# --Turns Nuclear War

**Nuclear war/VTL? We turn and solve.**

**Thiele, ’94** teaches political theory and serves as Director of Sustainability Studies at the University of Florida (Leslie Paul, August 1994, Political Theory, “Twilight of Modernity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Politics,” Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 481-2)

The importance of this 'secular' reading of Heidegger becomes clear in Kateb's subsequent reflections on human extinction. Kateb sets out to explore how we must think (about the world and about politics) so that a heightened attachment to existence induces us to do everything possible to eliminate the threat of nuclear annihilation. Democracy, or rather a democratic culture, is held to serve an important role in fostering the needed spiritual and emotional resources. Kateb's more surprising conclusion is that "the death of God, the end of all religiousness, best serves the cause of attachment to existence as such," and thus is the most important redress to our nuclear predicament.44 If we could somehow achieve an Archimedean point allowing an impartial judgment of life's worth, Kateb observes, then the abundant cruelty, waste, and ugliness of life would preclude its justification: "existence on the earth fails every test that is strenuously pressed by moral or teleological inquirers." 45But such metaphysical hypothesizing is beside the point. Kateb takes seriously Nietzsche's understanding that **we cannot properly evaluate life's worth**. Without a God's eye point of view, we can no more muster reasons to justify existence than we can muster reasons to condemn it. Religious or metaphysical justifications of life (under whose rubric we may subsume all moral and teleological efforts) are ill-begotten: at best they will fail to convince us of their impartiality and hence their prerogative to judge; at worst they will prove counterproductive begetting a destructive resentment of all the wickedness in life, for which they ultimately cannot account. This resentment of life may lead to political apathy or to a hyperactive pursuit of mastery, either of which may allow or **promote nuclear war making**. It follows that attachment to existence is best cultivated, and therefore the threat of human extinction best addressed, when all religious and metaphysical attempts to justify existence have been thoroughly discredited.

# 2NC Perm

**4. The perm bankrupts the alt – there is no middle ground for their motivations**

**Wrisley, ’10** (George, Prof of Philosophy @ U Iowa, 1 February 2010 “What Should Our Attitude Towards Suffering Be,” Nietzsche and Suffeirng- A Choice of Attitudes and Ideals, <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=site%3Ageorgewrisley.com+What+Should+Our+Attitude+Towards+Suffering+Be&aq=f&oq=&aqi>=) Zanezor

How should we comport ourselves to the suffering we find in our lives? When touching a hot stove or confronted with danger, our natural reactions are to pull back, to flee, to find safety. In general it seems that we naturally shy away from discomfort and pain—suffering of all types. The child laments his boring afternoon and the adult fears the impending death of a parent and the subsequent anguish the loss will bring, hoping and wishing they will never come. Suffering, it seems, is quite rightly seen as undesirable. However: When a misfortune strikes us, we can overcome it either by removing its cause or else by changing the effect it has on our feelings, that is, by reinterpreting the misfortune as a good, whose benefit may only later become clear. So, should we seek to abolish suffering as far as we can by removing its cause, or should we attempt to change our attitude toward suffering such that it is no longer seen as (always) undesirable? Taking Nietzsche seriously when he says that it is the meaning of our suffering that has been the problem, I will attempt to indirectly answer this question by looking at two possibilities found in Nietzsche for giving meaning to our suffering. The first possibility concerns a religious ethic that, according to Nietzsche, views suffering as undesirable, but which ultimately uses mendacious and deleterious means to provide a meaning for human suffering. The second possibility concerns the extent to which we can say Nietzsche endorsed the idea of giving meaning to suffering through acknowledging its necessary role in human enhancement and greatness. Since the religious ethic sees suffering as undesirable and thus something ultimately to be avoided (being itself the paradigmatic means for easing suffering), and the means it uses to give suffering meaning are ultimately mendacious, I will argue that if Nietzsche is significantly correct in both his attack on religious morality and his alternative ideal, we can take this as evidence that the avoidance of suffering is not the proper attitude. Unfortunately, I will not be able to address the question of whether Nietzsche is significantly correct in this paper. Secondly, given Nietzsche’s positive alternative—one that embraces the necessary role suffering has for the enhancement of human life—I will argue that we can take this as evidence that it is our attitude toward suffering that needs to be modified, i.e., we should modify so that we no longer see suffering as something to be avoided. Because of this, the middle position of avoiding suffering when possible and then seeing its positive attributes when it does occur does not recommend itself. That is, since it will be argued that suffering has a positive and necessary role to play, to seek to avoid it as far as possible and then to acknowledge its positive aspects when it does occur, is not really to acknowledge and accept suffering’s positive and necessary role. However, as we will see, all of this is complicated by the issue of the order of rank as found in Nietzsche’s writings.

# AT: Cede the Political

2. No link – the ballot is an ethical affirmation of life, not a political action

**White 91** [alan, Mark Hopkins Professor of Philosophy Williams College, http://www.williams.edu/philosophy/faculty/awhite/WNL%20web/WNL%20contents.htm]

The most provocative teachings I find in Nietzsche are not political, but rather ethical; Nietzsche does not attempt to tell us how to save the world, but rather how to save ourselves -- how to save ourselves from living lives that we will come to view with regret rather than with pride.And he teaches that we can do that without becoming supermen who blithely crush their supposed inferiors

### 2NC – A2 Perm Do the CP

#### First, it severs the agent. “The” means whole [USFG].

Merriam-Websters, 2010 (Online dictionary)

used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole

#### Courts can’t reduce—they rely on acquiescence.

Hanson et al, 2006 (Jon D. Hanson, professor at Harvard Law School; and Adam Benforado, Frank Knox Fellow at Cambridge University, “The drifters: Why the supreme court makes justices more liberal” January/February, online)

It would be a mistake to believe that the only situation that influences justices comes from within the Supreme Court building or individual judges’ limited spheres of interaction. The mechanisms designed to keep the judiciary independent of the other branches of government are necessarily incomplete, and there is good evidence that judges frequently interpret laws in ways that align with the particular policy desires of sitting members of Congress and the current president. This is not surprising given the forces that Congress and the president can bring to bear on the judiciary—including limiting or even stripping jurisdiction in certain areas, altering the size of federal courts, and instituting impeachment hearings. Just as important is the fact that the court cannot implement its orders without the acquiescence and assistance of other government actors. In addition, lower-court judges may be constrained by pressures not to be overruled by higher courts or the need to stake out particular positions in order to improve their chances of promotion within the judiciary.

#### Also, unenforceability.

Treanor and Sperling, 1993 (William Michael Treanor, Associate Professor of Law, Fordham University; and Gene B. Sperling, J.D., Yale Law School, Columbia Law Review, December, lexis)

Commentators have generally agreed with the overwhelming majority of courts that an overruling decision has the effect of automatically reviving statutes. For example, Erica Frohman Plave observed that revival was a necessary function of the limited scope of a judicial determination of unconstitutionality: "Such laws found unconstitutional are merely unenforceable until such time as they are found valid." 54 Professor Gerald Gunther has pronounced Attorney General Cummings's conclusion that Adkins "simply "suspended' enforcement" 55 of the District of Columbia minimum wage statute "persuasive," 56 and Professor Melville Nimmer similarly declared that "it seems clear that Attorney General Homer Cummings' opinion was correct." 57 Finally, Professor Oliver Field noted that a statute that has been found unconstitutional becomes enforceable when the case in which it was held unconstitutional is reversed because "a declaration of unconstitutionality does not operate as a repeal of a statute." 58 [\*1916]

#### ‘reduce’ modifies ‘restriction’ – means there must be legislative action

Hill and Hill (Gerald, Executive Director of the California Governor’s Housing Commission, Practice law for more than four decades, Kathleen, M.A. in political psychology from California State University. She was also a Fellow in Public Affairs with the prestigious Coro Foundation) 2005 “restriction” http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/restriction

restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision. In multi-unit real estate developments, condominium and cooperative housing projects, managed by homeowners' associations or similar organizations are usually required by state law to impose restrictions on use. Thus, the restrictions are part of the "covenants, conditions and restrictions," intended to enhance the use of common facilities and property, recorded and incorporated into the title of each owner.

#### Resolved.

Random House Dictionary, 2010 (© Random House, Inc. 2010)

firm in purpose or intent; determined.

#### Should.

[Same Source] Random House Dictionary, 2010 (© Random House, Inc. 2010)

must; ought (used to indicate duty, propriety, or expediency

### 2NC – A2 Perm Do Both

#### Links to politics – Only PRIOR court action solves

Garrett and Stutz, 2005 (Robert T. Garrett and Terrence Stutz, Dallas Morning News, “School finance now up to court Justices to decide if overhaul needed after bills fail in Legislature” lexis)

That could foreshadow the court's response to a chief argument by state attorneys – that the court should butt out and leave school finance to the Legislature. A court finding against the state would put the ball back in the hands of lawmakers, who have tended to put off dealing with problems in schools, prisons and mental health facilities until state or federal judges forced them to act. "It's the classic political response to problems they don't want to deal with," said Maurice Dyson, a school finance expert and assistant law professor at Southern Methodist University. "There is no better political cover than to have a court rule that something must be done, which allows politicians to say their hands are tied."

#### Mootness – the CP wont happen in a world of the perm

Lee, 1992 (Evan Tsen Lee, Associate Professor, University of California, Hastings College of the Law, Harvard Law Review, January, lexis)

ONE of the major impediments to the judicial protection of collective rights 1 is the group of doctrines falling under the rubric [\*606] of "justiciability" -- standing, ripeness, and mootness. 2 These are the gatekeeper doctrines; each regulates a different dimension of entrance to the federal courts. The law of standing considers whether the plaintiff is the proper person to assert the claim, the law of ripeness ensures that the plaintiff has not asserted the claim too early, 3 and the law of mootness seeks to prevent the plaintiff from asserting the claim too late. 4 By keeping certain public-minded plaintiffs and public-law claims out of federal court, these doctrines have shifted much of the battle for collective rights to the more steeply pitched fields of state courts or the political process. 5 In particular, defendants in public law litigation have had considerable success keeping such cases out of the federal courts by invoking the "case or controversy" requirement [\*607] of Article III. 6 Under current Supreme Court precedent, if a plaintiff cannot demonstrate that she possesses an ongoing "personal stake" in the outcome of the litigation, a federal court has no jurisdiction to adjudicate the claim on the merits. 7 No amount of judicial discretion can overcome this jurisdictional defect, because Article III demarcates the outer limit of federal court power. 8 As a result, many attempts to establish entitlements to important collective rights fail before courts can give them full consideration.

#### Even if the ruling happens, it would not make a constitutional claim.

Lee, 1992 (Evan Tsen Lee, Associate Professor, University of California, Hastings College of the Law, Harvard Law Review, January, lexis)

Doubtless some will point to Supreme Court opinions characterizing decisions in moot cases as advisory opinions and stating that the [\*651] court has no jurisdiction to proceed in moot cases. A few such opinions exist, 270 although many more imply that the mootness and advisory opinions doctrines are distinct (but related) ideas. 271 The most satisfying way to view the present doctrinal relationship of mootness, advisory opinions, and Article III is as follows: decisions in moot cases are currently prohibited because they are said to exceed the jurisdictional grants of Article III; additionally, decisions in moot cases implicate the prudential component of the advisory opinions doctrine, but they do not implicate the doctrine's constitutional core. Thus, the constitutional dimension to the prohibition against deciding moot cases stems directly from Article III and not from an analogy to advisory opinions. If the Court were to repudiate its position that the mootness doctrine is constitutionally compelled, the analogy to advisory opinions would pose no independent constitutional obstacle to deciding moot cases on the merits.

### 2NC - A2 Links to Politics —A2 Harrison

#### The Harrison evidence is not qualified, not supported by evidence, and should not be evaluated; this is NOT an ethical challenge.

Harrison, 2007(Lindsay Harrison, edebate, “Please post this email to edebate on my behalf” March 3, online)

It has come to my attention that teams are reading "evidence" from a debate blog that I ran last year when the high school topic was a legal one. I started the blog because, in judging debates on the topic, I was frustrated by what I saw as misunderstandings of the legal system by many in the debate community. I also was frustrated by a lack of creativity in devising arguments as a result of a lack of broad legal knowledge. I intended the blog both to educate and to generate new ideas for argumentation. I did NOT intend the blog to be used as evidence, especially not in college debates where I figured the community would recognize that none of my posts were peer-reviewed (or reviewed by anyone at all), none of my posts were backed up by specific research, and none of my posts would ever qualify as "legal scholarship." In fact, I am merely giving people ideas for arguments and I do not necessarily advocate any of the ideas as my own - I consider evidence to be taken out of context if it says, "debaters should argue that bush would get credit" and folks read only the part suggesting "bush would get credit," thereby attributing that idea to me. When I found out that people were reading "Harrison 06" evidence from the blog as link cards on the court politics argument, I made an effort to end this. Whenever anyone read this evidence in front of me, I asked that they not do so in the future. I also posted something on the blog that I intended as a disclaimer for people not to read "evidence" from the blog. I have been traveling internationally for several months and, upon my return, I found out that people have continued to read this evidence in debate rounds. Accordingly, I am now sending this to edebate in the hope that the community will recognize definitively that I do not want blog posts from my debate education blog to be read as "evidence" in rounds. Please do not read evidence from my debate education blog in rounds. I consider it to be taken out of context. I hope that if people do read this evidence in rounds that judges will penalize those teams for reading evidence that the author considers out of context.

### 2NC – A2 Links to Politics

#### Court action avoids energy lobby backlash

Matthew Hall (JD, Loyola Law School, former associate attorney at a litigation firm, and was an Adjunct Professor of Law at Loyola Law School) Winter 2010 “ A Catastrophic Conundrum, But Not a Nuisance: Why the Judicial Branch is Ill-Suited to Set Emissions Restrictions on Domestic Energy Producers Through the Common Law Nuisance Doctrine” 13 Chap. L. Rev. 265, Lexis

The energy lobby has long been accused of attempting to prevent, delay or at a minimum, assure the energy industry favorable terms in any comprehensive policy on climate change. 167 Energy companies have committed large sums of money to these causes. For instance, The American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, an advocacy group consisting of 48 energy producers, mining companies, and railroads, had committed $ 9.95 million to those ends as of March 2009. 168 Energy producers routinely make large campaign contributions to high-ranking members of Congressional committees charged with energy regulation and environmental action. For example, one of the largest contributors during the 2009-2010 campaign cycle to Rep. Joe Barton, Chairman of the House Committee on Energy & [\*295] Commerce, is none other than American Electric Power Co., the lead defendant in Connecticut v. American Electric Power Co. 169 The industries making the two largest contributions to Rep. Barton are the lectric utilities and oil & gas industries. 170 Given the aggressive attempts to influence climate change legislation that the energy lobby has demonstrated, an event causing energy producers to support emissions reduction legislation would be significant in making progress in this area. A decision authorizing piecemeal judicial regulation of emissions could be such an event. While the energy lobby has long resisted comprehensive emissions reduction policies, if such policies are to be initiated, it follows that energy producers would prefer they come from a source over which influence can be asserted to assure favorable terms. A judicially created emissions restriction seems to be a worst case scenario for energy producers. Unlike the political branches of government, the judiciary is intended to be beyond reproach by lobbyists. Without the need for (or the ability to accept) political contributions, the influence that can be asserted over the judiciary should be markedly less than that over the legislative process in Congress. The executive can be influenced in a similar manner, especially a first-term President needing cooperation on other major policy initiatives, including health care reform.

#### Courts don’t link to politics- shielded from political pressure

Ward, 2009 (Artemus Ward, Professor at NIU, Political Foundations of Judicial Supremacy, Congress and The Presidency, pg. 119)

After the old order has collapse the once- united, new-regime coalition begins to fracture as original commitments are extended to new issues. In chapter 3 Whittington combines Skowronek's articulation and disjunctive categories into the overarching "affiliated" presidencies as both seek to elaborate the regime begun under reconstructive leaders. By this point in the ascendant regime, Bourts are staffed by justices from the dominant ruling coalition via the appointment process - and Whittington spends time on appointment politics here and more fully in chapter 4. Perhaps counter-intuitively, affiliated political actors - including presidents - encourage Courts to exercise vetoes and operate in issue areas of relatively low political salience. Of course, this "activism" is never used against the affiliated president per se. Instead, affiliated Courts correct for the overreaching of those who operate outside the preferred constitutional vision, which are often state and local governments who need to be brought into line with nationally dominant constitutional commitments. Whittington explains why it is easier for affilitated judges, rather than affiliated presidents, to rein in outliers and conduct constitutional maintenance. The latter are saddled with controlling opposition political figures, satisfying short-term political demands, and navigating intraregime gridlock and political thickets. Furthermore, because of their electoral accountability, politicians engage in position-taking, credit-claiming, and blame-avoidance behavior. By contrast, their judicial counterparts are relatively sheltered from political pressures and have more straightforward decisional processes. Activist Courts can take the blame for advancing and legitimizing constitutional commitments that might have electoral costs. In short, a division of labor exists between politicians and judges affiliated with the dominant regime.

#### No backlash to the counterplan—provides cover.

Cramton et al, 2009 (Paul D. Carrington, Professor of Law at Duke University; and Roger C. Cramton, Robert S. Stevens Professor of Law Emeritus at Cornell University, Cornell Law Review, March, lexis)

This expansion of the Court's political responsibility obviously encroaches upon the responsibility of elected officials but is not necessarily an offense to these elected officials. Clearly, many elected politicians welcome the opportunity to leave the duty of making unwelcome decisions to "life-tenured" judges. 109 The politicians are free to denounce such decisions without bearing accountability to voters or campaign contributors. 110

### xt no water wars

**Interdependence checks**

**Deen 6**, internationally awarded U.N. bureau chief and editor of the U.N. edition of the IPS journal, 2006, Thalif, “'Water Wars' a Myth, Say Experts,” 8/25/06, Inter Press Service News Agency, http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=34465]

STOCKHOLM, Aug 25 (IPS) - The world's future wars will be fought not over oil but water: an ominous prediction made by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the British ministry of defence and even by some officials of the World Bank. But experts and academics meeting at an international conference on water management in the Swedish capital are dismissing this prediction as unrealistic, far-fetched and nonsensical. "Water wars make good newspaper headlines but cooperation (agreements) don't," says Arunabha Ghosh, co-author of the upcoming Human Development Report 2006 themed on water management. The annual report, commissioned by the U.N. Development Programme (UNDP), is to be released in December. In reality, Ghosh told the meeting in Stockholm, there are plenty of bilateral, multilateral and trans-boundary agreements for water-sharing -- all or most of which do not make good newspaper copy. Asked about water wars, Prof. Asit K. Biswas of the Mexico-based Third World Centre for Water Management, told IPS: "This is absolute nonsense because this is not going to happen -- at least not during the next 100 years." He said the world is not facing a water crisis because of physical water scarcities. "This is baloney," he said. "What it is facing is a crisis of bad water management," argued Biswas, who was awarded the 2006 international Stockholm Water Prize for "outstanding achievements" in his field. The presentation ceremony took place in Stockholm Thursday. According to the Paris-based U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), one-third of all river basins are shared by more than two countries. Globally, there are 262 international river basins: 59 in Africa, 52 in Asia, 73 in Europe, 61 in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 17 in North America. Overall, 145 countries have territories that include at least one shared river basin. Between 1948 and 1999, UNESCO says, there have been 1,831 "international interactions" recorded, including 507 conflicts, 96 neutral or non-significant events, and most importantly, 1,228 instances of cooperation. Despite the potential problem, history has demonstrated that cooperation, rather than conflict, is likely in shared basins," UNESCO concludes. The Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) says that 10- to 20-year-old arguments about conflict over water are still being recycled. "Such arguments ignore massive amounts of recent research which shows that water-scarce states that share a water body tend to find cooperative solutions rather than enter into violent conflict," the institute says. SIWI says that during the entire "intifada" -- the ongoing Palestinian uprising against Israel in the occupied territories of West Bank and Gaza -- the only thing on which the two warring parties continued to cooperate at a basic level was their shared waters. "Thus, rather than reaching for arguments for the 'water war hypotheses,' the facts seem to support the idea that water is a uniting force and a potential source of peace rather than violent conflict." SIWI said. Ghosh, co-author of the UNDP study, pointed out several agreements which were "models of cooperation", including the Indus Waters Treaty, the Israel-Jordan accord, the Senegal River Development Organisation and the Mekong River Commission. A study sponsored by the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars points that despite newspaper headlines screaming "water wars are coming!", these apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history. "No nations have gone to war specifically over water resources for thousands of years. International water disputes -- even among fierce enemies -- are resolved peacefully, even as conflicts erupt over other issues," it says. The study also points out instances of cooperation between riparian nations -- countries or provinces bordering the same river -- that outnumbered conflicts by more than two to one between 1945 and 1999. Why? "Because water is so important, nations cannot afford to fight over it. Instead, water fuels greater interdependence. By coming together to jointly manage their shared water resources, countries can build trust and prevent conflict," argues the study.

**Institutionalized cooperation spills over**

**Wolf et al 5**, Associate Professor of Geography at Oregon State University and Director of the Transboundary Freshwater Dispute Database, 2005 [Aaron, also professor of geography at Oregon State University, Annika Kramer, research fellow, Alexander Carius, Director of Adelphi Research in Berlin, and Geoffrey Dabelko, Director of the Environmental Change and Security Project at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, "Water Can Be a Pathway to Peace, Not War," Global Policy Forum, June 2005, http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/water/2005/06peace.htm]

These apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history: no nations have gone to war specifically over water resources for thousands of years. International water disputes—even among fierce enemies—are resolved peacefully, even as conflicts erupt over other issues. In fact, instances of cooperation between riparian nations outnumbered conflicts by more than two to one between 1945 and 1999. Why? Because water is so important, nations cannot afford to fight over it. Instead, water fuels greater interdependence. By coming together to jointly manage their shared water resources, countries build trust and prevent conflict. Water can be a negotiating tool, too: it can offer a communication lifeline connecting countries in the midst of crisis. Thus, by crying “water wars,” doomsayers ignore a promising way to help prevent war: cooperative water resources management. Of course, people compete—sometime violently—for water. Within a nation, users—farmers, hydroelectric dams, recreational users, environmentalists—are often at odds, and the probability of a mutually acceptable solution falls as the number of stakeholders rises. Water is never the single—and hardly ever the major—cause of conflict. But it can exacerbate existing tensions. History is littered with examples of violent water conflicts: just as Californian farmers bombed pipelines moving water from Owens Valley to Los Angeles in the early 1900s, Chinese farmers in Shandong clashed with police in 2000 to protest government plans to divert irrigation water to cities and industries. But these conflicts usually break out within nations. International rivers are a different story. The world’s 263 international river basins cover 45.3 percent of Earth’s land surface, host about 40 percent of the world’s population, and account for approximately 60 percent of global river flow. And the number is growing, largely due to the “internationalization” of basins through political changes like the breakup of the Soviet Union, as well as improved mapping technology. Strikingly, territory in 145 nations falls within international basins, and 33 countries are located almost entirely within these basins. As many as 17 countries share one river basin, the Danube. Contrary to received wisdom, evidence proves this interdependence does not lead to war. Researchers at Oregon State University compiled a dataset of every reported interaction (conflictive or cooperative) between two or more nations that was driven by water in the last half century. They found that the rate of cooperation overwhelms the incidence of acute conflict. In the last 50 years, only 37 disputes involved violence, and 30 of those occurred between Israel and one of its neighbors. Outside of the Middle East, researchers found only 5 violent events while 157 treaties were negotiated and signed. The total number of water-related events between nations also favors cooperation: the 1,228 cooperative events dwarf the 507 conflict-related events. Despite the fiery rhetoric of politicians—aimed more often at their own constituencies than at the enemy—most actions taken over water are mild. Of all the events, 62 percent are verbal, and more than two-thirds of these were not official statements. Simply put, water is a greater pathway to peace than conflict in the world’s international river basins. International cooperation around water has a long and successful history; some of the world’s most vociferous enemies have negotiated water agreements. The institutions they have created are resilient, even when relations are strained. The Mekong Committee, for example, established by Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Viet Nam in 1957, exchanged data and information on the river basin throughout the Viet Nam War.

### xt water alt cause

**Alt cause—grain importation requires a lot of water usage and importation**

**Conan and Clay 12/12/2011** Neal Conan, NPR correspondent and Jason Clay, senior vice president of market transformation at the World Wildlife Fund, “As the global population grows, water matters more,” http://www.npr.org/2011/12/12/143587133/as-global-population-grows-water-matters-more

POSTEL: That's right. Grain is the currency by which we trade water around the world. It takes about 1,000 tons of water to make one ton of grain. So the reason a country like Egypt imports more than half of its grain is not because it's short of land. It's because it's short of water.

So as it imports so much grain, it's actually importing 1,000 times that tonnage in water. So we call it virtual water. So you're trading - one of the ways we balance water budgets around the world is by trading grain.

So - and that's not been such a big issue so far. We've been able to do that with the extra grain. The problem that we're beginning to see and get worried about is that you have very large countries that used to be self-sufficient in grain, notably China, with 1.3 billion people, India with 1.2 billion people, Pakistan with nearly 200 million people, now beginning to become so water-short that they can't be food self-sufficient anymore.

And as they begin to look to the international grain market to buy more food, it's going to force prices up. And they'll be able to afford it, but what worries a lot of us is what that means for the people in South Asia and particularly sub-Saharan Africa that are hungry even today. And so that tension is going to worsen.

### at—root cause

**Even if they win the war scenario, water isn’t the root cause – politics is  
Lawfield 10** – an MA candidate at the University for Peace (Thomas, May 3, “Water Security: War or Peace?” <http://www.monitor.upeace.org/innerpg.cfm?id_article=715>)

Second, water wars are not caused by water, but rather an inability of politics. Barnett makes the case clear by arguing that water war would be a ‘failure of politics’ rather than the outcome of justified demands for essential resources.[28] In this way, it is not scarcity that is the driver in the Malthusian sense, but a political, and politicised issue. This is most noticeable where conflict occurs in areas where there are both political tensions and water resources challenges. For example, there are absurd and exaggerated claims of a linkage between Israel’s water management and surrounding states. In reality, conflict in this region is strongly influenced by political circumstance that speaks to a wider discourse around Israel’s position in the Near East. That environmental constraints and pressures are woven into wider discourses of politics is no indication that they are the cause of conflict, but rather more that they are an important contextual factor that may be mobilised for political reasons. For instance, in 2000 Lebanon started building a small pumping station on the Wazzani river which is used by downstream Israel. This rapidly became a media issue in Israel, probably due to the heightened security discourse surrounding water. Claims were made that the action was comparable to the 1964 diversion of the Hasbani, an Arab coalition move to harm the Israeli economy. However, the story diminished even faster than it emerged, when officials on both sides showed their dismay at the emerging media frenzy.[29] There are two key trends to note from this example: first, that wider discussions around water wars influence the articulation of war in reality, and second the water component of the conflict is not significant, rather it acts as a trigger for the utilisation of wider political narratives. In essence, water is merely a tool for political ends.

### naval power

**US Navy is resilient, despite asymmetric threats**

**Gates 10** – US Secretary of Defense (Robert M., "Navy League Sea-Air-Space Exposition" Remarks Delivered at the National Harbor at Maryland on May 3rd, <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1460>)

We know other nations are working on asymmetric ways to thwart the reach and striking power of the U.S. battle fleet. At the low end, Hezbollah, a non-state actor, used anti-ship missiles against the Israeli navy in 2006. And Iran is combining ballistic and cruise missiles, anti-ship missiles, mines, and swarming speedboats in order to challenge our naval power in that region. At the higher end of the access-denial spectrum, the virtual monopoly the U.S. has enjoyed with precision guided weapons is eroding – especially with long-range, accurate anti-ship cruise and ballistic missiles that can potentially strike from over the horizon. This is a particular concern with aircraft carriers and other large, multi-billion-dollar blue-water surface combatants, where, for example, a Ford-class carrier plus its full complement of the latest aircraft would represent potentially a $15 to $20 billion set of hardware at risk. The U.S. will also face increasingly sophisticated underwater combat systems – including numbers of stealthy subs – all of which could end the operational sanctuary our Navy has enjoyed in the Western Pacific for the better part of six decades. One part of the way ahead is through more innovative strategies and joint approaches. The agreement by the Navy and the Air Force to work together on an Air-Sea Battle concept is an encouraging development, which has the potential to do for America’s military deterrent power at the beginning of the 21st century what Air-Land Battle did near the end of the 20th. But we must also rethink what and how we buy – to shift investments towards systems that provide the ability to see and strike deep along the full spectrum of conflict. This means, among other things: Extending the range at which U.S. naval forces can fight, refuel, and strike, with more resources devoted to long-range unmanned aircraft and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities. New sea-based missile defenses; A submarine force with expanded roles that is prepared to conduct more missions deep inside an enemy’s battle network. We will also have to increase submarine strike capability and look at smaller and unmanned underwater platforms. These changes are occurring even as the Navy is called upon to do more missions that fall on the low end of the conflict spectrum – a requirement that will not go away, as the new naval operational concept reflects. Whether the mission is counterinsurgency, piracy, or security assistance, among others, new missions have required new ways of thinking about the portfolio of weapons we buy. In particular, the Navy will need numbers, speed, and the ability to operate in shallow water, especially as the nature of war in the 21st century pushes us toward smaller, more diffuse weapons and units that increasingly rely on a series of networks to wage war. As we learned last year, you don’t necessarily need a billion-dollar guided missile destroyer to chase down and deal with a bunch of teenage pirates wielding AK-47s and RPGs. The Navy has responded with investments in more special warfare capabilities, small patrol coastal vessels, a riverine squadron, and joint high-speed vessels. Last year’s budget accelerated the buy of the Littoral Combat Ship, which, despite its development problems, is a versatile ship that can be produced in quantity and go places that are either too shallow or too risky for the Navy’s big, blue-water surface combatants. The new approach to LCS procurement and competition should provide an affordable, scalable, and sustainable path to producing the quantity of ships we need.

## navy—no impact

**Sea power is irrelevant for future conflicts**

**Jarkowsky, 2** (Lt. Col. Jeffrey Jarkowsky, US Army War College, “’Boots on the Ground’–Will US Landpower still be decisive in future conflicts?” Stinet)

The role of seapower is unlikely to change from the vision expressed in current naval doctrine and vision. With no naval competitor in sight, the U.S. Navy's focus on projection of U.S. power ashore, and protection of global trade, fits the conditions expected in the future. The opening round of OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM has demonstrated the capability and contribution of seapower to America's future conflicts. The nature of the conflict will determine whether seapower can be decisive. Quite obviously, in a limited seaborne conflict, such as protecting shipping in the Straits of Hormuz, seapower was and can be the decisive element. In more general conflicts of the type we have recently seen and are likely to deal with again, although a key contributor, seapower is not likely to be the sole decisive force in achieving the conflict's objectives

## navy—alt cause

**Alt cause—Navy equipment shortages.**

**Peters 5** (Todd David Peters, Naval Postgraduate School, Thesis, “Bold Course into the Future or Lost at Sea: a Critical Evaluation of the United States; Navy’s Ongoing Transformation” 2005)

Implementation of the FRP marks a significant departure for the Navy in terms of how it organizes and employs its fleet formations. However, this type of change has very little impact on the strategic utility of the fleet in being. Reorganization is not the same as altering the composition of the fleet itself in order for any significant transformation to meet a new strategy. No amount of reorganization will alter the stark fact that while the platforms which comprise the vast majority ofthe Navy's current fleet would be perfectly capable of meeting a Soviet style force in direct combat, they are much less suited to undertake the peacekeeping and stability operations the Navy finds itself being tasked with. Furthermore, the current fleet structure remains unsuited to fight in the shallow littoral environment intowhich an increasing number of its potential adversaries have retreated.68

## carriers--obsolete

**Missiles have made carriers obsolete – they can do the job better with less risk**

**Rubel 11** - Dean of Naval Warfare Studies at the Naval War College. (Robert. Naval War College Review. “The Future of Aircraft Carriers.” http://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/87bcd2ff-c7b6-4715-b2ed-05df6e416b3b/The-Future-of-Aircraft-Carriers)

The cavalry role for carriers, practiced as late as the 1986 ELDORADO CANYON strikes on Libya, has become a victim of the missile age. In the most recent round of strikes on Libya, Tomahawk cruise missiles were used. Now possessing guided-missile submarines that can carry over a hundred Tomahawks, the Navy does not have to accept risks of running a carrier surreptitiously into hostile waters to carry out a strike or subjecting manned tactical aircraft to robust air defenses. In a similar manner, the introduction of the ballistic-missile submarine made the carrier nuclear-strike role obsolete. Whatever the trade-offs between tactical aircraft, manned or unmanned, andmissiles, the lethality of modern air defenses and the difficulty of moving naval forces undetected militate strongly against using carriers in this role. It does not appear that a carrier operating UCAVs would offer any significant advantage in the cavalry role over a submarine carrying cruise missiles.