350 and 700 ppm for one year, determining that elevated CO2 increased the biomass proportion of this weedy species in the community by a mere 1.2%, while total community biomass increased by 28%.  Similarly, Gavazzi et al. (2000) grew loblolly pine seedlings for four months in competition with both C3 and C4 weeds at atmospheric CO2 concentrations of 260 and 660 ppm, reporting that elevated CO2 increased pine biomass by 22% while eliciting no response at all from either type of weed.  Likewise, in a study of pasture ecosystems near Montreal, Canada, [Taylor and Potvin (1997)](http://www.co2science.org/journal/1998/120198b1.htm) found that elevated CO2 concentrations did not influence the number of native species returning after their removal (to simulate disturbance), even in the face of the introduced presence of the C3 weed Chenopodium album, which normally competes quite effectively with several slower-growing crops in ambient air.  In fact, atmospheric CO2 enrichment did not impact the growth of this weed in any measurable way. Ziska et al. (1999) also studied the C3 weed C. album, along with the C4 weed Amaranthus retroflexus, in glasshouses maintained at atmospheric CO2 concentrations of 360 and 720 ppm.  They determined that elevated CO2 significantly increased the photosynthetic rate and total dry weight of the C3 weed, but that it had no effect at all on the C4 weed.  Also, they found that the growth response of the C3 weed to a doubling of the air's CO2 content was approximately 51%, which is about the same as the average 52% growth response tabulated by Idso (1992), and that obtained by Poorter (1993) for rapidly-growing wild C3 species (54%), which finding suggests there is no enhanced dominance of the C3 weed over other C3 plants in a CO2-enriched environment. Wayne et al. (1999) studied another agricultural weed, field mustard (Brassica kaber), which was sewn in pots at six densities, placed in atmospheric CO2 concentrations of 350 and 700 ppm, and sequentially harvested during the growing season.  Early in stand development, elevated CO2 increased aboveground weed biomass in a density-dependent manner; with the greatest stimulation of 141% occurring at the lowest density (corresponding to 20 plants per square meter) and the smallest stimulation of 59% occurring at the highest density (corresponding to 652 plants per square meter).  However, as stands matured, the density-dependence of the CO2-induced growth response disappeared, and CO2-enriched plants exhibited an average aboveground biomass that was 34% greater than that of ambiently-grown plants across a broad range of plant densities.  Moreover, this final growth stimulation was similar to that of most other herbaceous plants exposed to atmospheric CO2 enrichment (30 to 50% biomass increases for a doubling of the air's CO2 content), once again evidencing that atmospheric CO2 enrichment confers no undue advantage upon weeds at the expense of other plants. In a study of a weed that affects both plants and animals, [Caporn et al. (1999)](http://www.co2science.org/journal/1999/v2n22b1.htm) examined bracken (Pteridium aquilinum), which poses a serious weed problem and potential threat to human health in the United Kingdom and other regions, growing specimens for 19 months in controlled environment chambers maintained at atmospheric CO2 concentrations of 370 and 570 ppm and normal or high levels of soil fertility.  They found that the high CO2 treatment consistently increased rates of net photosynthesis by 30 to 70%, depending on soil fertility and time of year.  However, elevated CO2 did not increase total plant dry mass or the dry mass of any plant organ, including rhizomes, roots and fronds.  In fact, the only significant effect of elevated CO2 on bracken growth was observed in the normal nutrient regime, where elevated CO2 actually reduced mean frond area. Finally, in a study involving two parasitic species (Striga hermonthica and Striga asiatica), Watling and Press (1997) reported that total parasitic biomass per host plant at an atmospheric CO2 concentration of 700 ppm was 65% less than it was in ambient air.  And in a related study, [Dale and Press (1999)](http://www.co2science.org/journal/2000/v3n1b1.htm) observed that the presence of a parasitic plant (Orobanche minor) reduced its host's biomass by 47% in ambient air of 360 ppm CO2, while it only reduced it by 20% in air of 550 ppm CO2. These several studies suggest that the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content likely will not favor the growth of weedy species over that of crops and native plants.  In fact, it may well provide non-weeds greater protection against weed-induced decreases in their productivity and growth.  Thus, future increases in the air's CO2 content may actually increase the competitiveness of non-weeds over weeds.

## 1NR

### Electricity Prices DA

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### PPAs undermine innovation and market development.

Wesoff 10, 5/12/2010 (Eric, Anatomy of a Power Purchase Agreement, Greentech Solar, p. http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/anatomy–of–a–power–purchase–agreement/)

Two of the major challenges to adoption of renewable energy include the barrier of high upfront costs. Power purchase agreements go a long way toward solving this problem, but they have their own set of flaws and advantages. Today's panel explored the state of PPAs. Marc Roper, the VP of Sales at PPA firm Tioga Energy, was the panelist most deeply entrenched in the PPA industry. Tioga works on PPAs for distributed generation in the several hundred kilowatts to multiple megawatts range. Roper said, "It's hard to be an innovator as a PPA provider –– we have to minimize technology risk. We are going to be at the tail end of the adoption curve." He added that new solar technology like "tracking, exotic materials, new types of electronics [like microinverters] –– we are a little less likely to adopt those." Most of those technologies will have to get to market through other means than PPAs.

#### That subsidizes cost and causes SMR models that shifts the cost to electrical grid

Cooper 9, November 2009 (Mark – Senior Fellow for Economic Analysis at the Institute for Energy and the Environment at Vermont Law School, All Risk, No Reward for the Taxpayers and Ratepayers: The Economics of Subsidizing the ‘Nuclear Renaissance’ with Loan Guarantees and Construction Work in Progress, p. http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/11\_03\_09\_Cooper%20All%20Risk%20Full%20Report.pdf)

Subsidies for Nuclear Reactor Construction Harms Taxpayers and Ratepayers Attempting to circumvent the sound judgment of capital markets, advocates of loan guarantees and construction work in progress claim that they lower the financing costs of nuclear reactors and are good for consumers, but shifting risk does not eliminate it and taxpayers and ratepayer will pay the price. • Because the subsidy induces the utility to choose an option that is not the least–cost option available, ratepayers will bear a higher burden. • Subsidies induce the utility to undertake risky behaviors that they would not otherwise have engaged in. When those undertakings go bad, the costs of the failures will be born by taxpayers and ratepayers in the form of expenditures on facilities that do not produce a flow of goods and services. • If the pre–approval process for loan guarantees and/or construction work in progress reduces scrutiny over cost escalation and overruns, ratepayers will end up paying a higher price than anticipated. • Even with subsidies, these projects are so risky and large that they tend to have adverse impacts on the utility’s financial rating, which results in substantial increases in the cost of service. • For cash–strapped consumers, taking after–tax dollars out of their pockets is a severe burden. If taxpayers and ratepayers have a higher discount rate than the utility rate of return, they would be better off having the present use of their money. There is a high probability that some or all of these factors will impose high costs on taxpayers and ratepayers (as described in Exhibit ES–2).

#### 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.

**No Impact to Natural Gas volatility – market corrections solve**

**Whitman 11** (Austin F. Whitman, M.J. Bradley & Associates LLC, “Natural Gas Price Volatility: Lessons from Other Markets,” Report for the American Clean Skies Foundation and the Task Force on Ensuring Stable Natural Gas Markets, 1-26-11,

<http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Natural%20Gas%20Price%20Volatility%20-%20Lessons%20from%20Other%20Markets.pdf>)

Natural gas prices do not always move in step with other commodities, but the least regulated markets of the U.S. and UK have seen greater natural gas price volatility than a core set of other global industrial, agricultural, and metals commodities – this in spite of the notorious commodity market boom and bust cycle that happened from 2006 to 2008. Yet excess volatility in the natural gas market **may not**, in the end, **be cause for alarm**. Price volatility is both a **necessary and permanent** part of a liquid market, as concluded in a 2003 study by the American Gas Foundation. 44 It may be that, to paraphrase President Franklin Roosevelt, the only thing we have to fear is fear of volatility – not volatility itself. If a free and open market lets buyers, sellers, and traders innovate and use market-based tools to cope with price fluctuations, **the net economic costs may be trivial**.

**No risk of price spikes – price will stabilize at a sustainable level**

**Dlouhy 12** (Jennifer A., report at Hearst Newspapers, Bachelor of Journalism, Journalism, Political Science at University of Missouri-Columbia, “Natural gas glut a dilemma for Obama,” FuelFix, 7-16-12, <http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/07/16/natural-gas-glut-a-dilemma-for-obama/>)

Energy companies and analysts have argued that current U.S. natural gas prices are unsustainable. It closed Friday at $2.874 per million British thermal units in trading on the New York Mercantile Exchange. The opposing argument is that exports could cause prices to spike, sending electricity bills upward and jeopardizing a resurgence in domestic manufacturing tied to abundant, cheap natural gas. Manufacturers that use natural gas to fuel their plants and as a building block to make other products were hit hard over the past two decades by volatile swings in prices, which last peaked over $15 in 2005. Because any position risks alienating important constituencies – energy producers and manufacturers as well as voters – few elected officials are pushing the issue. ‘Safer for politicians’ “It’s a lot safer for politicians who don’t want to be on the wrong side to defer it,” said Kevin Book, an analyst with ClearView Energy Partners. Even key stakeholders in the debate are keeping low profiles. Several major energy industry groups have kept mostly quiet, possibly for fear of advocating an export strategy linked to higher prices. Many manufacturers, meanwhile, are wary of visibly opposing energy exports and being painted as free trade foes. Some companies also are torn because their foreign operations could benefit from an influx of cheaper U.S. natural gas. President Barack Obama and Republican challenger Mitt Romney also have avoided making big pronouncements. Democratic U.S. Rep. Gene Green, whose east Houston district includes several **chemical plants**, says the key is finding a threshold that keeps prices low enough for manufacturers and **high enough** to sustain production levels. “I don’t want our gas prices to get so outrageous as seven years ago, when the chemical industry was transferring jobs to other places,” said Green, who backs case-by-case approvals. “I don’t want to kill the good things we’re doing, but I also know we want to **keep those drillers working**.” Advances in drilling technology have allowed energy companies to extract natural gas from dense rock formations coast to coast and tap what analysts widely describe as a 100-year supply of the fossil fuel. A few congressional critics are pushing for a timeout. Rep. Ed Markey, D-Mass., has introduced legislation that would halt new natural gas exports until 2025. Markey argues that the domestic natural gas explosion gives the U.S. a major global advantage that would be squandered by exports. “This is our biggest game-changing moment in a generation,” he said. “Low-priced natural gas is driving an American manufacturing renaissance.” Linking U.S. natural gas production with global markets would hamper moves to power more cars and produce more electricity with the gas, Markey said. “Natural gas producers do not want low prices. They want a global natural gas market that maximizes consumer pain domestically in the same way the global oil market does,” Markey added. “That would be painful for American consumers and catastrophic for the fertilizer manufacturers, the chemical and plastic makers, and the steel manufacturers who are relying on low-priced natural gas.” Prices to rise? Many analysts contend natural gas prices are destined to rise even without more exports, as companies scale back production. Bob Ineson, the head of North American natural gas research for IHS CERA, said he anticipates U.S. natural gas prices will rise without exports and stabilize around $3.50 to $4. “The current price environment is **unsustainably low**,” he said, because in some areas, gas costs more to produce than its price. A bipartisan group of lawmakers from areas rich in natural gas drilling warned the Energy Department in a letter earlier this month that if prices **don’t rise**, it could jeopardize **domestic natural gas production** and all of the jobs and **economic activity** tied to it.

#### No impact to methane release

Dorrite 7 (Dan, “Killer in Our Midst”, http://www.killerinourmidst.com/methane%20catastrophe.html)

First, methane itself is, like carbon dioxide, an asphyxiating gas, depriving aerobic organisms of needed oxygen. When released in the ocean, it would have impaired the metabolism of aerobic marine organisms, and, in sufficient concentrations, would have caused death. Although, upon reaching the atmosphere, methane could have had similar effects on non-marine organisms, its concentrations would have been unlikely to do much harm, because methane is lighter than air and would have been easily dispersed by winds.