# AT Green Jobs Plan

## States CP

Counter-plan: The 50 states and all relevant US territories should \_\_\_\_.

States solve the whole aff.

**Department of Labor 10** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

**A few states have begun implementing green economy initiatives of their own. California has taken the lead not only in** developing **clean energy industries, but also in** developing **the Clean Energy** Workforce **Training Program to provide a skilled workforce for these industries.** vi **New Jersey has also begun a similar** venture the **Green Job** Training Partnership **Program.** The New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development, supported in part by a $300,000 grant from the Conserve to Preserve Foundation of the New Jersey Resources Corporation, created the program to provide a pipeline of entry-level workers for the new jobs being created as a result of the energy-efficiency projects of the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities. The NJ Center for Energy and Environmental Training was created with technical assistance from several national organizations and state industry partners. vii In 2007, **Minnesota passed their own Green Jobs Act**, which helped facilitate green industry development in the state while also creating green jobs. viii **Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Washington have all enacted** initiatives or passed legislation to spur **green job creation or training.**

## Vets CP

Counter-plan text: The United States should fund vocational training including green jobs training for unemployed veterans. Funding will come from the same mechanism as the aff.

It’s mutually exclusive because it competes by reallocating funding which means no permutations. It’s also net beneficial.

Counter-plan solves the entirety of the case. Veterans are an effective target group for green jobs training. There’s no reason prisoners are key. **Lidov 13** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

**CleanEdison, a national training provider focused on clean tech**nology education, **has partnered with Veterans Green Jobs, a national nonprofit** organization **that puts veterans to work in the green** economic **sector.** Through this partnership, **the two organizations will advance training and employment** opportunities **for** military **veterans** in the clean energy field **nationwide.**

CleanEdison provides online, in-classroom, and hands-on vocational training and certification programs to individuals and pursuing career pathways in a variety of green job industries. It also regularly seeks grant opportunities from federal, state, local governments, utility agencies and other organizations and connects students with those opportunities. The new partnership brings together CleanEdison’s industry knowledge of job opportunities and grant funding for training with Veterans Green Jobs’ growing network of job-seeking veterans in sectors such as wind energy technology, solar energy technology, energy efficiency, renewable energy and environmental technology.

“We are very excited to partner with Veterans Green Jobs to get veterans into employment opportunities in energy efficiency and renewable energy,” said Avi Yashchin, CEO of CleanEdison. “Shocking as it may seem, clean energy jobs often go unfilled for months as companies struggle to find skilled workers, and with this partnership **we will** be able to **get veterans exactly the skills** that **companies are hiring for, at little to no cost.**”

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics in June 2012, **of veterans** who have served since 2001, **12**.7 **percent were unemployed** in May, and the youngest (18-24 years of age) are unemployed at a rate of 23.5 percent. **More than one million** veterans **are projected to leave the military** between 2011 and 2016, **placing increased demands on the workforce.**

### Politics NB

Counter-plan avoids the link to politics. Veterans are popular with the GOP.

**Kleefeld 12** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

**A new Gallup poll** analysis released on Memorial Day **shows that** among **veterans** with a very clear preference in the presidential race, a majority **support**s Mitt **Romney, corresponding with veterans’ Republican leanings.** Romney has 58 percent support among veterans, to Obama’s 34 percent. The data was collected from daily tracking polls between April 11 and May 24. During that same time frame, the two were tied overall at 46 percent among all registered voters; among non-veterans, Obama led with 48 percent to Romney’s 44 percent. The Obama administration has has aggressively reached out to active and former military personnel. But the new numbers suggest winning over what has traditionally been a solidly Republican bloc might be a bridge too far. **The numbers are consistent with recent past performance. In** the 20**04** exit poll, George W. **Bush carried** voters who had served in **the military**, with 57 percent to John Kerry’s 41 percent, while Bush narrowly won the national election. **In** the 20**08** exit poll, John **McCain carried** voters who had served in **the military** 54 percent to Barack Obama’s 44 percent, while Obama won the election by a wider margin than Bush had four years earlier.

*More evidence*

Counter-plan uniquely avoids politics. Troops have bipartisan support.

**Merchant 10** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

Furthermore, **Congress is infinitely more likely to approve funding** for R&D; and infrastructure **if the projects are military-related.** Which is depressing, but true -- the one thing that **no politician can get caught opposing** is the safety of **American troops.** In fact, the whole premise of the article is rather depressing, on point though it may be: The only way we may end up getting a competitive **clean energy** industry is through serious military investment, which is of course, serious government spending. Which **under any other guise would be vehemently opposed by conservatives.**

## Zavislan DA

Plan teaches prisoners to grow marijuana after release. **Sussman 12** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

Last week, more than 200 **prisoners** at California’s notorious San Quentin State Prison **turned out for a “green jobs” fair**. The soon-to-be-released felons were **greeted by** representatives from several **nonprofit groups and training programs**, all offering advice and information about the ecologically friendly employment opportunities that supposedly await the men beyond the prison’s gates.

The event was sponsored by the California Reentry Program, a social service agency that works with prisoners who are about to re-enter the outside world. While we applaud those who are attempting to assist such convicts, this skeptic believes that teasing these men with environmentally sustainable career options is pure folly.

One of the more prominent eco-orgs present at the jobs fair was Planting Justice. According to their pamphlets, this Oakland-based group is dedicated to “food justice, economic justice, and sustainable local food systems.

By the way, if “food justice” is an unfamiliar term, let me be the first to inform you that it has nothing to do with the carrot stick saying to the potato chip, “It’s not fair that people like you more than they like me.”  Advocates of food justice believe the wealthy have access to healthier food choices than do the poor.  The way to solve it, they believe, is through shakedown operations that result in a redistribution of wealth (a.k.a. tax the rich and create welfare programs).

The inmates of San Quentin also took part in psychobabble discussion groups.  An examination of the **topics** presented **included growing your own food** will save money; watching plants grow will develop patience; **gardening** will teach tolerance toward plants and people; **and another that literally promised, “smelling** the **plants changes behavior.”**

Hmm. My guess is smoking certain smelly plants was at least in part responsible for the behavior changes that initially got some of these guys traveling down the wrong road.

Another group present at the green jobs fair was the Insight Garden Program.  Located in San Francisco, this group contends that when the prisoners are  “**working in a**n organic **flower garden [they]** also **become ecologically literate** – developing an awareness of their connection to and impact on the world around them.”

The way utopian-minded non-profits like Planting Justice and Insight Garden Program see the world is, if we’ll just give an ex-con a bag of vegetable seeds upon release, he’ll grow his own food, save money, be more patient and tolerant, his overall behavior will forever be altered, and his criminal ways will be a distant image in the rearview mirror of life.   
If only it were so easy.

Forgive me for being cynical, but my antenna is way up.  Seems to me, if anything, Planting Justice and **the** Insight Garden **Program may be unknowingly preparing** some of these **prisoners to become master growers of marijuana and poppy plants.**

Growing marijuana destroys the environment.

**Cagle 12** writes[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Marijuana** advocates point to the fact that it’s “just a plant.” They’re not wrong! But **i**t’**s** a plant that’s often shipped hundreds of miles from production to consumer, and **either grown indoors at tremendous energy costs, or cultivated outdoors to the detriment of** the **local landscape.** First off: If you want your weed to be green, you have to go local. **Growing cannabis** plants **on dedicated farmland** isn’t the problem. The problem is that scenario **is really rare.** Far more often, **weed is grown outdoors in “guerilla” operations that** can **decimate local ecosystems** (if local wildlife doesn’t decimate the plants first). This has happened often in California, where this season’s massive marijuana harvest is just wrapping up. From The Sacramento Bee: A rush to profit from patient **demand for pot has resulted in irresponsible forest clearing, illegal stream diversion**s, **and careless pesticide** and fertilizer **use that has polluted waterways and killed wildlife**, state and local government officials said. Instead of being tilled back into gardens, **marijuana grow soil is often dumped outside where it can kill fish and stimulate** blue-green **algae blooms.** Responsible outdoor growing is possible; in Washington and Colorado, it could happen between about March and September, as cannabis grows best in warm temperatures and doesn’t do well with frost. But many growers in these states will opt for indoors, where they can have the most control over their product and perhaps more easily avoid the federal Drug Enforcement Agency. Unfortunately, they won’t avoid massive energy costs from the bright artificial lights used for up to 20 hours a day in order to speed up nature. About **a quarter of the cost of weed grown inside is** the cost of **energy — which** some **studies say could be 1 percent of all** the **energy** used **in the U.S. And that’s** been **without legalization. The way we smoke** now **is not sustainable.** But maybe new legalities will give us some space to figure out how to truly green the high.

Biodiversity loss causes extinction. **Diner 94**[[7]](#footnote-7)

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems are inherently more stable than less diverse systems: "**'The more complex the ecosystem, the more** successfully **it can resist** a **stress.**..[l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." By causing widespread extinctions humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. **As biological simplicity rises, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara desert in Africa, and the dustbowl** conditions **of** the 1930s in **the U.S. are** relatively **mild examples** of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, **each new** animal or plant **extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse, and human extinction.** Certainly, each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

## Politics DA Link

Green jobs link to politics.

**Fox 12** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

The **Obama** administration on Wednesday **acknowledged** a wide-ranging definition of **“green jobs” that include**s **bus driver, bicycle-shop clerk and other unexpected lines of employment, which the chairman of the GOP-led House oversight committee said is being done for “clearly political purposes.”**

GOP Rep. Darrell Issa, chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, made the assertion during a hearing on how the administration counts so-called green jobs and the Labor Department’s recent change to how reporters can access key unemployment reports and other information.

The Labor Department "has jeopardized the integrity of employment data in some cases for clearly political reasons," he said.

Issa suggested the administration is reclassifying such jobs to prove that billions of taxpayer dollars, through the federal stimulus program, have created green, or environmentally-focused jobs – a major initiative for President Obama.

**“It’s about politics. It’s always been about politics,”** said Issa, R-Calif. **“If you work at the Salvation Army, that’s a green job.”**

## Case

### Solvency

Green jobs training empirically fails – new Department of Labor audits prove.

**Dinan 12** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

President **Obama’s green jobs training** program, which was part of his stimulus, **has failed on most key jobs measures, according to a new internal audit that found it was training workers who** already had jobs that **didn’t need green energy skills, and was failing to place new enrollees in jobs once they finished** the training. The Labor Department’s inspector general also said grantees who received the green jobs-training money did a poor job of reporting their results. **Only 38 percent** of those who have completed training **got jobs based on it, and only 16 percent kept jobs for at least six months — the key measure of success** for the program. “Outcomes for participants were far less than originally proposed,” the auditors said. The government earmarked more than $400 million for green jobs training programs, and $328.5 million has been spent so far. About half were already working in the energy sector and wanted retraining, and half were potential new energy workers. Of those workers who already had energy-sector jobs, the auditors said they were retrained, even though they didn’t need it. “**We found no evidence that** the incumbent **workers** in our sample **required** services or **training to keep their job or obtain** a new **one**,” the investigators said in their report.

Empirics prove that green jobs training does nothing. **Colman 12** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

Placement in jobs retained more than six months through a $500 million Labor Department **green-jobs training** program **is falling 84 percent short of its goal**, according to a report released Friday. The Labor inspector general audit offered a bleak picture of one of President Obama’s chief stimulus and policy goals — creating green jobs. “Although grantees have reported achieving 90 percent of serving a collective goal of 126,493 participants, entered employment and retention results are far lower than planned,” the audit, which was an update to a September 2011 report, reports. The Obama administration defended the Labor program in a letter attached to the report, calling the grants “smart investments that are preparing Americans for the clean energy jobs driving our 21st Century economy.” That more than half of the grants for the program are still active indicates performance figures will improve, Jane Oates, assistant secretary for Labor’s Employment and Training Administration, said in the letter. Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, requested the audit. He likened the program to a handful of Energy Department-backed stimulus loans to now-bankrupt green-energy firms. “The **green jobs training** program **belongs in the long list of the Administration’s bad investments including** the bankruptcies of **Solyndra,** Beacon Power, **Abound, and** just this month, **A123,**” Issa said in a Friday statement. More than half of the 81,354 people that completed training in the stimulus program already had jobs, the report said. In a sample of 81 enrollees who already had jobs, the **investigators “found no evidence that they needed green job training”** to reach program goals of obtaining full-time employment, career advancement or job retention.

### Competitiveness

Green jobs kill competitiveness and destroy the economy. So many warrants.

**House Budget Committee 11** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

Two years later, the President’s promise of millions of jobs stands in stark contrast with reality. **As a recent report** from a Bay-Area news organization **made clear, green jobs** predictions **are “proving a pipe dream.”**[2] Reality Versus Fantasy Why haven’t the President’s promises translated into real economic gains? The answer lies in the federal government’s unsuitability for the role the President wants it to play. Since his inauguration, the President has spoken often of the federal government as an “investor” in alternative sources of energy. But the federal government’s job is to make and enforce the rules of the road, so that markets are fair, transparent and competitive – in other words, to foster an environment that is conducive to private-sector job creation. When the government takes on the role of “investor,” it usually does so because, according to the party in power, the “wrong” companies are winning in the free market, and the “right” companies are losing. **By seeking to pick winners** and losers **in a dynamic** and diverse **economy, the government-as-investor** model **distorts markets, weakens** the **rule of law, wastes tax**payer **dollars, and fails** to spur **sustainable job creation.** The President’s energy policies have exemplified this failed model. His approach has been characterized by punitive regulations on commercially competitive sources of energy, coupled with reckless spending on uncompetitive alternatives. Instead of promoting the innovative and entrepreneurial genius of American business, the President’s agenda has consolidated decision-making in Washington through a toxic mix of increased spending and more regulations. Those who support this agenda argue that government can direct labor and capital markets more equitably than individuals and businesses, without sacrificing efficiency. In fact, forcing firms that do not enjoy government support to compete against firms that do – instead of letting all firms compete on a level playing field – is neither equitable nor efficient. **The government**-as-investor model has a poor track record in general, and its **track record** of investing **in energy** alternatives **is** positively **abysmal.** In the late 1970s, in response to oil embargoes, the Carter Administration championed the development of synthetic fuels and ethanol. **One** memorable **failure pushed by** the **Carter** White House **was** the **Synthetic Fuels** Corporation, intended to finance the development of commercial synthetic fuel plants through massive subsidies. After exposing taxpayers to more than $400 billion in subsidies, this government-created corporation shut its doors in 1986.[3] Commercial “synfuels,” which were unable to compete commercially, stand today as just one example of the government’s inability to choose wise or productive investments in energy sector. There is a long history of failed efforts by federal agencies to develop commercially viable energy projects. In 1979, the **Carter** Administration **also initiated subsidies for corn ethanol**, continued today in the form of tariffs on imported ethanol and the federal renewable fuel standard (RFS), which requires a percentage of ethanol to be used in gasoline. A favorite of both parties, these “temporary” benefits have calcified into decades-old corporate welfare, and American families are still living with the resulting higher tax burdens and energy costs over 30 years later. Inflating one sector of the economy through complicated tax deductions, government handouts and new mandates carry hidden costs as well. **Subsidizing a favored industry drives down productivity, while driving up costs to the** broader **economy**. Targeted gains often prove fleeting, **with losses in job creation and growth**, not only in the favored industry, but **throughout the wider economy**.[4]This effect is clearly seen in the employment picture for “green” jobs, not just here in the U.S., but also in Europe, where government subsidies statistically had the counterproductive effect of either double-counting jobs that were shifted from one sector to another or, worse, of actually destroying jobs. **In Spain,** which spent $600,000 for every **green job**, recent **research found** the country’s **interventions** into the energy market **destroyed 2**.2 **jobs for every green position it created.** Similarly, **the U**nited **K**ingdom **found that 3.7 jobs were lost for every job** identified **in renewable energy**.[5] Job-creation and job-shifting are not the same. In Europe, policymakers made the same flawed assumption that President Obama made when he promised that government spending on green energy would create 5 million new jobs: that the “labor-intensity” of green energy was a virtue unto itself. Labor intensity – the labor required per unit of energy produced – is much higher in the green-jobs sector. Advocates point to this higher labor requirement as a benefit because, they say, it will tend to increase employment.[6] However, as Dr. William Bogart, a professor of economics at York College, explained in testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor in 2009, if the cost of energy increases as a result of inefficient production, then the net benefits available decrease. In the past, the efficiency and comparatively low cost of energy use in the U.S. led to higher productivity and higher standards of living. **With costlier energy systems, many goods will become more costly,** requiring consumers to pay more and **making American producers less competitive in world markets.**[7] Enough is Enough With green-energy stimulus funding driven by political calculus at the expense of economic return, the question becomes: How much is enough? In 2007, **the** U.S. Energy Information Administration (**EIA**) **conducted an analysis of subsidies** received by both alternative and conventional energy sources. On a dollar-per-unit-of-production basis, the level of **subsidies [for]** received by the **wind and solar** industries **were almost 100 times greater than** those for **conventional energy.**

Green jobs programs kill competitiveness. Workers within the industry concede.

**Sloan 12** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

Mitt **Romney** has recently taken fire not only from the Obama campaign but even from some left-leaning Republicans, for his rightful criticism of Obama’s destructive “green jobs” programs. Not only **is** Mr. Romney **right to criticize** these **[green jobs] programs -- and his position supported by many economic studies** -- but in fact the situation is even worse than anything suggested by these criticisms. **Green jobs are destroying** the abilities and spirits of **a whole generation of engineers. I should know. I was one of those engineers.** In 2008 I completed my Masters in Mechanical Engineering at Stanford and took a “Green Job” with a solar company. Excitingly, it seemed to match the green rhetoric--to have potential to create the incredible value of cleaner, cheaper energy. Unfortunately, the more I learned about my job and industry, the more I realized they were fundamentally flawed. Management said we would be competitive with oil and gas once we manufactured panels for $1.00/watt. But as a mechanical engineer, I learned most of solar’s cost is not panels themselves but “balance of system” (BOS) components like DC to AC converters, wiring, and structural mounting, adding about $3.00/watt for a best-case total of $4.00/watt. Coal and hydroelectric systems cost as low as $2.10/watt and $1.00/watt, respectively. **I found no evidence that solar**’s BOS **costs would decrease** meaningfully. **Nor did anyone have a solution to** the problem that has plagued solar and wind energy since their inception: **intermittency.** Solar and wind energy come intermittently, with no means to store it for later use that wouldn’t add considerably to their already-high cost. Thus, the idea of a large scale solar and wind economy is farcical. If the industry was fundamentally unproductive, so were my colleagues and I. We were wasting a tragic amount of time, talent--and other people's money--making a far inferior form of power when we could have been creating real advances in other, legitimate kinds of energy. Just as disturbing was what these “jobs” did to people’s spirits. Every high-ranking person in solar or wind must eventually figure out, as I did, that he cannot compete in the market, that his competitive advantages are government subsidies and forced limitations on competitors. Whatever technical advances we made didn’t solve the intractable problems, so our real victories came in forms such as the Cap and Trade Bill. I learned of the bill’s passage in the House of Representatives while driving home from a day spent on an interesting technical project. I knew my work was trivial in comparison. **Our true means of revenue**-generation **was** forcibly limiting carbon emissions, **to force consumers into using energy** sources **like ours.** I had looked forward to beating the competition, but with superior products--and working even harder if we should lose, or if that failed, joining the competition in creating a more energy-rich world. When the goal is not out-producing but crippling of the competition, the goodwill of "May the best man win" becomes "What kills them can only make me stronger." I wish I could say people work in Green energy because they sincerely believe in catastrophic global warming. But most also reject nuclear power, the only scalable form of CO2-free energy, hating it as a competitor while celebrating Fukushima for creating anti-nuclear sentiment. “Nuclear is dead!” proclaimed my boss at a staff meeting just days after the disaster. “This will be good for us!” he continued, in the wake of 20,000 deaths, not one caused by nuclear radiation. He was right--we needed disasters to compete. I remember researching catastrophic global warming claims extensively, then sharing evidence against such a threat with the director of engineering, a very intelligent man. I expected either a scientific counter-argument or excitement at the prospect that we do not face an unprecedented climate disaster and the unprecedented economic disaster of a carbon cap. Instead, he responded that our company would be better off if catastrophic global warming were imminent. He wanted it to be true, because it would help us. Our company could not survive on merit, so our interests were aligned with destruction. This is the kind of polluted cultural environment some of our nation’s most talented engineers are developing in--because the government is creating every incentive to bring it about. My relief came with financial hardship for my company and the following round of layoffs, as I was happily let go. I finally had time to find a real job, and now have a wonderful, rewarding one in a legitimate industry with a culture of productivity and achievement. It is a world of difference. Real wealth and jobs are not produced by means of subsidies extracted by force from helpless victims by the Obama administration, but by rational free people acting under their own initiative. **The sooner the government stops forcing green jobs on us, the sooner the** rest of America’s wasted **green workforce can** join me in **get**ting **real jobs.**

### Econ Defense

Studies show no correlation between decline and war. **Miller 2k**[[13]](#footnote-13)

[Ellipses in original text] 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 **[the Carnegie Endowment] 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).”

History proves – econ decline impacts are empirically denied.. **Ferguson 06**[[14]](#footnote-14)

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.

### Heg Defense

Hegemony Unsustainable; History Proves

**Layne 07**[[15]](#footnote-15)

States are ever-vigilant when it comes to maintaining their security because they want to survive as independent players in international politics. Up to a point, therefore, it is a good thing for a state to be powerful. But **when a state becomes too powerful, it frightens others; in self-defense, they seek to offset and contain** those **great powers** that aspire to primacy. And **the ironclad lesson of history is clear: states that bid for hegemony** (primacy)invariably **fail.** As Henry A. Kissinger has said, "hegemonic empires almost automatically elicit universal resistance, which is why all such claimants have sooner or later exhausted themselves." Indeed, the history of modern international politics is strewn with the geopolitical wreckage of states that bid unsuccesfully for primacy: **The Hapsburg Empire** under Charles V**, France under Louis XIV and Napoleon, Victorian Britain, Germany under Hitler.** By pursuing a strategy of primacy, the United States today risks the same fate that has befallen other great powers that have striven to dominate the international political system.

Domestic opposition to heg is an alt cause which the aff can’t solve.

**Bremmer 12** writes[[16]](#footnote-16)

I happen to think that there has been this significant “coming apart” within the United States of the top 10 percent and the bottom 90 percent economically. But that coming apart within the U.S. is also being mirrored by a coming apart globally. And that **there aren’t many Americans** that are **prepared to support the U.S. as** the **world**’s **policeman** anymore. There aren’t many Americans that are prepared to say they benefit from U.S.-led globalization. **With** the levels of **unemployment** that exist in the U.S., with manufacturing jobs that have gone away and aren’t coming back, with Katrina and New Orleans not getting rebuilt, large numbers of **Americans** are saying, “We **do not see the benefit** from all of what the U.S. has been doing internationally.” And **that will make it** politically **inconceivable for the U.S. to do the** kind of **things** that **it did** when it was putting together the old world order. I mean, Geithner can get on a plane and go to Europe and give as much advice as he wants to. But there’s nowhere near the level of political support in the United States for the Americans to pull off another Marshall Plan in Europe, or anything remotely close to that. And even in the case of Libya, which of course is the big intervention that happened after the 2008 financial crisis, look at what actually happened. The U.S. did not want to do it. Everyone hated Gadhafi — U.S. enemies, U.S. allies. The Brits and the French said, You’ve gotta remove this guy. And only then did the U.S. say they would, and still the U.S. did not have troops on the ground. In some ways, Libya is the exception that proves the rule, that whether we’re talking about trade or climate or security or the European crisis, all of these are issues where **we’re** just **not going to see** the kind of **leadership** anywhere that we have historically.

Potential to redeploy solves all your offense. **Conry 97** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

A more critical issue is the evolution of **the** international **system after U.S. hegemony**. Washington can exert considerable influence (though not full control) over the development of that system. Although a number of different scenarios may be acceptable to the United States, Washington should make certain that any global system that succeeds American hegemony has two important characteristics. First, international power and responsibility must be decentralized; the transfer of U.S. global influence and responsibilities to another state, alliance, or global organization such as the United Nations should not be permitted. It is as unrealistic to base the international system on the illusion that some other country or international organization can effectively lead the world as it is to depend on U.S. global leadership. Second, the international system must include a means of checking aspiring hegemons. Regional Security Organizations Such a system **could take several forms**. One possibility is the strengthening of regional security organizations, such as the Western European Union. Regional security organizations are an effective way of keeping order among member states and can also take care of contingencies in their general areas. Had the European countries not been so dependent on NATO, for example, the WEU should have been able to subdue the crisis in the former Yugoslavia if the conflict had been perceived as a wider threat to Europe. **Regional organizations could** also **serve as potential partners to the U**nited **S**tates **in the event of a** serious **threat** to their mutual interests elsewhere in the world. Unfortunately, regional security organizations require a high degree of cohesion among member states and therefore are not possible in many parts of the world. The WEU is probably the only such organization that is viable in the near future, although effective regional security organizations encompassing some Latin American and Asian countries are not inconceivable. In much of the rest of the world, however, there is little evidence of the cohesion and common interest that would be a precondition for a functioning regional security organization. Spheres of Influence An alternative to regional security organizations is the creation of spheres of influence. The notion of spheres of influence has in the past carried a rather sinister connotation and could still be troublesome if a dominant regional power sought to subvert its neighbors, especially if it subsequently aspired to challenge other major powers. But as long as dominant powers restrict their activities to typical "great power" behavior--which would generally mean shoring up security and prestige but not expansionism--there is nothing inherently evil about spheres of influence. Several prominent foreign policy scholars have pointed out the feasibility of spheres of influence. Ronald Steel of the University of Southern California has written, Regional disturbances that do not threaten the world power balance should be dealt with by the major powers of the region, ideally with the endorsement of the international community. Instead of seeking an ephemeral global security, we should, as Charles William Maynes has argued in Foreign Policy, encourage a policy of "regional self-reliance [that] would recognize that certain powerful states in each area will inevitably play a special security role." In other words, we must accept the reality of the longstanding tradition of spheres of influence--a tradition that we scrupulously insist upon in the Western Hemisphere under our unilaterally imposed Monroe Doctrine. [61] Spheres of influence make sense because the world's major powers have an interest in, and usually the ability to maintain a degree of order in, their regions. There is always some risk that the leading power in a particular sphere of influence may abuse its position or develop expansionist ambitions. The decentralization of international power, however, should ensure that **the U**nited **S**tates, **other major powers, or regional** security **organizations**--acting alone or in concert--**could check unacceptable behavior** on the part of a dominant regional power. Balance of Power Yet another alternative is the establishment of regional balance-of-power arrangements, which may be appropriate in the Middle East, for example. There are serious obstacles to the creation of a viable regional security organization in that area--as demonstrated by the problems the Gulf Cooperation Council has faced--and there is no clear dominant power around which a sphere of influence is likely to develop. Instead, the locus of power tends to shift among the larger states. The United States has in the past sought to manipulate the balance of power by bolstering certain countries as a means of checking others. That risky strategy had disastrous consequences with respect to Iran and Iraq, and, given the unpopularity of the regimes in Egypt and Saudi Arabia and those regimes' close identification with Washington, it may well backfire again. Allowing the balance of power in the region to evolve without U.S. interference would help shield the United States from the consequences of violent and sudden shifts in the balance but could still be expected to prevent a regional hegemon from rising. As University of Chicago political scientist Stephen M. Walt pointed out in The Origins of Alliances, Compared with the other hypotheses examined in this book, the general hypothesis that states choose allies in order to balance against the most serious threat was the clear winner. Its merits were shown in two important ways. First, balancing was far more common than bandwagoning, and bandwagoning was almost always confined to especially weak and isolated states. Second, the importance of ideological distinction declined as the level of threat increased; ideological solidarity was most powerful when security was high or when ideological factors and security considerations reinforced each other. [62] The tendency of states to balance against a prospective hegemon, instead of "bandwagoning," has been evident in the Middle East. As Walt observed, "Despite the fact that the Middle East lacks an established tradition of balance of power statecraft . . . , the advantages of seeking allies in order to balance against threats have obviously been apparent to the various actors in the Middle East. . . . the ascendancy of ambitious regional powers (such as Iraq under Nuri al-Said and Egypt under Nasser) consistently led other regional actors to join forces . . . to resist the attempt." [63] The strategic environment of the Middle East of the 1990s remains conducive to balancing, as an assortment of similarly sized powers--Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Iran--continue to share an interest in preventing the rise of any single power to primacy. The United States may have to tolerate a degree of instability as power shifts among those states, but American vital interests should be reasonably safe as long as power remains diffused throughout the region. **If a hegemon were to arise**, especially if it were clearly hostile to U.S. interests, **the U**nited **S**tates **would still have the option of acting alone or joining forces with** European and **other powers to deal with that problem.**

### Warming

Plan is not key. Free markets solve warming on their own. Any risk plan disrupts free market competition is a turn. **Whitman 08**[[18]](#footnote-18)

Global warming may soon get a saviour more effective than Al Gore and his doomsday Power-Point presentations: capitalism. The former U.S. vice-president, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize last year for his work on climate change, is credited with bringing widespread attention to the issue. But **the huge money**making opportunity **in going green will** be the big driver that **lead**s **to the reining in of** the release of **greenhouse gasses,** experts say. **Money is already pouring into environmental** initiatives and **technologies** in the United States. **Experts expect investment** in the area **to explode over the next few years** if, as anticipated, the government here imposes restrictions on the release of gases believed to be behind climate change. "**Capitalism will drive this,**" said Vinod Khosla, founding chief executive of Sun Microsystems and a longtime venture capitalist. Mr. Khosla, speaking on a panel at a recent investment summit on climate change at United Nations headquarters here, said **getting consumers to curb their energy use has never worked -- unless they've had a financial incentive.** "If we make it economic, it will happen," he said. The expected government-mandated cap on carbon emissions already is fueling innovation. Venture capitalists, for instance, are investing in new technologies that would make cement -- a major producer of carbon emissions -- actually absorb carbon instead. Cement makers could practically give the product away and reap the financial reward from government carbon credits.

Empirics prove global warming won’t cause extinction.

**NIPCC 11** writes[[19]](#footnote-19)

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 CO2will 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 change**s 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."**

No impact to warming – humans can adapt. **Moore 08** writes[[20]](#footnote-20)

Even if the pessimists are correct and future climate change reduces food production, wicked storms lash much of the planet, summers are plagued by terrible heat waves, and floods and droughts inundate large areas of the world and reduce the availability of clean water, **human** being**s will be better able to handle such** terrible **conditions** than they are now **because tech**nology **will advance and people will become richer** over the next century. Evidence of an increasing rate of technological advancement comes from patents; **the number of patents issued** for inventions **has continued to rise at an increasing rate** since 1790 (Fig 2). Although patented inventions are only a crude measure of technological growth, **they** do **indicate that tech**nology **will continue to change the world** in which we live. Consider the world 200 years ago when the fastest means of communication was by horseback, or just 100 years ago when telephones were only slowly spreading and radio, much less TV or the internet, were almost undreamed of. **Thus progress will allow our descendants to deal with** almost **any difficulties that climate change brings**.

## Aff Answers – Vets CP

Green vets counterplan links to politics.

**Weinstein 12** writes[[21]](#footnote-21)

**As if to underscore** Mitt **Romney's indifference to the 47 percent, his Republican Party** colleagues in the US Senate **used a** procedural **vote** Wednesday **to block a $1 billion bipartisan bill that would have given** tens of thousands of **jobless military vets** the opportunity to **work.** Inspired by President Obama's State of the Union Address challenge to get veterans working, the Veterans Job Corps bill would have created a program to fast-track 20,000 former service members into federal jobs as law enforcement officers, first responders, and parks workers. The legislation "was one of the few pieces of legislation [to] make it through Congress, which has been mired in partisan gridlock for the last two years," reports Stars & Stripes' Leo Shane. A few enthusiastic Republicans even added several provisions to the bill, including measures to increase internet access for job-seeking vets and to aid them in their transitions from military life. "Once it incorporated ideas from both sides of the aisle, I thought it would be an easy sell," Tom Tarantino, a war vets' lobbyist, told the Washington Post Wednesday. But despite support from 58 senators, the bill couldn't achieve the supermajority needed to get an up-or-down vote, dashing any chance that it could pass before Election Day in November. Forty Republicans succeeded in blocking the bill Wednesday afternoon, including self-styled budget hawks Sens. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) and Tom Coburn (R-Okla.). But chief among the bill's attackers was Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.), top Republican on the Senate Banking Committee. "Americans don't trust us," he said. "And why should Americans trust us when we keep using gimmicks and budget sleight of hand to hide more spending and drive the country further into debt?" **Conservatives say the bill was a budget-buster,** with Sessions **alleging that it "violate[d] the Budget Control Act** by adding to the deficit." **Coburn complained that the jobs bill made him want to quit** his own vocation. "I don't want to come [to work] anymore," he said, "and the reason I don't want to come anymore is because we're not doing anything to address the real problems that are in front of our country."

# AT Deradicalization Plan (Unfinished)

## Solvency

### AT Derad Recid Studies

Studies fail – costly and poor data. **Porges 10** writes[[22]](#footnote-22)

Since recidivism cannot be identified until well after a detainee's release, it is important to consider whether it is possible to gauge detainees' progress while they are still in custody. **Some programs evaluate** those in custody **through psych**ological **assessment**s, evaluations of their participation in various classes and activities, **and input from** less traditional sources, including **family members. This complicated procedure requires significant resources and individualized attention,** a particularly **difficult** proposition when working **with large numbers of detainees.** But although refining such assessment tools is crucial, they will never provide a perfect real-time measurement of a program's success.

No link and link turn. Aff studies are biased, and new evidence shows that derad causes terror. **Porges 10** writes[[23]](#footnote-23)

The most common way to measure effectiveness is by the rate of recidivism: how many graduates of a particular deradicalization program returned to terrorism. But **recidivism rates can be misleading. They are** often **inaccurate, reflecting only what is known to intelligence services, which is limited.** The **Saudi deradicalization** program, for example, **was considered a** complete **success until** just **last year, when the terrorist activities of 11 graduates were discovered. Further**more, **most derad**icalization **programs have not been around long enough** for observers **to judge** which strategies have **the** most lasting **impact on behavior. This will take years** -- which, of course, does not help U.S. officials wondering what deradicalization program may be suitable for the detainees currently held in Afghanistan and Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

Age and surveillance are alt causes that aff studies don’t consider. **Stern 10** writes[[24]](#footnote-24)

Marisa Porges raises important points about the significance of deradicalization efforts and the difficulty of assessing their quality. The list of difficulties is long, indeed. For example, **since terror**ism **is** generally **a young man's profession,** some ex-**detainees might appear deradicalized when** in fact **they have simply chosen to retire** from violent activity. In such cases, deradicalization programs may get credit they do not deserve. Similarly, **since some rehab**ilitation **programs involve extensive postrelease surveillance,** some of their apparent **success may result not from** effective jailhouse **derad**icalization **but from** the deterrent quality of this **monitoring.** These factors are hard to parse, but researchers must do so. Researchers would be helped if the Saudi government, among others, gave outsiders greater access to its program's methods and statistics. **It is not clear**, for example, **how the Saudis define and measure recidivism**, which for an ex-detainee **can mean many different things**, including being arrested for a new crime, being convicted of that crime, being sentenced to prison for that crime, or returning to prison for any technical violation.

### AT Modeling

Saudi program can’t be modeled in the US. **Stern 10** writes[[25]](#footnote-25)

That said, some of **the Saudi program’s main features, and thus** its **results, may be difficult to replicate elsewhere. The project is extremely expensive; it is constantly** being **updated**, based on input from the staff and participants. It includes psychological counseling, vocational training, art therapy, sports, and religious reeducation. Former Guantánamo **detainees who graduate** from the program **are given housing, a car, money for a wedding—even assistance in ﬁnding a wife**, if necessary. They receive help with career placement for themselves and their families. **There is an extensive postrelease program as well, which involves extensive surveillance.** The guiding philosophy behind these efforts, the program’s leaders explained, is that jihadists are victims, not villains, and they need tailored assistance— a view probably unacceptable in many countries.

US modeling Saudi derad would increase terrorism. **Stern 10** writes[[26]](#footnote-26)

Could aspects of the program nonetheless be replicated elsewhere? **The U.S.** government **has been trying to persuade the Saudi** government **to assist in reintegrating** into mainstream society **97 Yemeni terrorist** suspects who remained in Guantánamo as of October 2009. According to Benjamin Wittes of the Brookings Institution, **these** Yemenis **“include** many of **the worst of the worst.” Repatriating** them **to Yemen**, Wittes adds, **is not** an **attractive** option **because of the fragility of** the **Yemen**i state **and its** notoriously **leaky jails:** ten terrorist suspects escaped in 2003; in 2006, 23 suspects did. **And because the Saudi program depends on relatives to police** the **behavior** of the detainees once they are released, Boucek, of **the Carnegie Endowment** for International Peace, **describes the U.S. proposal to send the Yemenis to the Saudi program as “a catastrophically bad idea,”** unless the detainees grew up or have relatives in Saudi Arabia. Boucek favors giving U.S. assistance for a new program in Yemen that would be modeled in part on the one in Saudi Arabia.

## Reform PIC

CP Text: [Aff plan with the word “reform” instead of “deradicalize”]

The counter-plan solves better. Disengagement is better represented as reform.

**Horgan 8** writes[[27]](#footnote-27)

An immediately interesting feature of these programmes is **the** range of **terminology** used in the development and implementation. "Desertion", "demobilisation", "defection", "de-escalation", "**rehab**ilitation" and others [7]; while essentially implying a move away from involvement in terrorism, **carry** within them different, sometimes quite **nuanced**, **assumptions about the way** in which **disengagement** initiatives **ought to develop** (or be implemented) in different settings, at whatever stage in the terrorist campaign (or level of the moment) they may be directed. The Saudi Arabian government uses the Arabic equivalent of 'rehabilitation'. **One** of the **interviewee**s in my own sample, a radical Sunni preacher based in Tripoli in North Lebanon, **prefers the term 'reforming'.** To paraphrase one of my interviews with him, **if there is nothing wrong with 'radicalization', then it is offensive and misleading to speak of 'de-radicalization'.**

Review of literature proves that methodological shift away from deradicalization is key to solvency.

**Morris et al 10** write[[28]](#footnote-28)

The **derad**icalization **programs** established **to date have focused largely on ideological factors**—seeking to “deradicalize” program participants through disputation of the content of terrorist groups’ doctrines and religious interpretations (Barrett & Bokhari, 2009; Boucek, 2008, 2009; Boucek, Beg, & Horgan, 2009; Abuza, 2009). **The Saudi program** has a somewhat broader scope that **fosters** participants’ **reintegration with** their **families** and affords some economic assistance in the post-program period (Stern, 2010). **Review of the** relevant **lit**eratures **reveals a disjuncture between the** largely **ideological focus of current derad**icalization programs **and the factors found to motivat**e individuals’ **entry** into **and exit from terrorist organizations. Comparison of the derad**icalization **literature with the literatures on “deprogramming” of cult members and “deganging” suggests possible causes and implications of this disjuncture. Comparative review of findings indicates** significant consistency in motivations for entry and exit across the three types of groups (terrorist organizations, gangs, and cults); disjuncture between those factors motivating entry and exit and the design of disengagement programs in all three contexts; potential **directions for improving the efficacy of derad**icalization programs; **and areas for further research. These findings suggest that a shift in** the **methodology** of deradicalization programs **may yield substantially improved results.**

## T - Rehab

A. Interpretation, violation, and standard. Rehabilitation means focusing on behavioral change. This is distinct from deradicalization which focuses on ideological change. Conflating the two definitions perpetuates the crime metaphor for terrorism which is offensive.

**Kruglanski and Gelfand 12** write[[29]](#footnote-29)

By deradicalization programs one typically means programs carried out in detention centers of various Muslim countries. [1]Several such programs have existed including the well known ones in Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Singapore, Egypt, Indonesia and Iraq. **The concept of** a **prison based deradicalization** program **is rooted in the crime metaphor of terrorism** (Kruglanski, Crenshaw, Post &Victoroff, 2008). In the same way that the penal systems in numerous states are attempting to rehabilitate prison inmates, and turn them into law abiding citizens, governments and nongovernmental organizations are attempting to deradicalize terrorists. In fact, **the derad**icalization **programs are often referred to as rehabilitation** programs (for instance in Singapore, the deradicalization process is carried out by an organization referred to as the Religious Rehabilitation Group). **This terminology can be offensive to inmates** at detention centers[2] **because it equates the** altruistic struggle that members of **terrorist** organizations believe to take part in **with** the fundamentally egoistic (greed based) activities perpetrated by **mere criminals.**

Ideological elements in deradicalization programs. Indeed, **the overlap between derad**icalization programs **and** criminals **rehab**ilitation programs, while present, **is only partial. A major difference is that unlike rehab**ilitation programs, the **derad**icalization **programs contain a major ideological component.** Because a large majority of those programs is aimed at Islamic detainees, whose motivation derives at least in part from their religious beliefs, the deradicalization programs engage the detainees in a dialogue with moderate Islamic clerics (ulama) who attempt to dissuade them from the extremist interpretation of the Q’uran and the Hadith.

This distinction is crucial to accurate topic education.

**Stern 10** writes[[30]](#footnote-30)

These experiences made one thing clear: **any rehab**ilitation **effort must be based on a clear understanding of what drives people to terrorism in the ﬁrst place.** Terrorist movements often arise in reaction to an injustice, real or imagined, that they feel must be corrected. Yet **ideology is rarely the only, or even the most important, factor** in an individual’s decision to join the cause. The reasons that people become terrorists are as varied as the reasons that others choose their professions: **market conditions, social networks, education,** individual **preferences.** Just as the passion for justice and law that drives a lawyer at ﬁrst may not be what keeps him working at a law ﬁrm, **a terrorist’s motivations for remaining in**, or leaving, **his “job” change over time. Derad**icalization **programs need to take account**—and advantage—**of these variations** and shifts in motivations.

The voter is Saudi Derad education. Reject the aff for shoddy research. Focusing on specifics is key. **Morris et al 10** write[[31]](#footnote-31)

A. **Systematic research is required to evaluate** the efficacy of **existing deradicalization programs and** to **identify the factors that contribute to** or diminish **their efficacy.** B. Research is indicated on the causes, consequences, and (if appropriate) remedies for the observed disjuncture between the motivations for participation in terrorist organizations and the methodologies employed in the “deradicalization” programs designed to induce disengagement from those organizations. C. Research is required to ascertain the effects of detention on the processes of both radicalization and disengagement. **Such research should seek to isolate** the effects of **distinct features of detention**, such as physical conditions, ideological discussions or interventions, and interactions with others (including security personnel, interrogators, psychologists, prosecutors, defense counsel, judges, other detainees, and family members). D. While the literature suggests that ideological factors are not of primary significance in motivating individuals’ entry into or exit from terrorist organizations, ideological beliefs adopted while in the organization—and the cognitive dissonance that may be engendered by the abandonment of such beliefs—may be among the factors that may inhibit exit by an individual whose other motives for participation have receded. This effect may be particularly pronounced for an individual who has participated in violent acts justified by the organization’s ideology. Research is required to determine whether and how such an inhibiting factor operates and what mechanisms may be effective in reducing that inhibitory effect. E. Finally, **research is required to ascertain the effects of a variety of conditions of release. Such research should** be designed to **identify** the effects of **specific conditions** of release, such as monitoring and reporting requirements, employment status and assistance, social networks, and follow-up counseling or other aftercare or post-program management.

## T – Saudi Arabia

A. Interpretation – modeling Saudi Arabia isn’t topical. The Saudi system is actually reform.

**Horgan 8** writes[[32]](#footnote-32)

An immediately interesting feature of these programmes is **the** range of **terminology** used in the development and implementation. "Desertion", "demobilisation", "defection", "de-escalation", "**rehab**ilitation" and others [7]; while essentially implying a move away from involvement in terrorism, **carry** within them different, sometimes quite **nuanced**, **assumptions about the way** in which **disengagement** initiatives **ought to develop** (or be implemented) in different settings, at whatever stage in the terrorist campaign (or level of the moment) they may be directed. **The Saudi** Arabian **government uses the Arabic equivalent of** '**rehab**ilitation'. **One** of the **interviewee**s in my own sample, a radical Sunni preacher based in Tripoli in North Lebanon, **prefers the term 'reforming'.** To paraphrase one of my interviews with him, **if there is nothing wrong with 'radicalization', then it is offensive and misleading to speak of 'de-radicalization'.**

B. Violation –

C. Standards

1. No ground loss. Aff could have specced Yemen or any other country. Saudi Arabia isn’t core ground.

2. Precision. Specificity is key to derad education. **Morris et al 10** write[[33]](#footnote-33)

A. **Systematic research is required to evaluate** the efficacy of **existing deradicalization programs and** to **identify the factors that contribute to** or diminish **their efficacy.** B. Research is indicated on the causes, consequences, and (if appropriate) remedies for the observed disjuncture between the motivations for participation in terrorist organizations and the methodologies employed in the “deradicalization” programs designed to induce disengagement from those organizations. C. Research is required to ascertain the effects of detention on the processes of both radicalization and disengagement. **Such research should seek to isolate** the effects of **distinct features of detention**, such as physical conditions, ideological discussions or interventions, and interactions with others (including security personnel, interrogators, psychologists, prosecutors, defense counsel, judges, other detainees, and family members). D. While the literature suggests that ideological factors are not of primary significance in motivating individuals’ entry into or exit from terrorist organizations, ideological beliefs adopted while in the organization—and the cognitive dissonance that may be engendered by the abandonment of such beliefs—may be among the factors that may inhibit exit by an individual whose other motives for participation have receded. This effect may be particularly pronounced for an individual who has participated in violent acts justified by the organization’s ideology. Research is required to determine whether and how such an inhibiting factor operates and what mechanisms may be effective in reducing that inhibitory effect. E. Finally, **research is required to ascertain the effects of a variety of conditions of release. Such research should** be designed to **identify** the effects of **specific conditions** of release, such as monitoring and reporting requirements, employment status and assistance, social networks, and follow-up counseling or other aftercare or post-program management.

# AT SLP Culpability AC

## Role of the Ballot Off

Omitted.

## Parfit NC

Ignore permissibility and presumption because moral uncertainty means we’ll always have a non-zero credence in the existence of morality, so there’s always a risk of offense in favor of one action. This also creates a 1 to 1 burden structure.

If you do presume, presuming neg is key to fairness and real world education.

**Colling 12** writes[[34]](#footnote-34)

**A** ‘tabula rasa **default neg**ative lacking affirmative offense’ **paradigm is** also **real world because it is similar to** the way issues are ‘resolved’ in **court**s. **The prosecution has a burden to prove the accused guilty** in a criminal trial, or the plaintiff has a burden to prove their case in civil law. The defendant in either case, unless some type of affirmative defense is submitted, does not have this reciprocal burden. **Requiring a reciprocal burden would be** an **unfair** imposition upon the defendant because it would presume some level of guilt. The same would apply to the negative in a debate round **as it would presume the resolution true** on some level (**which** again also **defies the rules of logic.**) **The legalistic model is** as real world as the legislative model, as cases are considered daily by the courts. It could even be considered **more ‘real world’ considering the great frequency of court cases** resolved compared to legislation passed by Congress, **and more debaters end up lawyers than** the debaters that end up **legislators. The legalistic model seems a better fit for LD** as well considering the variety of issues and resolutions debated annually. Courts consider a large variety of issues on a daily basis. Certainly legislative bodies do as well, but while some LD value resolutions are focused on the value of policies, others are more focused on individual, ethical issues. Courts consider policies, at least the Constitutionality of policies, but they also must deal with the individualized concerns of the particular parties in each case. Legislative model paradigms are valuable and beneficial, but there is certainly no logical justification for why the legislative model should apply exclusively to LD, assuming it is applicable at all. So, in LD, negative offense should never be absolutely essential for a negative ballot because, in courts, the defendant, unless opting for an affirmative defense need not prove anything other than that the prosecutor or plaintiff did not prove their case.

Also, no side bias because aff won 50% of round 7 debates. This best determines side bias because (a) TOC rounds account for how theory norms have developed since the start of the topic, (b) Round 7 is the most power-matched round, so it best accounts for skill differential.

The **standard** is **internalizing utility-maximizing dispositions.**

[Framework Justifications Omitted.]

I accept that the neg burden is to prove culpability. I counter-define culpability as a pragmatic notion. We treat agents as culpable if it would be utility-maximizing to adopt the disposition that they are culpable. Metaphysical responsibility is irrelevant, so none of her offense links. Offense to my standard takes the form of reasons why it promotes happiness to treat agents as culpable or not.

I contend that valuing retribution and individual culpability are utility-maximizing dispositions.

Retribution is grounded in rule-util. It’s key to check state power. **Murphy 6**:[[35]](#footnote-35)

**Given this** simple **characterization of retributivism** **as the injunction that the state should never intentionally punish the** legally **innocent,** it was thought fairly easy to show that consequentialism and retributivism are compatible indeed, that **consequentialism provides the best support for** the respectable core of **retributivism. The** general justifying **aim of punishment is consequentialist to control dangerous anti-social conduct** (this is the good consequence) **but we should employ this** coercive mechanism **only on the** legally **guilty**, never on the legally innocent. And if one asks why, then **the typical answer** given by both Rawls and sometimes Hart **was** consequentialist, a version of **rule-util**itarianism. This Simply put, the argument was this**: a social rule** or practice **that would allow the** intentional **punishment of the** legally **innocent would**, in the long run, have many more bad than good consequences e.g., it would **prevent citizens from using the** criminal **law as a guide** to their susceptibility **to state coercion and would thus make citizens insecure with respect to** that **coercion.**

Also, Murphy counter-defines retribution and says that it’s key neg ground in the topic lit which proves the NC is fair.

Even if she wins that retribution must be backward looking, that doesn’t preclude the NC.

Aim of punishment theory also doesn’t preclude my offense. My link is that valuing a retributive aim of punishment solves extinction. It’s not about specific policies.

Treating criminals as culpable is key to rule of law whether or not they are actually culpable. It’s the basis for every aspect of the legal system. **Jones 3** writes[[36]](#footnote-36)

Additionally, because criminal law liability hinges on mens rea, **some** courts and commentators **assert that** in our current criminal justice system “**free will is a**n essential **prerequisite to criminal liability.”** 25 Nevertheless, **courts** almost **never articulate a** scientific or even a metaphysical **basis for this** belief system. **Rather, it is one based in** practicality and **social order**.26 Professors Franz Alexander and Hugo Staub illustrate this point: [**W**]**e may for practical purposes hold the individual responsible** for his acts; that is to say, we assume an attitude as if the conscious Ego actually possessed the power to do what it wishes. Such an attitude has no theoretical foundation, but it has a practical, or still better, a tactical justification.27 **The** free will **assumption allows for easy administration of justice and solves** any **tension** that might exist **between deterministic science and** normative **criminal** justice **theory. It allows criminal** **jurisprudence to be** foundationally **constructed around** the notion of human decisionmaking control and corresponding **personalized responsibility.** Not only does **this allow courts to avoid** the difficult task of **deciphering the** true **root of** all **human behaviors, it also justifies** another key component of criminal justice theory: **attributing blame to individuals.**

Independently, commitment to rule of law solves every existential risk. **Rhyne 58**[[37]](#footnote-37)

**Law and courts** exist to **protect every citizen** of the United States in his person and property and in his individual rights and privileges under the Constitution. The ultimate power to change or expand the law in our system remains with its source, the people. They can elect as lawmakers those who will vote for wise laws and vote out of office those who do not. They can also amend the Constitution as experience dictates the necessity of change. In these days of soul-searching and re-evaluation and inventorying of basic concepts and principles brought on by the expansion of man’s vision to the new frontiers and horizons of outer space, we want the people of the world to know that we in America have an unshakable belief in the most essential ingredient of our way of life—the rule of law. The **law** we honor **is the** basis and **foundation of our** nation’s **freedom** and the freedom for the individual which exists here. And to Americans our freedom is more important than our very lives. **The rule of law has** been the bulwark of our democracy. It has **afforded protection to the weak, the oppressed, the minorities,** the unpopular; it has made it possible to achieve responsiveness of the government to the will of people. It stands as the very antithesis of Communism and dictatorship. When we talk about “justice” under our rule of law, the absence of such justice behind the Iron Curtain is apparent to all. When we talk about “freedom” for the individual, Hungary is recalled to the minds of all men. And when we talk about peace under law—peace without the bloodbath of war—we are appealing to the foremost desire of all peoples everywhere. The tremendous **yearning of all peoples for peace can only be answered by** the **use of law to replace weapons in resolving international disputes**. We in our country sincerely believe that mankind’s best hope for preventing the tragic consequences of nuclear-satellite-missile warfare is to persuade the nations of the entire world to submit all disputes to tribunals of justice for all adjudication under the rule of law. We lawyers of America would like to join lawyers from every nation in the world in fashioning an international code of law so appealing that sentiment will compel its general acceptance. Man’s relation to man is the most neglected field of study, exploration and development in the world community. It is also the most critical. The most important basic fact of our generation is that the rapid advance of knowledge in science and technology has forced increased international relationships in a shrunken and indivisible world. Men must either live together in peace **or in modern war we will surely die together**. History teaches that the rule of law has enabled mankind to live together peacefully within nations and it is clear that this same **rule of law offers our best hope** as a mechanism to achieve and maintain peace between nations. The lawyer is the technician in man’s relationship to man. There exists a worldwide challenge to our profession to develop law to replace weapons **before** the dreadful holocaust of **nuclear war** overtake our people.

Moral uncertainty means that extinction comes first under any moral system.

**Bostrom 2** writes[[38]](#footnote-38)

These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest[s]** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **[that] We may not** now **know**—at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity;** we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly **uncertain about our ultimate aims,** then **we should recognize that there is** a **great option value in preserving**—and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.**

Extinction turns the AC. We kill innocent lives which treats them as culpable when they’ve done nothing wrong.

Valuing rehab masks coercive state power.

**Logan and Gaes 93** write[[39]](#footnote-39)

Proponents believe that rehabilitation programs reduce the harshness of imprisonment by softening and humanizing the prison environment. But what if this effect is more apparent than real? What if **prisons merely pay lip service to the ideal of rehab**ilitation **and create** what amounts to **a facade** of fine-sounding programs **that masks the harsh reality of doing time? Might this** approach not **reduce pressure** from the public **for real reform? A veneer of good intentions could undermine** the vigilance and the **restraint of power** that we need to maintain a system of just punishment. Rather than softening the pains of imprisonment, the rehabilitative goal may even add injustice to injury because it encourages individualized treatment, which undermines consistency and fairness. Individualized treatment requires discretion, which lends itself to abuse in the form of arbitrary and capricious distinctions. In pursuit of rehabilitation, offenders who have committed similar wrongs often are treated differently because of differences in personality, background, and social skills. Furthermore, when rehabilitative treatment is defined as an official goal of the agents and institutions of authority, then treatment, too, becomes paternalistic and authoritarian. The result is cynicism and resistance on the part of the intended beneficiaries. If our goal is to reform the conditions of life inside prisons, it is better to do so directly than under the rubric of rehabilitation. The direct approach has less chance of backfiring.

Disregard shady AC attempts to co-opt neg offense by redefining rehab. It doesn’t matter whether rehab can include punishment. What matters if whether rehab aims at punishment. All my offense is about what values we adopt.

Also, rehab doesn’t value punishment. Any punishment is coincidental, not intended. **Murphy 73**[[40]](#footnote-40):

The Kantian position on the issue of punishing the innocent, and the many ways in which the utilitarian might try to accommodate that position, constitute extremely well-worn ground in contemporary moral and legal philosophy. I do not propose to wear the ground further by adding additional comments on the issue here. What I do want to point out, however, is something which seems to me quite obvious but which philosophical commentators on punishment have almost universally failed to see-namely, that problems of the very same kind and seriousness arise for the utilitarian theory with respect to the punishment of the guilty. For a **util**itarian theory of punishment (Bentham's is a paradigm) **must** involve **justify**ing **punishment in terms of** its social results-e.g., deterrence, incapacitation, and **rehab**ilitation. **And thus even a guilty man is**, on this theory, being **punished because of the instrumental value** the action of **punishment will have in the future. He is** being used as **a means to some future good**-e.g., the deterrence of others. **Thus those** of a Kantian persuasion, **who see the importance of** worrying about **the treatment of persons as mere means, must**, it would seem, **object** just as strenuously **to** the **punishment** of the guilty **on util**itarian **grounds** as to the punishment of the innocent. Indeed the former worry, in some respects, seems more serious. For a utilitarian can perhaps refine his theory in such a way that it does not commit him to the punishment of the innocent. However, if he is to approve of punishment at all, he must approve of punishing the guilty in at least some cases. This makes the worry about punishing the guilty formidable indeed, and it is odd that this has gone generally unnoticed. It has generally been assumed that if the utilitarian theory can just avoid entailing the permissibility of punishing the innocent, then all objections of a Kantian character to the theory will have been met. This seems to me simply not to be the case.

Neg gets RVIs to 1AR theory run by St. Louis Park if there’s no theory offense in the NC. It’s key to deter 1AR timesucks which kill clash and substantive education.

## Case Answers

### AT Shady Spikes

I meet her interp. I will advocate a backwards-looking aim of punishment. This doesn’t preclude the NC framework. Even if a backwards-looking theory is wrong, it can still be good to value that theory if it would promote good consequences.

**Chappell 5** writes[[41]](#footnote-41)

**Sometimes the most rational thing to do is to cause yourself to become irrational**, paradoxical though this sounds. Towards the start of Reasons and Persons, Parfit describes a scenario where a robber threatens to kill your children unless you hand over the gold in your safe. But if you could take a drug which would render you entirely irrational, the robber's threats would be made impotent: Reeling about the room, I say to the man: 'Go ahead. I love my children. So please kill them.' The man tries to get the gold by torturing me. I cry out: 'This is agony. So please go on.' Given the state that I am in, the man is now powerless. He can do nothing that would force me to open the safe. Threats and torture cannot force concessions from someone is so irrational. The man can only flee, hoping to escape the police. (p.13) Threats of all sorts depend on exploiting another person's rationality. We can thus neutralize threats by making ourselves irrational. Since we have good reason to want to neutralize threats, it can be rational to make ourselves irrational! This can work just as well for offence as defence. Parfit later describes a society of perfectly rational individuals who are also transparent (others can tell whether they are being honest). Suppose one of these individuals could turn themselves into a threat-fulfiller - someone who always carries out their threats, no matter the cost to themselves. Would it be rational to make yourself irrational in such a way? In this case it would. Since you are transparent, whenever you make a threat others would know that you would carry it out if not appeased. And the others are all perfectly rational, so they would always placate you if the threat was serious enough. So **if you strapped a bomb to yourself, you could get others to do whatever you wanted simply by threatening to blow everyone up** if they didn't do as you say! **Everyone else should then** (rationally speaking) **impair their own rationality by becoming threat-ignorers and advertising this fact. You would no longer threaten them if you knew that they would ignore it, since then you would have to blow yourself up** and of course you would rather not have to do that! It's been a couple of years since I read Steven Pinker's How the Mind Works, but I think he explained the evolution of overpowering emotions in terms of the advantages such irrationality affords us. The best way to win a game of 'chicken' is to conspicuously remove your steering wheel and throw it out the window. When others can no longer rely on your rationality to compel you to compromise, their own rationality then forces them to surrender. The craziest man is the most dangerous, and the most dangerous man wins. Overpowering emotions such as jealous rage thus make one very powerful. Pinker argues that the jealous man's wife wouldn't dare have an affair if she knew that he'd kill her if he found out. I'm not entirely convinced of the evolutionary tale, but the game-theoretical issue is certainly an interesting one. And it doesn't only apply to rationality, but indeed to any goal-directed activity which may sometimes be best achieved through indirect means. **Thus util**itarians **could argue that morality requires us to form our character in such ways that we are disposed to sometimes act wrongly** (e.g. saving your own child at the cost of many others' lives). Such favouritism is still wrong, just like ignoring the threat-fulfiller's threat is still irrational. But it is justified in an indirect sense, since it results from dispositions that are dictated by the goal in question. **It is a case of what Parfit calls blameless wrongdoing.**

### AT Framework

Prefer the rule-utilitarian notion of culpability.

1. Culpability has nothing to do with free will. It’s a social value. **Horder 93** writes[[42]](#footnote-42)

**Criminal culpability is** thus a patterned mixture of the capacity, agency, and character theories, and not explicable by one such theory alone. Indeed, these theories themselves are **not** necessarily **natural, but** are in some measure **the product of cultural values**. There is nothing inevitable, for example, about the agency theory's judgment that bad moral luck affects culpability, because the accepted relationship between chance, fate and responsibility may vary as much according to time and place, or even gender, as according to abstract moral reasoning. 5~ Similarly, it is no coincidence that the commonest means by which violence may be excused or even justified in the criminal law is through a plea of necessity, duress, or self-defence. **In Western** liberal **societies,** the **fear of imminent harm** or of the use of force, which usually links these defences, **is accorded a** special cultural and **moral significance, whereas** (for example) **temptation,** however strong, **is not**. 55 **In a different** **society,** at a different place and time, **it could** easily **have been the other way** around; it could have been that reasonably to succumb to strong temptation would be regarded as the display of a more understandable facet of human character than acting on a fear of coercion. So our criminal law reflects the cultural significance which Moore claims for it. attributed in our society to a particular relationship between chance, fate, and responsibility, and to the fear of force or coercion over and above other motivations to commit crime? 6 What this shows is that the patterning of the capacity, character, and agency theories of culpability stems from our community being what Dworkin calls a community of principle rather than merely a community of rule. 5v Criminal laws are not (or not merely) pragmatically or rationally necessary barriers preventing self-interested citizens from taking certain paths to their goals that might hinder the attempts of others to reach their goals; that is the rule-book conception of criminal laws governing a community. As much through its conditions of culpability as anything else, our criminal law shows itself to be the product of the shared history of cultural-moral evolution, assumptions, and conflicts that is the mark of the community of principle. **Attempts to explain culpability as** the product of **a single moral theory** of choice or defiance merely **conceal this**, which is perhaps the greatest of all the errors involved.

2. Her form of culpability can’t be offense for the aff. Rehab assumes free will because it gets people to change themselves. **Jones 3** writes[[43]](#footnote-43)

**When imposing punishment**, the **traditional justifications have been** deterrence, rehabilitation, retribution, and incapacitation.32 These justifications **are a combination of free will assumptions and utilitarian rationales**, as becomes evident when each justification is examined in greater detail. For the sake of convenience, the four justifications are considered according to the degree to which each relies on free will assumptions. **Of the four justifications**, **rehab**ilitation arguably **relies on the free will assumption the most. If a defendant is incapable of determining the course of her own actions, punishing** her **is not going to transform her into an individual who avoids committing crimes.**

3. Personal identity is irrelevant to my offense. We can still ground the norm of culpability in the good end states it promotes. **Shoemaker 99**[[44]](#footnote-44)

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. Many people claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not justified in maximizing the good across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single, deeply unified person, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if the only justification for the different treatment of individual lives and sets of lives is the further fact, and this fact is undermined by the truth of reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment. **There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives** and sets of lives **is mistaken.** If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be the most plausible. Util**itarianism **is just such a theory.**

4. The entire NC implicitly clashes with her under-developed warrants.

### AT Contention

Under her conception of culpability, you still negate.

1. TURN – Treating someone as if they aren’t culpable is immoral, whether they’re actually culpable or not. **Korsgaard 86** writes[[45]](#footnote-45)

This latter is the basis of the duties of respect. Respect is violated by the vices of calumny and mockery (MMV 466-468/131-133): we owe to others not only a practical generosity toward their plans and projects - a duty of aid - but also a generosity of attitude toward their thoughts and motives. **To treat another with respect is to treat him as if he were using his reason** and as far as possible as if he were using it well. Even in a case where someone evidently is wrong or mistaken, we ought to suppose he must have what he takes to be good reasons for what he believes or what he does. **This is not because**, as a matter of fact, **he** probably **does have** good **reason**s. Rather, this attitude is something that we owe to him, something that is his right. And he cannot forfeit it. **Kant is explicit about** this: Hereupon is founded **a duty to respect man** even **in** the logical **use of** his **reason: not to censure** someone's **errors under the name of** absurdity, **inept judgement**, and the like, but rather to suppose that in such an inept judgment there must be something true, and to seek it out. ... Thus it is also with the reproach of vice, which must never burst out in complete contempt or deny the wrongdoer all moral worth, because on that hypothesis he could never be improved either -- and this latter is incompatible with the idea of man, who as such (as a moral being) can never lose all predisposition to good. (MMV 463-464/l28-l29)12 **To treat others as ends** in themselves **is always to** address and **deal with them as rational beings.** Every rational being gets to reason out, for herself, what she is to think or to choose or to do. So if you need someone's contribution to your end, you must put the facts before her and ask for her contribution. If you think she is doing something wrong, you may try to convince her by argument but you may not resort to tricks or force. The Kingdom of Ends is a democratic ideal, and poor judgment does not disqualify anyone for citizenship. In the Critique of Pure Reason, **Kant says: Reason depends on this freedom for its very existence. For reason** has no dictatorial authority; its verdict **is** always **simply the agreement of free citizens**, of whom each one must be permitted to express, without let or hindrance, his objections or even his veto. 9 This means that there cannot be a good reason for taking a decision out of someone else's hands. It is a rational being's prerogative, as a first cause, to have a share in determining the destiny of things.

2 The mere capacity for practical reason generates culpability. Actual rational decisions are irrelevant. **Morse 4** writes[[46]](#footnote-46)

**The claim that reason can guide** only **human action does not imply that human beings are always guided by reason**, including the reasons provided by moral and legal rules. Much human action is unreasonable, thoughtless, foolish, irrational, arational, and the like. Nevertheless, the **capacity to guide one’s actions** by reason develops through childhood and adolescence and **is present in most adults. Successful** human **interaction,** not to mention the survival of the species, **would be impossible without this** capacity. **It is the touchstone of moral and legal responsibility**. Moreover, when important rights and interests are at stake, we expect each other to use our capacity to be guided by reason, once again including reasons the law provides, to avoid risking harm to ourselves or others. In addition, the criminal law guides socializing agents, such as families, schools, and religious organizations, as they attempt to inculcate law-abiding attitudes, habits, and behaviors. **The failure of morality and law always to guide action** successfully **does not undermine the claim that** the **action-guiding function is** crucial **to the** theoretical and practical **importance of law and morality** in human interaction. The preceding discussion, which emphasizes responsibility for action, has assumed that the definition of “action” is clear, but the claim that only action can fully be guided by reason, including the reasons morality and law provide, requires some account of action.

3. All social factors including total determinism fail to preclude culpability. Compatibilism solves. **Morse 4** writes[[47]](#footnote-47)

The third response, **“compatibilism**” or “soft determinism,” is willing to concede that determinism is probably true, but **holds** that **responsibility is possible in a determined universe**.60 Compatibilists correctly claim that adult human beings possess the type of general capacities generally thought to ground ordinary responsibility, such as the capacity to grasp and be guided by reason.61 They also claim that determinism (or indeterminism) does not explain either responsibility or the excuses. Many compatibilists also believe that morality is a human construction that cannot be justified by appeal to an external, mind-independent source of moral authority.62 Compatibilism, which is probably the dominant response among philosophers, thus furnishes the most metaphysically plausible internal justification of responsibility in law and morals. The criminal law operates within the realm of practical reason. Within that realm, only the compatibilist view provides a potentially satisfactory answer to how action can be distinguished from endowment, opportunity, and results; and thus makes sense of the intuition that luck—commonly understood as determined events that are morally arbitrary— should not matter to desert. From the vantage point of practical reason, the **compatibilist**, action-guiding account of **responsibility** does not require god-like, contra-causal freedom for genuine responsibility; and it does not deny the thoroughgoing causality that a material conception of the universe appears to demand. Instead, it **holds that the** general **capacity for rationality is the criterion for responsibility and** desert, and it **assumes,** consistent with ordinary observation and common sense, that all **minimally rational adults** **retain the** general capacity and the underlying **ability to be guided by** good **reason**, whether or not determinism or mechanism is true. Compatibilism and common sense agree that **an agent retains** **the capacity to be guided by reason even if an agent** unluckily **has predispositions** or traits that lead the agent **to ignore** or undervalue the dictates of **reason**, even if the agent unluckily is exposed to the types of situations that make it most difficult to be guided by reason, **and even if we concede that character** and opportunity **are** largely and perhaps **entirely matters of luck for which the agent is not responsible.**63 In sum, the compatibilist action-guiding account has the elegance of libertarianism without the panicky metaphysics.

4. Hold the aff to an incredibly high threshold. She has to win no culpability under her standard. Retribution can account for mitigated culpability.

**Corlett 1** writes[[48]](#footnote-48)

Secondly, **it is unclear that Marx's words are plausible if** they are assumed to imply that the voluntariness- reducing factors of **capitalist societies render all law breaking excusable**. **Whatever lack of autonomy** or voluntariness that **persons experience under capitalism**, **it is** **hardly transparent** that **they lack** a **sufficient degree** of it **to make** at least some of **their wrongdoings punishable, if** only in a **mitigated** way. So assuming that Marx's above words are plausible, it hardly follows that retributivism is unjustified, or that punishment in general is. **For** at least some cases of **wrongdoing, though their circumstances are mitigated**, might **still warrant** some amount of **punishment**.74

5. Social factors don’t cause crime. The best studies prove criminals have the freedom of social mobility. **Farabee 5** writes[[49]](#footnote-49)

Regarding socioeconomic levels, **there is scant empirical support for** the assertion that **poverty leads** people **to** commit **crime**s (Akers 1994). In fact, although upward mobility across generations tends to be a slow process, **a recent study found that the majority of children** from U.S. households **falling in the lowest quintile** of wealth **move up by at least one quintile when** they are **adults** (Charles and Hurst 2002).

Prefer my study. The connection between social factors and crime is correlation, not causation. **Farabee 5** writes[[50]](#footnote-50)

But **most drug users are not criminals, nor** (as mentioned earlier) **are most people who are poor or have less** than a high school **education.** This misinterpretation of co-occurring events is a ubiquitous problem that arises in observational research. As social scientists Crano and Brewer put it, “The main problem with the **evaluation of freely-occurring variables** is that they **usually have natural covariates**; that is, the occurrence of the variable of interest is confounded by the co-occurrence of other factors that accompany it in nature” (Crano and Brewer 1986, 140). In other words, the **correlation between drug use, unemployment, and low education**al attainment on the one hand **and crime** on the other **may well be the result of** one or more **other factors common to all of these.**

### AT Reductionism

6. The phenomenological criterion undermines reductionism. We experience other beings as if they were persons. **Johnston 92** writes[[51]](#footnote-51)

The silly example of the tomato-man may help to suggest the oddity of the Cartesian trope from the point of view of our com- mon life, a life in which **persons are** conceived of as readily **accessible occupants of a common world. We identify** and reidentify **others** in easy and offhand ways mostly **on the strength of bodily appearance,** with continuity of manifest character playing a supporting role. In making such identifications **we are not attempting to locate separately existing entities behind the** stage of the bodily and psychological **appearances**. Any perceptive account of the predication of mental and physical features quickly stumbles on the fact that **persons, not their minds and** not their **bodies, are the** predominant **subjects of** both **mental and physical predication**. We are generated, nurtured, and socialized as human beings, not mental substances appended to human organisms. **When we touch living human bodies we touch persons**, not things merely inhabited by persons. **We,** and **not just** our **flesh, fall under the gaze of others**. Only explicit and arduous training can get us to see the bodies of our friends and familiars as instruments of mental substances. And, as Descartes himself noted, in one's own experience of plea- sure and pain one does not even seem to oneself to occupy one's body as a pilot does a ship.9 The phenomenology of embodiment belies the Cartesian idea and makes for a certain high (and, in the hands of occultists, mediocre) silliness in the very idea of the person as a detachable soul, a silliness sometimes felt even by sincere believers in eschatology. 10 The conception of persons as detachable or separate souls is at odds with the conception of persons immanent in our common life.

7. At best, she’ll only win weak reductionism, which triggers mitigated culpability. Even if static personal identity is false, we still have weak notions of continuity that can ground identity. **Johnston 92** writes[[52]](#footnote-52)

As against this, observing that the facts of personal identity do not involve superlative entities is not itself a criticism of the practices organized around identity. It would be a criticism only if such practices had to limn the metaphysical joints in order to be justified. But this is the impossibly strong condition on justification, the condition that would produce an all too automatic victory over ordinary life. **Even if there are no separate**ly existing **entities distinct from brains and bodies**, so that our person-directed concerns do not carve the world at its metaphysical joints, the facts of **personal identity can be "deep enough" to organize** and justify those **concerns.** The ordinary joints are significant if we are dis- posed to continue to find them significant as we critically absorb more relevant information. **Ordinary self-referential concerns are natural** and intelligible, **and** so far **we have found no good** critical **case against them**. This is as good a justification as we get for any of our basic attitudes and practices. Hence the Minimalist posi- tion-the superlative entities of the familiar metaphysical pictures are not the crucial justifiers of our attitudes and practices. **The** manifest **world of our common lived experience is** not shown to be mere maya or entangling illusion by being shown to be **a world with many boundaries that correlate** not with the metaphysical joints, but only **with our deepest practical concerns. When those concerns stand the test of criticism, the boundaries marked by differences** at the level of ordinary supervening facts **are as "deep" as anything ever gets.**29

8. Culpability Exists In A World Without Choice Or Free Will

**Horder 93** writes[[53]](#footnote-53)

**Choice,** like decision**, presupposes** a comparison **between alternative courses of actions**. 2° Presumably, Moore has it in mind that intentional or reckless wrongdoers were aware that they could have avoided causing or risking harm, but decided to cause or risk the harm rather than stick to a law-abiding course. **The problem** with this choice based analysis of the relationship between mens tea and culpability **is that it fails to capture many** **intentional** or reckless **wrongdoers who do not choose** or decide between courses of action, **but who are nonetheless** fully **culpable for their** intentional or reckless **conduct** as if they had. **The person who impulsively pushes** **an innocent bystander under a train**, and the person who in a sudden ' fit of temper throws another's property out the window, **are not** rightly described as **choosing** to do **these things,** because they are done spontaneously, without consideration of alternative courses of action. **Yet such a defendant is** surely as **culpable if not more culpable than the person who agonises over whether to push** an enemy under a train, or to destroy another's property, and then chooses or decides to do it. Not only, then, does the **choice theory,** like the defiance theory, **fail accurately to describe the conditions of criminal culpability**, **but it** also **lacks** the **normative appeal.**

# AT Enfranchisement Plan (Unfinished)

## General

### Inherency

**Status Quo Solves; Long-Term Reforms**

Porter 10

(Expanding The Vote: State Felony Disenfranchisement, 1997 – 2010. Nicole D. Porter. October 2010. State Advocacy Coordinator Of The Sentencing Project)

In recent years significant reforms in felony disenfranchisement policies have been achieved at the state level. Increased public exposure has resulted in expanding civil rights through legislative initiatives to individuals with felony convictions and to neighborhood-level efforts to educate and register people with felony convictions. This escalation in attention to felony disenfranchisement policies has translated into substantial state-level reform. This report provides an overview of reforms that have taken place since 1997. We find that since 1997, 23 states have amended felony disenfranchisement policies in an effort to reduce their restrictiveness and expand voter eligibility. These include: Nine states either repealed or amended lifetime disenfranchisement laws Two states expanded voting rights to persons under community supervision (probation and parole) Eight states eased the restoration process for persons seeking to have their right to vote restored after completing sentence Three states improved data and information sharing These policy changes represent national momentum for reform of restrictive voting rights laws. As a result of the reforms achieved during the period from 1997-2010, an estimated 800,000 persons have regained the right to vote.

### **AT: Racism**

**Disenfranchisement Is Not Racist; Legal Challenges Solve The Impact**

Kang 9

(Felon Disenfranchisement As A Legitimate State Regulation. Boyoung Kang, B.A., Ewha Womans University, 1998; M.A., Graduate School of Ewha Womans University, 2000; candidate for J.D., Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center, 2009. May 2009)

Felon disenfranchisement statutes applying any voting qualification or standard that results in the denial of the right to vote on account of race should be found unconstitutional.20 Courts have applied strict scrutiny in evaluating laws that prevent felons from voting, if the plaintiff proves that the law’s original enactment was motivated by a desire to discriminate against African Americans on account of race and the law continues to this day to have that effect.**21** However, most felon disenfranchisement statutes were enacted before African Americans were allowed to vote. Therefore, the statutes could not have been enacted with a discriminatory intent. Though difficult to prove, if felon disenfranchisement statutes indeed constitute “race-based voter disenfranchisement,” the statutes cannot withstand a Fourteenth Amendment challenge.22

**Disenfranchisement Is Not Racist; Multiple Warrants**

Kang 9

(Felon Disenfranchisement As A Legitimate State Regulation. Boyoung Kang, B.A., Ewha Womans University, 1998; M.A., Graduate School of Ewha Womans University, 2000; candidate for J.D., Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center, 2009. May 2009)

Opponents of felon disenfranchisement contend that the statutes have disparate impact on minorities, particularly African Americans, by excluding them from the political process.23 However, evidence of a correlative relationship between African Americans and disenfranchised felons does not amount to a determination that the statutes cause a denial or dilution of the African American vote on account of race.**24** Because this disparate impact does not directly result from felon disenfranchisement statutes, but stems from disproportional treatment of African Americans in the criminal justice system in which African Americans commit more crimes,**25** evidence of racial discrimination in the criminal justice system must be shown.**26** While plaintiffs are not required to prove discriminatory intent, they must show some “demonstrable causal connection between a challenged felon disenfranchisement statute and purposeful racial discrimination.”27 However, plaintiffs have failed to produce evidence demonstrating that felon disenfranchisement statutes are used as a tool to discriminate against minority voters.28

**Zero Risk Of A Link; Disenfranchisement Is Not Racist**

Kang 9

(Felon Disenfranchisement As A Legitimate State Regulation. Boyoung Kang, B.A., Ewha Womans University, 1998; M.A., Graduate School of Ewha Womans University, 2000; candidate for J.D., Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center, 2009. May 2009)

Felon disenfranchisement statutes resulting in “the denial of the right to vote on account of race” are unconstitutional; but this argument is separate and distinct from the more general argument that all felon disenfranchisement statutes shall be found unconstitutional. Without showing that the state enacted its felon disenfranchisement statute with discriminatory intent, or that the state has purposefully used its felon disenfranchisement statute to discriminate against African Americans, the argument that all felon disenfranchisement statutes are unconstitutional because of their discriminatory impact in the African American community lacks merit. The link between the injury to the African American community and the felon disenfranchisement statute is too attenuated.

### **Tea Party DA**

**The Tea Party Will Make Gains In The 2014 Elections, But Low Democratic Voter Turnout Is Key**

Bouie 12

(Jamelle Bouie, Staff Writer At The American Prospect. Why The Tea Party Will Find Success In 2014. 11/23/2012)

As both an ideological movement and a faction of the GOP, the tea party did not fare well in this month’s elections. President Obama won reelection — thus blocking tea-party Republicans from pursing their agenda from the White House — and Republicans failed to make gains in the Senate, thus blocking their ability to pass right-wing legislation. The Wall Street Journal [reports](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324712504578133473519800756.html?mod=googlenews_wsj&amp;_nocache=1353680897434&amp;user=welcome&amp;mg=id-wsj) that they’re regrouping from this setback and are planning for renewed action against Republican lawmakers they perceive as not conservative enough, thus bucking the recent trend of Republican “moderation”: The tea-party movement is trying to regroup after taking some licks in this month’s elections. Several groups already are setting their sights on 2014 congressional races, in which they plan to promote their preferred candidates and hope to weed out Republicans they consider insufficiently conservative. … Conservative groups also are considering potential challenges to GOP Sens. Lindsey Graham in South Carolina, Lamar Alexander in Tennessee and Saxby Chambliss in Georgia, whom some activists view as not conservative enough. If the goal is to build a more ideologically unified Republican Party, then this money could pay big dividends. There were two big obstacles to tea-party success in the 2012 elections: demographic changes and the composition of the electorate. There's nothing right-wing conservatives can do about the former — their share of the voting population will continue to shrink — but they can capitalize on the latter. The Democratic advantage in presidential elections comes from the party’s ability to mobilize unlikely voters, who are disproportionately nonwhite and low-income and are likely to vote for Democrats if they are at the polls. But midterm elections lack the spectacle, urgency and cultural resonance of the presidential contest, and as a result, far fewer people are willing to put the time or energy into voting. The GOP's base of older, whiter voters is smaller, but what it lacks in numbers, it makes up for in consistency. These are regular voters, who support Republican candidates in almost every election. Which is to say that for as much as 2012 was a disappointing year for tea-party Republicans, 2014 promises to be much better. In all likelihood, Democrats will have a hard time bringing their voters to the field, and as a result, the electorate will look less young — and less brown — than it did in 2012. With Democrats defending 20 Senate seats, there’s a fair chance of substantial Republican gains in the chamber. A tea party that devotes the next two years to promoting conservative candidates and removing moderates or non-ideologues is one that is well-positioned to expand its influence in the next round of elections.

Plan causes a democratic shift in elections. **Uggen and Manza 2** write[[54]](#footnote-54)

Universal suffrage is a cornerstone of democratic governance. As levels of criminal punishment have risen in the United States, however, an ever-larger number of citizens have lost the right to vote. The authors ask whether felon disenfranchisement constitutes a meaningful reversal of the extension of voting rights by considering its political impact. **Data from legal sources, election studies, and inmate surveys are examined** to consider two counterfactual conditions: (1) whether removing disenfranchisement restrictions alters the outcomes of past U.S. Senate and presidential elections, and (2) whether applying contemporary rates of disenfranchisement to prior elections affects their outcomes. Because felons are drawn disproportionately from the ranks of racial minorities and the poor, **disenfranchisement laws** tend to **take more votes from Democratic than** from **Republican candidates.** Analysis shows that felon **disenfranchisement played a decisive role in** U.S. **Senate elections in recent years.** Moreover, **at least one** Republican **presidential victory would have been reversed** if former felons had been allowed to vote, and at least one Democratic presidential victory would have been jeopardized had contemporary rates of disenfranchisement prevailed during that time.

**Tea Party Key To Check American Foreign Interventions; Congressional Influence**

Beehner, 2010:

(Another Tea Party Enigma: Foreign Policy. 6/29/2010. Lionel Beehner, Journalist For USA Today.)

Whatever their leanings, if more Tea Party loyalists enter Congress, expect U.S. foreign policy to change in subtle ways. In his new national security strategy, President [Obama](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/People/Politicians,+Government+Officials,+Strategists/Executive/Barack+Obama) genuflects to globalism and multilateralism, both of which are anathema to most Tea Partiers. "The only thing worse (for them) than a big federal government," says [Walter Russell Mead](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Walter+Russell+Mead) of Bard College, "is a big world government." Going forward, he adds, expect it to become even more difficult for Congress to ratify international conventions (on, say, global warming). Put more broadly, because of the influence of Tea Party upstarts such as Dennis and Paul who rail against ballooning deficits — to say nothing of the battle fatigue setting in, what with Afghanistan now the longest war in our history — expect Congress to lean more non-interventionist in the near future. The powers of the executive branch could be reined in. And congressional support for the wars may wane. To date, foreign policy has been largely absent from the Tea Party's agenda, but that will change as the movement gains steam.

**Interventionism Bad; Extinction-Level Counterbalancing**

Chomsky, 2003:

(Noam Chomsky He is an [Institute Professor](file://localhost/wiki/Institute_Professor) and professor [emeritus](file://localhost/wiki/Emeritus) of [linguistics](file://localhost/wiki/Linguistics) at the [Massachusetts Institute of Technology](file://localhost/wiki/Massachusetts_Institute_of_Technology). The Case Against US Adventurism in Iraq ,Star Tribune, March 13, 2003)

The most powerful state in history has proclaimed that it intends to control the world by force, the dimension in which it reigns supreme. President Bush and his cohorts evidently believe that the means of violence in their hands are so extraordinary that they can dismiss anyone who stands in their way. **The consequences could be catastrophic in Iraq and around the world. The United States may reap a whirlwind of terrorist retaliation -- and step up the possibility of nuclear Armageddon.** Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and company are committed to an "imperial ambition," as G. John Ikenberry wrote in the September/October issue of Foreign Affairs -- "**a unipolar world in which the United States has no peer competitor"** and in which "no state or coalition could ever challenge it as global leader, protector and enforcer."That ambition surely includes much expanded control over Persian Gulf resources and military bases to impose a preferred form of order in the region.

**Even before** the administration began beating the **war** drums **against Iraq, there were plenty of warnings that U.S. adventurism would lead to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as terror, for deterrence or revenge.** Right now, **Washington is teaching the world a dangerous lesson: If you want to defend yourself from us, you had better mimic North Korea and pose a credible threat. Otherwise we will demolish you.**

## Turns

### Federalism

**Enfranchisement Bad; Upsets Balance Between Federal And State Powers, Kills Federalism**

Clegg et al. 6

(The Case Against Felon Voting. Roger Clegg, George T. Conway III, And Kenneth K. Lee. Roger Clegg is the president and general counsel of the Center for Equal Opportunity in Sterling, Virginia. George T. Conway III is a partner at the law firm of Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz in New York City. Kenneth K. Lee is an associate also at Wachtell Lipton. 2006)

An expansive and unreasonable reading of the Voting Rights Act to cover felon disenfranchisement statutes not only contradicts the intent of Congress, but it also upsets the delicate balance between federal and state powers. The “clear statement” rule–which applies when, as in the case of the VRA, the statutory text is ambiguous–cautions courts to tread lightly in interpreting vague statutes to avoid impinging upon the traditional spheres of the states: [I]f Congress intends to alter the usual constitutional balance between the States and the Federal Government, it must make its intention *unmistakably clear* in the language of the statute . . . . [Congress must] make its intention *clear and manifest* if it intends to pre-empt the historic powers of the States.75 This rule of construction controls whenever a federal statute touches on “traditionally sensitive areas, such as legislation affecting the federal balance.” 76 When it applies, the rule requires that, absent a clear statement, courts must “interpret a statute to preserve rather than destroy the States’ ‘substantial sovereign powers.’”77 In *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, the Supreme Court faced the question of whether the Age Discrimination in Employment Act prohibited Missouri from enforcing a mandatory retirement age for state judges.78 The Court held that it did not. The Court applied the clear statement rule because the case implicated “the authority of the people of the States to determine the qualifications of their government officials.”79 The fact that Congress’s intent on the issue was “at least ambiguous” sufficiently resolved the question. 80 Under the clear statement rule, the Court could not “give the statedisplacing weight of federal law to mere congressional *ambiguity.*”81 Felon disenfranchisement involves authority that is at least as important as the State’s power to determine “the qualifications of their government officials,” as it involves the power to determine who gets to choose those officials and their qualifications. If defining the qualifications of important government officials lies at the heart of representative government, then surely defining who decides what those qualifications will be is equally, if not more, important. That by itself suffices to require a clear statement, but even more is involved here: the fundamental state power to “defin[e] and enforc[e] the criminal law,” for which, of course, “the States possess primary authority.”82

**Enfranchisement Bad; Destroys State Sovereignty At The Heart Of Federalism**

Clegg et al. 6

(The Case Against Felon Voting. Roger Clegg, George T. Conway III, And Kenneth K. Lee. Roger Clegg is the president and general counsel of the Center for Equal Opportunity in Sterling, Virginia. George T. Conway III is a partner at the law firm of Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz in New York City. Kenneth K. Lee is an associate also at Wachtell Lipton. 2006)

The confluence of these two fundamental lines of state authority expressly appears in the Constitution’s text. Thus, not only does the Constitution defer to the States to set voter qualifications even for federal elections, 83 but, as noted above, the Constitution affirmatively sanctions the States’ historic authority to disenfranchise people “for participation in rebellion, or other crime.”84 The Constitution provides that the States have the primary, if not exclusive, authority to decide whether felons should vote. Accordingly, if Congress wishes to disturb the federal-state balance in the area of voter qualifications, they must be clear about it. Congress certainly knows how to be quite clear when it comes to voting rights: Congress was clear about literacy tests;85 educational-attainment requirements;86 knowledge tests;87 moral character tests;88 vouching requirements;89 Englishlanguage requirements;90 English-only elections;91 and poll taxes;92 to give just a few examples. The text of the VRA makes no clear statement about felon disenfranchisement. Therefore, it cannot be construed “to pre-empt the historic powers of the States”93 and “to destroy the States’ ‘substantial sovereign powers’” 94 by prohibiting felon disenfranchisement.

### Constitution

**Enfranchisement Bad; Violates The Constitution**

Clegg et al. 6

(The Case Against Felon Voting. Roger Clegg, George T. Conway III, And Kenneth K. Lee. Roger Clegg is the president and general counsel of the Center for Equal Opportunity in Sterling, Virginia. George T. Conway III is a partner at the law firm of Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz in New York City. Kenneth K. Lee is an associate also at Wachtell Lipton. 2006)

There is yet another reason why Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act cannot be read to bar felon disenfranchisement laws: such an interpretation would exceed Congress’ enforcement powers under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. These two Reconstruction amendments contain parallel grants of power to Congress to “enforce”95 the amendments’ substantive provisions “by appropriate legislation.”96 But as the Supreme Court has emphasized in recent years, Congress cannot rewrite the constitutional provisions, as “Congress does not enforce a constitutional right by changing what the right is.”97 It has no power to engage in a “substantive redefinition of the . . . right at issue,” 98 and can only “enact . . . prophylactic legislation”–legislation that “proscribes facially constitutional conduct”–to the extent necessary “in order to prevent and deter unconstitutional conduct.”99

### Racism

**Enfranchisement Bad; Causes Racism**

Clegg et al. 6

(The Case Against Felon Voting. Roger Clegg, George T. Conway III, And Kenneth K. Lee. Roger Clegg is the president and general counsel of the Center for Equal Opportunity in Sterling, Virginia. George T. Conway III is a partner at the law firm of Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz in New York City. Kenneth K. Lee is an associate also at Wachtell Lipton. 2006)

Critics of felon disenfranchisement laws note that these laws have a disproportionate impact on certain racial minority groups.129 While society can be sensitive to such concerns, it is not a sufficient reason to abolish long-standing and justifiable laws in the attempt to achieve some form of racial balance. As W.E.B. DuBois once wrote, “Draw lines of crime, of incompetency, of vice, as tightly and uncompromisingly as you will, for these things must be proscribed; but a color-line not only does not accomplish this purpose, but thwarts it.”130 In fact, the abolition of felon disenfranchisement laws may have the unintended effect of creating “anti-law enforcement” voting blocs and victimizing the vast majority of law-abiding citizens who live in high-crime urban areas–people who are themselves disproportionately black and Latino.131 The political left’s compassion– ignoring the effect of its agenda on law-abiding people of color–is misplaced.

1. United States Department of Labor Women’s Bureau. Green Jobs Training: Funding, Implementing, Collaborating Fact Sheet. October 2010. <http://www.dol.gov/wb/media/Gr%20Jobs%20Training_Fact%20Sheet_102810%20FINAL.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Linda Lidov (Communications Consultant for Veterans Green Jobs, specializes in strategy, writing, marketing and media relations. Her work has appeared in The New York Times and ABC World News Tonight, industry magazines ranging from Disaster Recovery Journal to Public Works Magazine, and local radio, print and broadcast media.) CleanEdison and Veterans Green Jobs Join Forces to Put Veterans to Work. 15 January 2013. Veterans Green Jobs. <http://veteransgreenjobs.org/newsandevents/press-releases/cleanedison-partnership> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Eric Kleefeld (Eric Kleefeld joined TPM as an intern for the final months of the 2006 midterm elections, and then kept showing up for work. His other interests include guitars, old comic books and the politics of various English-speaking countries). Gallup: Veterans Still Going Big For Romney And GOP. 28 May 2012. Talking Points Memo. <http://2012.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/05/gallup-veterans-still-going-big-for-romney-and-gop.php> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Brian Merchant (Political & Environment Columnist at Discovery), 10/21/10, “How the US Military Could Bring Solar Power to Mass Market,” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/how-the-us-military-could-bring-solar-power-to-mass-market.html [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Brian Sussman (Brian Sussman hosts the morning show on radio station KSFO in San Francisco.) GREEN JOBS FAIR AT CALIFORNIA PRISON. Human Events. January 29, 2012. <http://www.humanevents.com/2012/01/29/green-jobs-fair-at-california-prison/> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Susie Cagle (Susie Cagle writes for Grist environmental news.) “Marijuana may be more law-friendly, but it’s not more eco-friendly.” Grist environmental news. 7 November 2012. <http://grist.org/news/marijuana-may-be-more-law-friendly-but-its-not-more-eco-friendly/> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. David N Diner [Major, U.S. Army], "The Army and the Endangered Species Act: Who's Endangering Whom?" Judge Advocate Officer Graduate Course (April 1994) [www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA456541&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA456541&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Fox News. “Issa: Obama administration classifies jobs with political purpose.” 6 June 2012. http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/06/06/issa-obama-administration-classifies-jobs-with-political-purpose/ [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Dinan, Stephen (Washington Times). Audit: Green jobs stimulus program wastes cash. 26 October 2012. http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/oct/26/audit-green-jobs-stimulus-program-wastes-cash/ [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Colman, Zack. Report: Green-jobs program struggling to place workers. The Hill. 26 October 2012. <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/264353-report-green-jobs-program-struggling-to-place-workers> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. House of Representatives Committee on the Budget. THE EMPTY PROMISE OF GREEN JOBS: The Costly Consequences of Crony Capitalism. 22 September 2011.

    <http://budget.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=261226> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Deborah Sloan (Deborah Sloan is a mechanical engineer and a researcher at the Center for Industrial Progress). “I had a green job.” 22 August 2012. <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/08/22/had-green-job/> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Morris Miller, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Niall Ferguson, prof. of history, *Foreign Affairs*, “The Next War of the World”, lexis, 2006 [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Christopher Layne (Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University) 2007 “American Empire: A Debate” p 63 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Speaking In An Interview with Salon.com. Ian Bremmer. Head of a global political risk research firm who has written for the Wall Street Journal, Newsweek and Foreign Affairs. Every Country For Itself. 4/22/2012. http://www.salon.com/2012/04/22/every\_country\_for\_itself/ [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Barbara Conry. Foreign Policy Analyst At The Cato Institute. 2/5/1997. “U.S. Global Leadership”: A euphemism For World Policeman” CATO Institute. <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=1126> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Janet Whitman, Financial Post writer, February 19 2008, <http://www.financialpost.com/story.html?id=317551> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change. Surviving the unprecedented climate change of the IPCC. 8 March 2011. http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, Stanford, Thomas Gale Moore “Global warming; the good, the bad and the ugly and the efficient” EMBO reports http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3317379/?tool=pmcentrez [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Weinstein Adam. (Mother Jones' engagement editor, specializing in explanatory journalism and new-media reporting, Navy vet and ex-Iraq contractor). “GOP to Jobless Vets: Drop Dead.” 19 September 2012. <http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2012/09/gop-jobless-vets-drop-dead> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Marisa L. Porges (International Affairs Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations). Jessica Stern (Advanced Academic Candidate at the Massachusetts Institute of Psychoanalysis and one of the foremost experts on terrorism. She serves on the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. In 2009, she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for her work on trauma and violence.) “Getting Deradicalization Right.” Porges’ Reply. Foreign Affairs. May/June 2010. <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66227/marisa-l-porges-jessica-stern/getting-deradicalization-right> [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Marisa L. Porges (International Affairs Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations). Jessica Stern (Advanced Academic Candidate at the Massachusetts Institute of Psychoanalysis and one of the foremost experts on terrorism. She serves on the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. In 2009, she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for her work on trauma and violence.) “Getting Deradicalization Right.” Porges’ Reply. Foreign Affairs. May/June 2010. <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66227/marisa-l-porges-jessica-stern/getting-deradicalization-right> [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Marisa L. Porges (International Affairs Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations). Jessica Stern (Advanced Academic Candidate at the Massachusetts Institute of Psychoanalysis and one of the foremost experts on terrorism. She serves on the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. In 2009, she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for her work on trauma and violence.) “Getting Deradicalization Right.” Stern’s Reply. Foreign Affairs. May/June 2010. <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66227/marisa-l-porges-jessica-stern/getting-deradicalization-right?page=2> [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Jessica Stern (Advanced Academic Candidate at the Massachusetts Institute of Psychoanalysis and one of the foremost experts on terrorism. She serves on the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. In 2009, she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for her work on trauma and violence.) “Mind Over Martyr: How to Deradicalize Islamist Extremists.” Foreign Affairs. Volume 89 No. 1. January-February 2010. <http://users.physics.harvard.edu/~wilson/pmpmta/stren_2010.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Jessica Stern (Advanced Academic Candidate at the Massachusetts Institute of Psychoanalysis and one of the foremost experts on terrorism. She serves on the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. In 2009, she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for her work on trauma and violence.) “Mind Over Martyr: How to Deradicalize Islamist Extremists.” Foreign Affairs. Volume 89 No. 1. January-February 2010. <http://users.physics.harvard.edu/~wilson/pmpmta/stren_2010.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. John Horgan (Director of the International Center for the Study of Terrorism at Penn State). “Deradicalization or Disengagement? A Process in Need of Clarity and a Counterterrorism Initiative in Need of Evaluation.” Perspectives on Terrorism, Vol 2, no 4, (2008). <http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php/pot/article/view/32/html> [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Madeline **Morris** (Professor of Law, Duke University School of Law, she has served as a member of the U.S. Secretary of State’s Advisory Committee on International Law and as a witness before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations), Frances **Eberhard** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law and Litigation, Duke University School of Law) Jessica **Rivera** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law, Duke University School of Law) Michael **Watsula** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law and Policy, Duke University School of Law) “Deradicalization: A Review of the Literature with Comparison to Findings in the Literatures on Deganging and Deprogramming.” May 2010. Institute for Homeland Security Solutions.

    <http://sites.duke.edu/ihss/files/2011/12/Morris_Research_Brief_Final.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Arie W. Kruglanski, Michele J. Gelfand, University of Maryland, College Park Rohan Gunaratna, Institute for Counterterroristm and Political Violence Research Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. “Aspects of Deradicalization.” Indonesia Research Foundation. 9 March 2012.

    <http://www.irf.or.id/publikasi/artikel/91-aspects-of-deradicalization.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Jessica Stern (Advanced Academic Candidate at the Massachusetts Institute of Psychoanalysis and one of the foremost experts on terrorism. She serves on the Hoover Institution Task Force on National Security and Law. In 2009, she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship for her work on trauma and violence.) “Mind Over Martyr: How to Deradicalize Islamist Extremists.” Foreign Affairs. Volume 89 No. 1. January-February 2010. <http://users.physics.harvard.edu/~wilson/pmpmta/stren_2010.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Madeline **Morris** (Professor of Law, Duke University School of Law, she has served as a member of the U.S. Secretary of State’s Advisory Committee on International Law and as a witness before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations), Frances **Eberhard** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law and Litigation, Duke University School of Law) Jessica **Rivera** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law, Duke University School of Law) Michael **Watsula** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law and Policy, Duke University School of Law) “Deradicalization: A Review of the Literature with Comparison to Findings in the Literatures on Deganging and Deprogramming.” May 2010. Institute for Homeland Security Solutions.

    <http://sites.duke.edu/ihss/files/2011/12/Morris_Research_Brief_Final.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. John Horgan (Director of the International Center for the Study of Terrorism at Penn State). “Deradicalization or Disengagement? A Process in Need of Clarity and a Counterterrorism Initiative in Need of Evaluation.” Perspectives on Terrorism, Vol 2, no 4, (2008). <http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php/pot/article/view/32/html> [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Madeline **Morris** (Professor of Law, Duke University School of Law, she has served as a member of the U.S. Secretary of State’s Advisory Committee on International Law and as a witness before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations), Frances **Eberhard** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law and Litigation, Duke University School of Law) Jessica **Rivera** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law, Duke University School of Law) Michael **Watsula** (Research Fellow in Counterterrorism Law and Policy, Duke University School of Law) “Deradicalization: A Review of the Literature with Comparison to Findings in the Literatures on Deganging and Deprogramming.” May 2010. Institute for Homeland Security Solutions.

    <http://sites.duke.edu/ihss/files/2011/12/Morris_Research_Brief_Final.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Richard Colling (Colling received a B.A., from the University of Houston . He is currently the Director of Forensics, Stony Point High School, and Partner & Co-Founder of The Forensics Files.) THE TRUTH-TESTING PARADIGM AS A STRAW MAN. The Forensics Files’s National Journal of Speech & Debate Vol. 1:1 (October 2012). <http://site.theforensicsfiles.com/NJSD1-1.Final.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Jeffrie G. Murphy, President Of The American Philosophical Association. Legal Moralism And Retribution Revisited. November 2006 [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. (Overcoming The Myth Of Free Will In Criminal Law: The True Impact Of The Genetic Revolution. Matthew Jones. 2003. Published IN The Duke Law Review) [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Charles S. Rhyne, Washington lawyer, Law Day Speech for Voice of America delivered on the first Law Day, 1958 [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Nick Bostrom, 2001 prof of Philosophy, Oxford University [ Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March 2002. First version: 2001 March, JStor [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. CHARLES H. LOGAN (University of Connecticut) and GERALD G. GAES (Federal Bureau of Prisons). META-ANALYSIS AND THE REHABILITATION OF PUNISHMENT. JUSTICE QUARTERLY, Vol. 10 No. 2, June 1993. <http://www.bop.gov/news/research_projects/published_reports/cond_envir/oreprlogangaes.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Murphy, “Marxism and retribution,” 1973 [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Richard Chappell (Blogs about util and stuff, went to Princeton) “Irrationality can be good.” Tuesday, March 22, 2005. Rational Irrationality.

    <http://www.philosophyetc.net/2005/03/rational-irrationality.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. (Criminal Culpability: The Possiblity Of A General Theory. 1993. Jeremy Horder, Professor Of Law At King’s College London) [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. (Overcoming The Myth Of Free Will In Criminal Law: The True Impact Of The Genetic Revolution. Matthew Jones. 2003. Published IN The Duke Law Review) [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Shoemaker, David (Dept of Philosophy, U Memphis). “Utilitarianism and Personal Identity.” *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 33: 183–199, 1999. <http://www.csun.edu/~ds56723/jvipaper.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Korsgaard, Christine (she puts the cat in CATegorical imperative). 1986. The right to lie: Kant on dealing with evil. Philosophy and Public Affairs 15, no. 4: 325-349. <http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/3200670/Korsgaard_RighttoLie.pdf?sequence=2> [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. (Reason, Results, And Criminal Responsibility. Stephen J. Morse, Professor Of Law & Psychology At The University Of Pennsylvania Law School. 6/30/2004) [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. (Reason, Results, And Criminal Responsibility. Stephen J. Morse, Professor Of Law & Psychology At The University Of Pennsylvania Law School. 6/30/2004) [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. (Making Sense Of Retributivism. J. Angelo Corlett. January 2001. Professor At San Diego State University) [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. David Farabee. “Rethinking Rehabilitation: Why Can’t We Reform Our Criminals?” American Enterprise Institute. 2005. <http://www.heart-intl.net/HEART/100507/RethinkingRehabilitation.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. David Farabee. “Rethinking Rehabilitation: Why Can’t We Reform Our Criminals?” American Enterprise Institute. 2005. <http://www.heart-intl.net/HEART/100507/RethinkingRehabilitation.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. (Reasons And Reductionism. Mark Johnston, Professor Of Philosophy At Princeton. July 1992) [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. (Reasons And Reductionism. Mark Johnston, Professor Of Philosophy At Princeton. July 1992) [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. (Criminal Culpability: The Possiblity Of A General Theory. 1993. Jeremy Horder, Professor Of Law At King’s College London) [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Christopher Uggen (U Minnesota) and Jeff Manza (Northwestern). Democratic Contraction? Political Consequences of Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States. American Sociological Review, Vol. 67, No. 6, Dec., 2002. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3088970> [↑](#footnote-ref-54)