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# Politics

## Generic Links

### New NASA spending is unpopular – guarantees backlash

**Handberg 11** (Rodger Handberg Ph.D, Professor of Political Science at University of Central Florida, The Space Review , “Small ball or home runs: the changing ethos of US human spaceflight policy”, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1>, 1/17/2011) SV

The US space program remained focused, not on duplicating Apollo, but on achieving another difficult goal such as going to Mars, a logical extension truly of the Apollo effort. Twice, the presidents Bush provided the presidential rationale, if not support, for achieving great things. The Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) in 1989 and the Vision for Space Exploration (VSE) in 2004 were announced with great fanfare but neither survived the realities of congressional and presidential budgeting. The VSE appeared on paper more realistic about funding, but its choices were draconian: the ISS and space shuttle were both to be sacrificed on the altar of the new program. The earlier SEI died quickly, so hard choices were not required, while the VSE in the form of the Constellation Program lingers on although its effective demise appears certain. The Obama Administration prefers another approach while the new Congress is likely more hostile to big ticket discretionary spending. If the Tea Party faction in the Republican House caucus means what it says, the future for Constellation or any other similar program is a dim one. The reality is that the Apollo program, the SEI, and the VSE are examples in space terms of the home run approach. Such efforts confront the cruel but obvious reality that the human spaceflight program is considered by the public and most of Congress to be a “nice to have,” but not a necessity when compared to other programs or national priorities. Congressional support is narrow and constituency-driven (i.e. protect local jobs), which means most in Congress only support the space program in the abstract. Big ticket items or programs are not a priority for most, given other priorities. What happens is what can be loosely termed normal politics: a situation where human spaceflight remains a low priority on the national agenda. Funding for bold new initiatives is going to be hard to come by even when the economy recovers and deficits are under control. The home run approach has run its course at least for a time; now the small ball approach becomes your mantra.

### Plan causes backlash – tight budget

**Pallante 11** (Mike Pallante, Freelance Writer, “NASA In Jeopardy: Has Presidential Policy Killed NASA?”, http://questional.com/blog/157-nasa-in-jeopardy-has-presidential-policy-killed-nasa/ 2/17/2011, 2/17/2011) SV

Currently limited use of space shuttles will continue; however, for Discovery the end is near. The Discovery is coming apart at the seams and NASA's future is uncertain. Unanswered questions still remain regarding private sector space travel. Will private industry succeed in manned space flight? When? President Obama's plan extends the orbit of the International Space Station until 2020 but potentially leaves us without a means to get there. During the Constellation Program days NASA canceled many contracts for replacement shuttle parts. The wisdom and expense of continual repair on shuttles like Discovery is in question. If President Obama is serious about the future of NASA he will have to do what President Bush did not: Follow through with his vision and create the infrastructure needed to accomplish his goals. That will require allocation of funds, a potentially unpopular move in a budget-heavy political climate. The next year will be an important one for NASA and space travel in general. How it will end remains to be seen.

### Congress just reached a debt deal – any new spending causes partisan fights

**Politi 8/1** (James Politi, Writer at the Financial Times, “More fiscal warfare on the horizon”, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/d0aa2d48-bc5c-11e0-acb6-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1Tnq3dSF5>, August 1, 2011) SV

The last-minute deal reached by Barack Obama and political leaders in Congress on Sunday was designed to avert default, but on its own does very little to solve America’s long-term debt problems. That task was instead delegated to a panel of politicians – six Republicans and six Democrats – which will have to issue its recommendations by November 23, with votes on their plan in Congress by the end of December. The group – which will soon be selected by congressional leaders in both parties – will be asked to identify some $1,500bn in savings over the next 10 years, including from popular government programmes such as Medicare and Medicaid, as well as tax reform. Please respect FT.com's [ts&cs](http://www.ft.com/servicestools/help/terms) and [copyright policy](http://www.ft.com/servicestools/help/copyright) which allow you to: share links; copy content for personal use; & redistribute limited extracts. Email ftsales.support@ft.com to buy additional rights or use this link to reference the article - <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/d0aa2d48-bc5c-11e0-acb6-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz1TnqeJHIh> The committee will not have to worry about setting discretionary spending levels. Those annual funding targets for government departments – from the Pentagon to the Treasury department, and the Environmental Protection Agency to the Securities and Exchange Commission – were established in Sunday’s deal, trimming $917bn from US deficits over the next decade. The menu of options available for additional deficit reduction are well-known by now after last year’s fiscal commission co-chaired by Alan Simpson and Erskine Bowles set up a plan to shrink $3,900bn from deficits over the next decade. Debt ceiling negotiations between the White House and congressional leaders over the past two months also helped to identify some areas where the two parties might be willing to make some painful cuts. But there was already a simmering disagreement between Republicans and Democrats over whether tax increases were on the table – the main sticking point throughout the debt ceiling negotiations, which is threatening to rear its head again in the new committee.

### New spending breaks fiscal displine – causes partisan fights

**Raasch 8/1** (Chuck Raasch, Gannett National Writer, “Republican freshmen forced deficit debate on their terms”, <http://www.app.com/article/20110801/NJNEWS18/308010056/Republican-freshmen-forced-deficit-debate-on-their-terms>, 2011) SV

WASHINGTON — The tentative, two-step dance to avert fiscal disaster and cut government spending by at least $2.1 trillion in the coming decade would not have happened without 87 new Republican members of Congress. They have changed the terms of the fiscal debate, with Congress and the country now fixated on budget deficits and debt, and they are emboldened to press their cause in legislative battles and to shape election year politics. In office just seven months, these new Republicans, many aligned with the tea party, have already been the most influential crop of freshmen since the GOP won the House of Representatives in 1994. Even though many were balking at voting for the compromise in the end because they thought it did not go nearly far enough, their collective strategy to force Congress to tie raising the debt ceiling to consequential deficit reduction angered and confounded many inside and outside Congress. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid called them “extremists” who were holding the nation’s finances hostage to a partisan agenda. But in the end, pending the deal’s approval, their unwillingness to get in line not only called into question House Speaker John Boehner’s ability to lead them, it forced President Barack Obama to agree to deep spending cuts without the tax increases on the rich he had sought.

## Flip Flop Links

### Obama recently cut the NASA budget

**Achenbach 10** (Joel Achenbach, Washington Post Staff Writer, “Obama budget proposal scraps NASA's back-to-the-moon program”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/01/AR2010020102145.html>, February 2, 2010) SV

The Obama administration is killing Constellation, NASA's ambitious back-to-the moon program. The decision represents a thunderous demolition of the Bush-era strategy at the space agency, which had already poured $9 billion into a new rocket, the Ares 1, and a new crew capsule, Orion. Both were years from completion. And now both have been spiked by the administration's 2011 budget, released Monday. The budget includes $2.5 billion over the next two years to shut down Constellation. Instead of continuing to develop the Ares 1 and Orion, the administration wants to invest $6 billion over five years in a commercial space taxi to carry astronauts into low Earth orbit. The budget would also funnel billions of dollars into developing new space technologies, such as the ability to refuel spacecraft in orbit. What isn't in the budget is a specific target for exploration.

### Obama set a five-year NASA budget freeze – any new spending causes partisan fights

**Santini 11** (Jean-Louis Santini, AFP, “Obama: five-year freeze on NASA budget”, <http://www.physorg.com/news/2011-02-obama-five-year-nasa.html>, 2//14/2011) SV

US President Barack Obama unveils his 2012 budget Monday, proposing a raft of spending cuts and tax hikes aimed at curbing a record budget deficit. Obama on Monday proposed reining in expenses at NASA, sending his 2012 budget blueprint to Congress calling for a five-year freeze on new spending at the US space agency. Obama would restrict NASA's budget to last year's levels, $18.7 billion annually through fiscal 2016. The figure represents a 1.6-percent decrease from the spending total the agency had sought for fiscal 2011, which ends in September. "This budget requires us to live within our means so we can invest in our future," NASA Administrator Charles Bolden told a news conference. Bolden sought to put a brave face on the budget limitations, saying the administration's proposal "maintains our commitment to human spaceflight" and research. Experts said it reflected Washington's new fiscal reality, framed by voter frustration with excessive government spending. "There is not a lot of money available," said John Logsdon, a former director of the Space Policy Institute in Washington. "It should not compromise what NASA wants to do but it certainly would slow it down," said Logsdon, an independent consultant to the Obama administration.

### Flip flop tanks political capital.

**Jamaica Observer 9** (http://www.jamaicaobserver.com/columns/html/20090126T200000-0500\_145308\_OBS\_THE\_DAWNING\_OF\_A\_NEW\_ERA\_FOR\_AMERICA\_.asp

So many things will have to be corrected and re-built and president Obama may very well spend the first term doing just that before he can really begin to put his own unique stamp on history. But he is starting out with great political capital. However, the reservoir of goodwill that he now has in America and the world can be easily dried up if he veers away from the person he presented himself to be in the election campaign. People expect him to govern on behalf of all Americans. As he himself stated, there is no blue America or red America but the United States of America. He must remain true to his core values and allow integrity to be his watchword.

# Spending DA

## UQ

### US econ stable – debt limit bill passed

Gonyea, Welna, & Langfitt 7/31 (National News Wire, “Obama: Deal Reached On Raising Debt Limit” <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/01/138866599/white-house-gop-discuss-potential-debt-limit-pact>. July 31, 2011)

President Obama on Sunday announced an eleventh-hour deal with congressional leaders to raise the nation's debt ceiling, possibly staving off a first-ever default on the nation's debt. "There are still some very important votes to be taken by members of Congress, but I want to announce that leaders of both parties in both chambers have reached an agreement to reduce the deficit and avoid default," Obama said at the White House. The agreement would slice at least $2.4 trillion from federal spending over a decade; the Treasury's authority to borrow would be extended beyond the 2012 elections. The plan has two parts: In the first, about $1 trillion will be cut in spending over the next 10 years. In the second, a newly created joint committee of Congress would be charged with recommending further deficit reductions by the end of November. The committee's proposals could trigger a debt limit increase of as much as $1.5 trillion, if approved by Congress. But if they do not materialize, automatic spending cuts would be applied across government to trim spending by $1.2 trillion. "In this stage, everything will be on the table," Obama said. The deal "makes a serious down payment on deficit reduction we need," Obama said, adding that it will "begin to lift the cloud of debt and the cloud of uncertainty that hangs over our economy." There were no revenue increases in the first part of the deal. Obama said he would spend the next few months persuading lawmakers of the need for a "balanced" approach, one that includes some revenue increases. The announcement was met with optimism in Asia's stock markets. Next Step: Congressional Action The House and Senate must still approve the agreement. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) endorsed the agreement and said leaders from both parties and in both chambers will present the agreement to their caucuses Monday. "To pass this settlement, we'll need the support of Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate," he said on the Senate floor Sunday, just before Obama's remarks. "There is no way either party in either chamber can do this alone." Also speaking on the Senate floor, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) said the pact "will ensure significant cuts in Washington spending." He assured the markets that a first-ever default on U.S. obligations won't occur. "There is now a framework to review that will ensure significant cuts in Washington spending," he said. Although there were indications the deal had found sufficient backing from Senate Democrats, it still lacked support among the most liberal Democrats and conservative Tea Party Republicans in the House of Representatives. House Speaker John Boehner, in a conference call with Republican members of the lower chamber, said the deal was a good one that met the demands of all Republicans. "It isn't the greatest deal in the world, but it shows how much we've changed the terms of the debate in this town," he said on a conference call, according to GOP officials. He added that the agreement was "all spending cuts. The White House bid to raise taxes has been shut down." The House Democratic leader, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, was noncommittal. "I look forward to reviewing the legislation with my caucus to see what level of support we can provide," she said in a written statement. No votes were expected in either house of Congress until Monday at the earliest, to give rank and file lawmakers time to review the package. Earlier Sunday, the Senate voted 50-49 to clear a procedural hurdle toward consideration of a bill put forth by Reid to resolve the debt-ceiling crisis; 60 votes were needed to advance the measure. Details Of Plan Details apparently included in the agreement provide that the federal debt limit would rise in two stages by at least $2.2 trillion, enough to tide the Treasury over until after the 2012 elections. Big cuts in government spending would be phased in over a decade. Thousands of programs — the Park Service, Labor Department and housing among them — could be trimmed to levels last seen years ago. No Social Security or Medicare benefits would be cut, but the programs could be scoured for other savings. Taxes would be unlikely to rise. The deal under discussion offers wins for both sides. Republicans and their Tea Party supporters would get spending cuts at least as large as the amount the debt ceiling would grow and avoid any tax increases. For Obama and Democrats, there would be no renewed battle over extending the borrowing limit until after next year's elections. One sticking point had concerned possible cuts in the nation's defense budget in the next two years. Republicans wanted less. Democrats pressed for more in an attempt to shield domestic accounts from greater reductions. The government has exhausted its $14.3 trillion borrowing limit and has paid its bills since May with money freed up by accounting maneuvers. The Treasury Department has said it will run out of available cash Tuesday without a debt ceiling extension. The administration has warned that an economy-shaking default would follow that could balloon interest rates and wound the world economy. If approved in Monday votes, the compromise would presumably preserve America's sterling credit rating, reassure investors in financial markets across the globe and possibly reverse the losses that spread across Wall Street in recent days as the threat of a default grew. Asian Stocks Buoyed News of the agreements sent Asian stocks higher. Japan's Nikkei stock index jumped about 1.5 percent. Hong Kong's Hang Seng was up over 1 percent. Markets in Singapore and Australia were also on the rise in early trading. China and Japan, the world's second- and third-largest economies, were concerned about a potential U.S. default. Together, they hold more than $2 trillion in U.S. treasury securities. Last week, China's official Xinhua news service called the partisan brinksmanship in Washington "dangerously irresponsible."

### US econ stable – debt limit bill passed

Gonyea, Welna, & Langfitt 7/31 (National News Wire, “Obama: Deal Reached On Raising Debt Limit” <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/01/138866599/white-house-gop-discuss-potential-debt-limit-pact>. July 31, 2011)

President Obama on Sunday announced an eleventh-hour deal with congressional leaders to raise the nation's debt ceiling, possibly staving off a first-ever default on the nation's debt. "There are still some very important votes to be taken by members of Congress, but I want to announce that leaders of both parties in both chambers have reached an agreement to reduce the deficit and avoid default," Obama said at the White House. The agreement would slice at least $2.4 trillion from federal spending over a decade; the Treasury's authority to borrow would be extended beyond the 2012 elections. The plan has two parts: In the first, about $1 trillion will be cut in spending over the next 10 years. In the second, a newly created joint committee of Congress would be charged with recommending further deficit reductions by the end of November. The committee's proposals could trigger a debt limit increase of as much as $1.5 trillion, if approved by Congress. But if they do not materialize, automatic spending cuts would be applied across government to trim spending by $1.2 trillion. "In this stage, everything will be on the table," Obama said. The deal "makes a serious down payment on deficit reduction we need," Obama said, adding that it will "begin to lift the cloud of debt and the cloud of uncertainty that hangs over our economy." There were no revenue increases in the first part of the deal. Obama said he would spend the next few months persuading lawmakers of the need for a "balanced" approach, one that includes some revenue increases. The announcement was met with optimism in Asia's stock markets. Next Step: Congressional Action The House and Senate must still approve the agreement. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) endorsed the agreement and said leaders from both parties and in both chambers will present the agreement to their caucuses Monday. "To pass this settlement, we'll need the support of Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate," he said on the Senate floor Sunday, just before Obama's remarks. "There is no way either party in either chamber can do this alone." Also speaking on the Senate floor, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) said the pact "will ensure significant cuts in Washington spending." He assured the markets that a first-ever default on U.S. obligations won't occur. "There is now a framework to review that will ensure significant cuts in Washington spending," he said. Although there were indications the deal had found sufficient backing from Senate Democrats, it still lacked support among the most liberal Democrats and conservative Tea Party Republicans in the House of Representatives. House Speaker John Boehner, in a conference call with Republican members of the lower chamber, said the deal was a good one that met the demands of all Republicans. "It isn't the greatest deal in the world, but it shows how much we've changed the terms of the debate in this town," he said on a conference call, according to GOP officials. He added that the agreement was "all spending cuts. The White House bid to raise taxes has been shut down." The House Democratic leader, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, was noncommittal. "I look forward to reviewing the legislation with my caucus to see what level of support we can provide," she said in a written statement. No votes were expected in either house of Congress until Monday at the earliest, to give rank and file lawmakers time to review the package. Earlier Sunday, the Senate voted 50-49 to clear a procedural hurdle toward consideration of a bill put forth by Reid to resolve the debt-ceiling crisis; 60 votes were needed to advance the measure. Details Of Plan Details apparently included in the agreement provide that the federal debt limit would rise in two stages by at least $2.2 trillion, enough to tide the Treasury over until after the 2012 elections. Big cuts in government spending would be phased in over a decade. Thousands of programs — the Park Service, Labor Department and housing among them — could be trimmed to levels last seen years ago. No Social Security or Medicare benefits would be cut, but the programs could be scoured for other savings. Taxes would be unlikely to rise. The deal under discussion offers wins for both sides. Republicans and their Tea Party supporters would get spending cuts at least as large as the amount the debt ceiling would grow and avoid any tax increases. For Obama and Democrats, there would be no renewed battle over extending the borrowing limit until after next year's elections. One sticking point had concerned possible cuts in the nation's defense budget in the next two years. Republicans wanted less. Democrats pressed for more in an attempt to shield domestic accounts from greater reductions. The government has exhausted its $14.3 trillion borrowing limit and has paid its bills since May with money freed up by accounting maneuvers. The Treasury Department has said it will run out of available cash Tuesday without a debt ceiling extension. The administration has warned that an economy-shaking default would follow that could balloon interest rates and wound the world economy. If approved in Monday votes, the compromise would presumably preserve America's sterling credit rating, reassure investors in financial markets across the globe and possibly reverse the losses that spread across Wall Street in recent days as the threat of a default grew. Asian Stocks Buoyed News of the agreements sent Asian stocks higher. Japan's Nikkei stock index jumped about 1.5 percent. Hong Kong's Hang Seng was up over 1 percent. Markets in Singapore and Australia were also on the rise in early trading. China and Japan, the world's second- and third-largest economies, were concerned about a potential U.S. default. Together, they hold more than $2 trillion in U.S. treasury securities. Last week, China's official Xinhua news service called the partisan brinksmanship in Washington "dangerously irresponsible."

### US econ stable – oil, manufacturing, and industry

Sharples & Schmollinger ’11 (Ben and Christian, Staff Writers for Bloomberg Businessweek. “Crude Climbs After Obama Says Congressional Leaders Agree Debt-Limit Deal” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-07-31/oil-climbs-in-new-york-as-u-s-senate-leader-close-to-deal-on-debt-ceiling.html>. Jul 31, 2011)

Oil advanced from a two-week low in New York after President Barack Obama said leaders of both parties in the U.S. House and Senate approved a deal to raise the nation’s debt ceiling, stoking optimism over the economic recovery in the world’s biggest crude-consuming nation. Futures surged as much as 1.7 percent after Obama spoke from the White House and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid endorsed the emerging accord between Republican leaders and the administration. The U.S. won’t default on its obligations, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell said. A Labor Department report on Aug. 5 may show July payrolls rose by 90,000 workers. “It’s a sigh of relief,” said Jonathan Barratt, a managing director of Commodity Broking Services Pty in Sydney, who predicts oil will average $100 a barrel this year. “It’s euphoric and oil has the potential to hit back through the top end of the range. Unemployment this week is the key.” Crude for September delivery rose as much as $1.59 to $97.29 a barrel in electronic trading on the New York Mercantile Exchange and was at $96.93 at 2:01 p.m. Sydney time. The contract slipped $1.74 to $95.70 on July 29, the lowest settlement since July 14. Prices gained 0.3 percent last month and are 19 percent higher the past year. Brent oil for September settlement climbed $1.41, or 1.2 percent, to $118.15 a barrel on the London-based ICE Futures Europe exchange. The European benchmark contract was at a premium of $21.23 to New York futures, compared with a record close of $22.63 on July 14. Debt Deal Congressional leaders are sifting through the details of the tentative bipartisan agreement to raise the debt ceiling, preparing to sell the deal to skeptical Republicans and Democrats ahead of possible votes today. The framework would raise the $14.3 trillion debt ceiling through 2012, cut spending by about $1 trillion and call for enactment of a law shaving another $1.5 trillion from long-term debt by 2021 -- or institute punishing reductions across all government areas, including Medicare and defense programs, according to congressional officials. “Prices moved sharply higher because of Obama’s speech,” said Ken Hasegawa, a commodity-derivatives sales manager at broker Newedge Group in Tokyo, who predicts oil will trade between $95 and $105 a barrel in the short term. “This market can avoid a collapse. The recovery of the global economy and increasing demand for winter fuels will push it higher.” Chinese Manufacturing A Chinese manufacturing index was higher than economists estimated in July, signaling the world’s second-biggest economy is withstanding interest-rate increases and tighter credit. The Purchasing Managers’ Index was at 50.7 for July compared with 50.9 in June, the China Federation of Logistics and Purchasing said in a statement today. That was more than every forecast in a Bloomberg News survey of 13 economists. The median estimate was for a reading of 50.2. Crude in New York is approaching technical resistance at the 50-day moving average of $97.28 a barrel, according to data compiled by Bloomberg. Futures dropped to as low as the 200-day mean of $94.95 on July 29. A breach of chart resistance typically means prices will continue to rise. Oil also rose as hedge funds increased bullish bets on gasoline for a fifth consecutive week, pushing futures to the highest since May. Large speculators increased wagers on rising prices by 1.9 percent in the week ended July 26 as U.S. imports declined and falling refinery output crimped supply, according to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission’s weekly Commitments of Traders report. It was the highest total since April 11. Storm Watch Oil and gas companies in the Gulf of Mexico are restoring production after Tropical Storm Don dissipated over Texas, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement said yesterday. About 6 percent of oil output and 3.5 percent of gas pumping in the Gulf was shut in as of 11:30 a.m. Central time, down from 11.9 percent and 6.2 percent respectively at the height of the storm, according to the bureau. Tropical Storm Eugene may strengthen to become a hurricane by tomorrow, according to the U.S. National Hurricane Center. The fifth named storm of the Eastern Pacific season is moving west-northwest over open water about 420 miles (676 kilometers) south-southwest of Acapulco, Mexico, at 10 miles per hour, the center said in an advisory at 11 p.m. Miami time yesterday. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries’ crude output rose in July to the highest level since December 2008, led by gains in Saudi Arabia and Angola, according to a Bloomberg News survey. Production increased 245,000 barrels, or 0.8 percent, to average 29.565 million barrels a day, according to the survey of oil companies, producers and analysts.

## Link Debate

### Only reductions now; new spending would lead to a default

New York Time 7/31 [NYT July 31, 2011. “To Escape Chaos, a Terrible Deal” ayc http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/01/opinion/to-escape-chaos-a-terrible-debt-deal.html?\_r=1&ref=opinion&pagewanted=print]

There is little to like about the tentative agreement between Congressional leaders and the White House except that it happened at all. The deal would avert a catastrophic government default, immediately and probably through the end of 2012. The rest of it is a nearly complete capitulation to the hostage-taking demands of Republican extremists. It will hurt programs for the middle class and poor, and hinder an economic recovery. It is not yet set in stone, and there may still be time to make it better. But in the end, most Democrats will have no choice but to swallow their fury, accept the deal and, we hope, fight harder the next time. For weeks, ever since House Republicans said they would not raise the nation’s debt ceiling without huge spending cuts, Democrats have held out for a few basic principles. There must be new tax revenues in the mix so that the wealthy bear a share of the burden and Medicare cannot be affected. Those principles were discarded to get a deal that cuts about $2.5 trillion from the deficit over a decade. The first $900 billion to a trillion will come directly from domestic discretionary programs (about a third of it from the Pentagon) and will include no new revenues. The next $1.5 trillion will be determined by a “supercommittee” of 12 lawmakers that could recommend revenues, but is unlikely to do so since half its members will be Republicans. If the committee is deadlocked, or its recommendations are rejected by either house of Congress, then a dreaded guillotine of cuts would come down: $1.2 trillion in across-the-board spending reductions that would begin to go into effect by early 2013. Negotiators have tried to make this penalty mechanism as unpalatable as possible to provide an incentive for the supercommittee and Congress to avert it. For Democrats, the penalty would include cuts to Medicare providers. The penalty for Republicans should have been new tax revenues, but of course they refused to consider that and got their way. Instead, their incentive will be trying to avoid large cuts in the military budget. Democrats won a provision drawn from automatic-cut mechanisms in previous decades that exempts low-income entitlement programs. There is no requirement that a balanced-budget amendment pass Congress. There will be no second hostage-taking on the debt ceiling in a few months, as Speaker John Boehner and his band of radicals originally demanded. Democratic negotiators decided that the automatic cut system, as bad as it is, was less of a threat to the economy than another default crisis, and many are counting on future Congresses to undo its arbitrary butchering. Sadly, in a political environment laced with lunacy, that calculation is probably correct. Some Republicans in the House were inviting a default, hoping that an economic earthquake would shake Washington and the Obama administration beyond recognition. Democrats were right to fear the effects of a default and the impact of a new recession on all Americans. President Obama could have been more adamant in dealing with Republicans, perhaps threatening to use constitutional powers to ignore the debt ceiling if Congress abrogated its responsibility to raise it. But this episode demonstrates the effectiveness of extortion. Reasonable people are forced to give in to those willing to endanger the national interest. Democrats can look forward to the expiration of the Bush tax cuts next year, and will have to make the case in the 2012 elections for new lawmakers who will undo the damage.

### Spending after the debt ceiling bill threatens US prosperity

Chicago Tribune 8/1 [August 1, 2011. “Hold your applause…” ayc <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/editorials/ct-edit-debtdeal-20110801,0,3101001.story>]

Let's be sure to attach the word "tentative" to the debt ceiling deal that members of Congress will begin debating Monday — and then will accept or reject. Given official Washington's tendency throughout this process to take one step forward and two steps back, none of us should be shocked to see still more clumsy footwork. But for now, let's pretend that the accord announced Sunday night will hold together and become law. If so, we will be pleased to forget for a while the fear about a potential debt default. This deal settles that threat for now, and also makes a down payment on reducing future deficits. Both good. Perhaps most important for the long run, the American people emerge from this process much more aware that the enormity of their government's borrowing — another day, another $4 billion — threatens the future prosperity of their children and their nation.

### Only reductions now that debt ceilings passed; new spending would lead to a default

New York Time 7/31 [NYT July 31, 2011. “To Escape Chaos, a Terrible Deal” ayc http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/01/opinion/to-escape-chaos-a-terrible-debt-deal.html?\_r=1&ref=opinion&pagewanted=print]

There is little to like about the tentative agreement between Congressional leaders and the White House except that it happened at all. The deal would avert a catastrophic government default, immediately and probably through the end of 2012. The rest of it is a nearly complete capitulation to the hostage-taking demands of Republican extremists. It will hurt programs for the middle class and poor, and hinder an economic recovery. It is not yet set in stone, and there may still be time to make it better. But in the end, most Democrats will have no choice but to swallow their fury, accept the deal and, we hope, fight harder the next time. For weeks, ever since House Republicans said they would not raise the nation’s debt ceiling without huge spending cuts, Democrats have held out for a few basic principles. There must be new tax revenues in the mix so that the wealthy bear a share of the burden and Medicare cannot be affected. Those principles were discarded to get a deal that cuts about $2.5 trillion from the deficit over a decade. The first $900 billion to a trillion will come directly from domestic discretionary programs (about a third of it from the Pentagon) and will include no new revenues. The next $1.5 trillion will be determined by a “supercommittee” of 12 lawmakers that could recommend revenues, but is unlikely to do so since half its members will be Republicans. If the committee is deadlocked, or its recommendations are rejected by either house of Congress, then a dreaded guillotine of cuts would come down: $1.2 trillion in across-the-board spending reductions that would begin to go into effect by early 2013. Negotiators have tried to make this penalty mechanism as unpalatable as possible to provide an incentive for the supercommittee and Congress to avert it. For Democrats, the penalty would include cuts to Medicare providers. The penalty for Republicans should have been new tax revenues, but of course they refused to consider that and got their way. Instead, their incentive will be trying to avoid large cuts in the military budget. Democrats won a provision drawn from automatic-cut mechanisms in previous decades that exempts low-income entitlement programs. There is no requirement that a balanced-budget amendment pass Congress. There will be no second hostage-taking on the debt ceiling in a few months, as Speaker John Boehner and his band of radicals originally demanded. Democratic negotiators decided that the automatic cut system, as bad as it is, was less of a threat to the economy than another default crisis, and many are counting on future Congresses to undo its arbitrary butchering. Sadly, in a political environment laced with lunacy, that calculation is probably correct. Some Republicans in the House were inviting a default, hoping that an economic earthquake would shake Washington and the Obama administration beyond recognition. Democrats were right to fear the effects of a default and the impact of a new recession on all Americans. President Obama could have been more adamant in dealing with Republicans, perhaps threatening to use constitutional powers to ignore the debt ceiling if Congress abrogated its responsibility to raise it. But this episode demonstrates the effectiveness of extortion. Reasonable people are forced to give in to those willing to endanger the national interest. Democrats can look forward to the expiration of the Bush tax cuts next year, and will have to make the case in the 2012 elections for new lawmakers who will undo the damage.

## N/U

### N/U - the economy is in the worst shape yet

Pethokoukis 7/29 [James – writer for Reuters. “Sputter to stall: U.S. economy dips into danger zone for recession”. July 29, 2011. Ayc http://blogs.reuters.com/james-pethokoukis/2011/07/29/sputter-to-stall-u-s-economy-dips-into-danger-zone-for-recession/]

More evidence, as if we needed it, that the U.S. economy is in sad shape. America’s gross domestic product grew just 1.3 percent in the second quarter, according to the Commerce Department. And first-quarter growth was revised down to just 0.4 percent. This is now the weakest two-year recovery since World War II.

# Generic Case Neg Work

## Heg Impact Defense

### Hegemony inevitable

**Friedman 9** (George Friedman Ph.D, Chief executive, founder of STRATFOR, Former Political Science Professor at Dickinson College, PhD in government, “The Next 100 Years”, 13-31) SV

We are now in an America-centric age. To understand this age, we must understand the United States, not only because it is so powerful but because its culture will permeate the world and deﬁne it. Just as French culture and British culture were deﬁnitive during their times of power, so American culture, as young and barbaric as it is, will deﬁne the way the world thinks and lives. So studying the twenty- ﬁrst century means studying the United States. If there were only one argument I could make about the twenty- ﬁrst century, it would be that the European Age has ended and that the North American Age has begun, and that North America will be dominated by the United States for the next hundred years. The events of the twenty ﬁrst century will pivot around the United States. That doesn’t guarantee that the United States is necessarily a just or moral regime. It certainly does not mean that America has yet developed a mature civilization. It does mean that in many ways the history of the United States will be the history of the twenty- ﬁrst century. There is a deep- seated belief in America that the United States is approaching the eve of its destruction. Read letters to the editor, peruse the Web, and listen to public discourse. Disastrous wars, uncontrolled deﬁcits, high gasoline prices, shootings at universities, corruption in business and government, and an endless litany of other shortcomings—all of them quite real—create a sense that the American dream has been shattered and that America is past its prime. If that doesn’t convince you, listen to Europeans. They will assure you that America’s best day is behind it. The odd thing is that all of this foreboding was present during the presidency of Richard Nixon, together with many of the same issues. There is a continual fear that American power and prosperity are illusory, and that disaster is just around the corner. The sense transcends ideology. Environmentalists and Christian conservatives are both delivering the same message. Unless we repent of our ways, we will pay the price—and it may be too late already. It’s interesting to note that the nation that believes in its manifest destiny has not only a sense of impending disaster but a nagging feeling that the country simply isn’t what it used to be. We have a deep sense of nostalgia for the 1950s as a “simpler” time. This is quite a strange belief. With the Korean War and McCarthy at one end, Little Rock in the middle, and Sputnik and Berlin at the other end, and the very real threat of nuclear war throughout, the 1950s was actually a time of intense anxiety and foreboding. A widely read book published in the 1950s was entitled The Age of Anxiety. In the 1950s, they looked back nostalgically at an earlier America, just as we look back nostalgically at the 1950s. American culture is the manic combination of exultant hubris and profound gloom. The net result is a sense of conﬁdence constantly undermined by the fear that we may be drowned by melting ice caps caused by global warming or smitten dead by a wrathful God for gay marriage, both outcomes being our personal responsibility. American mood swings make it hard to develop a real sense of the United States at the beginning of the twenty ﬁrst century. But the fact is that the United States is **stunningly powerful**. It may be that it is heading for a catastrophe, but it is hard to see one when you look at the basic facts. Let’s consider some illuminating ﬁgures. Americans constitute about 4 percent of the world’s population but produce about 26 percent of all goods and services. In 2007 U.S. gross domestic product was about $14 trillion, compared to the world’s GDP of $54 trillion—about 26 percent of the world’s economic activity takes place in the United States. The next largest economy in the world is Japan’s, with a GDP of about $4.4 trillion—about a third the size of ours. The American economy is so huge that it is larger than the economies of the next four countries combined: Japan, Germany, China, and the United Kingdom. Many people point at the declining auto and steel industries, which a generation ago were the mainstays of the American economy, as examples of a current deindustrialization of the United States. Certainly, a lot of industry has moved overseas. That has left the United States with industrial production of only $2.8 trillion (in 2006): the largest in the world, more than twice the size of the next largest industrial power, Japan, and larger than Japan’s and China’s industries combined. There is talk of oil shortages, which certainly seem to exist and will undoubtedly increase. However, it is important to realize that the United States produced 8.3 million barrels of oil every day in 2006. Compare that with 9.7 million for Russia and 10.7 million for Saudi Arabia. U.S. oil production is 85 percent that of Saudi Arabia. The United States produces more oil than Iran, Kuwait, or the United Arab Emirates. Imports of oil into the country are vast, but given its industrial production, that’s understandable. Comparing natural gas production in 2006, Russia was in ﬁrst place with 22.4 trillion cubic feet and the United States was second with 18.7 trillion cubic feet. U.S. natural gas production is greater than that of the next ﬁve producers combined. In other words, although there is great concern that the United States is wholly dependent on foreign energy, it is actually one of the world’s largest energy producers. Given the vast size of the American economy, it is interesting to note that the United States is still under populated by global standards. Measured in inhabitants per square kilometer, the world’s average population density is 49. Japan’s is 338, Germany’s is 230, and America’s is only 31. If we exclude Alaska, which is largely uninhabitable, U.S. population density rises to 34. Compared to Japan or Germany, or the rest of Europe, the United States is hugely under populated. Even when we simply compare population in proportion to arable land—land that is suitable for agriculture—America has five times as much land per person as Asia, almost twice as much as Europe, and three times as much as the global average. An economy consists of land, labor, and capital. In the case of the United States, these numbers show that the nation can still grow—it has plenty of room to increase all three. There are many answers to the question of why the U.S. economy is so powerful, but the simplest answer is military power. The United States completely dominates a continent that is invulnerable to invasion and occupation and in which its military overwhelms those of its neighbors. Virtually every other industrial power in the world has experienced devastating warfare in the twentieth century. The United States waged war, but America itself never experienced it. Military power and geographical reality created an economic reality. Other countries have lost time recovering from wars. The United States has not. It has actually grown because of them. Consider this simple fact that I’ll be returning to many times. The United States Navy controls all of the oceans of the world. Whether it’s a junk in the South China Sea, a dhow off the African coast, a tanker in the Persian Gulf, or a cabin cruiser in the Caribbean, every ship in the world moves under the eyes of American satellites in space and its movement is guaranteed—or denied—at will by the U.S. Navy. The combined naval force of the rest of the world doesn’t come close to equaling that of the U.S. Navy. **This has never happened before** in human history, even with Britain. There have been regionally dominant navies, but never one that was **globally and overwhelmingly dominant**. This has meant that the United States could invade other countries—but never be invaded. It has meant that in the ﬁnal analysis the United States controls international trade. It has become the foundation of American security and American wealth. Control of the seas emerged after World War II, solidiﬁed during the ﬁnal phase of the European Age, and is now the ﬂip side of American economic power, the basis of its military power. Whatever passing problems exist for the United States, the most important factor in world affairs is the tremendous imbalance of economic, military, and political power. Any attempt to forecast the twenty- ﬁrst century that does not begin with the recognition of the extraordinary nature of American power is out of touch with reality. But I am making a broader, more unexpected claim, too: the United Statesis only at the beginning of its power. **The twenty first century will be the American century**.

### Aging crisis solves

**Haas 7** (Mark L Haas, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne University, “A Geriatric Peace? The Future of U.S. Power in a World of Aging Populations” International Security, Vol. 32, No. 1, Summer, p 112-147 (EBSCO)) SV

**Global population aging will** influence U.S. foreign policies in five major ways in coming decades. First, this phenomenon will **be a potent force for the continuation of U.S. power dominance, both economic and military**. Aging populations are likely to result in the slowdown of states’ economic growth at the same time that governments face substantial pressure to pay for massive new expenditures for elderly care. This double economic dilemma will create such an austere fiscal environment that the other great powers will lack the resources necessary to overtake the United States’ huge power lead. Investments designed to improve overall economic growth and purchases of military weaponry will be crowded out. Compounding these difficulties, although the United States is growing older, it is doing so to a lesser extent and less quickly than all the other great powers. Consequently, the economic and fiscal costs for the United States created by social aging (although staggering, especially for health care) will be significantly lower for it than for potential competitors. **Global aging is** therefore **not only likely to extend U.S. hegemony** (because the other major powers will lack the resources necessary to overtake the United States’ economic and military power lead), **but deepen it as these others states are likely to fall even farther behind the United States**. Thus despite much recent discussion in the international relations literature and some policymaking circles about the likelihood of China (and to a lesser extent the European Union) balancing U.S. power in coming decades, the realities of social aging and its economic and military effects make such an outcome unlikely.6

### No Asian challengers

**Mead 7** (Walter Russell, senior fellow, Council of Foreign Relations. Prof of foreign policy, “China doesn't own the future”, <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/sunday/commentary/la-op-mead14oct14,0,113024.story?coll=la-sunday-commentary>, 10/14/2007) SV

Asia's Big Three -- China, India and Japan -- are in rough balance. Any two of them are economically and militarily strong enough to prevent the third from dominating the region. India and Japan could balance China. China and Japan could balance India. And Japan's dreams of dominating the Pacific died in 1945. With the U.S. also prepared to defend the balance of power in Asia, it seems unlikely that China, or any other nation, will waste time and money in the effort to overturn it. China will continue to modernize its military and test the limits of its power. But for it to build armed forces that could overcome the combined might of the U.S., India and Japan is not now, and probably never will be, a feasible project.

## Econ Impact Defense

### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

**Barnett 9** [senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC and a contributing editor/online columnist for Esquire magazine, columnist for World Politics Review, Thomas P.M. “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” World Politics Review, 8/252009, http://www.aprodex.com/the-new-rules--security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis-398-bl.aspx]

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order. Do I expect to read any analyses along those lines in the blogosphere any time soon? Absolutely not. I expect the fantastic fear-mongering to proceed apace. That's what the Internet is for.

### Economy resilient

**Zakaria 9** [Fareed Zakaria is editor of Newsweek International “The Secrets of Stability,” 12/12 http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/2]

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all. A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

# Mining Case Neg

## EU Solvency-Lunar Mining

D’Souza et al 6 (Marsha R. D’Souza, Diana M. Otalvaro, Deep Arjun Singh, researchers at the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, “Harvesting Helium-3 From the Moon,” Worcester Polytechnic Institute, February 17, 2006. <http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-031306-122626/unrestricted/IQP.pdf>)

Europe has made considerable progress in developing a framework in which individual European countries can integrate their various space programs towards a common goal as seen in the governance the European Space Agency (ESA). Through ESA, each country is able to contribute financially to embark on projects that would be too costly for the member country’s economy to support on its own. One of the objectives of the ESA is to look into the prospects of lunar exploration, development and utilization. They are stressing on the fact that in order to witness any breakthroughs in space explorations, the European governments should focus on creating technologies that are needed for conducting scientific studies on the Moon, from the Moon and on the Moon. The geophysical characterization of the interior of the Moon and the return of samples from the Moon are important near-future mission objectives, and opportunities for higher resolution chemical and mineralogical mapping from orbit should be pursued.

D’Souza et al 6 (Marsha R. D’Souza, Diana M. Otalvaro, Deep Arjun Singh, researchers at the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, “Harvesting Helium-3 From the Moon,” Worcester Polytechnic Institute, February 17, 2006. <http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-031306-122626/unrestricted/IQP.pdf>)

The drive to explore the Moon has influenced many countries other than USA and Russia. Even though, USA and Russia have been the major explorers of the lunar surface, Japan and the European Space Agency (ESA) have also been interested in Moon missions. In 1990 ISAS, a Japanese Space Agency devoted to space science, launched Hiten 1, which orbited the Moon and primarily tested the technologies for future Moon missions (NASA timeline). Also, just recently in 2003, ESA launched SMART 1, which was also an orbiter to test future technologies for Moon missions (NASA timeline). In this way, it can be easily seen that the countries capable of launching orbiters and probes to the Moon have already started to develop their technologies for future Moon missions that might even lead to landing more people on the lunar surface.

# SBSP Case Neg

## Warming F/L

### Fossil Fuel use inevitable-other countries depend on them

**Stanford 8** (Stanford University, Interview with BP Scientist, “The need for fossil fuels will last for decades, according to BP's chief scientist”, <http://www.physorg.com/news122143454.html>, 2/13/2008) SV

The industrialization of China and India will play a large role in driving the increasing energy demand, he said. China is opening a carbon-spewing coal plant at the rate of one a week, and India will increasingly turn to coal, he said. Koonin said he is pushing BP research in biomass fuels as potential petroleum replacements, but that all the means of alternative energy such as wind and solar would likely be unable to halt the increasing use of fossil fuels. Any country with an increasing per capita income is going to have a corresponding increase in energy demand, he said. Conservation measures may delay climate change, but will not prevent them, he said.

## Oil Advantage F/L

### They’re just wrong – Peak Oil is false, Unstable Regions shouldn’t be an issue, and China won’t lock up resources

**Gholz & Press 7** (Eugene Gholz Ph.D, Associate Professor at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Daryl G. Press Ph.D, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College and Coordinator of the War and Peace Studies Program, “Energy Alarmism The Myths That Make Americans Worry about Oil”, The Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-589.pdf>, April 5, 2007) SV

Many Americans have lost confidence in their country’s “energy security” over the past several years. Because the United States is a net oil importer, and a substantial one at that, concerns about energy security naturally raise foreign policy questions. Some foreign policy analysts fear that dwindling global oil reserves are increasingly concentrated in politically unstable regions, and they call for increased U.S. efforts to stabilize—or, alternatively, democratize—the politically tumultuous oil-producing regions. Others allege that China is pursuing a strategy to “lock up” the world’s remaining oil supplies through long-term purchase agreements and aggressive diplomacy, so they counsel that the United States outmaneuver Beijing in the “geopolitics of oil.” Finally, many analysts suggest that even the “normal” political disruptions that occasionally occur in oil-producing regions (e.g., occasional wars and revolutions) hurt Americans by disrupting supply and creating price spikes. U.S. military forces, those analysts claim, are needed to enhance peace and stability in crucial oil-producing regions, particularly the Persian Gulf. Each of those fears about oil supplies is exaggerated, and **none should be a focus of U.S. foreign or military policy**. **“Peak oil” predictions about the impending decline in global rates of oil production are based on scant evidence and dubious models of how the oil market responds to scarcity**. In fact, **even though oil supplies will increasingly come from unstable regions, investment to reduce the costs of finding and extracting oil is a better response to that political instability than trying to fix the political problems of faraway countries**. Furthermore, Chinese efforts to lock up supplies with long-term contracts will at worst be economically neutral for the United States and may even be advantageous. The main danger stemming from China’s energy policy is that current U.S. fears may become a self-fulfilling prophecy of Sino-U.S. conflict. Finally, political instability in the Persian Gulf poses surprisingly few energy security dangers, and U.S. military presence there actually exacerbates problems rather than helps to solve them.

### Peak Oil Theory is false – empirics prove it wrong and increasing technology allows greater URR extraction

**Gholz & Press 7** (Eugene Gholz Ph.D, Associate Professor at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Daryl G. Press Ph.D, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College and Coordinator of the War and Peace Studies Program, “Energy Alarmism The Myths That Make Americans Worry about Oil”, The Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-589.pdf>, April 5, 2007) SV

In the past decade, the authors of several widely read books and articles have raised alarms about the quantity of the world’s remaining oil reserves. According to the peak oil hypothesis, the world has recently passed an ominous milestone: half of the recoverable oil has already been consumed, and the rate of global oil production has therefore begun, or will soon begin, an irreversible decline.20 The implication, according to proponents of that hypothesis, is that in the coming decades oil prices will soar as supplies dwindle and demand grows.21 Some observers argue that the United States should use foreign policy tools to ensure access to the “American share” of oil supplies in that difficult environment;22 others ominously warn that it is exactly that sort of “mercantilism,” which they view as an inevitable consequence of passing the oil supply peak, that will draw the United States into resource wars.23 The pessimistic claims about peaking oil supplies should be treated with skepticism. For decades, analysts have argued that oil supplies were dwindling and that the peak rate of production would soon been reached. In fact, the most eminent advocate of that argument today once predicted that the global production peak would occur in 1989, but since then global crude oil production has grown by 23 percent, and oil supply (crude oil and other petroleum liquids) has grown by more than 28 percent.24 More telling, the world’s ultimately recoverable resources (URR) have been growing over time, largely because many fields contain substantially more oil than was originally believed.25 One reason URR are growing despite the world’s continuing consumption of oil is that improved technology has allowed a far greater fraction of reserves to be extracted from oil fields. In 1980 only 22 percent of the oil in the average field was recoverable, but with better extraction technology average recovery is now up to 35 percent, effectively increasing URR by more than 50 percent. The results of the growing URR and recovery rate are striking: in 1972 the “life-index” of global oil reserves, the length of time that known reserves could support the current rate of production, was 35 years; in 2003, after 31 more years of accelerating oil extraction, the life index stood at 40 years.26 In short, no one knows how much oil is ultimately recoverable from the earth, but there is no compelling evidence that reserves are running out or that production is near the peak.27

### Peak Oil is Wrong – It doesn’t account for complex realities – laundry list

**Maugeri 4** (Leonardo Maugeri, group senior vice president, Corporate Strategies, Eni Spa, Rome, Italy, “Oil: Never Cry Wolf—Why the Petroleum Age Is Far from over”, <http://www.energybulletin.net/node/347>, May 20, 2004)

After World War I, the United States was shaken by predictions of the exhaustion of domestic oil. Even the head of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)— among many others—deliv-ered a verdict of gloom in 1919: The country would run out of oil within 9 years! (1) Facing mounting hysteria, President Coolidge set up the Federal Oil Conservation Board in 1924, to draft legis-lation to preserve national re-sources. After the conversion of Great Britain’s naval fleet from coal to oil in 1914, the UK also feared that it would be vulnerable to oil shortages and moved to secure its grip on the Persian Gulf. These cycles of hysteria followed by new bonan-zas have continued to the present. Thus, it is not surprising that a new wave of “oil doomsters” predicting imminent petroleum scarcity has gained momentum (2–4). The worst effect of this recurring oil panic is that it has driven Western political circles toward oil imperialism and attempts to assert direct or indirect control over oil-producing regions. Yet the world is not running out of oil, and catastrophic views fail to take into account the complex reali-ty that will allow reliance on abundant sup-plies for years to come. The current model of oil doomsters is derived from K. M. Hubbert (5). The model is conceptually simple, but based on several assumptions. The first is that the geological structure of our planet is well known and thoroughly explored, so that discovery of unknown oil fields is highly improbable. Second, to resolve problems connected with erratic distribution and production from thousands of oil fields and uncertainty of future discoveries, production is assumed to follow the “Central Limit Theorem” from statistics. This theorem states that the sum of a large number of erratic variables tends to follow a normal distribution and assumes a bell-shaped curve (see figure above). Starting from zero, production grows over time until it peaks when half of the re-coverable resources have been extracted (“midpoint depletion”). Then, production irreversibly declines at the same rate at which it grew. The area under the curve shows the cumulative production of an oil field or the “ultimate recoverable re- sources” (URR) it holds and their life-span. Accordingly, to forecast Earth’s URR, one needs to process worldwide production and discovery trends and geological data. In 1956, Hubbert accurately predicted the peak oil production point of the U.S. lower 48 states. The Hubbert curves do not delineate the complex and dynamic nature of oil produc-tion and reserves in the world, because they are the product of a static model that puts an unjustifiable faith in geology and does not consider technology and cost/price functions. The model’s success in predict-ing U.S. peak production merely reflected the peculiar nature of this area, which is the most intensively explored and exploited in the world. Elsewhere, the pattern of pro-duction is not rendered by a bell curve but is marked by large discontinuities (see fig-ure on next page). Using different versions of the Hubbert model, several geologists have made pre-dictions in the last 20 years of an imminent crisis in oil availability that subsequently had to be revised. The most eminent among them is C. Campbell, who predicted that 1989 was the year of “peak” production (6). The estimates have been increasing steadily (see table, next page). Before looking at the real-world situa-tion in more depth, it is necessary to clear up some points, beginning with the distinction between “resource” and “reserve.” The former indicates the overall stock of a mineral in physical terms, without any associated economic value and/or estimation of its likeli-hood of being extracted. In other words, there may be large quantities that can nev-er be used because of the high cost or the impossibility of recovery, as in the case of the gold dispersed in the oceans. The concept of “re-serves”— like that of “recov-erable resources”—involves an economic assessment of the possibility of producing a part of the overall resources. In the oil sec-tor, there are additional definitions—the most important being that of “proven re-serves,” which include only those that can be economically produced and marketed at the present time according to existing tech-nologies and demand. Nearly all of the es-timates of the world’s oil URR, including those by oil doomsters, do not take into ac-count the so-called “nonconventional oils”—such as Canadian tar-sands and Venezuelan and Russian heavy oils—even though the availability of these resources is huge and the costs of extraction falling. Although hydrocarbon resources are ir-refutably finite, no one knows just how fi-nite. Oil is trapped in porous subsurface rocks, which makes it difficult to estimate how much oil there is and how much can be effectively extracted. Some areas are still relatively unexplored or have been poorly analyzed. Moreover, knowledge of in-ground oil resources increases dramati-cally as an oil reservoir is exploited. For example, the Kern River field was discovered in California in 1899. Calculations in 1942 suggested that 54 million barrels remained. However, in 1942 “…after [43] years of depletion, ‘re-maining’ reserves were 54 million barrels. But in the next [44] years, it produced not 54 but 736 million barrels, and it had an-other 970 million barrels ‘remaining’ in 1986. The field had not changed, but knowledge had….” (7). This is but one of hundreds of cases reported in oil-related literature that underscore the inherently dy-namic nature of oil reserves. As Klett and Schmoker have recently demonstrated, from 1981 to 1996 the estimated volume of oil in 186 well-known giant fields in the world [>0.5 billion (10 9 ) barrels (Bbl) of oil, discovered before 1981] increased from 617 to 777 Bbl without new discover-ies (8). Indeed, many studies have proved the phenomenon of “reserve growth”—i.e., that “additions to proven recoverable vol-umes are usually greater than subtractions” (8). This occurs because of four fundamen-tal elements: technology, price, political decisions, and better knowledge of existing fields—the last of these being possible on-ly through effective and intensive drilling. We anticipate that this trend will contin-ue.

## Middle East Oil Dependency Adv. CP

### TEXT: The United States federal government should withdraw peacetime military presence in the Persian Gulf.

### CP solves the reasons for instability and conflict over oil in the region

**Gholz & Press 7** (Eugene Gholz Ph.D, Associate Professor at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Daryl G. Press Ph.D, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College and Coordinator of the War and Peace Studies Program, “Energy Alarmism The Myths That Make Americans Worry about Oil”, The Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-589.pdf>, April 5, 2007) SV

Many Americans have lost confidence in their country’s “energy security” over the past several years. Oil prices were already high by historic standards in 2005 when Hurricane Katrina ravaged the Gulf Coast and temporarily shut down the refineries, pipelines, and offload terminals at the large Gulf Coast port complex, highlighting the apparent vulnerability of U.S. oil infrastructure. Furthermore, growing chaos in Iraq reminds Americans of their country’s limited ability to control events in the oil-rich Persian Gulf region. Finally, the reliability of even America’s domestic oil supplies was called into question last year when poor maintenance temporarily closed the pipelines that carry oil from Alaska to the contiguous 48 states. That a foreign company (British Petroleum) manages the Alaska pipeline only reinforced the overarching feeling that the United States has little control over the energy supplies it vitally needs. Because the United States is a net oil importer, and a substantial one at that, concerns about energy security naturally raise foreign policy questions. One set of arguments is based on fears about dwindling global oil reserves and their increasing concentration in politically unstable regions. Those so-called peak oil concerns have led some foreign policy analysts to call for increased U.S. efforts to stabilize— or, alternatively, democratize—the politically tumultuous oil-producing regions. A second concern focuses on the rise of China and Beijing’s alleged strategy for “locking up” the world’s remaining oil supplies through long-term purchase agreements and aggressive diplomacy. According to some analysts, the United States must respond to China’s energy policy, outmaneuvering Beijing in the “geopolitics of oil,” or else U.S. consumers will find themselves shut out from global energy markets. Finally, many analysts suggest that even the “normal” political disruptions that occasionally occur in oil-producing regions (e.g., occasional wars and revolutions) hurt Americans by disrupting supply and creating price spikes. U.S. military forces, those analysts claim, are needed to enhance peace and stability in crucial oil-producing regions, particularly the Persian Gulf. Each of those fears about oil supplies is exaggerated. Peak oil predictions about the impending decline in global rates of oil production are based on scant evidence and dubious models of how the oil market responds to scarcity. In fact, even though oil supplies will increasingly come from unstable regions, the ongoing investments designed to reduce the costs of finding and extracting oil are a more effective response to that political instability than trying to fix the political problems of faraway countries. Furthermore, fears of China are also overstated. Chinese efforts to lock up supplies with long-term contracts will at worst be economically neutral for the United States and may even be advantageous. The main danger stemming from China’s energy policy is that current U.S. fears may create a self-fulfilling prophecy of Sino-U.S. conflict. Finally, political instability in the Persian Gulf poses surprisingly few energy security dangers, and the U.S. military presence there actually exacerbates problems rather than helps to solve them. Those arguments do not mean that the United States can ignore energy concerns. Global demand for energy is soaring and shows no sign of relenting. Furthermore, oil supplies, though currently abundant, will eventually begin to run low, and the world will eventually need to develop other energy sources. But neither of those problems requires the sort of activist military policies that many foreign policy analysts suggest: specifically, U.S. oil interests do not require the United States to spread democracy across the Persian Gulf, confront China, or even **maintain a peacetime military presence in the Persian Gulf**.

# SBSP K Case Neg

## Reps Stuff

### Policy action comes before discourse

**Carr, 89** (Wilfred, Prof of Philosophy of Edu @ U. of Sheffield UK, “The Idea of an Educational Science,” Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vd. 23, No. 1, p 34 1989 http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/119440829/abstract)

But such discourse, Habermas notes, can only proceed if participants are satisfied that certain claims about the validity of what is being said are being met. These “validity claims”-that what is being said is comprehensible, that any factual assertions being made are true, that what is being said is in the context appropriate and justified, and that a speaker is being sincere and not trying to deceive the listener-are thus built into the very structure of discursive language. Hence, the very act of engaging in discourse presupposes a “communicative rationality” such that any agreement reached through a discussion in which these four validity claims are met constitutes what Habermas calls a “rational consensus”-an agreement arising precisely because “the force of the better argument” has been allowed to prevail. Habermas recognises, of course, that this kind of purely rational discourse does not describe the way in which disagreements are actually resolved. It nevertheless, creates the image of what Habermas calls an “ideal speech situation”-a social context in which constraints on free and open dialogue have been excluded and in which impediments to rational argumentation and deliberation have been removed. Thus, by their very use of language, individuals reveal an unavoidable allegiance to those forms of social life in which human reason has been “emancipated” from the corrupting influence of tradition and ideology-precisely the form of social life which a critical social science seeks to create.

### Reality shapes reps

**Fram-Cohen 85** (Michelle, Freelance Writer “Reality, Language, Translation: What Makes Translation Possible”, http://enlightenment.supersaturated.com/essays/text/michelleframcohen//possibilityoftranslation.html)

The idea that language is created inside one's mind independently of outside experience eliminates the possibility that the external world is the common source of all languages. But a common source of all languages underlies any attempt to explain the possibility of translation. Chomsky suggests that the common basis of all languages is universal phonetics and semantics, with the result that "certain objects of human thoughts and mentality are essentially invariable across languages." (13) To the best of my knowledge Chomsky did not develop this idea in the direction of explaining the possibility of translation. In contrast, linguist Eugene Nida insists that outside experience is the common basis of all languages when he writes that "each language is different from all other languages in the ways in which the sets of verbal symbol classify the various elements of experience." (14) Nida did not provide the philosophical basis of the view that the external world is the common source of all languages. Such a basis can be found in the philosophy of Objectivism, originated by Ayn Rand. Objectivism, as its name implies, upholds the objectivity of reality. This means that reality is independent of consciousness, consciousness being the means of perceiving reality, not of creating it. Rand defines language as "a code of visual-auditory symbols that denote concepts." (15) These symbols are the written or spoken words of any language. Concepts are defined as the "mental integration of two or more units possessing the same distinguishing characteristic(s), with their particular measurements omitted." (16) This means that concepts are abstractions of units perceived in reality. Since words denote concepts, words are the symbols of such abstractions; words are the means of representing concepts in a language. Since reality provides the data from which we abstract and form concepts, reality is the source of all words--and of all languages. The very existence of translation demonstrates this fact. If there was no objective reality, there could be no similar concepts expressed in different verbal symbols. There could be no similarity between the content of different languages, and so, no translation. Translation is the transfer of conceptual knowledge from one language into another. It is the transfer of one set of symbols denoting concepts into another set of symbols denoting the same concepts. This process is possible because concepts have specific referents in reality. Even if a certain word and the concept it designates exist in one language but not in another, the referent this word and concept stand for nevertheless exists in reality, and can be referred to in translation by a descriptive phrase or neologism. Language is a means describing reality, and as such can and should expand to include newly discovered or innovated objects in reality. The revival of the ancient Hebrew language in the late 19th Century demonstrated the dependence of language on outward reality. Those who wanted to use Hebrew had to innovate an enormous number of words in order to describe the new objects that did not confront the ancient Hebrew speakers. On the other hand, those objects that existed 2000 years ago could be referred to by the same words. Ancient Hebrew could not by itself provide a sufficient image of modern reality for modern users.

### Placing representations and discourse first trades off with concrete political change and makes no difference to those engaged in political struggles.

**Taft-Kaufman 95** (Jill , Professor, Department of Speech Communication And Dramatic Arts, Central Michigan University, “Other ways: Postmodernism and performance praxis”, [The Southern Communication Journal](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?RQT=318&pmid=17630&TS=1184952735&clientId=17822&VType=PQD&VName=PQD&VInst=PROD), Vol.60, Iss. 3;  pg. 222)

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure.

# SETI Case Neg

## Anthro

### A pragmatic approach is best to preserve the life of all beings

**Frodeman 8** (Robert Frodeman is a Proffessor and former chair in the Dept. of Philosophy at the University of North Texas, “Separated at Birth, Signs of Rapprochement Environmental Ethics and Space Exploration,” Vol. 13 No. 1 Spring 2008, Project Muse, Ethics and the Environment Journal http://www.csid.unt.edu/files/env\_ethics\_and\_space.pdf)

Revolutions in philosophic understanding and cultural worldviews inevitably accompany revolutions in science. As we expand our exploration of the heavens, we will also reflect on the broader human implications of advances in space. Moreover, our appreciation of human impact on Earth systems will expand as we come to see the Earth within the context of the solar system. Most fundamentally, we need to anticipate and wrestle with the epistemological, metaphysical, and theological dimensions of space exploration, including the possibility of extraterres- trial life and the development of the space environment, as it pertains to our common understanding of the universe and of ourselves. Such reflection should be performed by philosophers, metaphysicians, and theologians in regular conversation with the scientists who investigate space and the policy makers that direct the space program. The exploration of the universe is no experimental science, contained and controlled in a laboratory, but takes place in a vast and dynamic network of interconnected, interdependent realities. If (environmental) philosophy is to be a significant source of insight, philosophers will need to have a much broader range of effective strategies for interdisciplinary collaborations, framing their reflections with the goal of achieving policy-relevant results. If it is necessary for science and policy-makers to heed the advice of philosophers, it is equally necessary for philosophers to speak in concrete terms about real-world problems. A philosophic questioning about the relatedness of humans and the universe, in collaboration with a pragmatic, interdisciplinary approach to environmental problems, is the most responsible means of developing both the science and policy for the exploration of the final frontier.

### Anti-anthropocentrism is circular and can never truly be achieved; it requires rejecting all values and preferences so much so that we cannot flourish

**Grey 93** (William is professor at the University of Queensland, Australian National University, Temple University, and the University of New England, “Anthropocentrism and Deep Ecology,” Australiasian Journal of Philosophy, Vol 71, No 4 (1993), pp. 463-475, <http://www.uq.edu.au/~pdwgrey/pubs/anthropocentrism.html>)

The attempt to provide a genuinely non-anthropocentric set of values, or preferences seems to be a hopeless quest. Once we eschew all human values, interests and preferences we are confronted with just too many alternatives, as we can see when we consider biological history over a billion year time scale. The problem with the various non-anthropocentric bases for value which have been proposed is that they permit too many different possibilities, not all of which are at all congenial to us. And that matters. We should be concerned to promote a rich, diverse and vibrant biosphere. Human flourishing may certainly be included as a legitimate part of such a flourishing. The preoccupations of deep ecology arise as a result of human activities which impoverish and degrade the quality of the planet's living systems. But these judgements are possible only if we assume a set of values (that is, preference rankings), based on human preferences. We need to reject not anthropocentrism, but a particularly short term and narrow conception of human interests and concerns. What's wrong with shallow views is not their concern about the well-being of humans, but that they do not really consider enough in what that well-being consists. We need to develop an enriched, fortified anthropocentric notion of human interest to replace the dominant short-term, sectional and self-regarding conception. Our sort of world, with our sort of fellow occupants is an interesting and engaging place. There is every reason for us to try to keep it, and ourselves, going for a few more cosmic seconds [10]

### No Anthro Solvency, Links back to own reps

Ahkin 10(Mélanie works at Monash University, “Human Centrism, Animist Materialism, and the Critique of Rationalism in Val. Plumwood’s Critical Ecological Feminism,” Emergent Australasian Philosophers, 2010, Issue 3, <http://www.eap.philosophy-australia.com/issue_3/EAP3_AHKIN_Human_Centrism.pdf>)

Richard Sylvan and Val Plumwood's pioneering 1979 critique of human chauvinism within dominant western ethics defines the concept in relation to class chauvinism, as the “substantially differential, discriminatory and inferior treatment” of the class of non-human entities by members of the class of humans, where this treatment lacks sufficient justification**.**2 They contend that insofar as dominant western ethical systems unjustifiably treat humans as uniquely morally significant; fail to provide an account of humans' direct, non-instrumental moral obligations to non-humans; and promote varying degrees of human dominion over non-human nature**,** these frameworks sanction differential, discriminatory and inferior treatment of non-humans and are by consequence human chauvinist.3 Plumwood's development of this collaborative critique of human chauvinism in her early 1990's work, and beyond, draws on feminist analyses of oppression and rationalism as well as insights from liberation theory in order to enrich and expand the analysis of the human mastery of nature.4 Her critique of the dominant western framework of rationalist reason allows her to draw out the structural features and logical patterns common to various instantiations of oppression, namely the logic of centrism and its foundational value dualisms, and also the role of related instrumental egoist models of selfhood. Thus she is able to provide a more global critique of oppression than that offered by the earlier analysis of human chauvinism, involving not just the problems inherent in the human chauvinist framework's foundational instrumentalist value theory, but also highlighting the broader conceptual and perceptual distortions involved in centric structures and dualist logic, and the injustices and prudential dilemmas they cause in both social and environmental realms. On Plumwood's analysis, the rationalist conception of the human self is defined in polarised opposition to concepts such as materiality, nature, and necessity, and in accordance with those of reason, consciousness, culture, freedom and transcendence of nature**.** Together with an emphasis on instrumental and colonising forms of reason, this exclusionary conception provides an important conceptual foundation for the human mastery of nature. Indeed, the logic of the foundational human/nature and reason/nature dualisms which underlie this conception of the human self provide much of the justification and naturalisation for the instrumentalisation of nature, fostering the assignment of exclusive moral significance to humans based largely on their allegedly unique possession of the capacity for reason.5 This further emphasises their conceptual hyperseparation from non-human nature and permits the instrumental valuation and treatment of the sphere of nature. The rationalist tradition also holds feminine attributes to be similarly radically separate from human virtue (likewise defined principally in terms of reason), thus creating a “master perspective” which subordinates and is alienated from both the feminine and nature, marrying the concept of reason with power and domination.6 Given this connection between the subordination of women and that of nature, Plumwood appeals to androcentrism as a more fully theorised parallel model for the human mastery of nature and accordingly reconceptualises human chauvinism in terms of the logic of hegemonic centrism. Plumwood defines hegemonic centrism as “a primary-secondary pattern of attribution that sets up one term (the One) as primary or as centre and defines marginal Others as secondary or derivative in relation to it”.7 This logical structure is founded on that of a value dualism, defined as an exaggerated dichotomy involving the extreme polarisation of contrasting conceptual pairs and their formation in terms of a value hierarchy. Dualised concepts are formed by a relation of power, promoting the treatment of inferiorised concepts as mere means to the ends of the superior relata, which seek to differentiate, dominate and control the inferior relata**.**8 In Plumwood's terms, "[d]ualisms are not universal features of human thought, but conceptual responses to and foundations for social domination".9 The five key features of dualism's “logic of domination” are as follows: Radical exclusion or hyperseparation involves the denial of continuity between dominant and marginalised groups, instead stressing extreme difference and creating a polarised relation which denies any possibility of overlap. Combined with backgrounding- the dominant group's denial of its dependency on the marginalised group and rendering of the latter as inessential background**-** this works to justify and naturalise the superior relata's claim to unique importance and dominance over the radically discontinuous and seemingly inessential inferior relata. Incorporation or relational definition involves the definition and recognition of the inferior relata solely in relation to (as excluded from) the superior group; this assimilation to the superior relata's identity, needs and ends negates the needs and ends of the inferior relata and results in the latter's inability to impose moral constraints or limitations on the dominant group. Thus, it is subject to instrumentalisation and objectification: it is further stripped of intrinsic value, ends, and needs by means of the denial of its subjectivity and intentionality, facilitating its treatment as mere means to the ends of the dominant group. The formation of the dualised relata in terms of a moral hierarchy naturalises this instrumentalisation, making it seem a normal consequence of their differing degrees of moral significance. The final feature of homogenisation or stereotyping occurs when differences within the subordinated group are denied, allowing it to be attributed a reductive and stable identity, thus also promoting the treatment of its constituents as interchangeable and replaceable resources for the dominant group.

### Reps key

Lupisella 9 (Mark is and engineer and scientist for the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, “The search for extraterrestrial life: epistemology, ethics, and worldviews,” Published in Exploring the Origin, Extent, and Future of Life: Philosophical, Ethical and Theological Perspectives, September 28, 2009, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/31517429/Exploring-the-Origin-Extent-And-Future-of-Life-Philosophical-Ethical-And-Theological-Perspectives-Constance-M-Bertka>, Scribd)

In exploring ethical issues regarding the extraterrestrial environment, several writers have suggested the need for a "cosmocentric ethic" because they conclude that existing ethical theories exclude the extraterrestrial environment since they are geocentric and cannot be applied to extraterrestrial environments [18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. While many philosophers would disagree about the extent to which ethical theories are narrowly constrained to geocentric application, the relatively new context or "lens" of space does nevertheless appear to raise interesting and novel ethical challenges, and provides us with an additional perspective with which to re-examine ethics and value theory in general. Exploring a broader-based ethic such as a cosmocentric ethic may be helpful in sorting through issues regarding the moral considerability of primitive extraterrestrial life as well as other ethical issues that will confront humanity as we move out into the solar system and beyond [23, 24]. But as with environmental ethics, an important challenge for a cosmocentric ethic is justifying intrinsic value [25]. Indeed, part of the usefulness of appealing to the universe as a basis for an ethical view is that a justification of intrinsic value and perhaps degrees thereof might be possible since it could be based on what is for many a compelling objective absolute-the universe itself.Systemic nature is valuable as a productive system, with Earth and its humans on one, even if perhaps the highest in richness or complexity, of its known projects. Nature is of value its capacity to throw forward all the storied natural history. On that scale, humans on Earth are latecomers, and it seems astronomically arrogant for such late products to say that the system is only of instrumental value, or that not until humans appear to do their valuing does value appear in the universe. (Holmes Rolston III [26]) Holmes Rolston offers a view that appeals to the "formed integrity" of "projective nature." This view suggests that the universe creates objects of formed integrity (for example objects worthy of a proper name) which have intrinsic value and which should be respected**.** Robert Haynes points out, how-ever, that such a view appears to conflict with modifying the Earth, even to the benefit of humans[18]. The systemic interdependent connectedness of ecosystems is often cited as a foundation justifying the value of parts of the larger whole, since a subset con-tributes to the maintenance of the larger whole. Consider Leopold's egalitarian ecosystem ethic: "A thing is right when it if to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong if it tends to do otherwise" [27]. Freya Mathews suggests that intrinsic value can be grounded in self-realization, which is a function of interconnectedness. The universe qualifies for selfhood and hence self-realization (again, for which interconnectedness plays a critical role) and humans participate in this cosmic self-realization.

### Exploration causes anthropocentrism

**Lupisella 9** (Mark is and engineer and scientist for the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, “The search for extraterrestrial life: epistemology, ethics, and worldviews,” Published in Exploring the Origin, Extent, and Future of Life: Philosophical, Ethical and Theological Perspectives, September 28, 2009, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/31517429/Exploring-the-Origin-Extent-And-Future-of-Life-Philosophical-Ethical-And-Theological-Perspectives-Constance-M-Bertka>, Scribd)

While the focus of this chapter is not extraterrestrial intelligence, astrobiology nevertheless prompts us to consider values of other potential rational beings, especially as they might apply to non intelligent or primitive life forms. For example, if we take a view of ethics in which rational beings are the only moral agents, might the possible existence of rational extraterrestrial beings prompt the consideration of broader ethical views that might be important to them- such as a conservation ethic that extends to non-rational living beings (for example extraterrestrial microbes), perhaps as part of a broader environmental/ cosmic ethic? This is similar to considering values of our fellow human beings that might go beyond our own values. If others value something for plausible reasons, shouldn't we be prompted to consider respecting those values? Extraterrestrial intelligent beings may consider life in the universe, perhaps independent origins of life in particular, to be extremely valuable, perhaps intrinsically or "cosmically" valuable. Perhaps such values should be considered as we formulate our own views regarding how we should move out into the solar system and beyond.

## SETI Links

### Plan costs political capital – SETI is a joke

**Kingsley 9** (Stuart A. Kingsley Ph.D, Director of The Columbus Optical SETI Observatory, http://www.coseti.org/www.oldsynagogues.org/wessexjnews\_1.htm)

SETI is about the passive activity of 'listening' for signs of artificial electromagnetic signals emanating for other star systems in our galaxy. These may be attention-getting beacons or radio frequency leakage. CETI, i.e., Communication with Extraterrestrial Intelligence by electro-magnetic radiation on behalf of mankind, is not yet officially approved of by the United Nations, though protocols do exist for who will speak for Earth, and what should be said in reply, should a signal be received from an ET civilization. Thus, at present, there are no official radio or laser uplinks for sending messages to the stars. We do not presently have the technical capability to do the precise point-ahead-targeting required for laser transmitters nor sufficiently powerful space-based lasers, but we can be assured that mankind will be able to accomplish this within the next 50 years - no time at all on the cosmic scale. Over several decades, the American SETI community, which has been the main source of SETI research, has suffered ridicule in Congress because of the association in the public mind with UFOs and LGMs (Little Green Men). There has always been a "giggle factor" when the subject of ETIs is mentioned. Listening for signals from extraterrestrial beings is a very noble goal, and one that naturally flows from a world view that we are not alone in the universe. Only in the past century have we developed the technology to detect such signals, though Philosophers, Theologians and Scientists have pondered the issue of intelligent life elsewhere in the universe for a good part of the past 1,000 years, if not longer.

### Plan costs political capital – Congress doesn’t like SETI

**Atkinson 11** (Nancy Atkinson, Senior editor for Universe Today and a NASA Solar System Ambassador, “Budget Woes Put SETI’s Allen Telescope Array into Hibernation”, <http://www.universetoday.com/85121/budget-woes-put-setis-allen-telescope-array-into-hibernation/>, April 25, 2011) SV

SETI, the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence has suffered a big blow. The primary alien search engine –the Allen Telescope Array (ATA) in northern California — has been shut down due to budget woes. In a letter last week, the CEO of the SETI Institute, Tom Pierson told donors that in the ATA has been put into “hibernation,” — a safe mode of sorts, where “the equipment is unavailable for normal observations and is being maintained in a safe state by a significantly reduced staff.” The ATA has been in hibernation since April 15, with the equipment put in a safe configuration so that it stays ready to be turned back on should the SETI Institute find new sources of funding. While the ATA is not the only radio telescope that can be used for SETI searches, it was the observatory that was primarily used for that task, and now SETI researchers will have to borrow time on telescopes where “competition for observing time can be fierce or piggyback their searches on other ongoing observations,” according to John Matson, writing for Scientific American. The ATA was operating with 42 antennas, and was scheduled to expand gradually to 350 six-meter radio antennas to listen for possible radio emissions from any faraway civilizations that might exist elsewhere in the galaxy. But after the first $50 million phase was completed in 2007, additions to the array were delayed due to lack of funding. NASA had funded some of the early SETI projects, but Congress canceled any NASA contributions in 1993. The nonprofit SETI Institute, founded in 1984, relies mainly on private donations to support its research. Microsoft co-founder Paul Allen, had contributed $25 million to the first phase, with donations and grants funding the rest. According to astronomer Franck Marchis, who works for the SETI Institute and the University of California, Berkeley – which is responsible for operating the ATA, “the financial state of the observatory degraded significantly over the past 2 years with the loss of various sources of funding (NSF, California state) at UC Berkeley” forcing UC Berkeley to withdraw from the SETI project. And, as Marchis wrote on his blog, “because the project is mainly funded through private donors, the economic recession had a huge impact and delayed significantly the expansion of the array impacting the overall project.”

# Asteroids Case Neg

## CP

### The space elevator is necessary for implementing any asteroid deflection strategy- key to avoid a catastrophic strike.

**Edwards 06** (Bradley, Director of Research-Institute for Scientific Research, worked at Los Alamos researching advanced space technologies for 11 years, with Phillip Ragan, *Leaving the Planet by Space Elevator,,* p.159-160)

Protection from asteroids Have you seen the movies Armageddon or Deep Impact? In spite of the artistic license that these movies adopt, they highlight a critical issue. **There arc asteroids that could impact Earth causing global destruction.** The likelihood of an impact is believed to be low in the short-term but **it is clear what will happen if a large object does hit Earth**. **These large objects are extremely difficult to deflect and to do so will require extensive assets in space.** **If an asteroid were headed for Earth right now we would have little chance of protecting ourselves. With a large detector array in space we could detect dangerous objects on prior orbits giving months or years of warning**. **With extensive spaceship systems at geosynchronous orbit and the Elevator to support them, a system could be put in place to meet a dangerous object early,** when the minimum energy is required to deflect it. Even in this case, to deflect an object a kilometer across could require thousands of tons of fuel and hardware. **This would be challenging for the Elevator but much more viable than with any current system in place today.**

# SSA Case Neg

## SSA Links

### Plan costs political capital – partisan fights

**Dimascio 5/5** (Jen Dimascio, Writer at Aviation Week, “Fights Ahead Over Strategic Forces Budget,” <http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story_generic.jsp?channel=aerospacedaily&id=news/asd/2011/05/05/01.xml>, 2011) SV

Congressional fights are ahead over how the House Armed Services Committee panel that deals with strategic forces has chosen to fund U.S. missile defense and space efforts in fiscal 2012. The subcommittee added $100 million for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system run by Boeing in a move that would protect the program from failures in the testing process, according to subcommittee chairman Rep. Michael Turner (R-Ohio.) “We need to put more funding in this,” Turner said. “These test failures require that A, the source of the problem be identified, and B, that it be rectified, and C, that we continue to accelerate this program.” But the addition of that money is meeting resistance with Democrats who are supporting the administration’s move toward the Aegis-based Phased Adaptive Approach, led by Lockheed Martin, and its greater focus on theater-based missile defenses.

# SMD Case Neg

## \*\*\*1NC CP\*\*\*

### CP Text: The United States Federal Government should upgrade its ground based missile defense capabilities and the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System to include the capability to intercept intercontinental ballistic missile.

Ground based BMD would be able to overcome current problems

Frederick 9 – Lt Col Lorinda A. Frederick, USAF, BA, Michigan State University; MBA, Regis University; Master of Military Operational Art and Science, Air Command and Staff College; Master of Airpower Art and Science, School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, 9/1/09, “Deterrence and Space-Based Missile Defense,” Air and Space Power Journal, Fall 2009

After the Cold War, deterring ballistic missile threats became more complicated due not only to the increasing numbers of nuclear-capable states but also to the rise of hostile rogue elements within a state as well as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), along with missile technology and expertise.6 According to joint doctrine, “the predominant threat is not from a competing superpower, but more likely from the deliberate launch of a ballistic missile from a ‘rogue state,’ failed state, or terrorist group.”7 Yet, the United States has difficulty tracking ballistic missiles due to the shortage of accurate and reliable intelligence**,** having “been surprised in the past by an opponent’s earlier-than-expected military technology, including the testing of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, the testing of missiles by Iraq and North Korea, and the acquisition of Chinese missiles by Saudi Arabia.”8 Consequently, the “proliferation of advanced technologies for missiles, guidance systems, and WMD warheads *has increased the potential missile threat to the homeland*” (emphasis in original).9 Today, the United States must attempt to deter both state and nonstate actors.Nonstate actors and rogue elements complicate deterrence for a number of reasons.10 First, rogue elements’ decision makers are harder to identify and locate**,** let alone deter, than their state counterparts. Without the ability to attribute the use of WMDs to a rogue-element actor, or even its state sponsor, the United States may have difficulty deterring an attack. Leaders of rogue elements and proliferators threaten US, regional, and global security interests because they defy international laws or norms of international behavior and use asymmetric means to attack law-abiding nations.Second, the fact that states operate more in the open allows the United States to gauge their perceptions, based on their actions: “The objective of deterrence is to convince potential adversaries that courses of action that threaten U.S. national interests will result in outcomes that are decisively worse than they could achieve through alternative courses of action.”11 Because rogue elements do not operate in the open, the United States cannot accurately gauge their perceptions of capability and will.Third, the United States cannot threaten to inflict substantial costs on rogue elements that have few high-value assets, minimal territorial claims, and small populations, compared to their state counterparts.12 An adversary’s hidden calculation of cost, benefits, and risks complicates the US approach to deterrence.Fourth, it may prove difficult to discern what is important to rogue elements. The United States could easily assume that they share its goals and values—but this is a dangerous assumption.Fifth, the United States has neither established nor exercised communication channels with rogue elements to the same extent that it has with state actors**.** Communication is a necessary component of deterrence strategy with regard to relaying the United States’ intent to respond to aggression. Even after receiving a clear message, rogue elements may not be deterred. BMD could help the United States deter aggression and respond should deterrence fail.BMD should primarily be considered a vital part of a deterrent strategy and secondarily an effective tool to protect against ballistic missile attacks. BMD is an integral part of deterrence because it makes escalation less likely. Confidence in BMD technology may allow US decision makers to accept an increased risk of attack and allow time for other instruments of power to defuse the situation. Adversaries must consider US defensive capabilities in relation to their offensive capabilities. Confident that inbound ballistic missiles will not reach the homeland, the United States could choose not to respond in kind to such provocation**.**Extending BMD to friendly states bolsters deterrence because it effectively conveys to potential aggressors the US commitment to defense. Extended deterrence can keep other states out of the conflict. For example, the United States provided Israel with theater missile defense (TMD) during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm to protect the Israelis and keep them out of the broader conflict. Extended deterrence may encourage allies to “forgo indigenous development or procurement of duplicative military capabilities, thereby enhancing US counterproliferation efforts.”13 BMD is more than just a defensive measure that the United States possesses to knock down threatening missiles. Decision makers should think of it as a vital part of deterrence to help restrain rogue elements and proliferators.

### The MDA is already upgrading the Aegis system, all it needs to include is the ability to intercept ICBMs

Goure 11 – Dr. Daniel Goure, Vice President of the Lexington Institute, 4-26-11, “Aegis Missile Defense Success Refutes Critics,” The Lexington Institute, http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/aegis-missile-defense-success-refutes-critics?a=1&c=1171

Earlier this month, the U.S. Navy successfully tested its Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) consisting of an upgraded radar coupled with the advanced Standard Missile (SM) 3 Block IA against a simulated ballistic missile threat. The new SM-3 Block IA is the first in a series of improved variants of the interceptor that will permit it to engage longer-range, faster flying ballistic missiles, including eventually intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). This test suggests that the planned program to pursue sequential or block improvements in the Aegis radar, associated battle management and fire control and the SM-3 can produce a capable, multi-layered, land and sea-based defense against ballistic missiles of varying ranges. The Aegis BMDS and Standard Missile-3 rest at the core of the Obama Administration’s approach to a phased adaptive architecture (PAA). The plan for the PAA envisions deploying first sea-based and then land-based Aegis radar/battle managers along with ever-more capable SM-3s. In 2015, the first Aegis Ashore will be deployed along with the SM-3 Block IB. By 2020 the PAA intends to have the first ICBM-capable system in the field including a SM-3 Block II.

## Ground Based Solvency

### Ground based strategy solves heg- BMD, terrorism and cyberdeterrence

Pellerin, 7/21 [Cheryl Pellerin, American Forces Press Service PR, July 21, 2011, “Winnefeld: Military Must Prepare for Range of Conflicts,” U.S. Department of Defense, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=64762>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Reorganizing troops and equipment for such an effort will be a big challenge, he said, as will “making sure that we don't myopically focus on one type of conflict over another, but that we're prepared as well as we can be for whatever comes across the plate.” In his current position, Winnefeld is responsible for defense of the homeland, military support to civil authorities for domestic emergencies and aerospace warning and control for North America. As Northcom commander, he is responsible for the ground-based midcourse missile defense system, an element of the ballistic missile defense system that allows combatant commanders to engage and destroy limited intermediate- and long-range ballistic missiles. If confirmed, Winnefeld will act as chairman of the Joint Chiefs in the chairman's absence, and also will have key responsibilities related to requirements for future acquisition programs and efforts related to cybersecurity, the next-generation nuclear deterrent and more. Winnefeld said the services must continue to address and prepare for future challenges, “even as we resolve the conflicts we have going on today.” “This is a big ship in terms of the acquisition programs and processes and the embedded requirements process that we need to turn into a much more favorable direction for the taxpayers,” the admiral said. A confluence of tools will work for the department, he added. One is the Weapons System Acquisition Reform Act, signed into law in May 2009 to reform the way the Pentagon contracts for and buys major weapons systems. The legislation is good, Winnefeld said, but will take time to have its effect. The admiral attributed another tool to Ashton B. Carter, undersecretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics. “Undersecretary Carter has a very good approach in better buying power,” he said, “that he's imposing on the department to get more cost efficiencies, to provide incentives for industry, to provide more for competition and the like.” If he is confirmed, Winnefeld said, Cartwright has set him up for success to further improve the requirements process. The current vice chairman has been an active proponent of Pentagon efficiency efforts initiated last year by then-Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates. Those three things working together, the admiral said, “are going to get this ship turned in the right direction,” even in a challenging budget environment. Winnefeld said upcoming cuts in the defense budget should be applied “in a strategy-based manner.” As proposed defense cuts increase, he said, “the strategies we currently have are going to reach inflection points where we're just going to have to stop doing some of the things we are currently able to do.” The nation, he added, can’t afford to have defense cuts result in a hollow military force or irreversible damage to the industrial base. “We’ve got to make sure that the all-volunteer force remains viable and that we take care of these young men and women,” the admiral said. In response to a question about whether the United States still is engaged in a “war on terror,” Winnefeld said the term may be out of fashion, but the reality hasn’t changed. “We are still so much in a fight with al-Qaida and … related extremist groups that it sure feels like a war,” he said. Describing the status of that war, Winnefeld echoed Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta’s recent statement that the United States is close to being able to strategically defeat al-Qaida. The group’s lack of financial support and leadership crisis will “ultimately [cause] them to unravel from their internal contradictions, much the same way the Soviet Union did,” the admiral said. Still, he added, al-Qaida is morphing from a centrally controlled organization to a collection of homegrown terrorists. “So this is not yet over,” the admiral said. “It's not even close.” Addressing the Pentagon’s role in cyberdefense, Winnefeld said one component involves defense of its own networks within the “dot-mil” domain. “We also have a role in supporting the Department of Homeland Security in their role of helping defend the rest of government and the rest of the country,” he added. That’s a complex relationship, he said, noting that Gates and Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano struck a good agreement in October to work together to better protect against threats to military and civilian computer networks and systems. Army Gen. Keith B. Alexander, commander of U.S. Cyber Command, is doing a good job of working with Homeland Security to construct how that support would work, Winnefeld said. One of several elements of cyber deterrence, he said, is the ability to respond to an attack and to make that attack so costly for an attacker that they're unwilling to conduct it. The United States must consider the full range of potential responses to an attack, including military and diplomatic responses, the admiral added. “But I would never want to rule anything out in responding to a serious cyber attack on this country offensively,” he said, “and it could be a cyber response or a kinetic response, depending on the nature of the attack and the circumstances that surround it.”

### Ground based technology solves EMP best- PIPER

Newsome, 10 [Dr. Robert Troy Newsome, PhD. in electrical engineering and philosophy from Stanford University, ““GROUND-BASED PHOTOMETRIC IMAGING OF LIGHTNING EMP-INDUCED TRANSIENT LUMINOUS EVENTS,” <http://vlf.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Newsome.%20dissertation_online.pdf>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

In 1989, an entirely new class of lightning return stroke field effects was discovered in the form of large and brilliant but brief lightning-associated optical ashes in the upper atmosphere, collectively known as transient luminous events (TLEs). Elves, the most abundant kind of TLE, are rapidly expanding rings of light produced by lightning EMP-heating of the lower ionosphere. Centered above their parent lightning return strokes at 85{90 km altitudes, elves can expand to diameters of several hundreds of kilometers on sub-millisecond timescales. However, their very short lifetimes make elves difficult to observe, and most in-the- field studies of elves have featured instruments requiring manual triggering that allow for detailed study of captured events but necessarily involve high rates of missed detections. In this work, we present three years of elves observations made by a new free- running (non-triggered), **ground-based,** high-speed photometric imaging instrument called PIPER. This instrument is unique among ground-based instruments in that it does not require triggering and can observe nearly all elves activity within its field of view as it tracks a storm across the horizon over its several-hour lifetime. PIPER is a multi-wavelength, 64-anode photometer array composed of two horizontally-oriented and two vertically-oriented 16-anode photometer arrays. With a sampling rate of 25 kHz, the array provides ample time-resolution for resolving elves and adequate spatial resolution for discriminating elves from other transient optical phenomena (sprites, cloud ashes, meteors, etc.). We develop an algebraic technique for reconstructing the geometry of a particular elves from its photometric array observation. We then present aggregate observations of elves from four different multi-week summer observation campaigns and investigate many features of bulk elves activity that have not hitherto been possible to investigate with previous data sets. These features include peak storm-time elves production rates, the storm-to-storm and within-storm variability in elves production rates, elves production probability dependence on lightning return stroke parameters and local time of night, and distributions of elves geometric parameters. We also present observations of an unusual (and very infrequently reported) category of elves we call elves doublets" and interpret their causative mechanism in terms of the EMP radiated from compact intracloud discharges.

Ground based solves technological competitiveness- CP Spurs the private sector  
Kenyon, 7/26 [Henry Kenyon, “Air Force to build Space Fence to track orbital junk,” July 26, 2011, Government Computer News, <http://gcn.com/articles/2011/07/26/space-fence-track-orbital-junk.aspx>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Space Fence is a ground-based phased array radar operating in the S band, which is capable of detecting smaller objects at greater distances and through weather such as rain. The shorter wavelength of the S band will be an improvement over the current system, known as the very-high-frequency fence, which has been in service since the early 1960s and uses longer wavelength radars. When Space Fence is operational, it will allow ground controllers to see as many as 100,000 objects, a big jump from the 20,000 objects currently tracked. The new radar will also use state-of-the-art algorithms to better track objects, Burgess said. Raytheon is working with the Air Force to reduce the risk in the technology used to develop such a large phased array radar. But the company has years of experience developing phased array radar systems and understands how data is used in the space industry, Burgess said. Raytheon, Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman have all submitted designs for Space Fence. A preliminary design review of the program is scheduled in 2012, after which the Air Force will award a contract to one of the competing firms. Initial operating capability is slated for 2015 when the first sensor will be operational. Before going operational, Burgess said the program will test a prototype radar to mitigate technical risks and demonstrate that the design works and is economical to produce. When Space Fence is complete, it will use as many as three radars located on or near the equator in Australia, the Marshall Islands and Ascension Island. The radars will be large phased array structures, similar to the systems used to track ballistic missile launches. The VHF fence system’s radars are based in the continental United States.

CP key to heg— Ground based project spurs technological growth, solves jamming, and attack incentives  
Villasenor, 7/5 [John Villasenor, Nonresident Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, Center for Technology Innovation, The Brookings Institution, “Cyber-Physical Attacks and Drone Strikes: The Next Homeland Security Threat Defense, Homeland Security, Military Technology, Global Governance, Cybersecurity,” July 7, 2011, <http://www.militaryaerospace.com/index/display/wire-news-display/1452111283.html>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

[25] In short, the drone industry is large, complex, and global. Solutions to the national security risk posed by drones in the wrong hands include 1) measures designed to make it as difficult as possible for rogue groups to obtain drones, and 2) steps aimed at stopping or minimizing the harm due to attempted drone attacks on American interests. The process of putting such solutions into place will require significant time and coordination among multiple U.S. Government and international entities, and should to be started well in advance of receiving indications of a possible impending attack. Specific steps that can be taken include the following: Stages in the U.S. drone supply chain with relatively weaker security and that would therefore be more vulnerable to robbery or theft can be identified and secured. In addition, information about the operational characteristics, computer hardware, software systems, and communications and networking environments associated with drone operation can be more highly compartmentalized. Drone communications and control systems can be evaluated and modified as necessary to ensure that they are secure. As reported by the Wall Street Journal in 2009, in at least some instances U.S. Predator drones were transmitting video over an unprotected communications link, enabling insurgents in Iraq to intercept the video using inexpensive, off-the-shelf software.[26] Drone software systems can be designed so that they can be reprogrammed as needed post-deployment to implement appropriate encryption and anti-jamming methods. U.S.-made drones can be designed to include chips or other electronics that would enable them to be tracked if they are lost. With appropriate design, these chips can be made very difficult to find without destroying or significantly damaging the drone in the process. On-board computer systems on drones can be equipped with kill switches that could be tripped remotely if the drones go missing. Of course, it would also be important to ensure that the kill switches can only be accessed by a very limited group of trusted people. In addition, or in the alternative, in the manner of theft recovery software that is increasingly installed on laptop computers, the on-board computer systems on drones could include the ability to phone home upon activation, and to provide imagery and information related to location. Electronics and other system components used in drones can be designed to include steganographic (hidden) information that would allow the original manufacturer and purchaser to be traced and identified. This could aid after-the-fact identification of the perpetrators of a drone-based attack, and could also provide a disincentive to carry out attacks in the first place. Drones will be increasingly available internationally, potentially including on the international arms market. While that market is notoriously hard to monitor and even more difficult to regulate, the United States can use its engagement with other countries through organizations such as the Missile Technology Control Regime to continue to enhance global standards for drone export control, supply chain monitoring and integrity.

CP Solves BMDs, aerospace growth— Ground based growth spurs ATK systems  
American Machinist, 7/29 [American Machinist, Industry News Publication, “ATK to Supply Solid Rocket Motors for IRBM,” 07/29/2011, <http://www.americanmachinist.com/304/News/Article/False/87670/>, American Machinist, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Aerospace and defense products manufacturer ATK Aerospace Systems earned a $48-million subcontract from Orbital Sciences Corp. to supply commercial solid rocket motors for the Missile Defense Agency Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile (IRBM) target rocket program. If fully subscribed with all options, ATK indicated the contract could be worth up to $90 million. The IRBM target is a multi-stage vehicle that will be air-launched from a standard C-17 cargo aircraft via a parachute extraction system. it will increase testing flexibility for MDA’s development of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS). Orbital is the prime contractor to the MDA for the IRBM program. The ATK Orion solid rocket motors will provide first- and second-stage propulsion for the target rocket. ATK’s Orion motor was introduced in 1988 in a joint venture with Orbital that developed the winged Pegasus space launch vehicle. The motor design has been modified several times for use on various other platforms, and versions of Orion motors are used on the ground-based Midcourse Defense Orbital Boost Vehicle, too. In the new contract, ATK's initial award covers first eight Orion 50S XLT and 50 XLT vehicles, to be delivered by Q1 2013. Contract options cover deliveries of 14 more rockets through 2015. "This is an entirely new application for our versatile Orion solid rocket motor family," stated ATK’s Scott Lehr, vice president and general manager of Strategic and Commercial Systems. "ATK Orion motors are currently used by MDA and Orbital for missile defense and in a variety of Orbital commercial launch vehicles." "There is a significant cost and reliability benefit gained by selecting solid rocket motors that are already in production for other applications," he continued

## Aegis CP Solvency

Sea based power is the best internal link to US hegemonic growth  
Pruitt, 2k [John Pruitt, Security Studies professor at MIT, “The Influence of Sea Power in the 21st Century,” August 2000, <http://web.mit.edu/ssp/publications/working_papers/wp_00-4.pdf>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Does sea power have influence in the 21 st century? I think the answer is unequivocally yes –invaluable influence. At the beginning of this paper I identified the military strategy of the 20 t h century as one largely devoted to a territorial context. That was correct and prudent; there were a number of real, resourceful and active threats to vital lands during the last one hundred years. The defeat or waning of those threats and the expanding of the globalized further have changed the strategic challenge and thereby call for a strategic shift. Is a roughly equal three way split between Navy, Army and Air Force the most efficient use of finite defense budgets? Does it dictate, by default, a marriage to a strategy that is now outdated? Or does a more innovative approach offer greater chance of success? I have argued that **maritime-based forces offer the best chance of success in future security environment.** Such forces would stress the potential of conventional power projection from the sea that can protect and support our global interests through the flexibility and mobility of forces with combat credible deterrence, influence and coercion potential. Maritime-based forces also reduce the problems associated with cultural conflict and the dulling of combat capability during extended missions of occupation or overseas stationing. Such forces also offer a chance for true strategic innovation. What is left to consider are the economics and strategic wisdom of overstretching our commitments and any temptation toward a policy of isolation based on an overwhelming maritime capability. The British fell prey to both these traps but I believe they are manageable if a long-term view is maintained. The globalized world will demand a flexible mix of forces capable of international engagement and combat credibility against a wide array of potential threats. It will be built around the governance of a Trilateral Group of economically bloced nation-states whose prosperity continues to grow within a more integrated world that is continually evolving within the framework they establish. The 21 st century, like the 19 t h , will be an era shaped by economic interests and opportunities and built on a foundation of international stability provided by military power that must be flexible. In the past the U.S. has provided this stability and the bill has been enormous. In the future the U.S. will continue to provide most of the military power required for continued stability but the bill cannot be enormous. It is time to let our strategy shape our budget, not let our budget shape our strategy. Like Britain in the 19 t h century, the United States of the 21 st century stands at a strategic crossroads. Unlike Britain however, we have the British experience to consider as we confront our challenges. Based on that wisdom selection of a maritime-centric strategy makes the most economical and viable manifestation of our military power in the coming years. To put off tomorrow decisions of today eventually will result in a loss of influence for America in a world that needs and wants our help.

### Obama needs to pursue a more aggressive strategy for the Aegis system

Spring 11 – Baker Spring, F. M. Kirby Research Fellow in National Security Policy at The Heritage Foundation, 5-3-11, “Sixteen Steps to Comprehensive Missile Defense: What the FY 2012 Budget Should Fund” The Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/sixteen-steps-to-comprehensive-missile-defense-what-the-fy-2012-budget-should-fund

The Obama Administration’s missile defense program puts the Aegis missile defense system at the center of its Phased Adaptive Approach (PAA) to missile defense. Under the Administration’s proposed FY 2012 budget, the Aegis system would receive a total of $2.128 billion from two sources, $1.5 billion from its own budget line and $628 million from a PAA line.[19] The Administration has proposed buying 46 SM-3 interceptors in FY 2012.[20] Nevertheless, the Administration is not pursuing the development of the Aegis system aggressively enough in developing and ultimately deploying SM-3 interceptors capable of countering long-range missiles

### Aegis solves EMP

Spring 11 – Baker Spring, F. M. Kirby Research Fellow in National Security Policy at The Heritage Foundation, 5-3-11, “Sixteen Steps to Comprehensive Missile Defense: What the FY 2012 Budget Should Fund” The Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/sixteen-steps-to-comprehensive-missile-defense-what-the-fy-2012-budget-should-fund

As the Independent Working Group noted in a recent study, missile defense will play a critical role in protecting the U.S. against EMP attacks because ballistic missiles are the best delivery means for EMP warheads.[39] Upgrading the Aegis-based BMD system and establishing an East Coast test bed for missile defense would provide substantive capability to address the EMP threat, but this requires establishing clear mission requirements. Congress can ensure that the Department of Defense assigns these mission requirements appropriately.

## AT CP links to Politics

### The Counterplan avoids the link—weapons in space are politically unpopular

DeBlois et al 4--- Bruce DeBlois is Director of Systems Integration at BAE Systems and former Senior Fellow of Science and Technology at CFR, Richard Garwin is IBM Fellow Emeritus at the Research Center of IBM and former Senior Fellow of Science and Technology at CFR, and Scott Kemp is a Fulbright Fellow to the European Union and research staff at the Program on Science and Global Security at Princeton University, Jeremy C. Marwell is a Furman Scholar at the New York University School of Law, Fall 2004, “Space Weapons; Crossing the U.S. Rubicon” International Security, Pg. 50

IN SUM: GLOBAL FORCE PROJECTION. Global rapid and denied-access force projection is possible and will happen without the development of space weapons, through adaptations to existing systems. Except for the unique capability that might be contributed by space-based lasers for a small class of targets, terrestrial methods of force projection appear to be superior to space weapons systems, if they were to become a reality at some point in the future. Furthermore, **space weapons will be expensive, vulnerable to countermeasures, and politically inflammatory.** The question of whether to deploy space weapons, therefore, becomes a matter of marginal value added and opportunity costs. In the near term, **nonspace weapons** such as UAVs, cruise missiles, and ICBMs with conventional payloads will provide greater capability sooner and at lower cost.

### CP has bipartisan support and doesn’t link to politics

Pfaltzgraff, 9 [Robert L. Pfaltzgraff Jr., , “Boost Phase Missile Defense: Present Challenges, Future Prospects,” April 3, 2009, Boost-Phase Missile Defense, p. 5, <http://www.ifpa.org/pdf/Pfaltzgraff_Boost-Phase.Missile.Defense_Capitol.Hill-Marshall.Inst_3.April.09.pdf>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

In conclusion, there are several reasons, as I have indicated, only the United States has little or nothing in the way of boost-phase ballistic missile defense. However, there are also several reasons why we need such defenses, as I have also tried to point out. Whether and when we get the boost-phase defenses that we will increasingly need will depend on the future, as it has in the past, on the willingness of political leaders to place greater emphasis on boost-phase missile defense. In the present political environment, sea-based missile defense offers the greatest opportunity and there is broadening bipartisan support for such defense. On space, however, we remain far from political agreement, event though for reasons that I have indicated, space-based missile defenses would give us the best basis for a truly global missile defense that is layered and which includes the boost phase.

## AT Space based solves better-spillover

### 1. Schaffer 3 concludes neg— The US military can only access spillover effects when ground, and sea operations are strong.

### 2. Only Sea based power has spillover effects for US hegemony

Pruitt, 2k [John Pruitt, Security Studies professor at MIT, “The Influence of Sea Power in the 21st Century,” August 2000, <http://web.mit.edu/ssp/publications/working_papers/wp_00-4.pdf>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Does sea power have influence in the 21 st century? I think the answer is unequivocally yes –invaluable influence. At the beginning of this paper I identified the military strategy of the 20 t h century as one largely devoted to a territorial context. That was correct and prudent; there were a number of real, resourceful and active threats to vital lands during the last one hundred years. The defeat or waning of those threats and the expanding of the globalized further have changed the strategic challenge and thereby call for a strategic shift. Is a roughly equal three way split between Navy, Army and Air Force the most efficient use of finite defense budgets? Does it dictate, by default, a marriage to a strategy that is now outdated? Or does a more innovative approach offer greater chance of success? I have argued that **maritime-based forces offer the best chance of success in future security environment.** Such forces would stress the potential of conventional power projection from the sea that can protect and support our global interests through the flexibility and mobility of forces with combat credible deterrence, influence and coercion potential. Maritime-based forces also reduce the problems associated with cultural conflict and the dulling of combat capability during extended missions of occupation or overseas stationing. Such forces also offer a chance for true strategic innovation. What is left to consider are the economics and strategic wisdom of overstretching our commitments and any temptation toward a policy of isolation based on an overwhelming maritime capability. The British fell prey to both these traps but I believe they are manageable if a long-term view is maintained. The globalized world will demand a flexible mix of forces capable of international engagement and combat credibility against a wide array of potential threats. It will be built around the governance of a Trilateral Group of economically bloced nation-states whose prosperity continues to grow within a more integrated world that is continually evolving within the framework they establish. The 21 st century, like the 19 t h , will be an era shaped by economic interests and opportunities and built on a foundation of international stability provided by military power that must be flexible. In the past the U.S. has provided this stability and the bill has been enormous. In the future the U.S. will continue to provide most of the military power required for continued stability but the bill cannot be enormous. It is time to let our strategy shape our budget, not let our budget shape our strategy. Like Britain in the 19 t h century, the United States of the 21 st century stands at a strategic crossroads. Unlike Britain however, we have the British experience to consider as we confront our challenges. Based on that wisdom selection of a maritime-centric strategy makes the most economical and viable manifestation of our military power in the coming years. To put off tomorrow decisions of today eventually will result in a loss of influence for America in a world that needs and wants our help.

### 3. Turn- Space power would damage US hegemony— weaponization causes counterbalancing

Logsdon & Adams, 3 [Ed. John M. Logsdon and Gordon Adams, Professors of the Security Policy Studies Program

Elliott School of International Affairs at The George Washington University, “SPACE WEAPONS: Are They Needed?,” October 2003, <http://www.gwu.edu/~spi/assets/docs/Security_Space_Volume.Final.pdf>, p 17, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Second, the United States enjoys an unrivaled ability to project military power around the world. Although space weapons would further increase its expeditionary military capabilities, their benefits would be only marginal in the vast majority of scenarios. On the other hand, effective space weapons might greatly enhance the military capabilities of other states, which currently have little capability to attack the United States and whose military inferiority is due in no small part to the U.S. advantage in space capabilities. Moreover, while the United States would enjoy a large initial lead over its rivals in a space weapons competition, it already has a huge advantage in the other dimensions of military power, and there is little reason to believe that rivals would find it harder to challenge U.S. preeminence in space power than in sea or air power. Third, sanctuary nationalists argue that the dynamics of alliance formation and maintenance imply that if the U.S. leads the way in space weaponization it would not only antagonize rivals and enemies, but would also tend to weaken the system of security ties between the United States and its large and powerful bloc of allies. The potentially oppressive proximity and omnipresence of American weapons in orbit might encourage other states to align against an apparent assertion of U.S. hegemony, and would at least make them less comfortable with American dominance in international politics. 15 Even in the absence of such balancing behavior, a shift in U.S. military strategy toward greater autonomy from allies and coalition partners, which is one of the principal selling points of space-based weapons, would tend to weaken existing security relationships and increase the burden of defense on U.S. national resources.

## AT Layered defense is good

### 1. Brilliant Pebbles fails and only the CP solves layered defense strategy

Logsdon & Adams, 3 [Ed. John M. Logsdon and Gordon Adams, Professors of the Security Policy Studies Program

Elliott School of International Affairs at The George Washington University, “SPACE WEAPONS: Are They Needed?,” October 2003, <http://www.gwu.edu/~spi/assets/docs/Security_Space_Volume.Final.pdf>, p 170-171, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Brilliant Pebbles was initially estimated to cost $55 billion (in 1988 dollars), and would have been an extremely complex system. 33 When you consider the technical challenges of building interceptors with enough speed, range and agility, as well as the detection, tracking, and command and control systems to go with them, even this estimate looks optimistic. These factors, along with a myriad of political considerations, prompted Congress to cancel the program. More importantly, while orbital weapons may offer some advantages over ground-based systems in theory, they are not the only way to attack post-boost ballistic missiles. In fact, the Missile Defense Agency is currently developing a layered system that relies on ground-based interceptors for post boost-phase defense.

### 2. Aubin and Streland conclude neg— They argue “using sea-based missile defenses to complement the land-based system.” is needed and that Aegis cruisers and destroyers will solve shorter-range missiles inside the atmosphere, that SMD fails to solve.

## AT Conventional power wont check- Competitors will challenge

### 1. Competitors only rise after the plan— Space power is antagonizing towards key allies and causes counterbalancing

Logsdon & Adams, 3 [Ed. John M. Logsdon and Gordon Adams, Professors of the Security Policy Studies Program

Elliott School of International Affairs at The George Washington University, “SPACE WEAPONS: Are They Needed?,” October 2003, <http://www.gwu.edu/~spi/assets/docs/Security_Space_Volume.Final.pdf>, p 17, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Second, the United States enjoys an unrivaled ability to project military power around the world. Although space weapons would further increase its expeditionary military capabilities, their benefits would be only marginal in the vast majority of scenarios. On the other hand, effective space weapons might greatly enhance the military capabilities of other states, which currently have little capability to attack the United States and whose military inferiority is due in no small part to the U.S. advantage in space capabilities. Moreover, while the United States would enjoy a large initial lead over its rivals in a space weapons competition, it already has a huge advantage in the other dimensions of military power, and there is little reason to believe that rivals would find it harder to challenge U.S. preeminence in space power than in sea or air power. Third, sanctuary nationalists argue that the dynamics of alliance formation and maintenance imply that if the U.S. leads the way in space weaponization it would not only antagonize rivals and enemies, but would also tend to weaken the system of security ties between the United States and its large and powerful bloc of allies. The potentially oppressive proximity and omnipresence of American weapons in orbit might encourage other states to align against an apparent assertion of U.S. hegemony, and would at least make them less comfortable with American dominance in international politics. 15 Even in the absence of such balancing behavior, a shift in U.S. military strategy toward greater autonomy from allies and coalition partners, which is one of the principal selling points of space-based weapons, would tend to weaken existing security relationships and increase the burden of defense on U.S. national resources.

### 2. Goure evidence is not conclusive – you should prefer Logsdon & Adams who are professors in space policy and speak specifically about the plan’s implementation.

## AT Ground based fails

[Use any of the ground solves cards above]

**Ground base passes tests x\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

## AT Unilateral Space policy k2 deterrence

### Turn- Space power would damage US hegemony— weaponization causes counterbalancing

Logsdon & Adams, 3 [Ed. John M. Logsdon and Gordon Adams, Professors of the Security Policy Studies Program

Elliott School of International Affairs at The George Washington University, “SPACE WEAPONS: Are They Needed?,” October 2003, <http://www.gwu.edu/~spi/assets/docs/Security_Space_Volume.Final.pdf>, p 17, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Second, the United States enjoys an unrivaled ability to project military power around the world. Although space weapons would further increase its expeditionary military capabilities, their benefits would be only marginal in the vast majority of scenarios. On the other hand, effective space weapons might greatly enhance the military capabilities of other states, which currently have little capability to attack the United States and whose military inferiority is due in no small part to the U.S. advantage in space capabilities. Moreover, while the United States would enjoy a large initial lead over its rivals in a space weapons competition, it already has a huge advantage in the other dimensions of military power, and there is little reason to believe that rivals would find it harder to challenge U.S. preeminence in space power than in sea or air power. Third, sanctuary nationalists argue that the dynamics of alliance formation and maintenance imply that if the U.S. leads the way in space weaponization it would not only antagonize rivals and enemies, but would also tend to weaken the system of security ties between the United States and its large and powerful bloc of allies. The potentially oppressive proximity and omnipresence of American weapons in orbit might encourage other states to align against an apparent assertion of U.S. hegemony, and would at least make them less comfortable with American dominance in international politics. 15 Even in the absence of such balancing behavior, a shift in U.S. military strategy toward greater autonomy from allies and coalition partners, which is one of the principal selling points of space-based weapons, would tend to weaken existing security relationships and increase the burden of defense on U.S. national resources.

### 2. Frederick evidence flows negative— She argues that by *augmenting the current BMD architecture could let the nation redeploy land, sea assets and reduce is dependency on overseas bases.*

## AT Ground/Sea Based Fails

Their evidence doesn’t assume the world of the CP where our ground and sea capabilities are upgraded to include the capability to intercept intercontinental ballistic missile. Their authors argue our sea- and land- based capabilities would be better if they were upgraded.

## AT CP can’t solve EMP attacks- Boost Phase Key

### Only sea based defense solve boost phase and empirically Brilliant Pebbles fails

Pfaltzgraff, 9 [Robert L. Pfaltzgraff Jr., , “Boost Phase Missile Defense: Present Challenges, Future Prospects,” April 3, 2009, Boost-Phase Missile Defense, p. 3-4, <http://www.ifpa.org/pdf/Pfaltzgraff_Boost-Phase.Missile.Defense_Capitol.Hill-Marshall.Inst_3.April.09.pdf>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

Space-based defenses as well as sea-based defenses, and I would add the airborne laser, have boost-phase intercept capabilities. Yet space-based defenses have been politically the most controversial and therefore politically the least acceptable. As a result we have failed to deploy space-based interceptors that could destroy missiles and warheads in boost phase as well as midcourse and terminal phases. As we point out in the IWG Report, the United States had developed a missile defense that could have begun operating as early as the mid 1990s that included space-based interceptors known as Brilliant Pebbles providing for a layered defense against missiles launched from any point against the United States itself of its interests overseas. By the early 1990s, as a result of the technology investments during the preceding decade, the space-based elements were more technically mature and capable of rapid development than the ground-based missile components of the missile defense system then envisioned. The space-based missile defense based on kinetic energy interceptors would have placed heavy emphasis on boost-phase interception. It was a program that had survived numerous peer reviews, had been approved by the Pentagon’s acquisition authorities, and yet was curtailed by Congress in 1991 and 1992 and then canceled by the Clinton Administration. Despite this cancelation, advances in the commercial , civil, and other defense sectors since that time would now permit even lighter mass, lower cost, and higher 4 performance than would have been possible with the 1990-era technology base. Advances in technology would make possible boost-phase intercept of even short- and medium-range ballistic missiles as well as ICBMs.

### CP solves for boost phase atleast as well as the aff

Pfaltzgraff, 9 [Robert L. Pfaltzgraff Jr., , “Boost Phase Missile Defense: Present Challenges, Future Prospects,” April 3, 2009, Boost-Phase Missile Defense, p. 4, <http://www.ifpa.org/pdf/Pfaltzgraff_Boost-Phase.Missile.Defense_Capitol.Hill-Marshall.Inst_3.April.09.pdf>, DA 7/31/11]//RS

On a concluding note, it is useful to point out that sea-based defenses can potentially intercept a missile in its boost phase, provided the sea-based platforms are located in the necessary proximity to the launch point. Ground-based interceptors deployed on the territory of allies could also provide a degree of boost-phase intercept capability against ICBMs launched from some locations, but gaining such access and deployment rights would be more difficult than stationing ships in international waters or deploying space-based interceptors.

# K Essentials

### Fiat’s bad – it obscures our responsibility and disengages us from real politics

**Kappeler 95** (Susanne, The Will to Violence, p. 10-11)

We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equival­ent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness’ and its accompanying phe­nomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens even more so those of other nations have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or­ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers: For we tend to think that we cannot `do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution." 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our `non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' our readiness, in other words, to build ident­ities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence. “destining” of revealing insofar as it “pushes” us in a certain direction. Heidegger does not regard destining as determination (he says it is not a “fate which compels”), but rather as the implicit project within the field of modern practices to subject all aspects of reality to the principles of order and efficiency, and to pursue reality down to the finest detail. Thus, insofar as modern technology aims to order and render calculable, the objectification of reality tends to take the form of an increasing classification, differentiation, and fragmentation of reality. The possibilities for how things appear are increasingly reduced to those that enhance calculative activities. Heidegger perceives the real danger in the modern age to be that human beings will continue to regard technology as a mere instrument and fail to inquire into its essence. He fears that all revealing will become calculative and all relations technical, that the unthought horizon of revealing, namely the “concealed” background practices that make technological thinking possible, will be forgotten. He remarks: The coming to presence of technology threatens revealing, threatens it with the possibility that all revealing will be consumed in ordering and that everything will present itself only in the unconcealedness of standing-reserve. (QT, 33) 10 Therefore, it is not technology, or science, but rather the essence of technology as a way of revealing that constitutes the danger; for the essence of technology is existential, not technological. 11 It is a matter of how human beings are fundamentally oriented toward their world vis a vis their practices, skills, habits, customs, and so forth. Humanism contributes to this danger insofar as it fosters the illusion that technology is the result of a collective human choice and therefore subject to human control.

### Realism is a self-fulfilling prophecy

**Wendt 99** (Alexander, Associate Professor of Political Science at Yale, Social Theory of International Politics, p. 331-2)

The underlying logic here is the self-fulfilling prophecy: by treating the Other as if he is supposed to respond a certain way Alter and Ego will eventually learn shared ideas that generate those responses, and then by taking those ideas as their starting point they will tend to reproduce them in subsequent interactions. Identities and interests are not only learned in interaction, in other words, but sustained by it. The mass of relatively stable interactions known as “society” depends on the success of such self-fulfilling prophecies in ever day life.’ Although he does not distinguish between the behavioral and construction effects of interaction, this idea is nicely captured by what Morton Deutsch calls “the crude law of social relations”: “[t]he characteristic processes and effects elicited by any given type of social relation tend also to induce that type of social relation,”44 to which we might add “mediated by power relations.” From the “Crude Law” can be drawn the conclusion that the most important thing in social life is how actors represent Self and Other. These representations are the starting point for interaction, and the medium by which they determine who they are, what they want, and how they should behave. Society, in short, is “what people make of it,” and as corporate “people” this should be no less true of states in anarchical society. Which brings us to the question of how states might learn the egoistic conceptions of security that underpin Hobbesian cultures. We have already shown how states might become egoists through natural selection and imitation. They might also do so through learning. The key is how Alter and Ego represent themselves in the beginning of their encounter, since this will determine the logic of the ensuing interaction. If Ego casts Alter in the role of an object to be manipulated for the gratification of his own needs (or, equivalently, takes the role of egoist for himself), then he will engage in behavior that does not take Alter’s security needs into account in anything but a purely instrumental sense. If Alter correctly reads Ego’s “perspective” he will “reflect” Ego’s “appraisal” back on himself, and conclude that he has no standing or rights in this relationship. This will threaten Alter’s basic needs, and as such rather than simply accept this positioning Alter will adopt an egoistic identity himself (egoism being a response to the belief that others will not meet one’s needs), and act accordingly toward Ego. Eventually, by repeatedly engaging in practices that ignore each other’s needs, or practices of power politics, Alter and Ego will create and internalize the shared knowledge that they are enemies, locking in a Hobbesian structure. The self-fulfilling prophecy here, in other words, is “Realism” [sic] itself.50 If states start out thinking like “Realists” then that is what they will teach each other to be, and the kind of anarchy they will make.

### We are the best form of political activity – the best politics are found in individual ontologies, not policy arguments.

**Kay 03** (Sarah; Professor of French and Occitan Literature at the University of Cambridge; Žižek: A Critical Introduction; Cambridge: Polity; 2003; p. 152-155)

As I said when discussing Badiou's concept of the 'event' (in chapter 5), it is not self-evident what constitutes an 'event' (or an 'act'). Examples of what Žižek calls 'acts' vary widely in scope and impact. At the lowest level of agape there is a kind of Pollyanna-ish 'saying "Yes!" to life in its mysterious synchronic multitude' *(Fragile Absolute,* 103; also *Fright,* 172; cf. *Ticklish Subject, 150).* Then there is the *fait divers* of Mary Kay Letourneau's affair with a boy under the age of consent. Some characters in works of literature or film perform an 'act' when they sacrifice what they hold dearest, committing what Žižek calls 'a strike against the self'. An example is Kevin Spacey's shooting of his own wife and daughter, who are being held hostage by rival gangsters, in *The Usual Suspects (Fragile Absolute, 149-50).* Others literary characters, like Antigone and Sygne, or Sophie in *Sophie's Choice (Enjoy!,* 70ff), act in such a way as to kill themselves, whether physically, symbolically or both. When we move to the political dimension, and the act is no longer the affair just of an individual, there is a marked raising of the stakes. Talk is no longer about renunciation or suicide, but terror. The historical Terror of the French Revolution is a constant reference point, and we learn that 'there is something inherently terroristic in every authentic act' *(Ticklish Subject, 377).* The 'political act *par excellence'* (ibid.) would be revolution, even though that seems not to be an option today. On the other hand, Nazism and Stalinism fail to qualify as events (or acts), because (says Žižek) they don't emerge *ex nihilo,* and nor do they institute a paradigm change; instead, they rely on appeal to some 'global order of being' *(Ticklish Subject, 132 -* the wrong kind of universal?).16 He reaches the same conclusion *vis-a-vis* the events of September 11, 2001, which, one might have thought, have some claim to be read as an act, since they involved multiple suicide, declarations that the world would never be the same again, and the forging of a new universal movement against terrorism." Yet Žižek stresses instead how the bombings were already internal to American fantasy, and how what seemed like an external irruption against the USA was in fact 'a distilled version of our own essence', the reversion upon us of centuries of Western violence. So far, in his view, the new is yet to emerge from these events. He exhorts us not to be deterred by such pseudo-acts, but to 'search even more stringently for the "good terror"' *(Ticklish Subject,* 378). The problem is that the 'good terror' is as elusive as the 'good universal'. It is a blow for change that Žižek recognizes as coming from the Left - that is, from where he positions himself - but that is impossible to anchor in any other way. Saying 'Yes!' to life could be more of an act than bombing the World Trade Centre. As Grigg puts it, 'there is no objective criterion and there can clearly be no appeal to any subjective features to distinguish an act of absolute freedom from a gratuitous act' ('Absolute Freedom', 123).18 Of course, Grigg's critique doesn't say anything Žižek would not agree with. The whole point of the act, for Žižek, is that the subject surrenders all guarantees and gives up its *objet a* [fantasy-object]as a hostage to fortune. The act is perilous, but it has to be: the purgative force of the death drive is the only force adequate to cauterize the wound of civilization, whether it be individual 'castration' or political subjection. As another of Zizek's favourite quotations has it, 'the wound can only be healed by the spear that smote you':19 it is only by momentarily suspending symbolization that its terms can be altered. Hope, freedom and agency can come only through madness. Such a concept of the act is incompatible with political calculation. This is not to say that Žižek does not believe in political activity. But activity does not have the capacity for radical change that is born with the act." The choice, as he repeatedly says, is between bad and worse: worse is better than bad if good will follow. There is a striking combination of optimism and pessimism in this view: pessimism about the situation as it is, optimism that it could be transformed. What is the therapeutic basis for this optimism? Žižek's theorization of the act varies in this regard. Broadly speaking, he remains within the framework of Lacan’s definition according to which 'an act *[acte],* a true act, always has an element of structure, by the fact of concerning a real that is not self-evidently caught up in it' *(Seminar XI, 50).* In Lacan, the *acte* isdistinct from hysterical 'acting out', and also from the *passage a l'acte,* a psychotic impulse in which the subject's relation to the symbolic order is suspended, and the subject as such therefore ceases to exist, but is instead objectified." The true act - like a praxis, as he defines it at the beginning of *Seminar XI* when defining psychoanalysis itself - is a way to 'treat the real by [means of] the symbolic' (15). This phrase is echoed in *Contingency* when Žižek says: Precisely because of this internality of the Real to the Symbolic, it is possible to touch the Real through the Symbolic - that is the whole point of Lacan’s notion of psychoanalytic treatment; this is what the Lacanian notion of the psychoanalytic act is about - the act as a gesture which, by definition, touches the dimension of some impossible Real. (*Contingency*, 121) In *Enjoy!* Žižek nevertheless seems to inflect the term in the direction of Lacan's *passage a l'acte.* In the second chapter he uses examples of suicidal behaviour from Rosselini’s films that recall Freud's case study of the young homosexual woman who tried to kill herself in an act of desperate self-abdication - the case which, for Lacan, typifies the *passage a l'acte.* For example, when the character Edmund in Rosselini's *Germany, Year Zero* commits suicide, Žižek says that 'he passes over to the act' *(Enjoy!, 35).* This bent continues at least to *The Ticklish Subject,* where, in the course of an argument with Badiou, Žižek criticizes him for opposing the 'full revolutionary *passage a l'acte' (Enjoy!, 166).* More recent writings have refocused his understanding of the act. An important passage in *On Belief (81-5)* picks up but modifies a note in *Enjoy!* where Žižek plots the concept of act through the registers of symbolic, imaginary and real." The act, he now says explicitly, is not the hysterical 'acting out' (of the imaginary), nor an act/edict (of the symbolic), nor yet again the psychotic *passage a l'acte* (of the real). 'The act proper is the only one which restructures the very symbolic co-ordinates of the agent's situation: it is an intervention in the course of which the agent's identity itself is radically changed' (On Belief, 85). This passage continues with a comparison between the act and belief. This shift towards symbolic responsibility is evident too in the roughly contemporary Contingency,Hegemony, Universality (121-2): So when we are reproached by an opponent for doing something unacceptable, an act occurs when we no longer defend ourselves by accepting the underlying premiss that we hitherto shared with the opponent; in contrast, we fully accept the reproach, changing the very terrain that made it unacceptable - an act occurs when our answer to the reproach is 'Yes, that is precisely what I am doing'. It seems to me that the licence Žižek gives himself vis-a-vis Lacan serves two purposes. First, it enables him both to keep and to reverse Lacan's formula whereby, via the act, we can 'treat the real by means of the symbolic'. The act, as Žižek understands it, will also 'treat the symbolic by means of the real' - that is, allow us to reboot in the real so as to start up our relationship with the symbolic afresh. Second, it means that he effects a convergence between Lacan's acte, which belongs on the side of the analyst, and Lacan's passage a l'acte, which belongs on the side of the patient. In so doing, Žižek has brought together the two halves of the analytic scene in a way which I signalled in my Introduction a propos the anecdote of his therapy with Miller, where Žižek scripts himself as both analyst and patient. [The psychoanalytic term *object a*, which designates the object of fantasy, has been translated in brackets to “fantasy object” for coherence – FMK]

## Security K stuff

### Rejecting the affirmative’s discourse solves

**Neocleous, 8**[Mark Neocleous Professor of the Critique of Political Economy at Brunel University, 2008 “Critique of Security”]

The only way out of such a dilemma, to escape the fetish, is perhaps to eschew the logic of security altogether - to reject it as so ideologically loaded in favour of the state that any real political thought other than the authoritarian and reactionary should be pressed to give it up. That is clearly something that can not be achieved within the limits of bourgeois thought and thus could never even begin to be imagined by the security intellectual. It is also something that the constant iteration of the refrain 'this is an insecure world' and reiteration of one fear, anxiety and insecurity after another will also make it hard to do. But it is something that the critique of security suggests we may have to consider if we want a political way out of the impasse of security. This impasse exists because security has now become so all-encompassing that it marginalises all else, most notably the constructive conflicts, debates and discussions that animate political life. The constant prioritising of a mythical security as a political end - as the political end - constitutes a rejection of politics in any meaningful sense of the term. That is, as a mode of action in which differences can be articulated, in which the conflicts and struggles that arise from such differences can be fought for and negotiated, in which people might come to believe that another world is possible - that they might transform the world and in turn be transformed. Security politics simply removes this; worse, it removes it while purportedly addressing it. In so doing it suppresses all issues of power and turns political questions into debates about the most efficient way to achieve 'security', despite the fact that we are never quite told - never could be told - what might count as having achieved it. Security politics is, in this sense, an anti-politics,141 dominating political discourse in much the same manner as the security state tries to dominate human beings, reinforcing security fetishism and the monopolistic character of security on the political imagination. We therefore need to get beyond security politics, not add yet more 'sectors' to it in a way that simply expands the scope of the state and legitimises state intervention in yet more and more areas of our lives. Simon Dalby reports a personal communication with Michael Williams, co-editor of the important text Critical Security Studies, in which the latter asks: if you take away security, what do you put in the hole that's left behind? But I'm inclined to agree with Dalby: maybe there is no hole.142 The mistake has been to think that there is a hole and that this hole needs to be filled with a new vision or revision of security in which it is re-mapped or civilised or gendered of humanised or expanded or whatever. All of these ultimately remain within the statist political imaginary, and consequently end up reaffirming the state as the terrain of modern politics, the grounds of security. The real task is not to fill the supposed hole with yet another vision of security, but to fight for an alternative political language which takes us beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois security and which therefore does not constantly throw us into the arms of the state. That's the point of critical politics: to develop a new political language more adequate to the kind of society we want. Thus while much of what I have said here has been of a negative order, part of the tradition of critical theory is that the negative may be as significant as the positive in setting thought on new paths. For if security really is the supreme concept of bourgeois society and the fundamental thematic of liberalism, then to keep harping on about insecurity and to keep demanding 'more security' (while meekly hoping that this increased security doesn't damage our liberty) is to blind ourselves to the possibility of building real alternatives to the authoritarian tendencies in contemporary politics. To situate ourselves against security politics would allow us to circumvent the debilitating effect achieved through the constant securitising of social and political issues, debilitating in the sense that 'security' helps consolidate the power of the existing forms of social domination and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms. It would also allow us to forge another kind of politics centred on a different conception of the good. We need a new way of thinking and talking about social being and politics that moves us beyond security. This would perhaps be emancipatory in the true sense of the word. What this might mean, precisely, must be open to debate. But it certainly requires recognising that security is an illusion that has forgotten it is an illusion; it requires recognising that security is not the same as solidarity; it requires accepting that insecurity is part of the human condition, and thus giving up the search for the certainty of security and instead learning to tolerate the uncertainties, ambiguities and 'insecurities' that come with being human; it requires accepting that 'securitizing' an issue does not mean dealing with it politically, but bracketing it out and handing it to the state; it requires us to be brave enough to return the gift.

### Reject their impacts – Their epistemology is flawed

**Neocleous 08** (Mark is a Professor at Brunel; Head of Department of Politics & History, he joined Brunel University in the Department of Government in 1994. “CRITIQUE OF SECURITY”, 2008. Pg. 182-183)

I have been arguing, then, that the ideology of security shaped a whole tranche of academic work within the social sciences, which then reinforced the very project being undertaken in the name of security, to the extent that dominant paradigms within the social sciences concerning development, modernization, mass communication and political culture were in fact part and parcel of the paradigm of domination, as Simpson puts it. This is not to say that every scholar in these disciplines was some kind of political lackey – the US state’s role in Vietnam came under fire from some Southeast Asia specialists, its policy concerning Pakistan came under fire from some within South Asian studies, its role in Latin America came under fire from some of those working in Latin America studies, and the same can be said for its role in Middle East politics. My point, rather, is that most of the major and many of the minor concepts used within the disciplines I have been discussing were shaped by a political project that under its broadest label could be called the search for security. Far from being autonomous disciplines, never mind ones founded with a critical political edge, these disciplines were central to the ideological growth of the logic of security, part of the discursive economy built up to project the logic of security across the face of the globe. They become crucial capillaries for the dissemination and articulation of the meaning, production and spread of a certain kind of knowledge oriented around the idea of security, and their key thinkers became the ‘organic intellectuals’ of the security state, accepting, parroting and legitimizing the official security policy of the hegemonic power, the political economy of security, and the logic of security as a whole. They were well equipped to serve in this way because their categories of analysis, particularly their conceptions of power, knowledge and order were no different from those found in the political rhetoric of the state itself.

### Events may be objective but danger and framing isn’t – the perception of threat is pure construction

**Campbell 92** (David, Professor of Political Geography at the University of Durham, Writing Security)

Furthermore, the role of interpretation in the articulation of dan­ger is not restricted to the process by which some risks come to be considered more serious than others. An important function of interpretation is the way that certain modes of representation crystallize around referents marked • as dangers. Given the often tenuous relation­ship between an interpretation of danger and the "objective" incidence of behaviors and factors thought to constitute it, the capacity for a particular risk to be represented in terms of characteristics re­viled in the community said. to be threatened can be an important impetus to an interpretation of danger. As later chapters will demonstrate, the ability to represent things as alien, subversive, dirty, or sick has been pivotal to the articulation of danger in the American experience. In this context, it is also important to note that there need not be an action or event to provide the grounds for an interpretation of dan­ger. The mere existence of an alternative mode of being, the presence of which exemplifies that different identities are possible and thus de­naturalizes the claim of a particular identity to be the true identity, is sometimes enough to produce the understanding of a threat' In con­sequence, only in these terms is it possible to understand how some acts of international power politics raise not a whit of concern, while something as seemingly unthreatening as the novels of a South Amer­ican writer can be considered such a danger to national security that his exclusion from the country is warranted.' For both insurance and international relations, therefore, danger results from the calculation of a threat that objectifies events, disciplines relations, and sequesters an ideal of the identity of the people said to be at risk.

### Their assumptions result in policy failure

**Dillon 2k** [Michael Dillon, Professor of Political Science at Lancaster and internationally renowed author and Julian Reid, lecturer on international relations and progessor of political Science at King’s College in Longon, “Governance, Liberal Peace, and Complex Emergency”]

**As a precursor to global governance**, governmentality, **according to Foucault's initial account**, poses the question of order not in terms of the origin of the law and the location of sovereignty, **as do traditional accounts of power**, but in terms instead of the management of population. **The management of population** is furtherrefined in terms of specific problematics to which population management may be reduced. These typically include but are not necessarily exhausted by the following topoi of governmental power:economy, health, welfare, poverty, security, sexuality, demographics, resources, skills, culture, and so on. Now**,** where there is an operation of power there is knowledge, and where there is knowledge there is an operation of power**.** Here discursive formations emerge **and, as Foucault noted, in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality.[ 34]** More specifically, where there is a policy problematic there is expertise, and where there is expertise there, too, a policy problematic will emerge. Such problematics are detailed and elaborated in terms of discrete forms of knowledge as well as interlocking policy domains.Policy domains reify the problematization of life in certain ways by turning these epistemically and politically contestable orderings of life into "problems" that require the continuous attention of policy science and the continuous resolutions of policymakers. Policy "actors" develop and compete on the basis of the expertise that grows up around such problems or clusters of problems and their client populations**. Here, too, we may also discover what might be called** "epistemic entrepreneurs.**" Albeit the market for discourse is prescribed and policed in ways that Foucault indicated,** bidding to formulate novel problematizations they seek to "sell" these, or otherwise have them officially adopted. **In principle, there is no limit to the ways in which the management of population may be problematized. All aspects of human conduct, any encounter with life, is problematizable**. Any problematization is capable of becominga policy problem. Governmentality thereby creates a market for policy, for science and for policy science, in which problematizations go looking for policy sponsors while policy sponsors fiercely compete on behalf of their favored problematizations.Reproblematization of problems is constrained by the institutional and ideological investments surrounding accepted "problems," and by the sheer difficulty of challenging the inescapable ontological and epistemological assumptions that go into their very formation. There is nothing so fiercely contested as an epistemological or ontological assumption**.** And there is nothing so fiercely ridiculed as the suggestion that the real problem with problematizations exists precisely at the level of such assumptions**.** Such "paralysis of analysis" is precisely what policymakers seek to avoid since they are compelled constantly to respond to circumstances over which they ordinarily have in fact both more and less control than they proclaim**.** What they do not have is precisely the control that they want. **Yet serial policy failure--the fate and the fuel of all policy--compels them into a continuous search for the new analysis that will extract them from the aporias in which they constantly find themselves enmeshed.[ 35**] Serial policy failure is no simple shortcoming that science and policy--and policy science--will ultimately overcome. Serial policy failure is rooted in the ontological and epistemological assumptions that fashion the ways in which global governance encounters and problematizes life as a process of emergence through fitness landscapes that constantly adaptive and changing ensembles have continuously to negotiate**.** As a particular kind of intervention into life, global governance promotes the very changes and unintended outcomes that it then serially reproblematizes in terms of policy failure**.**

### Security rhetoric furthers the perpetual threat of destruction and justifies unending, state-sanctioned violence.

**Coviello 2000** [Peter Coviello, assistant professor of English at Bowdoin College, “Apocalypse From Now On”, 2000]

Perhaps. But to claim that American culture is at present decisively postnuclear is not to say that the world we inhabit is in any way post-apocalyptic. Apocalypse, as I began by saying, changed – it did not go away. And here I want to hazard my second assertion: if, in the nuclear age of yesteryear, apocalypse signified an event threatening everyone and everything with (in Jacques Derrida’s suitably menacing phrase) “remainderless and a-symbolic destruction,” then in the postnuclear world apocalypse is an affair whose parameters are definitively local. In shape and in substance, apocalypse is defined now by the affliction it brings somewhere else, always to an “other” people whose very presence might then be written as a kind of dangerous contagion, threatening the safety and prosperity of a cherished “general population.” This fact seems to me to stand behind Susan Sontag’s incisive observation, from 1989, that, “Apocalypse is now a long running serial: not ‘Apocalypse Now’ but ‘Apocalypse from Now On.’” The decisive point here in the perpetuation of the threat of apocalypse (the point Sontag goes on, at length, to miss) is that the apocalypse is ever present because, as an element in a vast economy of power, it is ever useful. That is, though the perpetual threat of destruction – through the constant reproduction of the figure of the apocalypse – the agencies of power ensure their authority to act on and through the bodies of a particular population. No one turns this point more persuasively than Michel Foucault, who in the final chapter of his first volume of *The History of Sexuality* addressess himself to the problem of a power that is less repressive than productive, less life-threatening than, in his words, “life-administering.” Power, he contends, “exerts a positive influence on life … [and] endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations.” In his brief comments on what he calls “the atomic situation,” however, Foucault insists as well that the productiveness of modern power must not be mistaken for a uniform repudiation of violent or even lethal means. For as “managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race,” agencies of modern power presume to act “on the behalf of the existence of everyone.” Whatsoever might be construed as a threat to life and survival in this way serves to authorize any expression of force, no matter how invasive, or, indeed, potentially annihilating. “If genocide is indeed the dream of modern power,” Foucault writes, “this is not because of a recent return to the ancient right to kill’ it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population.” For a state that would arm itself not with the power to kill its population, but with a more comprehensive power over the patters and functioning of its collective life, the threat of an apocalyptic demise, nuclear or otherwise, seems a civic initiative that can scarcely be done without.

# Topicality

## SETI

1. Increase is defined as a direct augmentation

Random House Webster’s College Dictionary 96

Increase: 1) to make greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality; augment 2) to become greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality 3) to multiply by propagation 4) growth or augmentation in size, strength, quality 5) the act or process of increasing

2. Space exploration is defined as investigation by means of spacecraft

Encyclopedia Britannica 95 (http://www.uv.es/EBRIT/macro/macro\_5002\_27\_23.html) OP

Space exploration may be defined as the investigation, by means of spacecraft, of all the reaches of the universe beyond the atmosphere of the Earth. Spacecraft, vehicles that operate above the Earth's atmosphere, include sounding rockets, Earth satellites, and lunar, planetary, and deep space probes.

# Prizes CP Addendum

## 1NC Heg NB

### Private sector is key to heg—cheaper tech, our own launch pads, better innovation

**Walker 11** (Robert S. Walker is former chairman of the President’s Commission on the Future of Aerospace and former chairman of the U.S. House Science Committee. He is currently executive chairman of the Washington lobbying firm Wexler & Walker Public Policy Associates. “A Powerful Case for Commercial Space” <http://spacenews.com/commentaries/110502-powerful-case-for-commercial-space.html> //)

The Russians are giving us an excellent view of what to expect once the shuttle has been retired and they are the exclusive transport to the space station. Just recently they announced a new price increase from $56 million to $63 million per astronaut. Once American commercial launch providers have qualified their vehicles for crew delivery, the cost is thought to be on the order of $20 million per astronaut. And their anticipated timetable for achieving that capability is considerably shorter than the NASA heavy-lift vehicle, a rocket that would not really be very useful for low orbit activity anyway. So, for those in the Congress who worry about our reliance on the Russians for space station transport, the answer is more investment in the commercial option. What needs to be realized is that it is not only the civilian space programs that benefit from the growth of a commercial space industry. Our military needs also can be en hanced by competition. Fixed-price contracts for delivery of services can replace cost-plus contracts. Payloads hosted on commercial satellites can give the Pentagon lower-cost options for many of its missions. As launch costs come down because of the efficiencies that commercial providers bring to the market, traditional contractors will have to find ways to lower their costs as well. And vigorous competition among a wide range of providers, launch and satellite, will mean a broader industry with the capacity to contribute more to the national economy and the national defense. For those who worry about our ability to compete internationally in the space arena, the commercial option offers much hope. We already are beginning to see the cost curve favor American launchers over their foreign competition, including the Chinese. When we have affordable launch, the result will be a better business climate for our satellite manufacturers. That, in turn, will lead to the survival of third-, fourth- and fifth-tier industrial suppliers, meaning less need to purchase components offshore. What we know after 50 years of space history is that each time we have seen technology mature to the point the investors and entrepreneurs can see real business potential, the role of space in our lives has expanded and the benefits to our economy and our national security have been enhanced. Communication, GPS and remote sensing have all contributed significantly to our national well-being and have become more valuable the longer they have been market-driven. Today, commercial space entrepreneurs appear to have a better grasp of the complex formula of resources, risk, technology, vision and imagination that define space leadership than do government bureaucracies. Tapping that asset will carry us forward to remarkable new adventures and discoveries.

### Great power war

**Zhang and Shi 11**(Yuhan Zhang is a researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C. Lin Shi is from Columbia University. She also serves as an independent consultant for the Eurasia Group and a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, D.C. “America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry” <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/> //)

Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

## 2nc NASA Fails

### Tons of barriers to NASA innovation

Krombach 11 **(**Leah, “Public or Private: How to Save NASA” <http://www.english.umd.edu/sites/default/files/interpolations/pdf/krombach1.pdf> /)

Although continued survival of NASA is essential for the reasons stated above, it cannot stay afloat the way it is currently operating. Even if NASA eliminated waste, fraud and abuse, and ran a more efficient space program by prioritizing programs and getting rid of the ones that eat up the budget, it would not be enough. In the end, Congress, which authorizes and appropriates a certain amount of money to NASA yearly to fund all its projects, has the ability to cut NASA’s funding at any time, and they do so because of the country‘s massive debt. The United States has fallen into a recession and the government has to fund hundreds of agencies who all need more money yearly; there is just not enough money to go around. Senator Richard Shelby of Alabama stated in a press conference, “If this budget is enacted, NASA will no longer be an agency of innovation and hard science. It will be the agency of pipe dreams and fairy tales" (Shelby). Senator Shelby warns that if NASA’s budget keeps getting cut, the agency will not be able to perform all of its scientific advancement, and there would be no point having NASA around at all. NASA needs to find a way to continue functioning by cutting back more of its programs.

### Long term budgeting issues jack your offense

Krombach 11 (Leah, “Public or Private: How to Save NASA” <http://www.english.umd.edu/sites/default/files/interpolations/pdf/krombach1.pdf> /)

I saw Gabriel was saddened by this statement, so I asked him how long it usually took for an idea to be made into something that could actually be sent into space. He said it could take ten years or more for something to get off the drawing board and go through testing until it could be completed and sent into space. I then asked him why it took so long. He replied that usually the deal breaker was that NASA had to wait for funding to come from the government, even when the design was finalized. Gabriel noted that a lot of projects do not even get funding for prime time after years of work. Funding could be delayed many times, or NASA would have to wait for the next time the government would allocate a new technology grant. He said he even had a project he was working on years ago that the government promised it would fund but cut funding at the last moment. He said there are so many great ideas at JPL, so much they could do, but there is just not enough money to do it all. It was this experience that led me to realize that NASA needed reform.

## 2NC Solvency—Innovation

### The market rules, increased flexibility, the same brilliant minds, and sufficient funding guarantees solvency for the X-prize, NASA just mucks up the process with politics

Murphy 5 (Robert Murphy is an adjunct scholar of the Mises Institute. He teaches economics at Hillsdale College “The Free Market in Space” <http://mises.org/freemarket_detail.aspx?control=525> //)

On October 4, 2004, the privately funded SpaceShip-One climbed to an altitude of over 70 miles, clinching the $10 million "X Prize." Many analysts were excited by the prospects for commercial space travel, and the day when orbital or even interplanetary flights would be affordable for the average person. As if to rebut the naysayers who dismissed SpaceShipOne as a mere tourist attraction for millionaires, Las Vegas hotel magnate Robert Bigelow capitalized on the event by announcing a $50 million prize for the first team to put a privately funded space station into orbit. Beyond the obvious implications for sci-fi buffs and other space enthusiasts, the episode sheds light on the versatility of free enterprise. Most obvious, we see that the government is not necessary for space exploration; engineers and pilots do not suddenly become smarter when they are hired by NASA. Indeed, because a free market in space industries would be open to all competitors, we have every reason to expect technological innovation to be much quicker than in a monopolized space program. In a free market, the maverick pioneer just needs to convince one or a few capitalists (out of thousands) to finance his revolutionary project, and then the results will speak for themselves. In contrast, an innovative civil servant at NASA needs to convince his direct superiors before trying anything new. If his bosses happen to dislike the idea, that’s the end of it. Prior to the exploits of SpaceShipOne, the standard justification for government involvement in space was that such undertakings were "too expensive" for the private sector. But what does this really mean? The Apollo moon program certainly didn’t create labor and other resources out of thin air. On the contrary, the scientists, unskilled workers, steel, fuel, computers, etc. that went into NASA in the 1960s were all diverted from other industries and potential uses. The government spent billions of dollars putting Neil Armstrong on the moon, and consequently the American taxpayers had billions fewer dollars to spend on other goods and services. This is just another example of what Frédéric Bastiat described in his famous essay, "That Which Is Seen, and That Which Is Not Seen." Whenever the government creates some public work, everyone can see the obvious benefits. For example, everyone can appreciate the fact that we put a US flag on the moon, and listened as Neil Armstrong apparently flubbed his memorized line. Or to use a more mundane example, everyone can see a beautiful new sports stadium financed (in part) by tax dollars. What people can’t see are the thousands of other goods and services that now won’t be enjoyed, because the scarce resources necessary for their production were devoted to the government project. Politicians may break moral laws, but they can’t evade economic ones: If they send a man to the moon (or build a new stadium), consumers necessarily must curtail their enjoyments of other goods. Thus the question becomes: Was the Apollo program (or new stadium) sufficiently valued by consumers to outweigh its opportunity cost (i.e., the value consumers place on the goods that now cannot be produced)? At first glance, this seems to be a difficult question to answer. After all, how can we possibly compare the benefits of the Apollo program with, say, the benefits of the additional shoes, diapers, automobiles, research on cancer, etc. that could have been alternatively produced? The short answer is, we can’t. This is just a specific example of the more general principle elaborated by Ludwig von Mises: the impossibility of economic calculation under socialism. Even if a central planning board were truly benevolent, and even if it had access to all of the technical conditions (such as resource supplies and technological recipes) of the economy, the planners would be at a loss to deploy the scarce resources in an efficient way. There would be no way to determine whether the chosen output goals were good ones, or whether an alternative plan could have provided the subjects with a better outcome. The above analysis might puzzle the reader. Yes, it is certainly difficult in practice to tell whether the Apollo program (or any other government project) is worth its cost, but isn’t that true of any undertaking? Why should this be a unique drawback for government endeavors? The crucial difference is that private projects are subject to the profit and loss test. The owner of a private firm must pay market prices for all of his or her scarce resources. If the consumers do not then voluntarily spend enough money on the final product or service to recoup these expenditures, this is the market’s signal that the resources are more urgently needed in other lines (according to the consumers). It can never be the case that all entrepreneurs find a particular resource "too expensive" to use; if no entrepreneurs were buying it, then the price of this resource would fall until some did. For example, it would be unprofitable—"wasteful"—to use gold in the construction of bridges; the extra money motorists would pay to drive across a golden bridge would not cover the additional expense. Yet it is profitable to use gold in the construction of necklaces or rings. Consumers are willing to pay enough for golden necklaces (versus silver or copper ones) that it makes it worthwhile for jewelers to buy gold for this purpose. Hence, the high price of gold is (among other things) a signal to engineers not to use gold in building bridges, because consumers would rather the scarce metal be used in jewelry. The principle is the same when it comes to space travel. The reason private entrepreneurs would never have financed the moon program in the 1960s is that the financial returns from such a project wouldn’t come close to covering the expenses. Yet this is just the market’s way to tell these entrepreneurs that the computers, scientists’ labor, fuel, etc. would be better devoted to other ends. By seizing tax dollars and financing the Apollo program, President Kennedy et al. simply forced Americans to forgo the thousands of products that, according to their own spending decisions, they would have preferred to the space adventures. Is this perspective crude materialism? Surely, there are all sorts of things that are not profitable in the narrow sense, and yet are of tremendous importance to humanity. Consequently, are we not in need of noble politicians acting in the public interest? Well, consider the $10 million dollar X Prize. This was a gift designed to promote space exploration. The same is true of Bigelow’s $50 million prize. The private sector’s promotion of abstract knowledge (as opposed to practical, marketable discoveries) is nowhere better demonstrated than in the Clay Mathematics Institute’s million dollar awards for the solution to any of seven important problems. Historically, there were many rich patrons of the arts and science; didn’t the Vatican pay Michelangelo not only to create beautiful art but also to increase donations? Indeed, it is a common misconception that in the free market, "the highest bidder" determines things. No, in a free market, the owner determines the use of a piece of property. When a man lets his teenage son take the car for the night, is he renting it to the highest bidder? Of course not. A system of property rights, and the freely floating prices that accompany the exchange of these rights, is necessary to ensure the best possible use of resources. This is true in something as mundane as car production, or something as exotic as trips to Mars. The private sector can finance safe and efficient space exploration, but it will only do so in projects where the benefits (including donations from enthusiasts) truly outweigh the costs. The success of SpaceShipOne illustrates these facts. Now that the public has seen the potential of private space flight, perhaps it will become politically possible to axe NASA and return its budget to the private sector. .FM

### Everyone loves prizes—we have a laundry list of examples that prove the cp will solve R&D better

Economist 10 (“And the winner is… Offering a cash prize to encourage innovation is all the rage. Sometimes it works rather well” <http://www.economist.com/node/16740639> //)

The foundation began with the Ansari X Prize: $10m to the first private-sector group able to fly a reusable spacecraft 100km (62 miles) into space twice within two weeks. It was won in 2004 by a team led by Burt Rutan, a pioneering aerospace engineer, and Paul Allen, a co-founder of Microsoft. Other prizes have followed, including the $10m Progressive Automotive X Prize, for green cars that are capable of achieving at least 100mpg, or its equivalent. Peter Diamandis, the entrepreneur who runs the foundation, says he has become convinced that “focused and talented teams in pursuit of a prize and acclaim can change the world.” This might sound like hyperbole, but other charities, including the Gates Foundation, have been sufficiently impressed to start offering their own prizes. An industry is now growing up around them, with some firms using InnoCentive, an online middleman, to offer prizes to eager problem-solvers. Now governments are becoming keen too. As a result, there is a surge in incentive prizes (see chart). Such prizes are not new. The Longitude Prize was set up by the British government in 1714 as a reward for reliable ways for mariners to determine longitude. And in 1795 Napoleon offered a prize to preserve food for his army, which led to the canned food of today. In more recent times incentive prizes have fallen out of favour. Instead, prizes tend to be awarded for past accomplishments—often a long time after the event. As T.S. Eliot remarked after receiving his Nobel prize, it was like getting “a ticket to one’s own funeral”. Incentive prizes do spur innovation. A study led by Liam Brunt of the Norwegian School of Economics scrutinised agricultural inventions in 19th-century Britain and found a link between prizes and subsequent patents. The Royal Agricultural Society awarded nearly 2,000 prizes from 1839 to 1939, some worth £1m ($1.6m) in today’s money. The study found that not only were prize-winners more likely to receive and renew patents, but that even losing contestants sought patents for more than 13,000 inventions. Today’s prizes appear to have a similar effect. The Ansari X Prize, for example, has attracted over $100m in investment into the (previously non-existent) private-sector space industry. The technology used by the winning spaceship is now employed by Virgin Galactic to develop a commercial space-travel service, and many of the losing contestants have formed companies in the burgeoning sector. The important thing about a well-designed prize, argues Dr Diamandis, is its power to “change what people believe to be possible”. Indeed, **they open up innovation**. A study co-authored by Karim Lakhani of Harvard Business School reviewed scores of problems solved on InnoCentive and found that people from outside the scientific or industry discipline in question were more likely to solve a challenge. **Prizes also help form new alliances**. Netflix, an American company that rents films, offered a $1m prize to anyone that could do a better job than its own experts in improving the algorithms it uses in online recommendations. It was stunned to receive entries from over 55,000 people in 186 countries. The seven members of the winning team, who collaborated online, met physically for the first time when they picked up the prize in 2009. Inspired by such successes, governments are now offering prizes. Britain, Canada, Italy, Russia and Norway, in co-operation with the Gates Foundation, are funding the Advanced Market Commitment (AMC) to develop vaccines for neglected diseases in the developing world. The AMC is offering $1.5 billion to drugs firms that can deliver low-priced vaccines for pneumococcal disease, a big killer of children. GlaxoSmithKline plans to deliver such vaccines to Africa next year. Alpheus Bingham, a co-founder of InnoCentive, says government agencies, ranging from America’s space agency, NASA, to the city of Chicago, now use his company’s platform to offer prizes. There is even a bill in the American Congress that would grant every federal agency the authority to issue prizes. Is this a good thing? Prizes used to promote a policy are vulnerable to political jiggery pokery, argues Lee Davis of the Copenhagen Business School. Thomas Kalil, a science adviser to Barack Obama, acknowledges the pitfalls but insists that incentive prizes offered by governments can work if well crafted. Indeed, he argues that **the very process of thinking critically about a prize’s objectives sharpens up the bureaucracy’s approach to big problems.** One success was NASA’s Lunar Lander prize, which was more cost-effective than the traditional procurement process, says Robert Braun, NASA’s chief technologist. Another example is the agency’s recent prize for the design of a new astronaut’s glove: the winner was not an aerospace firm but an unemployed engineer who has gone on to form a new company. When the objective is a technological breakthrough, clearly-defined prizes should work well. But there may be limits. Tachi Yamada of the Gates Foundation is a big believer in giving incentive prizes, but gives warning that it can take 15 years or more to bring a new drug to market, and that even AMC’s carrot of $1.5 billion for new vaccines may not be a big enough incentive. No prize could match the $20 billion or so a new blockbuster drug can earn in its lifetime. So, in some cases, says Dr Yamada, “market success is the real prize.”

### Empirics prove our argument—the market can travel to space efficiently and the competition created ensures that

Morgan 9 (Jaison G. Morgan is the lead manager of the Prize Development Department for the X PRIZE Foundation. The Department houses the intellectual property and knowhow that has enabled the successful design of over $60 million of inducement prizes. Over the next five years, the Foundation plans to launch between 10-15 additional prizes, representing a combined purse value of over $300 million. Morgan holds degrees from Hampden-Sydney College (BA) and the University of Chicago (MA) and is a frequent blogger and lecturer on the continuing evolution of prizes to induce innovative breakthroughs. “ Inducing Innovation Through Prizes” <http://www.usa.gov/webcontent/reqs_bestpractices/challenges/documents/InnovationsJournalFall08PrizesJaisonMorgan.pdf> //)

Offering prizes as a financial incentive to inspire innovative breakthroughs is a time-honored model (see Text Box, p.111).3 The most recent corollary for the Orteig Prize came from the X PRIZE Foundation, with the awarding of the Ansari X PRIZE in 2004. Once again, the model engaged commercial interests, changed public perceptions, and opened new markets. In 1996, the X PRIZE Foundation launched the first private race to space. Frustrated with the pace of innovation from government programs, Dr. Peter Diamandis developed a competition that offered a prize to the first privately financed team that reached an altitude of 100 kilometers carrying a payload equivalent of three passengers and capable of replicating the feat twice within two weeks.He cultivated a partnership with the Ansari family, which made possible the cash purse of $10 million. Over the course of eight years, the Ansari X PRIZE led to important developments in private space travel. Twenty-six teams from seven nations registered to compete,4 and the combined value of their efforts exceeded $100 million.5 The care-free reentry and cantilevered hybrid rocket motor technology developed by the winning team have both since evolved into commercial applications, and preflight sales of suborbital space tickets are showing promising interest. The winning spacecraft, SpaceShipOne, now hangs in the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum next to the Spirit of St. Louis. Whether or not private space travel will achieve the commercial success found in other civil aviation sectors has yet to be determined, but we can attribute many critical developments in the early formation of this new industry to the Ansari X PRIZE.

### CP solves innovation—it frees up more times for NASA to do other things

Changand and Bronstein 10’[Alicia and Seth, AP contributors for MSNBC, “NASA's space change: Renting the Right Stuff,” <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/35169753/ns/technology_and_science-space/t/nasas-space-change-renting-right-stuff/>]

Getting to space is about to be outsourced. The Obama administration on Monday will propose in its new budget spending billions of dollars to encourage private companies to build, launch and operate spacecraft for NASA and others. Uncle Sam would buy its astronauts a ride into space just like hopping in a taxi. The idea is that getting astronauts into orbit, which NASA has been doing for 49 years, is getting to be so old hat that someone other than the government can do it. It's no longer really the Right Stuff. Going private would free the space agency to do other things, such as explore beyond Earth's orbit, do more research and study the Earth with better satellites. And it would spur a new generation of private companies — even some with Internet roots — to innovate.

## 2NC Solvency Colonization/Exploration

### The cp is the only way we will ever be able to colonize space—NASA lacks ideas innovation and efficiency

Hudgins 4 (Edward L. Hudgins, director of The Objectivist Center, is the editor of the Cato Institute book, Space: The Free-Market Frontier. “Move Aside, NASA” <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=2514> //)

One reaction to President Bush's plan for a permanent moon base and a trip to Mars is, "Great! It's about time NASA stopped going around in circles in low Earth orbit and returns to real science and exploration." Unfortunately, there's not a snowball's chance in the sun that the same agency that currently is constructing a downsized version of its originally planned space station, decades behind schedule, at 10 times its original budget, a few hundred miles up in orbit, will be able to build a station several hundred thousand miles away on the moon. **If Americans are again to walk on the moon and make their way to Mars, NASA will actually need to be downsized and the private sector allowed to lead the way to the next frontier**. The lunar landings of over three decades ago were among the greatest human achievements. Ayn Rand wrote that Apollo 11 "was like a dramatist's emphasis on the dimension of reason's power." We were inspired at the sight of humans at our best, traveling to another world. In announcing NASA's new mission, President Bush echoed such sentiments, speaking of the American values of "daring, discipline, ingenuity," and "the spirit of discovery." But after the triumphs of Apollo, NASA failed to make space more accessible to mankind. There were supposed to be shuttle flights every week; instead, there have been about four per year. The space station was projected to cost $8 billion, house a crew of 12 and be in orbit by the mid-1990s. **Instead, its price tag will be $100 billion and it will have only a crew of three. Worse**, neither the station nor the shuttle does much important science. **Governments simply cannot provide commercial goods and services. Only private entrepreneurs can improve quality, bring down the prices, and make accessible to all individuals cars, airline trips, computers, the Internet, you name it**. Thus, to avoid the errors of the shuttle and space station, NASA's mission must be very narrowly focused on exploring the moon and planets, and perhaps conducting some basic research, which also might serve a defense function. This will mean leaving low Earth orbit to the private sector. Thus, the shuttle should be given away to private owners. The United Space Alliance, the joint venture between Boeing and Lockheed-Martin that refurbishes the shuttle between flights, would be an obvious candidate. Let a private owner fly it for paying customers--including NASA, if necessary -- if it is still worth flying. NASA also should give up the money-draining space station, and sooner rather than later. The station might be turned over to international partners or, better still, to the mostly private Russian rocket company, Energia -- and the Western investors who were in the process of commercializing and privatizing the Mir space station before the Russian government brought it down for political reasons. If need be, NASA can be a rent-paying station tenant. NASA centers that drive up its overall budget but do not directly contribute to its mission should be shut down. If the government wants to continue satellite studies of the climate and resources or other such functions, they could be turned over to other agencies, such as EPA and Interior Department. NASA and the rest of the government should contract for launch services with private companies, which would handle transportation to and from low Earth orbit. Contracting with private pilots with private planes is what the Post Office did in the 1920s and 1930s, which helped the emerging civil aviation sector. Further, to facilitate a strong private space sector, the government needs to further deregulate launches, export licensing and remove other barriers to entrepreneurs. Creating enterprise zones in orbit would help make up for government errors of the past. Rep. Dana Rohrabacher proposes a "Zero Gravity, Zero Tax" plan that would remove an unnecessary burden from "out-of-this-world risk-takers." NASA will also need to do business in new, innovative ways. For example, if a certain technology is needed for a moon mission, NASA could offer a cash prize for any party that can deliver it. The federal government used such an approach for aircraft before World War II, modeled after private prizes that helped promote civil aviation. Even if the federal government foots the bill for a moon base, it should not own it. Rather, NASA should partner with consortia of universities, private foundations and even businesses that are interested in advancing human knowledge and commercial activities. NASA could simply be a tenant on the base. Or consider a radical approach proposed by former Rep. Bob Walker. The federal government wouldn't need to spend any taxpayer dollars if it gave the first business to construct a permanent lunar base with its own money a 25-year exemption from all federal taxes on all of its operations, not just those on the Moon. Think of all the economic activity that would be generated if a Microsoft or General Electric decided to build a base! And the tax revenue from that activity probably would offset the government's revenue losses from such an exemption. If we're true to our nature, we will explore and settle planets. **But only individuals with vision, acting in a free market, will make us a truly space-faring civilization**.

## Perm Cards

### No solvency—any NASA intervention crowds out the private sector links to all of our turns

Hudgins 98 (Edward L. Hudgins, director of The Objectivist Center, is the editor of the Cato Institute book, Space: The Free-Market Frontier. “Time to Privatize NASA” <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5960> //)

The government has had many opportunities to turn over civilian space activities to the private sector. In the 1970s, American Rocket Co. was one of the private enterprises that wanted to sell launch services to NASA and private businesses. But NASA was moving from science to freight hauling, and planned to monopolize government payloads on the shuttle and subsidize launches of private cargo as well. The agency thus turned down American Rocket. In the late 1980s, Space Industries of Houston offered, for no more than $750 million, to launch a ministation that could carry government and other payloads at least a decade before NASA's station went into operation. (NASA's station currently comes with a price tag of nearly $100 billion for development, construction and operations.) NASA, not wishing to create its own competition, declined Space Industries' offer. In 1987 and 1988, a Commerce Department-led interagency working group considered the feasibility of offering a one-time prize and a promise of rent to any firm or consortium that could deliver a permanent manned moon base. When asked whether such a base were realistic, private-sector representatives answered yes -- **but only if NASA wasn't involved.** That plan was quickly scuttled. Each shuttle carries a 17-story external fuel tank 98 percent of the distance into orbit before dropping it into the ocean; NASA could easily -- and with little additional cost -- have promoted private space enterprise by putting those fuel tanks into orbit. With nearly 90 shuttle flights to date, platforms -- with a total of 27 acres of interior space -- could be in orbit today. These could be homesteaded by the private sector for hospitals to study a weightless Mr. Glenn or for any other use one could dream of. But then a $100 billion government station would be unnecessary. **As long as NASA dominates civilian space efforts**, **little progress will be made toward inexpensive manned space travel**. The lesson of Mr. Glenn's second flight is that space enthusiasts ignore economics at their peril.

### More evidence—smaller NASA key to spur the private sector

Gough 97 (Michael Gough is director of science and risk studies at the Cato Institute. “Don’t Lavish Funds on NASA” http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=6120 //)

These heady Sojourner days are a time to examine NASA, not a time to lavish funds on it. To begin, the examination needs to separate NASA’s manned and unmanned programs. The manned vehicles are expensive and deliver few scientific or commercial payoffs. Cheap by comparison, the unmanned vehicles continue exploring the universe, the business that has excited us since NASA’s beginnings. But, successful or unsuccessful, NASA’s programs have crowded out commercial and nonprofit explorers. Should NASA funding end, private sources would take up the slack for worthwhile ventures into space.

### Zero permutation solvency – NASA empirically blocks private investment

Powers 3’ [Blake, Director of Outreach for NASA’s Space Product Development Program, “A Time for Everything,” August 24, <http://laughingwolf.net/archives/000400.html>]

At the same time, NASA has not exactly been a friend to commercial space enterprises. This is particularly true for efforts to develop alternative manned space access. NASA has a great deal invested in being the only way to get people into space, from hardware and infrastructure to an internal culture that claims that only career NASA civil servants can be called astronauts. All those others who fly, or meet the international guidelines for being called such, cannot be called such in any NASA publication. NASA has for years tried to block the development of manned commercial access. Just take a look at the regulatory environment for such and NASA’s role in it. NASA has bitterly resisted any suggestion that any other launch service be used, unless it was completely under their control. There are many other examples, for those who care to go do the homework and look them up. It’s official support of commercial activities has been limited. Despite various actions by Congress and its own charter, the agency has not been supportive of commercial research and development. Just go take a look at the history of the Space Product Development Program, which has managed to do some very important and good things with industry, for a good example. Take a good look at the so-called commercialization efforts of Dan Tam, or the idea that Headquarters had that companies would pay for large portions of the ISS without being able to display logos or use their sponsorship in advertising. Those ideas were patently ridiculous, obvious to anyone who had any real-world experience, and beloved by top NASA management who should have known better.

### Private sector key to development and commercialization of space—moon mission proves

CEN 7 [Chemical and Engineering News, “NASA Gets Ready to Revisit the Moon,” February 5, <http://pubs.acs.org/cen/government/85/8506gov1.html>]

Agency officials have already begun talks with several countries interested in being part of the lunar mission, and they also are looking for ways to involve the private sector. For its part, the private sector doing business in human space travel isn't waiting for NASA to get to the moon. In fact, some observers believe NASA should let the private sector develop the details of how to get to and from the moon and should focus instead on next-generation technologies, such as nuclear propulsion, which will enable deeper space travel. "NASA should be playing a Lewis and Clark function with respect to space travel," says Rick Tumlinson, president of X-Tremespace and Orbital Outfitters. In other words, he says, "NASA should go over the hill and tell us what's there. Then the private sector can go out there and figure out ways to utilize it and create wealth from it."

### Government control crowds out the private sector—kills innovation

Dinerman 7 [Taylor, editor and publisher of SpaceEquity.com, January 15, “Independent space colonization: questions and implications,” <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/784/1>]

In the long term the effort to impose controls on private space colonization by the use of a vague process of international consensus-seeking will create a reaction not only against the OST but against the whole idea that Earth governments should be allowed any say whatsoever in the governance of off-Earth activities. In the near term it is relatively easy for governments to impose their will on space activities, but when vehicles that can provide low-cost access to low Earth orbit are as available to the public as oceangoing private yachts, maintaining control will be much harder.

## 2NC Perm Do the CP

### a) Congress goes to work to make the cp not happen and they got all the power—not normal means

Zimmerman 4 (Robert Zimmerman, is an award-winning space historian, writing articles and books on issues of science, history, technology, and culture “Congress Impedes NASA Prizes” <http://www.spacedaily.com/news/nasa-04zt.html> //)

Worse, the legal and bureaucratic hurdles for NASA to offer an award for a human spaceflight, comparable to **the X Prize, are formidable.** When you talk about humans it involves other obstacles, Sponberg told United Press International. We've got to coordinate with (NASA's) Office of Mission Safety Assurance, with the office of the Chief Medical Officer, and this also involves the (Federal Aviation Administration). He added, We don't yet know whether we will be able to pursue a human mission or not.

Here, too, Congress has made no effort to grease the wheels and make it easier for NASA to encourage private human space travel. NASA officials have spent innumerable hours over the last few months lobbying Congress for some increased authority and have gotten nothing. In fact, the only bills pending in Congress specifically limit NASA from awarding any prize larger than $1 million. Yet Sponberg still thinks the program can get off the ground.

### b) Even if their ‘NASA contracts out’ ev talks about private companies doing stuff, that is still not what NASA normally does—vagueness in the plan should be punished otherwise affs are encouraged to not research creating lazy debates.

Zimmerman 4 (Robert Zimmerman, is an award-winning space historian, writing articles and books on issues of science, history, technology, and culture “Congress Impedes NASA Prizes” <http://www.spacedaily.com/news/nasa-04zt.html> //)

Under the agency's old way of doing business, officials decided what they wanted built, asked private companies to bid on building it, then awarded a contract to the lowest acceptable bidder - who often was located in an important Congressional district. Then, whether the project succeeded or not, NASA would pay out monies to the winning bidder, based on that bidder's predicted construction cost. For example, Lockheed Martin won the billion-dollar-plus contract to build the X-33 in 1996 on the basis of its radical engineering concept. The company then attempted to build it, pocketing $1.2 billion in fees. When the program was canceled due to engineering problems with the X-33's composite fuel tanks, no one expected Lockheed to give the money back. The Centennial Challenge Awards would follow a new paradigm, following the X Prize mode and hoping to repeat the success of SpaceShipOne, the winner of the $10 million purse and the first privately funded craft to carry a human occupant in a sub-orbital spaceflight. Winners will be determined by actual achievements, not proposals, said Brant Sponberg, NASA's award program manager at the Nov. 15 meeting as he outlined NASA's initial roadmap for the program. Sponberg explained to an audience of private commercial space developers - including Peter Diamandis of the X Prize Foundation and David Gump of t/Space - prize competitors will have to produce some results first before NASA will fork out any cash.