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\*\*\*CASE\*\*\*

Power Projection – A2 Can’t Supply Military

1. SPS is the most reliable method – it bypasses terrain to directly beam bases energy, cutting down supply chains and costs – that’s Dinerman

2. Their NRL ev isn’t relevant – it’s talking about beaming power directly to battery packs on soldiers’ backs, NOT a stationary rectenna – doesn’t affect our solvency

3. SPS key to military power projection and readiness through force mobility

Jeff Foust, Editor and publisher of the Space Review online journal, 8/13/2007, “A renaissance for space solar power?”, The Space Review, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/931/1>

Air Force Lt. Col. Michael “Coyote” Smith, leading the NSSO study, said during a session about space solar power at the NewSpace 2007 conference in Arlington, Virginia last month that the project had its origins in a study last year that identified energy, and the competition for it, as the pathway to “the worst nightmare war we could face in the 21st century.” If the United States is able to secure energy independence in the form of alternative, clean energy sources, he said, “that will buy us a form of security that would be phenomenal.” “The military would like nothing better than to have highly mobile energy sources that can provide our forces with some form of energy in those forward areas,” Smith said. At the same time, the DOD has been looking at alternative fuels and energy sources, given the military’s voracious appetite for energy, and the high expense—in dollars as well as lives—in getting that energy to troops deployed in places like Afghanistan and Iraq. Soldiers, he noted, use the equivalent of one AA battery an hour while deployed to power all their devices. The total cost of a gallon of fuel delivered to troops in the field, shipped via a long and, in places, dangerous supply chain, can run between $300 and $800, he said, the higher cost taking into account the death benefits of soldiers killed in attacks on convoys shipping the fuel. “The military would like nothing better than to have highly mobile energy sources that can provide our forces with some form of energy in those forward areas,” Smith said. One way to do that, he said, is with space solar power, something that Smith and a few fellow officers had been looking at in their spare time. They gave a briefing on the subject to Maj. Gen. James Armor, the head of the NSSO, who agreed earlier this year to commission a study on the feasibility of space solar power. There was one problem with those plans, Smith said: because this project was started outside of the budget cycle, there was no money available for him to carry out a conventional study. “I’ve got no money,” he said, “but I’ve got the ability to go out there and make friends, and friends are cheap.” So Smith and his cadre of friends have carried out the research for the study in the open, leveraging tools like Google Groups and a

blog that hosts discussions on the subject. Smith made it clear, though, that he’s not looking for a quick fix that will suddenly make solar power satellites feasible in the near term. “If I can close this deal on space-based solar power, it’s going to take a long time,” he said. “The horizon we’re looking at is 2050 before we’re able to do something significant.” The first major milestone, he said, would be a small demonstration satellite that could be launched in the next eight to ten years that would demonstrate power beaming from GEO. However, he added those plans could change depending on developments of various technologies that could alter the direction space solar power systems would go. “That 2050 vision, what that architecture will look like, is carved in Jell-O.” The idea of a demonstration satellite was endorsed by Shubber Ali, an entrepreneur and self-described “cynic” who also participated on the NewSpace panel. “The first step in this case needs to be a cheap, simple satellite, just to prove that we can beam power back down,” he said. A satellite that generated just 10 kilowatts of power—less than some commercial GEO communications satellites—could be developed for on the order of $100 million, he said. If space solar power is to become a reality, Smith said, it will have to be because of a “massive collaborative effort” in which the DOD will play a small, but not leading, role. Ali said there needs to be a “coalition of the willing” that includes the DOD and other government agencies like NASA and DOE, as well as “the usual suspects” in the commercial space sector, to help advance space solar power if it appears it can be feasible. That group, he said, should also include oil companies. “We like to think of ‘Big Oil’ as a big, ugly, evil set of companies that are just taking our money at the gas tank,” he explained, “but the reality is that they are not idiots and they do take the long view.” Smith agreed, and noted that his team had already met with some representatives off major oil companies, in part because “we realized we didn’t want to get ‘Tuckered’ out of the business,” a reference to Preston Tucker, who clashed with the established Detroit automakers in the 1940s. If space solar power is to become a reality, he said, it will have to be because of a “massive collaborative effort” in which the DOD will play a small, but not leading, role. “This is not the Department of Defense’s job. We do not want to be in the energy business, we don’t want to be a producer of energy,” he said. “We just want to be a customer of a clean energy resource that’s out there.”

India – A2 Oil Shale

Case outweighs and solves –

1. Middle East war outweighs – the terminal impact is global nuclear exchange as regional hostilities escalate – multiple nuclear actors like Israel, Pakistan and India ensure nuclear launch. The terminal impact to oil shale is literally ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.
2. SPS solves that better – provides lasting energy to military forces and ensures power projection – that’s Dinerman

If you didn’t read the Dinerman card (it’s in the Power Projection scenario):

SPS is key – provides the only sustainable power source to the military

Taylor Dinerman, senior editor at the Hudson Institute’s New York branch and co-author of the forthcoming Towards a Theory of Spacepower: Selected Essays, from National Defense University Press, 11/24/2008, “Space solar power and the Khyber Pass”, The Space Review, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1255/1

Last year the National Security Space Office released its initial report on space solar power (SSP). One of the primary justifications for the project was the potential of the system to provide power from space for remote military bases. Electrical power is only part of the story. If the military really wants to be able to operate for long periods of time without using vulnerable supply lines it will have to find a new way to get liquid fuel to its forward operating forces. This may seem impossible at first glance, but by combining space solar power with some of the innovative alternative fuels and fuel manufacturing systems that are now in the pipeline, and given enough time and effort, the problem could be solved. The trick is, of course, to have enough raw energy available so that it is possible to transform whatever is available into liquid fuel. This may mean something as easy as making methanol from sugar cane or making jet fuel from natural gas, or something as exotic as cellulosic ethanol from waste products. Afghanistan has coal and natural gas that could be turned into liquid fuels with the right technology. What is needed is a portable system that can be transported in standard containers and set up anywhere there are the resources needed to make fuel. This can be done even before space solar power is available, but with SSP it becomes much easier. In the longer run Pakistan’s closure of the Khyber Pass supply route justifies investment in SSP as a technology that landlocked nations can use to avoid the pressures and threats that they now have to live with. Without access to the sea, nations such as Afghanistan are all too vulnerable to machinations from their neighbors. Imagine how different history would be if the Afghans had had a “Polish Corridor” and their own port. Their access to the world economy might have changed their culture in positive ways. Bangladesh and Indonesia are both Muslim states whose access to the oceans have helped them adapt to the modern world.

Tech Spillover – A2 Tech Now

1. Try or die – only a risk aff develops MORE tech advancements at a faster rate because of government funded R&D

2. Tech obviously doesn’t exist now or SPS would already be commercially deployed – the key barrier is high cost launches which can only be solved through government funding

Solar High Study Program, “Solar High: Energy for the 21st Century”, March 2011, http://solarhigh.org/Overview.html//jchen

Space hardware is expensive. Satellite equipment is expensive because it is constructed in small quantities, by hand, in clean rooms. The mass production needed for power satellites will reduce these prices to terrestrial levels. In fact, the fabrication cost for a power satellite will be much less than for a comparable terrestrial solar power plant, because the solar array is much smaller. The current study by the Solar High Study Group indicates that technology available now permits a Block I power satellite to be built at a hardware cost of ~$8,500 per kilowatt. Foreseeable near-term advances are expected to reduce the cost of a Block II satellite to ~$4,000/kW. Building the rectenna would add ~$1000/kW to these figures. 2. SBSP requires a major expansion of space operations. While small compared to terrestrial solar arrays of similar output, power satellites are large compared to anything yet deployed in space. Note however that the massive effort needed to build generating capacity during the next 25 years will cost trillions of dollars, **regardless of the energy technologies that are used**. Developing SBSP will be a relatively modest but important part of that undertaking. 3. Spaceflight is too expensive for SBSP. If the energy needed to launch a payload to low Earth orbit (LEO) could be obtained at the current retail price of electricity**, the cost would be less than $1/kg.** Launch is expensive only because it is infrequent, and it is infrequent because it is expensive. Air travel would be equally expensive if Boeing built only four 777s each year, and if airlines scrapped the aircraft after each flight. SBSP provides the launch market needed to escape this Catch 22.

3. Their ev is terrible –

1. Mankins only proves companies are producing tech usable to MAKE SPS – our advantage is predicated off the REVERSE – SPS development spills over into further innovation and tech
2. Fan is an aff card – says that SPS will cause overall improvements on launch cost making space exploration possible

Tech Spillover – A2 Tech Now – Shuttles

SPS develops far more than shuttles – breakthroughs are key to all future space exploration

NSSO, National Security Space Office, 10/10/07, “Space‐Based Solar Power: As an Opportunity for Strategic Security”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473860&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf//jchen

FINDING:  The SBSP Study Group found that retirement of the SBSP technical challenges begets other significant strategic benefits for exploration, commerce and defense, that in‐and‐of‐themselves may justify a national program. • At present, the United States has very limited capabilities to build large structures, very large apertures or very high power systems in orbit.  It has very limited in‐space maneuver and operational capability, and very limited access to space.  It cannot at present move large amounts of mass into Earth orbit.  The United States correspondingly has extremely limited capabilities for in‐space manufacturing and construction or in‐situ space resource utilization.   It has no capability for beamed power or propulsion.  SBSP development would advance the state of the art in all of the above competencies. • The expertise gained in developing large structures for space based solar power could allow entirely new technologies for applications such as image and real‐time surface and airborne object tracking services, as well as high bandwidth telecommunications, high‐definition television and radio, and mobile, broadcast services.  It would enable entirely new architectures, such as power platforms that provide services to multiple payloads, autonomous self‐constructing structures, or wireless cooperative formations.  The Solar Electric Transfer Vehicles (SETV) needed to lift the Space Solar Power Satellites out of low‐earth orbit, and perhaps even form its components, would completely revolutionize our ability to move large payloads within the Earth‐Moon system.      • The technology to beam power over long distances could lower application satellite weights and expand the envelope for Earth‐ and space‐based power beaming applications.   A truly developed Space‐Based Solar Power infrastructure would open up entirely new exploration and commercial possibilities, not only because of the access which will be discussed in the section on infrastructure, but because of the power available on orbit, which would enable concepts as diverse as comet / asteroid protection systems, de‐orbit of space debris, space‐to‐space power utilities, and beamed propulsion possibilities including far‐term concepts as a true interstellar probe such as Dr. Robert Forward’s StarWisp Concept.

Tech Spillover – Innovation Add-on

****Continued innovation is key to prevent extinction****

Barker 2k, **BRENT is manager of corporate communications, having earlier served as manager of strategic and executive communications and for12 years as the Journal's editor-in-chief, Technology and the Quest for Sustainability, EPRI Journal**

**Sustainability has been the subject of much discussion and a steady stream of policy forums since the World Commission on Environment and Development, headed by Dr. Gro Brundtland, put it on the world stage in 1987. The Brundtland Commission defined** sustainable development as growth that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs**. As such, sustainability carries with it the distinct feeling of a modern problem. But it is not.** We have been on a seemingly unsustainable course for hundreds of years, but the rules, stakes, and speed **of the game** keep changing**, in large part** because of our ability to use technology to extend limits and to magnify human capabilities**.** As long as the population continues to consume a finite store of resources, we must continue to change our course or fail**.** If, with the global population approaching 9-10 billion **people by midcentury,** we were to lock in current technologies and development patterns, we would l ikely find ourselves heading toward **environmental disaster or worse**.Our best hope**--perhaps our only hope--**is to evolve rapidly enough, using our ingenuity, our technology**, and our growing ethical framework of inclusiveness and respect for the diversity of life,** to stay ahead of the proverbial wolf**. Despite the environmental pessimism of the current age,** there are **a handful of** signs that suggest we are struggling in fits and starts in the right direction, **possibly even gaining more ground than we are losing. Farm productivity is one of the most significant of the great reversals in human fortune that have occurred in recent times, reversals that offer both hope and strategic guidance. Largely as a result of crop yields growing at 1-2% per year, the millenniaold pattern of clearing forests and grassland for farms and pastures has begun to be reversed in some regions of the world. According to one of the world's leading scholars on technological change, Arnulf Grubler of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, some 18 million hectares (45 million acres) of cropland in Europe and North America have been reconverted to forest and grassland between 1950 and 2000, while agricultural output in those regions has continued to grow.** Great reversals are also beginning to occur in areas as diverse as population, resource utilization, energy, and transportation. **Fertility rates continue to drop below the replacement level (2.1 children per woman) in affluent nations. First evident in France more than a century ago, the preference for smaller families is spreading throughout the world as economic development expands. As a result, roughly 90% of the population growth in the next 50 years will occur in today's poorest nations. Overall, we are looking at a new demographic dynamic in which population is exploding in some parts of the world while imploding in others. Nevertheless, it is significant that year after year the United Nations continues to crank down its projection of global population in the twenty-first century, suggesting greater certainty that the population is leveling off.**

Oil – Terrorism Impact

A terrorist attack escalates to a global nuclear exchange

Speice 06 – 06 JD Candidate @ College of William and Mary [Patrick F. Speice, Jr., “NEGLIGENCE AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION: ELIMINATING THE CURRENT LIABILITY BARRIER TO BILATERAL U.S.-RUSSIAN NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS,” William & Mary Law Review, February 2006, 47 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 1427]

Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it **incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon** once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be **immense political pressure** in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially **triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict**. 50 In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. 51 **This** proliferation **will** increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States [\*1440] or its allies by hostile states, 52 as well as **increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the U**nited **St**ates **and** **escalate to the use of nuclear weapons**. 53

Oil – A2 Persian Gulf Turn

1. No dependence on Persian Gulf now - alt causes minimize already low imports

Westhawk is a former Global Research Director, Former US Marine Corps officer, 1/2/08, “Could the U.S. walk away from the Persian Gulf?”, http://westhawk.blogspot.com/2008/01/could-us-walk-away-from-persian-gulf.html//jchen

According to the U.S. Energy Department, as of July 2007 the U.S. relied on imports for 59.9% of its net crude oil and petroleum product consumption. Yet just 17% of those imports came from the Persian Gulf. One could foresee a scenario by which U.S. reliance on Persian Gulf oil could decline toward zero. Increasing crude oil production from Angola and political stabilization in Nigeria could result in an increase in oil exports from west Africa to the U.S. Reform of Pemex in Mexico could revive production there (see this article from the Economist for caveats). The collapse of the Chavez regime in Venezuela would see an increase in exploration and production there. And the boom in exploration and production in Alberta and the Canadian Rockies should continue. Thus, a combination of mileage mandates, mandates to expand the alcohol fuel industry, the arrival of plug-in hybrid vehicles, and the expansion of crude oil production in the Western hemisphere could turn the Persian Gulf into an economic and strategic **irrelevancy** for the United States.

2. Case solves the impact – their turn is just an effect of hegemonic collapse – Westhawk’s scenario is actually about a multipolar power struggle to fill in diminished US military in the Gulf – SPS would prevent US power collapse.

Walter Russell Mead is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Wall Street Journal, “Why We’re In the Gulf”, 12/27/2007, http://relooney.fatcow.com/0\_New\_2724.pdf/jchen

For the past few centuries, a global economic and political system has been slowly taking shape under first British and then American leadership. As a vital element of that system, the leading global power -- with help from allies and other parties -- maintains the security of world trade over the seas and air while also ensuring that international economic transactions take place in an orderly way. Thanks to the American umbrella, Germany, Japan, China, Korea and India do not need to maintain the military strength to project forces into the Middle East to defend their access to energy. Nor must each country's navy protect the supertankers carrying oil and liquefied national gas (LNG). For this system to work, the Americans must prevent any power from dominating the Persian Gulf while retaining the ability to protect the safe passage of ships through its waters. The Soviets had to be kept out during the Cold War, and the security and independence of the oil sheikdoms had to be protected from ambitious Arab leaders like Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser and Iraq's Saddam Hussein. During the Cold War Americans forged alliances with Turkey, Israel and (until 1979) Iran, three non-Arab states that had their own reasons for opposing both the Soviets and any panArab state. When the fall of the shah of Iran turned a key regional ally into an implacable foe, the U.S. responded by tightening its relations with both Israel and Turkey -- while developing a deeper relationship with Egypt, which had given up on Nasser's goal of unifying all the Arabs under its flag. Today the U.S. is building a coalition against Iran's drive for power in the Gulf. Israel, a country which has its own reasons for opposing Iran, remains an important component in the American strategy, but the U.S. must also manage the political costs of this relationship as it works with the Sunni Arab states. American opposition to Iran's nuclear program not only reflects concerns about Israeli security and the possibility that Iran might supply terrorist groups with nuclear materials. It also reflects the U.S. interest in protecting its ability to project conventional forces into the Gulf**. The end of America's ability to safeguard the Gulf and the trade routes around it would be enormously damaging** -- and not just to us. Defense budgets would grow dramatically in every major power center, and Middle Eastern politics would be further destabilized, as every country sought political influence in Middle Eastern countries to ensure access to oil in the resulting free for all.

Oil – Persian Gulf – A2 Energy Independence=Withdrawal

Energy independence doesn’t affect US influence in Persian Gulf – we’re there for strategic purposes

Walter Russell Mead is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Wall Street Journal, “Why We’re In the Gulf”, 12/27/2007, http://relooney.fatcow.com/0\_New\_2724.pdf/jchen

True, the security of America's oil supply has been an element in national strategic thinking at least since Franklin Roosevelt met with King Abdul Aziz in the waning days of World War II. And true, the U.S. government has never been indifferent to the concerns of the major oil concerns. But the security of our domestic energy supplies plays a relatively small role in America's Persian Gulf policy, and the purely commercial interests of American companies do not drive American grand strategy. The U.S. today depends on the Middle East for only a small portion of its energy supplies. Still the world's third largest oil producer and holding large coal reserves, America is significantly less dependent on foreign energy sources than the other great economies. Imports account for 35% of U.S. energy consumption versus 56% for the European Union and 80% for Japan. Nearly half the oil and all the natural gas imported by the U.S. comes from the Western Hemisphere; sub-Saharan Africa supplies most of the balance. Only 17% of U.S. oil imports and less than 0.5% of our natural gas come from the Persian Gulf; 80% of Japan's imports come from the Gulf, and by 2015 70% of China's oil will come from the same source. While U.S. import needs are projected to grow significantly, U.S. dependence on Persian Gulf energy is not, thanks largely to expected production increases in the Western Hemisphere and subSaharan Africa. U.S. energy imports from the Persian Gulf are expected to remain below 20% of total consumption. The oil market, of course, is global, and if something were to happen to the Middle Eastern supplies, prices would rise world-wide, and the U.S. economy would be seriously disrupted. But domestic supply is not the key to American interest in the Gulf.

Oil – Persian Gulf – A2 Mead=/=Westhawk

Westhawk is a blogger citing Mead then asking his followers for a discussion

Westhawk is a former Global Research Director, Former US Marine Corps officer, 1/2/08, “Could the U.S. walk away from the Persian Gulf?”, http://westhawk.blogspot.com/2008/01/could-us-walk-away-from-persian-gulf.html//jchen

Or would it? Even if the U.S. managed to reduce its crude oil imports from the Persian Gulf to zero, historian Walter Russell Mead argues that it would be dangerous for the U.S. to walk away from the region. While we can imagine America’s reliance on Persian Gulf oil dropping away, the dependence of China, India, Japan, Europe, and others to the Persian Gulf will remain high and rising. If the U.S. walks away from the Persian Gulf leaving a security vacuum, other powers will have step in, as Mr. Mead describes:

The end of America's ability to safeguard the Gulf and the trade routes around it would be enormously damaging--and not just to us. Defense budgets would grow dramatically in every major power center, and Middle Eastern politics would be further destabilized, as every country sought political influence in Middle Eastern countries to ensure access to oil in the resulting free for all.

The potential for conflict and chaos is real. A world of insecure and suspicious great powers engaged in military competition over vital interests would not be a safe or happy place. Every ship that China builds to protect the increasing numbers of supertankers needed to bring oil from the Middle East to China in years ahead would also be a threat to Japan's oil security--as well as to the oil security of India and Taiwan. European cooperation would likely be undermined as well, as countries sought to make their best deals with Russia, the Gulf states and other oil rich neighbors like Algeria.

Is Mr. Mead’s argument convincing? If America’s potential peer competitors had to waste resources on military budgets and even wars for Persian Gulf oil, while the U.S. stood aside and looked on, might that actually prolong America’s position as the leading power in the world? Or would the U.S. economy suffer as its international trading partners beat each other up? If the other powers spent vastly more money on military muscle and gained experience in combat (while the U.S. peacefully looked on), would that not prepare these future peer competitors to later challenge the U.S. itself?

Oil – A2 No Escalation

1. Oil dependence magnifies every other impact – without a sustainable energy source the US is incapable of effective deterrence or conflict prevention– hampers military, economic and political action – that’s Bengston

2. Their Aonorat ev goes aff – he concludes oil doesn’t cause war, the PEOPLE behind oil do – they prevent political change to alternatives and cause energy conflicts

3. Oil shortages empirically cause war – impact is extinction

Richard Heinberg, CORE FACULTY MEMBER AT NEW COLLEGE OF CALIFORNIA, The Party’s Over: Oil, War and the Fate of Industrial Societies, 2003, p. 230

Today the average US citizen uses five times as much energy as the world average. Even citizens of nations that export oil – such as Venezuela and Iran – use only a small fraction of the energy US citizens use per capita. The Carter Doctrine, declared in 1980, made it plain that US military might would be applied to the project of dominating the world’s oil wealth: henceforth, any hostile effort to impede the flow of Persian Gulf oil would be regarded as an “assault on the vital interests of the United States” and would be “repelled by any means necessary, including military force.” In the past 60 years, the US military and intelligence services have grown to become bureaucracies of unrivaled scope, power, and durability. While the US has not declared war on any nation since 1945, it has nevertheless bombed or invaded a total of 19 countries and stationed troops, or engaged in direct or indirect military action, in dozens of others. During the Cold War, the US military apparatus grew exponentially, ostensibly in response to the threat posed by an archrival: the Soviet Union. But after the end of the Cold War the American military and intelligence establishments did not shrink in scale to any appreciable degree. Rather, their implicit agenda — the protection of global resource interests emerged as the semi-explicit justification for their continued existence. With resource hegemony came challenges from nations or sub-national groups opposing that hegemony. But the immensity of US military might ensured that such challenges would be overwhelmingly asymmetrical. US strategists labeled such challenges “terrorism” — a term with a definition malleable enough to be applicable to any threat from any potential enemy, foreign or domestic, while never referring to any violent action on the part of the US, its agents, or its allies. **This policy puts the US on a collision course with the rest of the world. If all-out competition is pursued with the available weapons of awesome power, the result could be the destruction not just of industrial civilization, but of humanity and most of the biosphere.**

Water – A2 No Escalation

1. Water shortage does not lead to cooperation: Their evidence is from 2000. In the last 11 years water levels have dwindled and tension have been rising.

2. Even if they win that water wars won’t go nuclear, water shortages still cause extinction.

Solvency – A2 “Used for Military”

1. SPS isn’t directly usable for military purposes – its beam is too weak and costs ten times as much as a conventional ICBM – that’s NSSO 7

2. Boyle [their card] doesn’t say SPS is a military weapon – just that it could supply energy to military bases. That’s added solvency – proves our energy advantages are true.

Solvency – A2 Violates Outer Space Treaty

This turn is literally impossible –

A. The outer space treaty is limited to weapons of mass destruction and celestial bodies

FAS, Federation of American Scientists, No Date, http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/ost/index.html//jchen

The Outer Space Treaty contains an undertaking not to place in orbit around the Earth, install on the moon or any other celestial body, or otherwise station in outer space, nuclear or any other weapons of mass destruction. It limits the use of the moon and other celestial bodies exclusively to peaceful purposes and expressly prohibits their use for establishing military bases, installation, or fortifications; testing weapons of any kind; or conducting military maneuvers.

B. That proves no link – solar satellites aren’t nuclear weapons or stationed on the moon

Solvency – A2 SQO Solves

1. Our inherency says otherwise – the technology already exists but there is zero commercial action – federal funding would immediately catalyze further development – that’s Edmonton Journal

2. Their evidence on the issue is terrible –

1. Scientific American concludes aff – it says tech exists but the federal government should provide funding to make it commercially available
2. The Economist isn’t conclusive – private markets may be an alternate solution but doesn’t preclude federal action
3. O’Hanlon is outdated and he’s not even talking about SPS – cuts have been made since 2004 disproving their argument
4. They say that the status quo will develop SPS, but it will take atleast 5 years for anything to happen.
5. We must act now- even if SPS will inevitably happen, the US must take the lead. That’s 1AC Shea.

3. SBSP is key to hegemony for hundreds of years, but we’re not the only ones in the race, Japan is an upcoming rival

**Farrar**, writer for CNN, 6/1/20**08**, CNN (Lara, “How to harvest solar power? Beam it down from space!”, http://www.cnn.com/2008/TECH/science/05/30/space.solar/index.html)

The study also concluded that solar energy from satellites could provide power for global U.S. military operations and deliver energy to disaster areas and developing nations. "The country that takes the lead on space solar power will be the energy-exporting country for the entire planet for the next few hundred years," Miller said. Russia, China, the European Union and India, according to the Pentagon report, are interested in the concept. And Japan, which has been pouring millions of dollars into space power studies for decades, is working toward testing a small-scale demonstration in the near future.

4. SPS is inevitable – US development is key to dominance

Taylor Dinerman, author and journalist from New York, 7-16-2007, “Solar power satellites and space radar”, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/910/1

Space solar power is, in the long run, inevitable. The Earth’s economy is going to need so much extra power over the next few decades that every new system that can be shown to be viable will be developed. If the US were to develop space solar power for military applications it would give the US civilian industry a big head start. As long as the military requirements are legitimate, there is no reason why this cannot be made into a win-win outcome.

Solvency – A2 Japan Producing Now

That’s our argument – 1AC Shea ev proves it’s a race to develop SPS first – whoever reaches it first attains solar powered hegemony for eternity

Only a reason to boost US development – all our advantages are disads to Japan getting the tech first; US would lose out on tech innovation, economic and military opportunities

Solvency – A2 Launch Cost High

1. Large scale deployment drastically reduces costs – once developed to a commercial scale technology can be mass produced lowering launch costs and making exploration possible – that’s Lior

2. Expanding market solves – higher costs now prove once SPS is deployed it lowers cost

Mark Williamson, UK-based space-technology consultant to the space industry. He is the author of six books, including The Cambridge Dictionary of Space**,** 2010, “May the power be with you”, POWERSPACE//ZY

With launches of five-tonne satellites currently costing upwards of $50m, “the cost of launch is certainly a hurdle”, confirms Mankins. “However, launch costs are driven by markets more than anything else,” he says, and launches are so expensive because there are so few of them per year. In fact, in Mankins’s opinion, the emergence of a large new commercial market for launches,suchasSSP,“will bring down the cost dramati- cally of getting to space”

Solvency – Simanek Indict

The article was posted as SATIRE – he was making fun of alarmist propaganda

Donald E. Simanek, Lock Haven University, “The Hazards of Solar Energy,” 1998, <http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/solar.htm>//jchen

Over the years I have heard and read much nonsense, to the point where nothing surprises me any more. Recently an item caught my eye, a pamphlet put out by the Citizens' Reactionary Alliance Concerned with Keeping the Environment Decent. It's a nice example of the style and `logic' common to propaganda pieces from many groups of alarmists and `aginers.'

— Donald E. Simanek

Solvency – Solves SBL

SPS enables deployment of space based lasers – solves power generation issues

Ramos 2k (Kim, US Air Force Major, Thesis submitted for the AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLL MAXWELL Air Force Base, “Solar Power Constellations: Implications for the United States Air Force,” April, <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA394928>)

United States Space Command developed four operational concepts to guide their vision. One of those operational concepts is global engagement. The USSPACECOM Long Range Plan defines global engagement as an “integrated focused surveillance and missile defense with a potential ability to apply force from space.”27 This application of force from space involves holding at risk earth targets with force from space.28 New World Vistas identifies several force application technologies. One of the technological issues associated with developing these space force application technologies is that they all require large amounts of power generation. A solar power satellite can supply the required power. Two technologies in particular would benefit from integration with a solar power satellite, directed energy weapons, such as lasers, and jamming devices. The space-based lasers currently under study accomplish ground moving target indication, and air moving target indication, which would be part of missile defense.29 The main difficulty with the laser is designing a power plant, which can produce the required energy in space without the enormous solar arrays required. By using a solar power satellite to beam power to the laser, this eliminates the problem. Another project, which would benefit from integration with a solar power satellite, is a device, which would beam RF power to a particular geographic location to blind or disable any unprotected ground communications, radar, optical, and infrared sensors.30 As with the laser and other directed energy applications, the limiting factor right now is generating enough power in space to energize the RF beam.

Solvency – A2 Chinese Militarization

1. China won’t militarize: The 1NC Shixiu evidence talks about US Space Weaponization. SPS is not a weapon and does not have dual-use capabilities
2. SPS cannot be used for directly military purposes, its beam is too weak and imprecise. That’s NSSO 7
3. SPS will actually boost US-China Relations. Extend 1AC Schwab evidence that SPS is key if we want international coop in space.

\*\*\*TOPICALITY\*\*\*

2AC T – Its

1. We meet – the aff advocates in the plan text that the United States federal government will do the plan, not any different government.

2AC T –“Substantial”

1. We meet – the plan text says “fully fund” SPS, which would be an increase in NASA’s budget more than \_\_%.

2. Counter-interpretation: The affirmative should not have to specify the exact amount that the plan spends, and it should not have to be a specific percentage increase of NASA’s budget.

Substantially increase means by a large amount

**NRC 3** (Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards Policy and Procedures, April 2003,) <http://www.fontana.org/main/dev_serv/planning/ventana_eir/appendix_e.pdf>

“Substantial increase” means “important or significant in a large amount, extent, or degree,” and not resulting in insignificant or small benefit to the public health and safety, common defense and security, or the environment, regardless of costs. However, this standard is not intended to be interpreted in a way that would result in disapproval of worthwhile safety or security improvements with justifiable costs.2

3. Our interpretation is good - clearly going into space is expensive, so every affirmative plan is going to be expensive and be a substantial increase. This is better for debate --the neg cannot pin down the aff to a specific number.

4. Their interpretation is bad - it justifies the negative saying a substantial increase is any random percentage of NASA’s budget. This skews ground because the negative can adapt to the specific expense of the plan after the 1AC is read by naming a percentage and calling the aff un-topical. This makes debate impossible because the aff can never predict what the neg is going to say and so can never write their plan topically.

5. Good is good enough – better than competing interpretations because it avoids the extreme margins of debate and avoids a “race to the bottom” -- good is good enough focuses the debate away from topicality and theory and towards substance.

2AC T – “space”

1. We meet – solar powered satellites are not placed on celestial bodies, they are placed in space.

2AC T – “Development”

1. We meet – their definition includes any development related to the launch of space objects, which is what SPS falls under.

2. Counter-interpretation: SPS is development of space.

3. Our interpretation is good – SPS is in the topic literature and is a big aff for this resolution. Topic literature is key to ground because it is what each side bases their cases off of. If SPS is excluded as un-topical then a large part of the topic literature is lost. This is bad for debate because it decreases education.

4. Their interpretation is bad – it justifies the negative calling any aff in the topic literature un-topical. This skews ground because the aff can no longer run a 1AC, even if it is clearly in the topic literature, without the negative calling it un-topical.

5. Good is good enough – better than competing interpretations because it avoids the extreme margins of debate and avoids a “race to the bottom” -- good is good enough focuses the debate away from topicality and theory and towards substance.

2AC T – “Increase”

1. We meet – the technology for SPS has previously been developed.

2. Counter-interpretation:

1) Explore – To travel over new territory for adventure or discovery

Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary1985

Webster <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/explore?show=0&t=1308841396> LS

to travel over (new territory) for adventure or discovery

3. Our interpretation is good because increase refers to exploration -- “substantially increase its exploration.” This means that the definition of exploration has to be looked to first because otherwise we don’t know what we’re increasing.

4. Their interpretation is bad– it overlimits the resolution. It takes out good affirmatives like colonization, militarization and mining. All that is left for the aff to choose from is the small number of already exsisting NASA missions like constellation. This skews ground because the affirmative has almost no affs left to choose from. Skewed ground is bad for debate, because equal ground is what makes debate a fair game to play.

5. Good is good enough – better than competing interpretations because it avoids the extreme margins of debate and avoids a “race to the bottom” -- good is good enough focuses the debate away from topicality and theory and towards substance.

2AC T – Increase =/= Funding

1. We meet -- In order to develop and utilize SPS, we will have to construct the technology.

2. Counter-Interpretation: The aff should be able to mandate funding for a space mission.

Increase must be a net increase

(Judge **Rogers,** STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., 6-24-**05**, PETITIONERS v. U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, RESPONDENT, NSR MANUFACTURERS ROUNDTABLE, ET AL., INTERVENORS, 2005 U.S. App.)

 [\*\*48]  Statutory Interpretation. [HN16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fe428155fdfc9074f3623f0dae9d78a&docnum=14&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=0ebd338d6a7793de8561db53b915effd&focBudTerms=term%20increase&focBudSel=all#clscc16)While the CAA defines a "modification" as any physical or operational change that "increases" emissions, it is silent on how to calculate such "increases" in emissions. [42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_butNum=103&_butInline=1&_butinfo=42%20U.S.C.%207411&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=1f89a0e47b1996a5400e8d865d8da08a). According to government petitioners, the lack of a statutory definition does not render the term "increases" ambiguous, but merely compels the court to give the term its "ordinary meaning." See [Engine Mfrs.Ass'nv.S.Coast AirQualityMgmt.Dist., 541 U.S. 246, 124 S. Ct. 1756, 1761, 158 L. Ed. 2d 529(2004)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=104&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b541%20U.S.%20246%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=48f016ea3eabfdb898b67b348b11662c); [Bluewater Network, 370 F.3d at 13](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=105&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b370%20F.3d%201%2cat%2013%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=78fdfe9d48c7b91d7659b90c0198707e); [Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees v. Glickman, 342 U.S. App. D.C. 7, 215 F.3d 7, 10 [\*23]  (D.C. Cir. 2000)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=106&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b342%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%207%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=fb18ff0b92931ac00621d88dae997e67). Relying on two "real world" analogies, government petitioners contend that **the ordinary meaning of "increases" requires the baseline to be calculated from a period immediately preceding the change.** They maintain, for example, that in determining whether a high-pressure weather system "increases" the local temperature, the relevant baseline is the temperature immediately preceding the arrival of the weather system, not the temperature five or ten years ago. Similarly,  [\*\*49]  **in determining whether a new engine "increases" the value of a car, the relevant baseline is the value of the car immediately preceding the replacement of the engine**, not the value of the car five or ten years ago when the engine was in perfect condition.

3. Our interpretation is good for debate because it gives substantial ground to both sides, while still debating the merits of a policy. In some cases funding is the only way for the aff to discuss the merits of a policy, so funding is justified.

4. Their interpretation is bad – it overlimits the resolution; funding is a necessary component in getting a mission off the ground – without funding, problems with the mission cannot be fixed and it cannot be built in the first place. Limits are good for debate because without them debaters would run to the margins and debate would not be educational.

5. Good is good enough – better than competing interpretations because it avoids the extreme margins of debate and avoids a “race to the bottom” -- good is good enough focuses the debate away from topicality and theory and towards substance.

2AC T – “Beyond the Earth’s Mesosphere.”

1. We meet – SPS’s will be placed outside the limit of the earth’s mesosphere.

\*\*\*DISADS\*\*\*

2AC Debt Ceiling (1/3)

1) Debt Ceiling won’t pass- Kyle and GOP block

Kaperowicz, Pete Kasperowicz, writer for The Hill, June 20, 2011, “Kyl: GOP wants 10-year plan to cut spending as part of debt deal”, http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/167407-kyl-gop-wants-10-year-plan-to-cut-spending-as-part-of-debt-ceiling-deal, Date accessed June 29, 2011

Senate Minority Whip Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) on Monday said Senate Republicans want commitments on a 10-year budget plan that guarantees reduced spending as part of any agreement to increase the debt ceiling." Let's have a down payment on significant savings now," he said. "Let's set the budget numbers for the next 10 years so that they actually represent a reduction in spending, not an increase."Kyl added that Republicans also want real entitlement reform, to make sure spending continues to drop after 10 years. He said Republicans are likely to be uninterested in any agreement that does not include these elements."Let's do that in such a way that we absolutely put constraints on Congress and the president — we put us in a straitjacket so to speak — so that we can't create exceptions and waivers and get around it in other ways," he said. "Unless we do those things, I don't think most of the people on my side of the aisle are going to have an appetite for increasing the debt ceiling. I know I'm not."Kyl used his time on the floor to argue that raising taxes is not necessarily the way to increase government revenues, and said a study by Alan Reynolds of the Cato Institute shows that historically, more revenue is generated by lower taxes. Kyl argued that this is because taxes are a tax on economic activity, which is stunted when taxes rise.Vice President Biden's debt-ceiling group is expected to meet at least three times this week in the hopes of securing an agreement on how to allow for an increase. Kyl is part of this group, along with House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.), Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii), and others.

2) Fiat means the plan passes instantaneously through Congress and doesn’t cost any political capital.

3) Renewable energy is bipartisan

Ledyard King and Larry Bivins, reporters for USA today, 2010, Rapid City Journal, from USAtoday originally

The demise of "cap-and-trade," as the climate-change bill was called, disappointed President Obama and other Democrats who supported the measure. But the prospects are brighter for a more moderate step -- still meaningful, but with bipartisan support -- requiring that a greater portion of America's electricity come from renewable energy sources such as wind and solar power. "There are not many Republicans or Democrats out there that don't want to see America move toward a more sustainable homegrown source of energy," said Matt McLarty of the South Dakota chapter of the Environmental Law & Policy Center, which promotes clean energy and sustainable business. He called a federal renewable electricity standard "something that most people can get behind." That would be good news for South Dakota, one of the top five states in terms of wind energy potential, McLarty and other environmental advocates said. Even though they would welcome tighter restrictions on carbon emissions from coal-fired power plants and other sources, they said the divisive atmosphere surrounding climate-change legislation stymied progress on other fronts, including the adoption of a renewable energy standard. Under cap-and-trade, energy producers faced limits on what they emit. If they exceeded those limits, they would have to pay extra under a market-driven system that determines prices. Critics said many consumers would have faced higher energy prices -- at least in the short term -- largely because about half of the nation's electricity is generated by coal, one of the main greenhouse gas producers. The demise of cap-and-trade "actually helps. Now we can talk about the issues," said Steve Wegman, executive director of the South Dakota Wind Energy Association. "We can go back and talk about why you should have energy diversity, and that's the discussion we've never had. Climate change gets too many emotions involved."

2AC Debt Ceiling (2/3)

4) Issues in Congress are compartmentalized – no spillover between an external policy like the plan and Obama’s political capital.

5) Our heg advantage solves the DA – Heg is key to the economy.

Boot 6 (Max Boot, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations,“Power for Good; Since the end of the Cold War, America the Indispensable”, The Weekly Standard, Vol. 11 No. 28)

Mandelbaum also points to five economic benefits of American power. First, the United States provides the security essential for international commerce by, for instance, policing Atlantic and Pacific shipping lanes. Second, the United States safeguards the extraction and export of Middle Eastern oil, the lifeblood of the global economy. Third, in the monetary realm, the United States has made the dollar "the world's 'reserve' currency" and supplied loans to "governments in the throes of currency crises." Fourth, the United States has pushed for the expansion of international trade by midwifing the World Trade Organization, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and other instruments of liberalization. And fifth, by providing a ready market for goods exported by such countries as China and Japan, the United States "became the indispensable supplier of demand to the world."

6 ) No impact – even if we reach the debt ceiling there’s no risk of economic collapse.

Adelmann 2011. Bob Adelmann, columnist for the New American, 31 January 2011, “Myth: The Sky Will Fall if the Debt Ceiling Isn’t Raised” http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/economy/commentary-mainmenu-43/6127-the-sky-will-fall-if-the-debt-ceiling-isnt-raised-and-other-myths

At this moment the national debt, according to the U.S. National Debt Clock, is at $14.094 trillion and increasing by $4 billion every day. With the current ceiling on the U.S. National Debt at $14.294 trillion, there are just 49 days left until U.S. government spending hits the ceiling. Expect the noisy chorus of misinformed warnings about the consequences of such an action to rise as well. For instance, on Sunday the new Speaker of the House, John Boehner, explained on Fox News that the Republicans would push for spending cuts regardless of the imminent coming of the debt ceiling, and he was then pilloried by a Fox News writer. Boehner said: If the president is going to ask us to increase the debt limit, then he’s going to have to be willing to cut up the credit cards. I think our team has been listening to the American people. They want us to reduce spending, and there is no limit to the amount of spending that we’re willing to cut. Afterward an anonymous writer for Fox launched into unreality by explaining that only the Congress can approve taking on more debt: “If it doesn’t approve raising the ceiling, then the U.S. will default on its loans and lose its standing as the globe’s most reliable bet.” As Erick Erickson of Redstate.com exclaimed, “There is no other way to put this than it is an out and out lie!” (Emphasis added.) Just because the bank has pulled the credit cards from the government (to expand on Boehner’s analogy) doesn’t mean the government won’t have the money to continue making the minimum payments, as noted by newly elected Senator Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) during an interview with Neil Cavuto: The debt service, [the] interest on our debt, is about 6 percent of everything the federal government has to pay. So we would be taking in enough revenue to cover more than 10 times all the interest we owe. There is no reason we would have to default on our interest obligations…. Now, there are vendors who would have to wait to be paid. There are probably employees of the federal government who would have to wait to get paid. This [would result in] lots of dislocation. I am not suggesting that this is a desirable path, but I am suggesting that we have to get serious about getting our budget under control. President Clinton used the same falsehood to frighten Congress when it threatened to refuse to raise the debt ceiling. As the Economist noted, “In early 1996, Bill Clinton warned that because the debt ceiling had not been raised, Social Security cheques might be late. This scared Congress into passing [an] increase in the debt ceiling.” It’s helpful to note and understand the difference between hitting the debt ceiling, and defaulting. When the debt ceiling is hit in 49 days, the U.S. government will not be able to issue any new debt securities. But it most certainly will have the income to pay the interest due on its existing debt, and will also be able easily to “roll over” debt issues that are coming to maturity. Default, on the other hand, is changing the terms of the deal midstream. Since a debt instrument is a contract, any failure to keep any part of the contract, puts it into default. It could be something as simple as delaying an interest payment, or by failing to renew the contract at its maturity date. For example, any change to the promise to pay benefits from a pension plan, puts that contract into default. It may, of course, be “cured” by the other parties to the contract agreeing with the changes. But such a difference doesn’t deter writers such as those at the Economist who asked, rhetorically, How can the world’s most powerful economy not pay its bills on time? Even a brief default on Treasury debt would be unprecedented, with widespread systemic ramifications. Would banks around the world have to classify Treasury holdings as non-performing? Would money-market mutual funds break the buck? Would all federal entities lose their AAA-credit rating? Would the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation’s ability to backstop the nation’s banks come into question? Would foreign central banks start to shift out of dollars? Felix Salmon at Reuters provides clarity here: If the debt ceiling were reached but not raised, “It stands to reason that just about any other form of government spending would get cut before [Treasury Secretary] Tim Geithner dreamed of defaulting on [its] risk-free bonds.” Putting this into proper perspective then means that if the ceiling were reached without extension, life in the debt markets would likely continue much as it did before. Measures of risk, such as the stock market’s volatility index and increases in interest rates on government bonds, have remained subdued. Professionals who trade these markets daily are unconcerned. So to use the ceiling as a call for compromise by those recently elected to Congress to stop government spending beyond its means is more than a little disingenuous. If those members who made those promises actually keep them, and begin to force the government genie back into its constitutional bottle, then risk premiums based upon concerns about the country’s ability to pay its bills will likely remain quiescent, and may even decline further.

2AC Debt Ceiling (3/3)

7) Economic decline doesn’t cause war.

Ferguson 2006. Niall, prof. of history, Foreign Affairs, “The Next War of the World,” Lexis Nexis.

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

2AC Elections (1/5)

The GOP will win, but a new initiative could lead to an Obama Victory

Rove 11 [Karl Rove, former senior adviser and deputy chief of staff to President George W. Bush, 6/30/11, “ How the GOP Can Blow It in 2012” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304450604576415703953311980.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>, Caplan]

High unemployment, anemic growth, defections in key groups such as independents and Hispanics, and unpopular policies are among the reasons President Obama is unlikely to win re-election. But **likely to lose is far from certain** to lose. If Republicans make enough unforced errors, Mr. Obama could win. The first such mistake would be forgetting that the target voters are those ready to swing away from Mr. Obama (independents, Hispanics, college educated and young voters) and those whose opposition to Mr. Obama has deepened since 2008 (seniors and working-class voters). These voters gave the GOP a big win in the 2010 midterm. They are deeply concerned about the economy, jobs, spending, deficits and health care. Many still like Mr. Obama personally but disapprove of his handling of the issues. They are not GOP primary voters, but they are watching the contest. The Republican Party will find it more difficult to gain their support if its nominee adopts a tone that's harshly negative and personally anti-Obama. The GOP nominee should fiercely challenge Mr. Obama's policies, actions and leadership using the president's own words, but should stay away from questioning his motives, patriotism or character. He will do this to his GOP opponent to try to draw Republicans into the mud pit. They should avoid it. It won't be easy. Mr. Obama can't win re-election by trumpeting his achievements. And he has decided against offering a bold agenda for a second term: That was evident in his State of the Union emphasis on high-speed rail, high-speed Internet and "countless" green jobs. Instead, backed by a brutally efficient opposition research unit, the president will use focus-group tested lines of attack to disqualify the Republican nominee by questioning his or her values, intentions and intelligence. Republicans should avoid giving him mistakes to pounce on and should stand up to this withering assault, always looking for ways to turn it back on Mr. Obama and his record. The GOP candidate must express disappointment and regret, not disgust and anger, especially in the debates. Ronald Reagan's cheery retorts to Jimmy Carter's often-petty attacks are a good model. Any day that isn't a referendum on the Obama presidency should be considered wasted. Republicans also must not confuse the tea party movement with the larger, more important tea party sentiment. As important as tea party groups are, and for all the energy and passion they bring, for every person who showed up at a tea party rally there were dozens more who didn't but who share the deep concerns about Mr. Obama's profligate spending, record deficits and monstrous health-care bill. The GOP candidate must stay focused on this broader tea party sentiment, not just the organized groups, especially when some of them stray from the priorities that gave rise to them (for example, adopting such causes as the repeal of the 17th Amendment, which established election of U.S. senators by popular vote). The broader sentiment is what swung independents so solidly into the GOP column last fall. The GOP nominee could also lose if the Republican National Committee (RNC) and battleground-state party committees battleground-state party committees don't respond to the Obama grass-roots operation with a significant effort of their own. The GOP had the edge in grass-roots identification, persuasion, registration and turnout efforts in 2000 and 2004. It lost these advantages in 2008, big time, in part because its candidate didn't emphasize the grass roots. It must regain them in 2012. Only the RNC and the state party committees can effectively plan, fund and execute these efforts. Finally, Republicans cannot play it safe. It is tempting to believe that Mr. Obama is so weak, the economy so fragile, that attacking him is all that's needed. Applying relentless pressure on the president is necessary but insufficient. Setting forth an alternative vision to Mr. Obama's will be required as well. Voters are looking for a serious GOP governing agenda as a reason to turn Mr. Obama out of office. Failing to offer a well-thought-out vision and defend it against Mr. Obama's inevitable distortions, demagoguery and straw-man arguments would put the GOP nominee in the position of Thomas Dewey in 1948, whose strategy of running out the clock gave President Harry Truman the opening he needed. Mr. Obama could have enjoyed the advantage of incumbency—with its power to set the agenda and dominate the stage—until next spring when the GOP nomination will be settled. Instead he prematurely abandoned the stance of an assured public leader to become an aggressive political candidate. Now his re-election depends on political rivals making significant errors. That's dangerous for any politician, but given his Oval Office record, Mr. Obama may have no other viable strategy.
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Plan overwhelmingly popular- policymakers understand its key to the economy

McGowan , Elizabeth McGowan is a Washington DC and elections correspondent, June 21, 2011, “House Bill Would Cut Clean Energy and Efficiency Programs by 40 Percent”,

http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/21/idUS282235896420110621, Date accessed June 27, 2011

"At a time when our economy is already fragile, abandoning scientific research would cause the United States to lose even more high-tech jobs to our foreign competitors." Rep. Jeff Flake of Arizona was the sole Republican who joined 19 Democrats in opposing the bill that passed on a 26-20 vote. The full House will be considering the measure, one of a dozen sweeping federal spending bills, after Independence Day. On the energy front, this version of the bill snips $1.9 billion from the White House request for investments in energy efficiency research, renewables such as solar, wind and geothermal, fuel-conserving vehicles, weatherization, biomass and other programs. That's more than 40 percent below current funding levels. Energy insiders, however, doubt the Senate will approve such draconian paring of clean energy enterprise. Overall, the sprawling bill slices a total of $5.9 billion from President Obama's request for the budget year beginning in October. Those cuts put funding about $1 billion below current levels, roughly equaling dollars doled out in 2005. "The ... funding bill is another glaring example of the widening gap between Republican rhetoric and reality," said Colorado Rep. Jared Polis, one of 48 members of the coalition. "We need a new American energy policy that will lower prices for families, reduce our reliance on dirty, foreign energy and increase our energy independence."Nitty-Gritty of House Bill Overall, this appropriations legislation is designed to provide annual funding for the various agencies and programs under the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and various regional water and power authorities. Coalition members are most alarmed that the GOP engineered a bill that slashes close to $500 million from DOE's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE). That leaves the office with just 40 percent of the amount Obama asked for when he presented his budget back in February. Briefly, the White House 2012 budget request for EERE programs is the largest ever. It rings in at a total of $3.2 billion, which is bordering on 11 percent of the total DOE budget. That's significant because it's a jump of $983 million — or 44 percent — above 2010 appropriations. In addition, the legislation increases funding for DOE's Fossil Energy Office by $32 million while decreasing designated dollars for Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E) by $80 million. Energy Department Secretary Steven Chu modeled ARPA-E after a similar program at the Department of Defense to support breakthroughs by clean energy entrepreneurs. Obama had asked that the chronically underfunded ARPA-E receive about $650 million next year. The GOP House bill would jeopardize the relatively new initiative designed to fund early-stage innovation projects that are deemed riskiest and most transformative. As well, the president had called for lopping the fossil office by $417 million, 44 percent below 2010 appropriations. Savings for the president's budget figure of $520 million would have come from peeling away money for fossil energy research and development, as well as the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Slashing ARPA-E Illogical Lew Milford, founder and president of the Montpelier, Vt.-based nonprofit Clean Energy Group complimented Chu for recognizing ARPA-E as an avenue for expanding a nascent industry."We're cutting off our nose to spite our face," Milford told SolveClimate News in an interview about ARPA-E's rocky funding record. "ARPA-E is one of the few public programs that focuses on energy innovation. Without it, we won't get the big bang of technology benefits to produce jobs and economic benefits in the long run." The last actual appropriation for ARPA-E was $389 million for fiscal year 2009. DARPA, the military program Chu is mimicking, is unusual because it serves a customer that will buy at any cost, Milford said. But that freedom within the Department of Defense supports a unique model that allows an idea to morph into a prototype that is deployed throughout branches of the military before spilling over into the civilian marketplace. "That's what you need for energy technologies to be working and seamlessly connected," Milford said, adding that DOE has wisely signed a memorandum of understanding agreement with the Defense Department to give ARPA-E room to grow. "To [deal](http://www.reuters.com/finance/deals) with issues such as market demand, DOE has to expand its portfolio of options and essentially create customers." He emphasized that eventually DOE should form ARPA-E partnerships with states because development agencies at that level are looking for niche strategies to boost the clean energy policies they have in place."It's not ARPA-E's fault or anybody else's that we're not there yet," Milford said. "The clean energy industry is young at 10 to 20 years old when compared to a fossil fuels industry that's more than 100 years old."GAO: National Strategy Necessary In the midst of this season's budget travails, the Government Accountability Office has issued a new report recommending what likely seems obvious to even casual observers of congressional politics — the need to replace a piecemeal approach to climate and energy with a national plan. Rep. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) released the 90-page report by the investigative arm of Congress on Monday. The somewhat clunky title is "Climate Change: Improvements Needed to Clarify National Priorities and Better Align Them with Federal Funding Decisions." To get there, the GAO spells out a two-step solution that is probably easier written on paper than actually accomplished. First, federal authorities need to set clear strategic climate change priorities that identify
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specific roles and responsibilities of key federal entities involved in the enterprise.Second, those same authorities have to assess how effective they are now at not only defining and reporting federal climate change funding but also lining up that funding with agreed-upon priorities. Those practices will have to be polished so Congress and the public can fully grasp how the government spends money designated for climate change. The trick is that before embarking on step one, entities that fall under the executive branch such as the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Energy and Climate Change Policy, the Office and Management and Budget, and Office of Science and Technology Policy have to consult with Congress and collaborate with relevant federal agencies and interagency coordinating bodies. And that looks to be a daunting challenge if those tasked with GAO's recommendations refer to the baffling maze of a chart on page 13 of the report. Authors of the GAO report refer to federal climate change program as complex and crosscutting." This report shows the significant work the United States government is already taking to understand and address climate change while creating new jobs and industries in America," said Markey, the ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee. "So far this has been accomplished with little national leadership. In these challenging budgetary times, we need to make sure funding matches national priorities. This GAO report shows us we still have work to do." Assessment Follows Party LineRepublican leaders had nothing but high praise for the way they reshaped President Obama's original budget request. Such "smart and significant" spending reductions were necessary to programs with "massive and unnecessary increases," Appropriations Committee Chairman Hal Rogers of Kentucky said.

If policymakers and the public understand why SPS and green-tech are key to the economy, then they will support NASA in the long run so that the economy will benefit from the plan

Econ Not key to election- personal charisma outweighs

Beinart 11

[Peter Beinart, senior political writer for The Daily Beast, is associate professor of journalism and political science at City University of New York and a senior fellow at the New America Foundation, “ Lousy Economy Won't Sink Obama”, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/06/06/obama-will-be-reelected-in-2012-despite-stagnant-economy-high-unemployment.html>, 6/6/11, Caplan]

For a couple of years now, optimists about Barack Obama’s reelection prospects (myself included) have peddled the Ronald Reagan analogy. Reagan, you may remember, won 49 states in 1984 with the unemployment rate at 7.4 percent. The lesson: a president overseeing a weak economy can still win reelection—easily—if people believe the worst is over and prosperity is about to return. The recent jobs numbers make that analogy less convincing. In 1982, when Reagan got shellacked in the midterm elections, the unemployment rate was near 11 percent. But it dropped sharply in 1983 and 1984. This March, when unemployment dipped to less than 9 percent (from almost 10 last November), it looked like Obama might benefit from a similar trajectory. But now that unemployment has edged up again for two months in a row, that looks unlikely. The best bet is that when voters go to the polls next fall the economy won’t be in free fall, as it was when Obama took office. But neither will it have turned the corner. For most Americans, it will have been lousy for as long as Barack Obama was president, and there will be no tangible evidence that it will get any better in his second term. So why do I still think Obama will win in 2012? Because if the Ronald Reagan analogy may not exactly hold, the George W. Bush analogy just might. Unemployment wasn’t particularly high when Bush sought reelection in 2004, but Americans were in a sour mood nonetheless. Throughout the summer and fall of 2004, a clear majority of Americans said the country was on the wrong track. The numbers, in fact, were only marginally better then than they are now. So how did Bush win? For one thing, people’s feelings about him outpaced their feelings about the state of the country. Despite saying the country was on the wrong track, a slight majority of Americans approved of his job performance, and he was reelected by essentially that margin. One explanation is that some portion of Americans simply liked Bush personally, even though they didn’t think America was faring very well on his watch. For some, it may have been his personal rectitude after Bill Clinton. For others, it was his religiosity. For others, it was the sense that he was a regular guy. Obama enjoys a similar dynamic. Maybe it is intelligence and eloquence. Maybe it is the fact that he, like Bush, seems comfortable in his own skin. Maybe it is his own reputation for rectitude, a reputation buttressed by the lack of scandals in his administration. Maybe it is a lingering pride in what his election says about America. This isn’t true for all presidents. Americans never thought very highly of Bill Clinton as a person even as they acknowledged that the country was thriving under his leadership. But for whatever reason, Americans seem a little softer on Obama than the hard economic realities would suggest. The second thing that helped Bush was a weak opponent. From the beginning of the race, Bush’s advisers insisted that the 2004 election was a choice between him and his opponent, not a referendum on his presidency. And they succeeded in making John Kerry’s alleged flip-flopping a dominant factor in the race. We don’t know who the Republicans will nominate in 2012, but a strong
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candidate will need to appear: 1) up to the job, 2) like a person of conviction, 3) able to relate to ordinary Americans and 4) ideologically mainstream. Right now, Mitt Romney struggles with numbers 2 and 3. Tim Pawlenty struggles with number1. Newt Gingrich struggles with number 3. Sarah Palin, Michelle Bachman and Herman Cain struggle with numbers 1 and 4. Perhaps one of them will overcome those deficiencies, and perhaps Jon Huntsman will turn out to have none of the weaknesses, but as of now, it looks like a field of substantially flawed candidates. And by 2012, they may look even more flawed. In a party as ideologically charged as today’s GOP, it’s enormously difficult to win over base voters—and bring them to the polls in November—while also appearing ideologically mainstream. Obama will exploit that. The happier Rush Limbaugh is with the Republican nominee, the easier it will be for Obama to galvanize Democrats to go to the polls. Yes, liberals are not as passionate about Obama as they once were. But conservatives were not as passionate about Bush either, and he got a larger base turnout in 2004 than 2000, largely because in this hyper-polarized age, it’s not hard to scare your core voters about the other side. Many things could upend this analysis. It depends on Obama running as good a campaign as he did last time and performing as well in debates. And it depends on the economy merely stagnating, not collapsing. But in this moment of sudden pessimism about Obama’s chances, it’s worth remembering that presidential elections are not exercises in econometrics. Candidates matter, and so far, at least, it looks likely that the better one will be the guy occupying the White House right now.

Aging Crisis sustains Hegemony anyway

Haas 7 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne University (Summer 2007, Mark L., "A Geriatric Peace? The Future of U.S. Power in a World of Aging Populations," International Security)

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](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1277921935683&returnToKey=20_T9657885901&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.141506.23549559515" \l "fnote6) Second, global aging increases the likelihood of continued peaceful relations between the United States and the other great powers. Studies have shown that the probability of international conflict grows when either the dominant country anticipates a power transition in favor of a rising state or states, or when such a transition actually takes place. [7](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1277921935683&returnToKey=20_T9657885901&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.141506.23549559515" \l "fnote7) By adding substantial support to the continuation of U.S. hegemony, global aging works against either outcome from transpiring. An aging world therefore decreases the probability that either hot or cold wars will develop between the United States and the other great powers. Third, the effects of global aging will likely increase the United States' unilateral foreign policy tendencies. The aging problem in the other great powers is so severe that these states will have tremendous difficulty maintaining the extent of their international commitments. Consequently, when the United States engages in major international undertakings in the future, the other major actors in the system will be able to offer less help than they can today. Fourth, although the United States is in better demographic shape than the other great powers, it, too, will confront massive new costs created by its own aging population. As a result, it will most likely be unable to maintain its current international position. Thus while the United States will be even more secure from great power rivalry than it is today, it (and its allies) will be less able to realize other key international objectives, including preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), funding nation building, engaging in military humanitarian interventions, and mitigating the effects of local security problems. Global aging, in short, is likely to result in a great power "geriatric peace," but this same phenomenon may threaten other important U.S. international interests, including by facilitating international conflict in non-great power relations. Fifth, as the costs created by the United States' aging population grow, the saliency of neo-isolationist or "offshore balancing" grand strategies is likely to increase. [8](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1277921935683&returnToKey=20_T9657885901&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.141506.23549559515" \l "fnote8) In a time of fiscal austerity brought on by social aging, these strategies are likely to become more compelling because they mesh with the need to reduce spending. An aging world therefore increases the likelihood that the United States will withdraw from the international system even more than budget constraints dictate.
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Hegemony doesn’t solve anything

Hachigan and Sutphen, 8 (Nina Hachigian is a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, and Mona K. Sutphen is a senior government official, lobbyist, and writer on foreign policy, “Strategic Collaboration: How the United States Can Thrive as Other Powers Rise,” CSIS, The Washington Quarterly • 31:4 pp. 43–57, Autumn, October, 2008)

When U.S. interests frame the analysis, the ben- efits that the rise of these powers delivers for the United States become clear. Although the United States will hold predomi- nant power for a long time to come, that power is no longer sufficient to keep Americans safe and prosperous. Primacy has not been the answer to stabilizing Afghanistan and Iraq, denuclearizing North Korea or Iran, defeat- ing al Qaeda, addressing climate change, or resurrecting global trade. Only with other nations can the United States combat the true threats and best realize new opportunities. This new world is shaped most fundamentally by technology, not ideology. A truly global financial system now allows money, goods, and many people to cross borders nearly seamlessly. China, India, and Russia have embraced capi- talism and this system, as the United States urged for many decades. As a re- sult, their economies are now growing, as is their influence. At the same time, technology has empowered nonstate threats, such as terrorists and pathogens. Moreover, small countries such as North Korea are now able to wield the kind of destructive power that once was reserved only for the strongest states. In this new era, the greatest threats to the peace and prosperity that the pivotal powers want and need does not emanate from other strong powers but from these technologically empowered forces of chaos—the rotten fruit of glo- balization. Order-seeking nation-states must band together to combat these threats.

Even if a Republican win in the elections will kill heg, it will not solve for anything in the long run meaning that the neg’s impacts are denied, and the elections will have no big effect
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A. Uniqueness- United States economy is strong and growing in the status quo

Econ Post, Economic News, February 14, 2011, http://econpost.com/unitedstateseconomy/us-economic-outlook-index-forecasts-stronger-growth

The United States economy is predicted to have stroner growth in the months ahead based on positive signs in January 2011 in an index that measures the strength of the U.S. economy. The USA Today/IHS Global Insight Economic Outlook index's January indicators forecast a growth rate of 3.7% for the U.S. economy in March and April 2011. This growth rate is up from the Index's earlier forecast for the same period of 2.1% back in September 2010.

B. Since the economy is strong, the SPS cost will not affect it. Also, if it the economy did take a hit, it is resilient—empirics like after WWII prove

**C. No link – initial investments would rapidly recover**

Kluck, Instructor at the El Dorado High School, 1996, El Dorado High School (Rebecca, 1996, “Solar Power Satellites”<http://scitation.aip.org/getpdf/servlet/GetPDFServlet?filetype=pdf&id=ASCECP000207041774000176000001&idtype=cvips&doi=10.1061/40177(207)176&prog=normal&bypassSSO=1>)

The cost of the construction of a solar power satellite would be anywhere from nine hundred million to (fifteen billion dollars (Bova, 1993). But the necessity of relatively harmless. yet plentiful energy is obvious. A solar power satellite will provide a more than adequate amount of energy, which could be used for communications and even government uses (Bova, 1994). This price may seem immense but the truth is this method of collecting and delivering energy from space to earth will become cheaper in the long run. Cheap? That’s right, the solar power satellite, once constructed, will run on solar solar energy so no fuel will be necessary which will make the operation of the satellite expensive. Financing the building of such a large satellite might be a slight problem. Either taxpayers’ money could be used or long-term, low-interest federal loans could be taken out just as loans were taken outfor the large power dams (Bova,1993). If the loans were used, the money borrowed would be rapidly recovered due to the vast amount of energy beamed back to earth. The idea of launching a solar power satellite would also increase the amount of exploration done within the next century. For instance receptions could also be placed on the moon and on various planets where the environment is possible suitable for life. The excess energy could be used to launch an aircraft which would decrease the cost of the launching, therefore additional and more frequent missions could take place. There are several motives for the manufacturing of a solar power satellite. First, it is clearly beneficial for the general public, and it will galvanize development for existing technological bases. It would also promote international cooperation (Bova, 1993). All of these positive outcomes would help the United States and the rest of the world prosper economically.

D. Even if the plan did affect the budget, the reward would be so huge it could solve our debt problem
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E. Aff would only cost $500 million

Rubenchik, Alexander M Rubenchik, is a physicist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, April 2009, “Solar Power Beaming: From Space to Earth”, http://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=%E2%80%9CThe+cost+to+deploy+the+first+space-based+solar+energy+system+is+estimated+at+approximately+%24500+million.+A+significant+percentage+of+this+cost+is+attributed+to+the+laser%2C+the+solar+reflector%2Fcollector+systems%E2%80%9D+&hl=en&btnG=Search&as\_sdt=1%2C30&as\_sdtp=on, Date accessed June 24, 2011

The cost to deploy the first space-based solar energy system is estimated at approximately $500 million. A significant percentage of this cost is attributed to the laser, the solar reflector/collector systems and the ground receiver/power generation station on Earth. This cost includes a single space- based power beaming system and a single receiver station on Earth. Multiple industries would be engaged supporting their areas of expertise to comprise the total required system. A rough order of magnitude cost for a first system is shown in the following table:Subsequent systems would cost significantly less. The cost to launch future additional vehicles into LEO is estimated to be several times less than the initial launch, and the cost of the laser system is also estimated to be several times less than the first deployed unit. Since a first article is yet to be designed and built, it is difficult to estimate with strong confidence the actual cost of our proposed system. However, the attributes of the system as explained in previous sections, strongly support villages worldwide. However, even in this initial, rather low throughput case, the start-up costs look prohibitively high. We believe that our proposed system can be deployed and begin power-beaming operations at a cost of a few hundred of millions of dollars. Although this initial system may be far from economical, it certainly can stimulate the technological development (as an example, the solar power beaming lift vehicle) to reduce costs, such that space-based solar power can be an economic realization in the not too distant future.

F. The Aff would cost about the same as two fighter jets that the government is ordering. It is not enough to make a significant dent/impact on the economy. F-35+22 proves.
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1) The F-35 is in no danger of the chopping block because it is too big to fail

Haddick 5/27 (Robert is Robert Haddick is Managing Editor of Small Wars Journal. He writes the “This Week at War” column for Foreign Policy and is a member of the Small Wars Journal management team. 5/27/11 “This Week at War: The Jet That Ate the Pentagon” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/05/27/this\_week\_at\_war\_the\_jet\_that\_ate\_the\_pentagon)

The Government Accountability Office reported that although Pentagon management of the program is improving, developers have only completely verified 4 percent of the F-35's capabilities. The program received another blow this week when the Senate Armed Services Committee learned that the Pentagon will likely have to spend $1 trillion over the next 50 years to operate and maintain the fleet of F-35s. Evidently reeling from sticker shock, Sen. John McCain demanded that "we at least begin considering alternatives." But is it too late to prevent the F-35 program from devouring the Pentagon's future procurement budgets? Air Force officials themselves may now doubt the wisdom of the size of the commitment to the F-35. According to a recent Aviation Week story, Air Force Undersecretary Erin Conaton placed new emphasis on the importance of the Air Force's next-generation long-range bomber. With procurement funds sure to be tight in the decade ahead, Conaton hinted that the Air Force may have to raid the F-35's future budgets in order to help pay for the new bomber. The rapidly changing strategic situation in Asia and the western Pacific should compel policymakers to reexamine the size of the commitment to the F-35. Yet another critical report on the F-35 from the Pentagon's acquisition office dated Dec. 31, 2010, revealed that the Air Force version of the attack jet would have a combat mission radius of 584 miles, just short of the original stated requirement of 590 miles, and significantly less than a recent expectation by program officials that the jet would be able to strike targets 690 miles away without midair refueling. A combat radius of 584 miles leaves planners with few options when contemplating operations over the vast distances in the Asia-Pacific region. As I discussed in a recent column, China's growing inventories of ballistic and cruise missiles are already capable, according to the U.S.-1) China Economic and Security Review Commission, of striking the U.S. Air Force's main bases in the region. These missiles are also putting the Navy's aircraft carriers increasingly at risk, which could compel the Navy to move the vessels out of the F-35's strike range. The solution is combat aircraft with much longer ranges, which would operate from distant bases less vulnerable to missile attack. This would explain Conaton's increased emphasis on the new long-range bomber and the Navy's interest in a long-range combat drone that would launch from its aircraft carriers and some of its amphibious ships. There are still significant roles for the F-35 and many of its leading-edge stealth and electronic capabilities. The F-35 can defend against enemy aircraft, can collect and distribute intelligence from over a battlefield, and can attack heavily defended targets within its range. In any case, the program is "too big to fail," or at least "too big to kill," and it is far too late in the day to now consider alternatives. But it seems increasingly likely that the Air Force and Navy will eventually truncate their planned purchases and redirect those savings into new long-range platforms. Doing so would cause the unit cost of the F-35 to spike even higher which would likely lead many foreign partners to drop out. But that regrettable consequence may be necessary if the Air Force and Navy are to have the money to buy capabilities that will actually be useful in the vast stretches of the Pacific.

**This entire DA proves just how big the F-35 program is, thus proving that it can not fail, if everyone thinks this is key to heg, no rational congressman would cut it or trade-off funds**

**2) And the F-22 already has all of the capabilities of the F-35, and is even a better fighter, experts prove. Therefore, we do not necessarily need the F-35 to solve for heg, when we have a plane that can already do it better.**

3) Even if the F-22 can not maintain heg in the world currently, we still control the best internal link to the heg impact as having an orbital power grid that could give energy to US troops deployed anywhere in the world maintains a significant sign of power. That’s our Dinerman and Kagan evidences from the 1AC

2AC Spending Tradeoff (2/2)

4) The F-22 has unique qualities that make it superior to the F-35 meaning it solves for heg better

Kopp 7 (Carlo Kopp is a prominent Australian freelance defence analyst and academic who has published ~300 articles in trade publications such as Defence Today, Air International, Journal of Electronic Defense, Jane's Missiles and Rockets, Australian Aviation and the Asia Pacific Defence Reporter on matters of aerospace technology, stealth, information warfare 1/7 “Lockheed-Martin F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter Assessing the Joint Strike Fighter” http://www.ausairpower.net/APA-JSF-Analysis.html)

From a 'bombing productivity' perspective, armed with the GBU-39/B, supercruise in the F-22A provides a unique advantage. At ranges where the transit time between runway and target dominates the sortie duration, the ability of the F-22A to cruise supersonic at nearly twice the subsonic cruise speed of the JSF permits it to perform more sorties - at some range this becomes twice as many sorties, effectively doubling the 'bombing productivity' of the F-22A vs the JSF. Both aircraft are equipped with external wing pylons to carry external weapons and/or fuel in scenarios where stealth is no longer required, and both will suffer range penalties due to external stores cruise drag when carried. The F-22A has four jettisonable pylons with paired AMRAAM rail launchers, each rated to 5,000 lb, the JSF four pylons, inboard at 5,000 lb, outboard at 2,500 lb, with further outboard auxiliary pylons rated at 300 lb for AAMs. An external stores pod was in development for the F-22A, which would allow the stealthy external carriage under the wing of up to four 2,000 lb class external stores such as the JDAM.

5) The F-22 is superior in strike capability

Kopp 7 (Carlo Kopp is a prominent Australian freelance defence analyst and academic who has published ~300 articles in trade publications such as Defence Today, Air International, Journal of Electronic Defense, Jane's Missiles and Rockets, Australian Aviation and the Asia Pacific Defence Reporter on matters of aerospace technology, stealth, information warfare 1/7 “Lockheed-Martin F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter Assessing the Joint Strike Fighter” http://www.ausairpower.net/APA-JSF-Analysis.html)

In comparing the JSF and F-22A in air-combat roles, the F-22A is vastly superior. In long range BVR combat the F-22A has major advantages in sustained energy performance, stealth, radar range and missile kinematic performance - an AMRAAM goes a lot further if launched from twice the altitude at supersonic speed. In close in combat the F-22A's greater agility cannot be contested - on dry thrust the F-22A outclimbs and outaccelerates an afterburning F-15. The JSF is designed to achieve similar performance to the F-16C, itself inferior to the F-15 series. In any Combat Air Patrol scenario, supercruise permits the F-22A to cover four times the footprint of a JSF. It can engage and disengage opponents at will, unlike the slower and less stealthy JSF. The F-22A outclasses the JSF across the board and is several times as effective in most air combat regimes.

6) The F-22 is much better in Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance

Kopp 7 (Carlo Kopp is a prominent Australian freelance defence analyst and academic who has published ~300 articles in trade publications such as Defence Today, Air International, Journal of Electronic Defense, Jane's Missiles and Rockets, Australian Aviation and the Asia Pacific Defence Reporter on matters of aerospace technology, stealth, information warfare 1/7 “Lockheed-Martin F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter Assessing the Joint Strike Fighter” http://www.ausairpower.net/APA-JSF-Analysis.html)

In comparing the JSF and F-22A in Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance (ISR) roles, the F-22A does much better for a number of reasons. Both aircraft will have a respectable capability for high resolution SAR ground mapping and electronic intelligence gathering built in - adaptation for ISR requires an internal digital recorder and datalink transmit capability, neither expensive. High quality optical and thermal imaging reconnaissance would require specialised payloads for both types - the JSF EOTS is not competitive against even current multi-Megapixel focal plane imagers, and the same would be true of any equivalent system used in the growth of the F-22A. Payloads such as thermal imaging strip mappers, visible/IR digital framing cameras and hyperspectral imagers would have to be carried in the internal bays of these aircraft. In this respect the F-22A's Sidewinder bays are much better situated geometrically, compared to the JSF's main ventral bays, permitting oblique imaging without a stealth reducing faceted bay door bulge. In the ISR game, timeliness and survivability are top considerations, and the supercruising F-22A wins this game without question. Future ISR payloads are likely to evolve for both types as depot fit weapon bay payloads, with additional software added.

7) Issues in Congress are compartmentalized, meaning that SPS and the F-35 project are not conflicting matters, therefore, trade-off is simply a scare tactic used to gain credibility and benefits for the program

2AC Ozone

1. SPS won’t have a significant effect on the ozone layer.

Mark Prado, former advanced planner for Pentagon space program, 2002, “§ 5.12.3 Environmental Effects of SPSs on Earth” <http://permanent.com/p-sps-bi.htm>

Many people ask about the effects on the ozone layer of SPSs. Answer: none. The SPS in no way affects the ozone layer. Rocket launches do cause various forms of pollution comparable overall to a power plant on the ground, but ozone depletion would be negligible. (Valentino/DoE, ref. 88) Using materials already in space, i.e., asteroidal and lunar materials, will greatly reduce launch needs. Others asked about whether a SPS could crash to Earth. No. Unlike low Earth orbit space stations and spy satellites, the SPSs are located in a very high Earth orbit, and it would take many thousands of years before the SPS's orbit could possibly decay to cause atmospheric entry. Notably, large scale space development using asteroid-derived fuel propellants will insure that dead satellites in low orbit do not crash to Earth, even old satellites.

2.Even if SPS were to have an impact on the ozone layer, its overall benefits for the environment make it a preferable solution for alternative energy.

Aleksander Zidanšek et al, 11.30.2010 Jožef Stefan Institute, Jamova cesta 39, Ljubljana, Slovenia b Jožef Stefan International Postgraduate School, Department of Physics, Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, University of Maribor, University of Pennsylvania, Department of Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics, “Solar orbital power: Sustainability analysis” Elsevier Ltd, Volume 36, Issue 4, 5th Dubrovnik Conference on Sustainable Development of Energy, Water & Environment Systems

Currently we get about 85% of the world energy from fossil fuels. They generate about 10 MJ of energy per 1 kg of CO2 emissions. We compare this to the solar power satellite emission results shown in Table 1, assuming 25 years of operation for the solar power satellite. In its lifetime 1 W of space solar electric power will thus produce about 760 MJ of energy, if we assume that it operates 95% of the time, and we would get more than 500 MJ of energy to Earth, if we assume 70% efficiency of the energy transmission system [16]. In this paper we define efficiency as the ratio between the electricity delivered by the rectenna into the terrestrial transmission line and the electricity generated in space as the input to the space microwave transmission system. All the data in the tables are calculated for the power received at the rectenna on Earth. If we produce the same amount of energy on Earth from oil (energy density about 40 MJ/kg), we get about 50 kg of CO2 emissions at 100% thermal efficiency and 1oad factor. For a more realistic efficiency of about 30% these emissions are about 150 kg, i.e. two orders of magnitude more than for a typical space power station. This means that all the described Earth launched solar power satellites produce about one order of magnitude less CO2 emissions than fossil fuels for the same amount of generated electricity. If the satellites are built and launched from the Moon, the emissions are even lower. With this result it is important to keep in mind that CO2 emissions are not the only cost to environment. Among other environmental impacts it is for example important to take into account that the rocket fuel emissions may also destroy ozone, and it is important to explore the possible effects of microwaves and laser beams on the ionosphere. However, such a clear advantage of orbital solar power satellites demonstrates that this is indeed a very sound energy technology from a global warming reduction point of view.

2AC China Relations (1/3)

1. Non Unique:

US-China relations are low now

Michael J. Green, associate professor of international relations at Georgetown University, 1/13/11, “Good News and Bad News About US-China Relations”, Foreign Policy, <http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/01/13/good_news_and_bad_news_about_us_china_relations>

The administration and outside experts have rightly grown concerned over the role of the People's Liberation Army this past year. PLA generals are regularly opining on foreign-policy issues -- often in nationalistic and controversial ways -- without any clearance from the Communist Party leadership, let alone the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. PLA journals and Chinese netizens are citing every move by the United States, Japan, NATO, or India as part of a larger strategy designed to encircle and weaken China (frequent claims include the assertion that Hillary Clinton asked the Norwegians to give the Nobel Peace Prize to Liu Xiaobo). Most worrisome, aggressive PLA operations such as the January 2007 anti-satellite test and the test flight of China's new J-20 "stealth" fighter during Gates's visit to China, are coming as obvious surprises to China's political leadership. Hu is chair of the Central Military Commission and the party controls senior promotions, but there is virtually no day-to-day civilian oversight of PLA operations, and it shows. Hu did not fix this problem, and reports that Xi Jinping's advancement was delayed by the PLA suggest he may have even less luck (though some experts hope that Hu's wife will help, since -- in Pirates of Penzance fashion -- she is a popular PLA singer and a major general). 2. What Exactly Did the United States Get? Across the U.S. government, officials can point to small signs of a more positive tone in official U.S.-China discourse, but much of it may be tactical and all of it is reversible. The PLA leadership was clear during the recent Gates visit that it is prepared to sever military-to-military dialogue again in response to Taiwan arms sales or other issues. Meanwhile, the PLA military buildup and cyberoperations against U.S. targets continue unabated. The renminbi has appreciated slightly against the dollar before … and then been repegged. Beijing appears to have played a role in discouraging Pyongyang from reacting to South Korean artillery drills, but South Korean pledges to bomb the North if it did certainly played a role as well, and there is little evidence that China is moving away from its emphasis on stability in North Korea over denuclearization. Recent Chinese pledges on intellectual property rights protection and "indigenous innovation" are welcome, but the proof will be in implementation. None of this is surprising -- it is in the nature of U.S.-China interactions. But the underlying structural challenges to the relationship remain.

2. No link and turn:

China doesn’t want cooperation, and relations will result in space Pearl Harbor

**Logan 8**

CRS Report for Congress: China’s Space Program: Options for U.S.-China Cooperation by Jeffrey Logan, Specialist in Energy Policy

Resources, Science, and Industry Division 9-29-2008

http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22777.pdf

Inadvertent technology transfer: From this perspective, increased space cooperation with China should be avoided until Chinese intentions are clearer. Joint space activities could lead to more rapid (dual-use) technology transfer to China, and in a worst-case scenario, result in a “space Pearl Harbor,” as postulated by a congressionally appointed commission led by Donald Rumsfeld in 2001. Moral compromise. China is widely criticized for its record on human rights and non-democratic governance. Any collaboration that improves the standing of authoritarian Chinese leaders might thus be viewed as unacceptable. Ineffectiveness. Some argue that increased collaboration will not produce tangible benefits for the United States, especially without a new bilateral political climate.

2AC China Relations (2/3)

China doesn’t want to cooperate – they are focused on establishing own space programs

Wolf 1-2

Jim Wolf, staff writer for Reuters Analysis: Space: a frontier too far for U.S.-China cooperation 1-2-11

http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/01/02/us-china-usa-space-idUSTRE7010E520110102

(Reuters) - The prospects for cooperation between the United States and China in space are fading even as proponents say working together in the heavens could help build bridges in often-testy relations on Earth. The idea of joint ventures in space, including spacewalks, explorations and symbolic "feel good" projects, have been floated from time to time by leaders on both sides. Efforts have gone nowhere over the past decade, swamped by economic, diplomatic and security tensions, despite a 2009 attempt by President Barack Obama and his Chinese counterpart, Hu Jintao, to kick-start the bureaucracies. U.S. domestic politics make the issue unlikely to advance when Obama hosts Hu at the White House on January 19. Washington is at odds with Beijing over its currency policies and huge trade surplus but needs China's help to deter North Korea and Iran's nuclear ambitions and advance global climate and trade talks, among other matters. Hu's state visit will highlight the importance of expanding cooperation on "bilateral, regional and global issues," the White House said. But space appears to be a frontier too far for now, partly due to U.S. fears of an inadvertent technology transfer. China may no longer be much interested in any event, reckoning it does not need U.S. expertise for its space program. New obstacles to cooperation have come from the Republicans capturing control of the U.S. House of Representatives in the November 2 congressional elections from Obama's Democrats. Representative Frank Wolf, for instance, is set to take over as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that funds the U.S. space agency in the House.

3. No Impact:

a. Their global warming impact is too long term and is not terminal. Collapse of the entire environment will take more than this lifetime and biological life has survived the ice age. Chances of complete extinction are far off.

b. Global warming doesn’t risk extinction – doomsayers are wrong

Bailey, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine, testified before Congress, author of numerous books, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, 2k [ Ronald, “[Earth Day, Then and Now](http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now)

The planet's future has never looked better. Here's why.”, <http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now/4>]

Earth Day 1970 provoked a torrent of apocalyptic predictions. "We have about five more years at the outside to do something," ecologist Kenneth Watt declared to a Swarthmore College audience on April 19, 1970. Harvard biologist George Wald estimated that "civilization will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind." "We are in an environmental crisis which threatens the survival of this nation, and of the world as a suitable place of human habitation," wrote Washington University biologist Barry Commoner in the Earth Day issue of the scholarly journal *Environment*. The day after Earth Day, even the staid *New York Times* editorial page warned, "Man must stop pollution and conserve his resources, not merely to enhance existence but to save the race from intolerable deterioration and possible extinction." Very Apocalypse Now. Three decades later, of course, the world hasn't come to an end; if anything, the planet's ecological future has never looked so promising. With half a billion people suiting up around the globe for Earth Day 2000, now is a good time to look back on the predictions made at the first Earth Day and see how they've held up and what we can learn from them. The short answer: The prophets of doom were not simply wrong, but spectacularly wrong**.** More important, many contemporary environmental alarmists are similarly mistaken when they continue to insist that the Earth's future remains an eco-tragedy that has already entered its final act. Such doomsters not only fail to appreciate the huge environmental gains made over the past 30 years, they ignore the simple fact that increased wealth, population, and technological innovation don't degrade and destroy the environment. Rather, such developments preserve and enrich the environment. If it is impossible to predict fully the future, it is nonetheless possible to learn from the past. And the best lesson we can learn from revisiting the discourse surrounding the very first Earth Day is that passionate concern, however sincere, is no substitute for rational analysis.

2AC China Relations (3/3)

c. Economic decline doesn’t cause war – Mead is wrong.

Ferguson 2006 (Niall, MA, D.Phil., is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University. He is a resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He is also a Senior Reseach Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct)

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

2AC Space Militarization (1/3)

Non unique: Chinese space militarization is imminent – the U.S. isn’t backing down in its assertive posture of self-defense

News24 2/5/2011 – South Africa’s premier news source in science technology, member of the Online Publishers Association (OPA), and and a DMMA member (News24, “US worry over China space weapons”, http://www.news24.com/SciTech/News/US-worry-over-China-space-weapons-20110205#)

"The investment China is putting into counterspace capabilities is a matter of concern to us," deputy secretary of defence for space policy Gregory Schulte told reporters as the defence and intelligence communities released their 10-year National Security Space Strategy (NSSS).  The NSSS marks a huge shift from past practice, charting a 10-year path in space to make the US "more resilient" and able to defend its assets in a dramatically more crowded, competitive, challenging and sometimes hostile environment, Schulte said. "Space is no longer the preserve of the US and the Soviet Union, at the time in which we could operate with impunity," Schulte said. "There are more competitors, more countries that are launching satellites... and we increasingly have to worry about countries developing counterspace capabilities that can be used against the peaceful use of space.  "China is at the forefront of the development of those capabilities," he said.  Satellite signals jammed US concerns over China's space activities have led Defence Secretary Robert Gates to seek to include space in the stability dialogue with the Chinese, Schulte said.  In 2007, China shot down one of its own weather satellites using a medium-range ground missile, sparking international concern not only about how China was "weaponising" space, but also about debris from the satellite.  Years later, Chinese space junk is still floating around in space. Last year, debris from the satellite passed so close to the International Space Station that crew had to change orbit and take cover.  Shooting down the satellite not only focused the world's attention on the amount of junk in space but also on Chinese counterspace capabilities, which go beyond shooting down spacecraft, said Schulte.  Among other counterspace activities, Beijing has jammed satellite signals and is developing directed energy weapons, which emit energy toward a target without firing a projectile, said Schulte.  And China isn't the only country flexing its counterspace muscle. Iran and Ethiopia are, too, he said.  International partnerships "They've jammed commercial satellites... If Ethiopia can jam a commercial satellite, you have to worry about what others can do against our military satellites.  "Fifteen years ago we didn't have to worry about that but now we have to think differently, to think about how we can continue to conduct the critical functions that are performed from space, or, if they're degraded, we have to have alternative solutions," said Schulte.  The 10-year strategy document proposes ways to protect US space assets, including by setting up international partnerships along the lines of Nato, under which an attack on one member would be an attack on all, drawing a unified response from members of the alliance.  The US also "retains the option to respond in self-defence to attacks in space, and the response may not be in space, either," Schulte said.

**No seriously**

Peckham 5/9 – contributer to TIME (Matt, 2011, "Militarization of Space Continues with Launch of Missile-Tracking Satellite," http://techland.time.com/2011/05/09/militarization-of-space-continues-with-launch-of-missile-tracking-satellite/, RG)

What goes up and doesn't come down, but has the potential to take all sorts of other stuff down?

If you said a bunch of balloons [**launched by a misguided games publisher**](http://www.pcworld.com/article/221353/gdc_what_floats_up_must_rain_down_in_homefront_balloon_debacle.html) in March, you win a point (two, if you guessed a bit torrent file). But if you said a $1.3 billion U.S. geosynchronous military satellite capable of detecting, tracking, and *countering* enemy missiles, ding-ding-ding!

The U.S. launched just such an orbital device on Saturday, piggybacking on an [Atlas 5](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlas_V%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) rocket. It's called the Space-Based Infrared System, or SBIRS (best guess, pronounced SPEERS, like the thing you throw), and it's designed to provide early launch warning, battlefield and other miscellaneous intel, and, you know, to deploy high-tech U.S. kung-fu on enemy missiles.

And this one's just the start. The SBIRS program calls for three additional satellites in the sky by 2016 and operating in tandem with the first--each orbiting some 22,000 miles above the planet's surface. They'll be called SBIRS "high," while another 24 satellites dubbed SBIRS "low" (more recently "space tracking and surveillance system") will keep an eye out for ballistic missiles and in theory allow "interceptors" to get on the ball sooner.

Of course [not everyone agrees](http://mitworld.mit.edu/video/182%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) putting weapons (or the precursors thereto) in space is such a grand idea, since it could trigger a space-based arms race with potentially calamitous consequences.

2AC Space Militarization (2/3)

Link turn – space power prevents rogue militarization

Pfaltzgraff ‘7 – Boston Council on Foreign Relations (Robert L., June 18, "Weapons in Space", http://www.ifpa.org/pdf/BCFR\_061807.pdf)

This then represents a good transition to the final part of my presentation. Large numbers of countries are acquiring missiles that could be equipped with nuclear, biological, or chemical warheads. These include states such as Iran and North Korea as well as non-state actors who could have such weapons in the years ahead. Hezbollah was able to launch thousands of Katuchya rockets against Israel last summer. **The ability of the United States to counter missile proliferation and to defend itself and its allies depends on continued utilization of space.** Targets identified from space by the United States or by enemies of the United States could be attacked with missiles or commando strikes or, in the case of attacks against the United States, by terrorist groups using satellite imaging easily downloadable from the Internet, as I have already shown.

Finally, we are entering a period in which additional countries are likely to acquire nuclear forces as well as their own space capabilities. We spend a great deal of time thinking about North Korea and Iran. If we cannot halt these programs, as appears to be the case, we will need to be able to counter them – to deter them from using such weapons or to defend ourselves if they are tempted to use them. Space affords the arena in which a missile defense could be deployed, adding a more robust layer to our capabilities. It also provides essential reconnaissance, surveillance, communications, and other essential capabilities. Space will also be increasingly important as we update security assurances to countries that may feel threatened by North Korea (especially Japan) or by Iran (Israel and NATO Europe). As we have seen, **space militarization and weaponization is already part of the twenty-first-century security landscape.** The importance of space can only grow in the years ahead.

Decline in competitiveness crushes the economy and ends hegemony

Adam Segal, Maurice R. Greenberg Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations and the author of “Digital Dragon: High Technology Enterprises in China”, November/December 2004, “Is America Losing its Edge?” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/60260/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

2AC Space Militarization (3/3)

SSP solves US space diplomacy

Schwab, Martin Schwab, Professor of Philosophy, Philosophy School of Humanities, English Professor School of Humanities, Director of Humanities and Law Minor, April 15, 2002, “The New Viability of Space Solar Power: Global Mobilization for a Common Human Endeavor”, http://scholar.google.com/scholar?start=40&q=unilateral+solar+powered+satellites&hl=en&as\_sdt=0,30&as\_ylo=2000, Date accessed June 25, 2011

In recent months, the National Research Council (NRC) has stated that NASA’s SSP has “important commercial, civil and military applications for the nation.” The NRC went on the recommend that industry experts, academia and officials from other government agencies such as the Department of Energy, Department of Defense and the National Reconnaissance Office should be engaged in charting SSP activities, along with NASA. The NRC also says that significant breakthroughs are still required to achieve the final goal of producing cost-effective terrestrial power. Specifically, the NRC concluded, as has this paper that the ultimate success of SSP for terrestrial power critically depends on “dramatic reductions” in the cost of transportation from Earth to orbit. The SSP reviewers at the NRC conclude by calling for ground demonstrations of point-to-point wireless transmission of power. NASA, the panel also says, should study the desirability of ground to space and space-to-space demonstrations by using the International Space Station as a test platform for SSP related hardware.51 This paper has examined current research into SSP from the perspective of national and international security in the face of potential terrorist sabotage of U.S. and global energy grids. The promise of and institutional commitment to inflatable space structures for SSP and a variety of human activity in space is perhaps the most exiting revelation of this research. This paper also considered the potential diplomatic advantages to including the developing world, as much as possible in developing SSP as a common human endeavor. The final conclusion of this paper is that mobilization around SSP would indeed be a worthy expression of the economic, social, political and military power of the United States.

Space development is key to multilateral alliances and global leadership

National Research Council, the working arm of the United States National Academies, carrying out most of the studies providing scientific and technical services, 2009, “America's Future in Space: Aligning the Civil Space Program with National Needs”, pg. 42-43

Strategic leadership for the United States means thinking about the future in a way that sees beyond immediate and particularly American needs and policies—such as ensuring access to resources or a temporary military advan­tage—and positioning the nation to help set an agenda for worldwide action. In considering both its own national interests and benefits to humankind, the United States should aim for more than immediate solutions to transitory problems and should find approaches that seek to shape the future. Space is viewed by many countries of the world as a global commons, a resource not owned by any one nation but crucial to the future of all humankind. Indeed, human beings around the world view space not just as a place, but rather as symbolic of the future itself. For U.S. exertion of strategic leadership there is thus no venue more special than space. Through its efforts and achievements, the nation has earned its position of leadership in space. True strategic leadership will be achieved not by dominance, which in many cases is no longer possible, but by example and in cooperation with other nations. In addition to protecting those activities in space that are judged to be essential to U.S. national interest, and for which the United States must continue as an undisputed leader, there should also always be concern for the larger world and for how the United States is viewed as a benevolent nation with foresight and determination to make a better world for all humankind. A *goal of the U.S. civil space program is to enhance U.S. global strategic leadership through leadership in civil space activities.* **Strategic Leadership** The goals just enumerated—Earth stewardship, scientific discovery, expanding human frontiers, technological, economic, and societal benefits, and inspiration—provide the foundation for a preeminent U.S. civil space program. If America chooses to achieve these goals, in support of national interests and in the interests of the world at large, we can also achieve a goal of particular importance—to enhance U.S. strategic leadership

Alternate reasons for space militarization such as Space Based Lasers, etc.

Case outweighs

SPS is key to maintaining leadership which solves for international cooperation and soft power that’s key to preventing power wars that go nuclear heg is enough to prevent war with Russia no matter what the situation.

\*\*\*COUNTERPLANS\*\*\*

2AC Laser Transmission

1. Perm Do Both – Multiple methods of transmission would ensure a constant power source. This solves for case and the net benefit.

2. Lasers cannot do what microwaves do, they arent as effective and actually damage human health

Geoffrey A. Landis, an American scientist, working for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on planetary exploration, interstellar propulsion, solar power and photovoltaics, 2009, MIT Energy Club

Laser transmission removes problem of inherently large sizes, but lasers have their own problems. First, laser efficiencies are considerably lower than microwave efficiencies, for lasers with good coherence. High power semiconductor diode lasers arrays are highly efficient (50% conversion efficiency or higher), but are not mutually coherent-- the net result of a high-power laser diode array is that it will have the diffraction pattern characteristic of a flashlight, not the narrow diffraction-limited spot size of a laser. Existing technology lasers might have efficiency approaching ~ 40% (for example, for a diode-pumped alkali) A second problem is that PV converter efficiencies are also low. The conversion efficiency is better than solar conversion efficiency, because the beam can be made monochromatic at a wavelength tuned to the optimum conversion wavelength of the cell, but is still lower than rectenna conversion efficiencies. 50% conversion efficiency is a reasonable efficiency.6 For laser transmission, clouds are now a problem. In addition, eye safety is now a problem. Overall, use of a PV array for power receiving

3. Lasers link to backlash DA – Lasers are perceived as weapons

[Read Backlash as a DA to the counteplan]

4. Microwave beams are safe – they’re less intense than sunlight

NSSO, National Security Space Office, 10/10/07, “Space‐Based Solar Power: As an Opportunity for Strategic Security”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473860&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf//jchen

FINDING:   The SBSP Study Group found that when people are first introduced to this subject, the key expressed concerns are centered around safety, possible weaponization of the beam, and vulnerability of the satellite, all of which must be addressed with education. • Because the microwave beams are constant and conversion efficiencies high, they can be beamed at densities **substantially lower than that of sunlight** and still deliver more energy per area of land usage than terrestrial solar energy.  The peak density of the beam is likely to be significantly less than noon sunlight, and at the edge of the rectenna equivalent to the leakage allowed and accepted by hundreds of millions in their microwave ovens.  This low energy density and choice of wavelength also means that biological effects are likely extremely small, comparable to the heating one might feel if sitting some distance from a campfire.

5. Condo bad – Causes strat skew, moots 2ac offense, allows for an infinite amount of advocasies, kill in-depth debate and education, voter for fairness and education

2AC Nuclear Powered Satellites (1/2)

1) Nuclear satellites fail – solar cell advances have gained priority

FAS, 3/2/01, “DOD'S 'FLIRTATION' WITH NUCLEAR-POWERED SATELLITES ENDS, ANALYST SAYS”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/03/iaf030201.html//jchen

Budget constraints and recent advances in solar cell technologies have ended what one industry analyst calls the Defense Department's longstanding flirtation with developing nuclear power sources for spacecraft, according to industry and Pentagon sources. The military had an ongoing flirtation with nuclear power for nearly 50 years, and now they are saying it is over, said Steven Aftergood, senior research analyst at the non-profit Federation of American Scientists, a think tank based in Washington, DC. Nuclear power offers at least a 100-fold increase in power generation over traditional technologies -- such as solar power or heat-based power -- which explains DOD's affinity for the technology as it relies more and more on space-based assets for its operations, according to Aftergood. However, he notes that the Pentagon's recently released Space Technology Guide does not mention nuclear power, an omission he describes as a real shift in DOD policy, or at least a significant departure.

2) Permutation do the counterplan

3) The counterplan links to politics – budget cuts and political opposition

FAS, Federation of American Scientists, March 2nd, 2001, “DOD’s ‘FLIRTATION’ WITH NUCLEAR-POWERED SATELLITES ENDS, ANALYST SAYS”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/03/iaf030201.html | AK

 Budget constraints and recent advances in solar cell technologies have ended what one industry analyst calls the Defense Department's longstanding flirtation with developing nuclear power sources for spacecraft, according to industry and Pentagon sources. The military had an ongoing flirtation with nuclear power for nearly 50 years, and now they are saying it is over, said Steven Aftergood, senior research analyst at the non-profit Federation of American Scientists, a think tank based in Washington, DC. Nuclear power offers at least a 100-fold increase in power generation over traditional technologies -- such as solar power or heat-based power -- which explains DOD's affinity for the technology as it relies more and more on space-based assets for its operations, according to Aftergood. However, he notes that the Pentagon's recently released Space Technology Guide does not mention nuclear power, an omission he describes as a real shift in DOD policy, or at least a significant departure. The National Space Policy and the Defense Department's space policy remain the same, said Pentagon spokeswoman Susan Hansen. Both policies preclude the use of nuclear power in Earth orbit without the specific approval of the president. Any requests for approval must take into account public safety, economic considerations, treaty obligations and U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, Hansen wrote in a statement for Inside the Air Force. Those policies have been in place for quite some time and have not changed. DOD created the Space Technology Guide in response to Congress' request for an overarching guide of investments in key technologies needed for national security space purposes. Congress requested the guide in the fiscal year 2000 defense authorization act, and the Defense Department released it earlier this month (ITAF, Feb. 9, p16). The guide includes a list of key enabling technologies for national security space that identifies a need for investment in advances for solid rocket motors, electric and plasma thrusters and solar and chemical power generation. Nuclear power does not appear on the list. In a query submitted to Charles Williams, who works on such issues in the office of the assistant secretary of defense for command, control, communications and intelligence, Aftergood suggested that the official omission of nuclear power in the guide could be the result of political pressures or technical considerations. In his response to Aftergood, Williams said that while politics and technical challenges were factors, the key reasons for the subject's removal from the guide were funding and public safety. In the STG, the Congress asked for an investment strategy for space technology. Given the severely constrained funding available for space technology development, funds for nuclear power devices would not make the priority cut, Williams wrote. Even if we could produce them economically, the mission costs would be unaffordable because of the measures necessary for safety. These scarce resources are needed to fund technologies that provide real, accountable leverage to meet future mission requirements, he continued. These economic and technical reasons obviate any need to pursue nuclear power options. Additionally, Hansen noted there is no DOD requirement for nuclear power sources for spacecraft. All of our space-based power needs are being met with alternative methods, such as vastly improved and more efficient solar cells, new battery technologies, and future power technologies such as flywheels. Advances in solar cells are also more than sufficient to maintain ample power supplies, Williams added. Before these alternate technologies matured, however, the Pentagon frequently funded research efforts into nuclear reactors for satellites. As recently as 1991, the Pentagon funded classified work on a nuclear-powered rocket engine program called Timberwind that was part of the Strategic Defense Initiative, Aftergood said. Prior to Timberwind, DOD dabbled in various programs -- some as a partner with the Energy Department or NASA -- to produce space-based nuclear reactors. Timberwind evolved out of such

2AC Nuclear Powered Satellites (2/2)

[continued, no text deleted]

programs as SP-100, on which Aftergood said DOD spent about $500 million, and the Multi-Megawatt program, which is considered a basis for much of the modern understanding of space-based nuclear power technology. DOD also participated in a program that in 1965 launched an experimental reactor into space; the reactor malfunctioned 43 days later, Aftergood said. Although the National Space Policy and the Defense Department's space policy require presidential approval for the launch of payloads containing nuclear reactors, that stipulation has not prevented DOD's involvement in such projects, Aftergood said. In his four years in office, former President George Bush approved two such launches. While recent advances in other technologies provide the Defense Department with a more politically correct and safer source of energy preferable for use on spacecraft on Earth orbit, Williams noted in his correspondence to Aftergood that the only type of mission where space nuclear power would be needed is an interplanetary one, such as NASA's Cassini mission to Saturn. On such a long journey, solar and battery power could not alone power a spacecraft, William said. Indeed, Aftergood said he expects NASA to continue investing in space-based nuclear power alternatives for spacecraft. However, the Defense Department's Earth-focused mission precludes further involvement on a practical basis, he added. -- Amy Butler

4) Permutation do both

5) Nuclear powered satellites are obsolete – politically contentious, dangerous and redundant

FAS, 3/2/01, “DOD'S 'FLIRTATION' WITH NUCLEAR-POWERED SATELLITES ENDS, ANALYST SAYS”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/03/iaf030201.html//jchen

The National Space Policy and the Defense Department's space policy remain the same, said Pentagon spokeswoman Susan Hansen. Both policies preclude the use of nuclear power in Earth orbit without the specific approval of the president. Any requests for approval must take into account public safety, economic considerations, treaty obligations and U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, Hansen wrote in a statement for Inside the Air Force. Those policies have been in place for quite some time and have not changed. DOD created the Space Technology Guide in response to Congress' request for an overarching guide of investments in key technologies needed for national security space purposes. Congress requested the guide in the fiscal year 2000 defense authorization act, and the Defense Department released it earlier this month (ITAF, Feb. 9, p16). The guide includes a list of key enabling technologies for national security space that identifies a need for investment in advances for solid rocket motors, electric and plasma thrusters and solar and chemical power generation. Nuclear power does not appear on the list. In a query submitted to Charles Williams, who works on such issues in the office of the assistant secretary of defense for command, control, communications and intelligence, Aftergood suggested that the official omission of nuclear power in the guide could be the result of political pressures or technical considerations. In his response to Aftergood, Williams said that while politics and technical challenges were factors, the key reasons for the subject's removal from the guide were funding and public safety. In the STG, the Congress asked for an investment strategy for space technology. Given the severely constrained funding available for space technology development, funds for nuclear power devices would not make the priority cut, Williams wrote. Even if we could produce them economically, the mission costs would be unaffordable because of the measures necessary for safety. These scarce resources are needed to fund technologies that provide real, accountable leverage to meet future mission requirements, he continued. These economic and technical reasons obviate any need to pursue nuclear power options. Additionally, Hansen noted there is no DOD requirement for nuclear power sources for spacecraft. All of our space-based power needs are being met with alternative methods, such as vastly improved and more efficient solar cells, new battery technologies, and future power technologies such as flywheels. Advances in solar cells are also more than sufficient to maintain ample power supplies, Williams added.

6) Conditionality is a voter – strat skew and time skew – kills aff offense and moots the 2AC – key to in-depth discussion and education – voter for fairness and education – dispostionality and pre-round conditionality solve all your offense.

2AC Private Actors (1/3)

Condo bad – Causes strat skew, moots 2ac offense, allows for an infinite amount of advocasies, kill in-depth debate and education, voter for fairness and education

Perm solves best – only combination of federal and private efforts ensures aerospace dominance

NSSO, National Security Space Office, 10/10/07, “Space‐Based Solar Power: As an Opportunity for Strategic Security”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473860&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf//jchen

The Aerospace Commission recognized that Global U.S. aerospace leadership can only be achieved through investments in our future, including our industrial base, workforce, long term research and national infrastructure, and that government must commit to increased and sustained investment and must facilitate private investment in our national aerospace sector. The Commission concluded that the nation will have to be a space‐faring nation in order to be the global leader in the 21st century—that our freedom, mobility, and quality of life will depend on it, and therefore, recommended that the United States boldly pioneer new frontiers in aerospace technology, commerce and exploration.  They explicitly recommended hat the United States create a space imperative and that NASA and DoD need to make the investments necessary for developing and supporting future launch capabilities to revitalize U.S. space launch infrastructure, as well as provide Incentives to Commercial Space.  The report called on government and the investment community must become more sensitive to commercial opportunities and problems in space.  Recognizing the new realities of a highly dynamic, competitive and global marketplace, the report noted that the federal government is dysfunctional when addressing 21st century issues from a long term, national and global perspective.  It suggested an increase in public funding for long term research and supporting infrastructure and an acceleration of transition of government research to the aerospace sector, recognizing that **government must assist industry by providing insight into its long‐term research programs**, and industry needs to provide to government on its research priorities.  It urged the federal government must remove unnecessary barriers to international sales of defense products, and implement other initiatives that strengthen transnational partnerships to enhance national security, noting that U.S. national security and procurement policies represent some of the most burdensome restrictions affecting U.S. industry competitiveness.   Private‐public partnerships were also to be encouraged.  It also noted that without constant vigilance and investment, vital capabilities in our defense industrial base will be lost, and so recommended a fenced amount of research and development budget, and significantly increase in the investment in basic aerospace research to increase opportunities to gain experience in the workforce by enabling breakthrough aerospace capabilities through continuous development of new experimental systems with or without a requirement for production.  Such experimentation was deemed to be essential to sustain the critical skills to conceive, develop, manufacture and maintain advanced systems and potentially provide expanded capability to the warfighter.  A top priority was increased investment in basic aerospace research which fosters an efficient, secure, and safe aerospace transportation system, and suggested the establishment of national technology demonstration goals, which included reducing the cost and time to space by 50%.  It concluded that, “America must exploit and explore space to assure national and planetary security, economic benefit and scientific discovery. At the same time, the United States must overcome the obstacles that jeopardize its ability to sustain leadership in space.”  An SBSP program would be a powerful expression of this imperative.

Private sector fails – government key to R&D and policy regulation

NSSO, National Security Space Office, 10/10/07, “Space‐Based Solar Power: As an Opportunity for Strategic Security”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA473860&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf//jchen

Several major challenges will need to be overcome to make SBSP a reality, including the creation of low‐ cost space access and a supporting infrastructure system on Earth and in space.  Solving these space access and operations challenges for SBSP will in turn also open space for a host of other activities that include space tourism, manufacturing, lunar or asteroid resource utilization, and eventually settlement to extend the human race.   Because DoD would not want to own SBSP satellites, but rather just purchase the delivered energy as it currently does via traditional terrestrial utilities, a repeated review finding is that the commercial sector will need Government to accomplish three major tasks to catalyze SBSP development.  The first is to retire a major portion of the early technical risks.  This can be accomplished via an incremental research and development program that culminates with a space‐ borne proof‐of‐concept demonstration in the next decade.   A spiral development proposal to field a 10 MW continuous pilot plant en route to gigawatts‐class systems is included in Appendix B.   The second challenge is to facilitate the policy, regulatory, legal, and organizational instruments that will be necessary to create the partnerships and relationships (commercial‐commercial, government‐ commercial, and government‐government) needed for this concept to succeed.   The final Government contribution is to become a direct early adopter and to incentivize other early adopters much as is accomplished on a regular basis with other renewable energy systems coming on‐line today.

2AC Private Actors (2/3)

Privatization of the aerospace industry is costly in terms of the economy and hegemony

David **Wu**, Chairman of the House of Science and Technology, April 15, 20**10**, “Obama’s Space Privatization Plan is a Costly Mistake”, http://www.aolnews.com/2010/04/15/debate-obamas-space-privatization-plan-is-a-costly-mistake/

In testimony before the House Science and Technology Committee on Feb. 25, NASA administrator Charles Bolden admitted that his agency had not conducted a single market survey on the potential costs of privatizing space exploration. Instead, the administration relied solely on information provided by the aerospace industry when formulating its plans for privatizing the human spaceflight program. While these estimates may indeed be accurate, we cannot know for sure what the potential costs associated with this dramatic move will be without independent, unbiased estimates.

Simply put, the president's vision lacks clearly defined objectives and metrics for measuring success. The administration cannot adequately explain where the space program's shifted focus will lead. And the president's justification for privatizing human space exploration relies on the proverbial fox guarding the hen house. The American people deserve better.

The Constellation program is not perfect. But putting all of our eggs in a private-sector basket is simply too risky a gamble. If the president's plan is implemented, we would be jeopardizing our nation's lead in space exploration, and we would be jeopardizing our children's future.

The space program encourages us to reach for the stars in both our dreams and our actions. It helps drive innovation, and it challenges us to find creative solutions to technological challenges. Moreover, it inspires America's next generation of scientists and engineers to pursue their passions -- something we must have if our nation is to compete in the 21st century global economy.

The president's plan to privatize our spaceflight program will hinder our nation's ability to remain at the forefront of human achievement for generations to come. We must reconsider.

The private sector is politically controversial – bipartisan opposition

Andy Pasztor, correspondent to the Wall Street Journal, January 24th, 2010, “White House Decides to Outsource NASA Work”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704375604575023530543103488.html | AK

The White House has decided to begin funding private companies to carry NASA astronauts into space, but the proposal faces major political and budget hurdles, according to people familiar with the matter. The controversial proposal, expected to be included in the Obama administration's next budget, would open a new chapter in the U.S. space program. The goal is to set up a multiyear, multi-billion-dollar initiative allowing private firms, including some start-ups, to compete to build and operate spacecraft capable of ferrying U.S. astronauts into orbit—and eventually deeper into the solar system. Congress is likely to challenge the concept's safety and may balk at shifting dollars from existing National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs already hurting for funding to the new initiative. The White House's ultimate commitment to the initiative is murky, according to these people, because the budget isn't expected to outline a clear, long-term funding plan.

2AC Private Actors (3/3)

Counterplan cedes space to China—kills leadership, economy and education.

Thomas R **Webber,** director of the Heritge Planetarium and astronomical journalist, February 23, **11**. Locals dismayed by space cuts <http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2010/feb/23/locals-dismayed-by-space-cuts/>

Obama wants the future of manned space exploration to more heavily involve private-sector partners. He is calling for $6 billion over the next five years to develop commercial spacecraft that could take astronauts to low-Earth orbit. Under this plan, NASA would oversee private companies designing and building these technologies. "It means that essentially the U.S. has decided that they're not going to be a significant player in human space flight in the foreseeable future," Michael Griffin, a former NASA administrator and pioneer of the Constellation Program, has said. "The path that they're on with this budget is a path that can't work." John Gedmark, executive director of the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, is more optimistic; he's argued that opponents to Obama's plan are underestimating the capabilities of the private sector.

"The Defense Department began using commercial rockets a long time ago to launch priceless national security satellites that our troops' lives depend on. If the Pentagon can trust private industry with that responsibility, we think NASA can, too," he said.

And although he takes the White House decision personally, Taylor is understanding.

"The administration was very truthful in what they said - there wasn't enough money to go around to do everything they wanted," he said. "We have big eyes, but we don't have enough money."

Paul Lewis, UT's director of astronomy outreach, predicts "a tremendous battle in Congress" over the space-exploration strategy.

The problem, he said, is that "people want instantaneous gratification and can't see the long-term consequences of that reaction."

Former U.S. Sen. Harrison "Jack" Schmitt, an Apollo 17 astronaut and friend of Taylor's who spoke at UT in November 2008, has chaired NASA's Advisory Council.

He is much more blunt than Taylor in his criticism of Obama: "The administration finally has announced its formal retreat on American space policy after a year of morale-destroying clouds of uncertainty. The administration does not understand, or want to acknowledge, the essential role space plays in the future of the United States."

Schmitt is also concerned about the effect of Obama's budget decision on future energy needs. Schmitt sees the isotope Helium-3, which is rare on Earth but plentiful on the moon, as a potent nuclear fusion fuel when combined with heavy hydrogen. It is nonpolluting and has virtually no radioactive byproducts. Scientists estimate that there are over 1 million tons of Helium-3 on the moon, enough to [No Text Removed]

power the entire world for thousands of years.

Just one shuttle full of Helium-3 could supply the entire energy needs of the United States for a year.

Right now, the technology doesn't exist to reach that energy source. But Taylor is also a longtime proponent of developing science to take advantage of this untapped lunar resource.

Taylor sees another victim in reducing funds to the space program - education.

"We find it hard to realize that we are falling behind," he said. "Every time there is a poll, the United States ranks 15th or 16th in the world in math and science."

Taylor also raises an economic argument for furthering space programs.

"Compare NASA's roughly $18 billion budget with just the $660 billion going to the Department of Defense," he said.

Taylor notes that for every dollar spent by NASA, there is a $24 return to the Gross National Product - one of the highest dollar turn-arounds in the country.

"Whenever there is a major project, like the space race, there is a national boom in technology," he said.

So if the United States withdraws from the race back to the moon, who does Taylor think will be the next to have astronauts plant their flag on the lunar surface?

"China," he said. "They have a dichotomy of two governments: Capitalism to give them lots of funds to do it, and communism to give them one person to say, 'Go ahead! No Congress!'"

2AC China Co-op (1/2)

1. Perm do the plan then cooperate with China in space.

US must establish presence in space before coop – it’s key to miscommunications

Eric **Sterner** 20**10**, George C. Marshall Institute, “Worthy of a Great Nation? NASA’s Change of Strategic Direction,” Apr.

The United States can only continue to set a global agenda in space by challenging countries to work together in pursuit of a unifying purpose. It took decades after the Apollo program and the stunning loss of seven astronauts aboard the space shuttle Columbia for U.S. policymakers to establish a bipartisan, bicameral consensus on the future of the human exploration program. The fiscal year 2011 budget proposal has already undone that consensus, dividing proponents of a forward leaning civil space program from advocates of space commercialization, human spaceflight from robotic exploration, and one state from another. In retreating from an exploration program focused on establishing a permanent presence on the moon and reaching Mars within a specific timeframe, the United States will create uncertainty about its plans, leaving others to take the initiative, lay moral claims to a leadership role, and increase their influence in establishing the formal and informal norms that will govern human space exploration for decades. Leadership requires the reverse.

2. The counterplan can’t solve for US Leadership. Our successes will inevitably be shared with China in the event of cooperation. And extend 1AC Segal evidence that the US must technologically compete with China in order to maintain Hegemony.

3. They can’t solve any of our advantages because:

a. China says no – lack of diplomatic reciprocity empirically proves

Dean Cheng, Research Fellow in Chinese Political and Security Affairs in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation, 10/30/09, Heritage Foundation, “U.S.–China Space Cooperation: More Costs Than Benefits”//jchen

Reciprocity Lacking. According to the discus- sions between Presidents Bush and Hu Jintao, NASA Administrator Michael Griffin’s groundbreak- ing visit to China in 2006 (the first by a NASA administrator to the PRC) was supposed to be matched by a visit to the U.S. by the head of China’s Second Artillery. Yet the PRC has never agreed to that visit, despite Hu’s commitment and repeated invitations from the U.S. If reciprocity in terms of basic leadership visits cannot be obtained, it is even more problematic how either side would achieve reciprocity in other areas. There is a general disparity in technology between the U.S. and the PRC. Under such circum- stances, reciprocity would likely benefit the Chinese side far more than the U.S. side. And if the U.S. holds back, it only undermines the case for cooper- ation. Yet well-founded reticence on the part of the U.S. to share information could also jeopardize the missions and safety of the crews. These are the high costs of cooperation with the Chinese on manned space flight. Covering funding shortfalls seems to be the only tangible motivation for the U.S., and even that prospect is not promising. If U.S. decision-makers conclude that a manned-space capacity is important to American interests, they should find a way to properly fund it—and not rely on the one country in the world likely to emerge as a peer competitor for global influence.

b. Cooperation empirically fails – fears of national security and military tech transfer

Reuters, Michael Martina, 4/29/11, “China astronaut calls for U.S. cooperation”, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/42822072/ns/technology\_and\_science-space/t/china-astronaut-calls-us-cooperation///jchen

Efforts at U.S.-China cooperation in space have failed in the past decade, stymied by economic, diplomatic and security tensions, despite a 2009 attempt by President Barack Obama and his Chinese counterpart, Hu Jintao, to launch collaboration. Obama and Hu, in a statement in November 2009, called for "the initiation of a joint dialogue on human spaceflight and space exploration, based on the principles of transparency, reciprocity and mutual benefit." U.S. fears over national defense and inadvertent technology transfer have proven to be major roadblocks, particularly after Beijing carried out an anti-satellite test in January 2007, using a ground-based missile to destroy one of its inactive weather satellites. Yang, considered a hero of China's ambitious space program and the first from his country to enter space, made the statement during a carefully controlled media visit to China's astronaut training facility in the western suburbs of Beijing. There, journalists were ushered through an echoing hall housing three new space flight training simulators, none in use by China's 24 astronauts. But China is pushing forward without the United States, its funding in the face of NASA scale-backs and its cooperative efforts with Russia and other countries possibly constituting the next best hope for the future of space exploration.
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4. Turn: Extend that cooperation will lead to shared Sino- US power in the world.

Lack of US dominance will cause a global power vacuum and nuclear wars.

Niall Ferguson, Professor of History at NYU, 7/1/2004 “A World Without Power,” Foreign Policy, http://fnf.org.ph/downloadables/A\_World\_Without\_Power\_as\_published\_in\_Foreign\_Policy.pdf

So what is left? Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. These are the Dark Age experiences that a world without a hyperpower might quickly find itself reliving. The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the Dark Age of the ninth century. For the world is much more populous--roughly 20 times more--so friction between the world's disparate "tribes" is bound to be more frequent. Technology has transformed production; now human societies depend not merely on freshwater and the harvest but also on supplies of fossil fuels that are known to be finite. Technology has upgraded destruction, too, so it is now possible not just to sack a city but to obliterate it. For more than two decades, globalization--the integration of world markets for commodities, labor, and capital--has raised living standards throughout the world, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. The reversal of globalization--which a new Dark Age would produce--would certainly lead to economic stagnation and even depression. As the United States sought to protect itself after a second September 11 devastates, say, Houston or Chicago, it would inevitably become a less open society, less hospitable for foreigners seeking to work, visit, or do business. Meanwhile, as Europe's Muslim enclaves grew, Islamist extremists' infiltration of the EU would become irreversible, increasing trans-Atlantic tensions over the Middle East to the breaking point. An economic meltdown in China would plunge the Communist system into crisis, unleashing the centrifugal forces that undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out and conclude that lower returns at home are preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers. The wealthiest ports of the global economy--from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai--would become the targets of plunderers and pirates. With ease, terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas, targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East. In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. In Africa, the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work. The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. If the United States retreats from global hegemony--its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier--its critics at home and abroad must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony, or even a return to the good old balance of power. Be careful what you wish for. The alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be apolarity--a global vacuum of power. And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.

\*\*\*KRITIKS\*\*\*

2AC Security – Short

1) Framework – the role of the ballot should be to determine the desirability of the 1AC by weighing it against the status quo or a competing policy option. This is best for debate – alternative frameworks are vague and moot the 1AC, which destroys clash and education.

2) Case outweighs

a) empirically United States hegemony and security logic has been key preventing

conflict – during World War II, recently in Libya etc.

b) warming is a systemic impact that is not constructed with a security logic minset –warming is scientifically proven to happen, it’s a real impact.

c) our water shortages impact is a structural oppression impact – the people are oppressed by the structure – it’s a real systemic threat that only the plan solves.

3) No link – the Bormann and Sheehan card is talking about militarization of space driven by the Cold War. Not only was the Cold War 60 years ago, but our plan doesn’t militarize space – SPS aren’t perceived as dual-use, that’s our NSSO ev from the solvency flow – ICBMs mean its not seen as military and the peak intensity of the beams reaching Earth is the same as sunlight, it can’t be used as a weapon

4) Perm do both – nothing in the alternative neccesitates rejecting SPS specifically – we can reject security logic while also moving ahead with the plan.

5) Security means the potential for emancipation, not mere survival. Safety is the only foundation for human flourishing

Ken Booth, Prof. of IR @ Wales, ‘5 [*Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, p. 22]

The best starting point for conceptualizing security lies in the real conditions of insecurity suffered by people and collectivities. Look around. What is immediately striking is that some degree of insecurity, as a life determining condition, is universal. To the extent an individual or group is insecure, to that extent their life choices and chances **are taken away**; this is because of the resources and energy they need to invest in seeking safety from domineering threats - whether these are the lack of food for one’s children or organizing to resist a foreign aggressor. The corollary of the relationship between insecurity and a determined life is that **a degree of security creates life possibilities**. Security might therefore be conceived as synonymous with **opening up space in people’s lives.** This allows for individual and collective **human becoming** - the capacity to have some choice about living differently - consistent with the same but different search by others. Two interrelated conclusions follow from this. First, security can be understood as an instrumental value; it frees its possessors to a greater or lesser extent from life-determining constraints and so allows different life possibilities to be explored. Second, security is synonymous simply with survival. One can survive without being secure (the experience of refugees in long-term camps in war-torn parts of the world, for example). Security is therefore **more than mere** animal survival (basic animal existence). It is survival-plus, the plus being the **possibility to explore human becoming**, As an instrumental value, security is sought because it frees people(s) to some degree to do other than deal with threats to their human being. The achievement of a level of security - and security is always relative - gives to individuals and groups some time, energy, and scope to chose **to be or become**, **other than merely survival as human biological organisms**. Security is an important dimension of the process by which the human species can reinvent itself beyond the merely biological.

6) The alternative fails because it is unrealistic – policy debate is supposed to reflect the policy making process in government, so the neg can’t fiat individuals changing their mind about security logic – someone would always object.

7) Perm – do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alt – you get the benefits of the plan while also rejecting security logic.

2AC Security – Long (1/6)

1) The role of the ballot should be to evaluate the desirability of the plan against the status quo or a competing policy option – this is best

a) Predictability – the resolution calls for policy action – alternative frameworks are arbitrary and moot the 1AC. Resolutionally based Aff choice is the only way to ensure fair ground for both teams

b) Prefer our methodology – empiricism and positivism are better than their over-generalized theory.

2) Case outweighs – prefer our specific internal links – the plan is key to sustain U.S. hegemony and prevent great power wars – even if the alt can solve, it can’t access the aff’s timeframe distinction.

3) Prior questions fail and paralyze politics – IR theory is grounded in reality not theory.

Owen 2 (David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.
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4) Perm do the plan and all non mutually exclusive parts of the alternative – we must engage in policy to counter threats in order to effectively rethink security

Booth 5 (Ken Booth E H Carr Professor of the Department of International Politics at Aberystywth University 2005 Critical Security Studies and World Politics p. 272-276)

Although constructivism offers important insights into the dynamics of world politics,36 it does not in itself constitute a theory of international rela­tions, comparable with realism, for example, with its distinctive set of ideas about the centrality of states, the causal significance of the distribution of power, and the logic of balance-of-power policies. Constructivism is a metatheoretical orientation, seeking to offer richer explanations of how the world works37; it does not in itself give us a politically relevant ontology or praxiological orientation. It offers little or no guidance as to whether glob­alization is desirable or whether the U.S.-UK invasion of Iraq in 2003 was sensible. Constructivism is not a theory of security; what it does is act as a counter to those theories claiming that life, including politics among nations, is determined (by biology, for example). It reinforces the idea, to paraphrase Alexander Wendt, that security is what we make it.38 Real People in Real Places While criticizing various contending theories, and outlining the case for a specific critical theory of security. I want to emphasize the desirability of pluralism. Any project aimed at rethinking security from the bottom up must not be closed to the ideas and questions raised by different theoretical perspectives. That being said, the drawing of theoretical lines is essential for an effective research strategy, not to mention any political orientation. At the same time, whatever one's theoretical preference, regular engage­ment with other theoretical perspectives, including political realism, will help keep everybody honest. There should be no synthesis of critical approaches around the lowest common denominator or any misinformed ignoring of the tradition of political realism. Students of security these days seem to be condemned to a lifetime of theoretical dialectic, but the typical student will not be interested in theory for its own sake but rather for what it can do in helping us to understand what is happening around us ("theory explains the world"), then in engag­ing with world politics more effectively ("there is nothing more practical than a good theory"). In other words, most of us are interested in theory because we are interested in real people in real places. So, for example. the concept of emancipation should not be allowed to be characterized, as it sometimes is by critics, as abstract or unrelated to real conflicts. In Chapter 10, Joseph Ruane and Jennifer Todd showed in the all too concrete conflict in Northern Ireland that emancipatory notions played a significant part in helping to shift the three decades of Troubles there to a situation in which peace could finally be envisaged. Being directly relevant to real situations—being a set of guidelines for action—has supposed to have been the particular strength of political real­ism (as was discussed in Chapter 1). Unlike most political realists, one of its founding figures, E. H. Carr, questioned what he called "pure realism" or "consistent realism.- He argued that sound political thought and sound political life were synonymous with finding a place for both utopianism and realism. Although he struggled to bring together the planes of utopi­anism and realism, he was sure that it was an "unreal kind of realism" that ignored the element of morality in any world order. He therefore concluded that the "essential ingredients of all effective political thinking" were "a finite goal, an emotional appeal, a right of moral judgement and a ground for action."39 I believe the framework for a critical theory of security mapped out earlier—albeit in a preliminary way—contains those essential ingredients and in doing so helps to point in the direction of a utopian real­ist theory of security. Carr would have rejected such a possibility (he thought it impossible to bring together the planes of realism and utopi­anism), but he would have been sympathetic with the attempt. Utopian real­ism attempts to bring together the theoretical and the empirical, as well as the where we are (globally and locally) and the where we want to go (a har­monious human community with enhanced world security).40 It attempts to do so in a nondualistic manner, fusing ends and means in a manner where­by one's ideals are evident in how one acts, not only in what one hopes to achieve. Old thinking about world politics guarantees old practices; the means recommended by traditional theories will ensure that the end will be the same old world with the same old dangers—and perhaps worse, given the predictable tinderbox of the decades ahead. By this I mean that states with weapons of mass destruction (WMD) will not persuade others to give them up (except by coercion) if those very WMD states themselves continue to develop the weapons and implicitly if not explicitly declare their posses­sion to have political and strategic utility. Likewise, when powerful states use violence, even if it is claimed to be a last resort for humanitarian pur­poses, they are not acting in a manner calculated to make violence less like­ly; if they achieve success in their own terms, they do so only by proving to others that strategic violence can have political utility. Consistency requires that those who propose that world politics is run by laws behave lawfully themselves and that those powerful states that proclaim democracy should be willing themselves to live with being outvoted. The strategic challenge for emancipatory politics is to develop ideas for dealing with today's secu­rity threats (to whatever referents we are studying) in ways sensitive to the view expressed by Albert Camus that the means one uses today shapes the ends one might perhaps reach tomorrow:41 If a critical theory of security is to reverse the "escape from the real" that has characterized so much academic writing about international rela­tions,42 then it is essential to ask what it means for real people in real places. What, for example, does one's theorizing mean for the people(s) of the Balkans, women in east Africa, the prospects for the poorest classes in some region, the war on terror, the future of the Middle East, the likelihood of resource wars, or the possibility of nuclear weapons being used some­where? It has only been constraints on space that have prevented more case studies being offered in this volume, to illustrate what critically informed empirical studies might look like. Such an engagement with the real should be

2AC Security – Long (3/6)

[continued, no text deleted]

the heart of the next stage in the growth of critically informed security studies.43 Another central task is that of trying to learn lessons, in the hope of contributing to the prevention of oppressive structures and situations devel­oping in the first place. In this respect, the U.S.-led war on Iraq in 2003 will provide fertile ground for lessons. While President George W. Bush and his allies, notably Prime Minister Tony Blair, argued that the war made the world a safer place, critics argue that U.S. and UK leaders and policies over the years contributed significantly to creating the dangerous regional situa­tion in the first place, while their policies in 2002-2004 made the situation less rather than more secure. In light of this record, critics maintain that nobody could have confidence that U.S.-UK policies in Iraq would create postconflict harmony in the region. Critics point out that different attitudes to building up local strongmen, supplying arms to human rights abusers, pursuing nuclear disarmament, strengthening the UN, and the more vigor­ous (and less partisan) search for a just and lasting peace between Palestine and Israel—to mention only headline items—would have helped create a different relationship between Iraq and the West. The war against Iraq in 2003, according to this argument, has made the world a more dangerous place, not only by exacerbating the situation in the Middle East but also by replicating policies that legitimize violence and that reject multilateral international bodies. Meanwhile, as leaders of many states focus on the war on terror, more important long-term threats to human security and regional order—poverty, disease, environmental decay—remain marginal or ignored. Remembering Camus, we should understand that human society will never achieve tomorrow what its most powerful do not choose to begin to practice today. There are, however, resources for benevolent change. Immanent cri­tique points to the growing voice of global civil society, for example, though the obstacles to benign change should not be underestimated.44 Where one stands on these matters is a scholarly responsibility to be considered with utmost seriousness because somewhere, some people, as these very words are being read, are being starved, oppressed, threatened, or killed in the name of some theory of international politics or economics— or security. The framework of critical security theory outlined above is policy-rele­vant, concerned with improving the conditions of political possibility in the issue area of security. One familiar difficulty from any critical perspective in this respect is the fact that current crises are the symptoms of particular structural wrongs and so are deeply embedded in the workings of society. In order to deal with such difficulties, as the old saying goes, one would not want to start from here. When one is already embroiled in a crisis, realistic options are massively reduced. The main contribution of critical approach­es must therefore be precrisis, to help us think more constructively about ethical commitments, policies, agents, and sites of change. To help humankind, in whole and in part, to move away from the structural wrongs that ensure that crises, like earthquakes, will periodically rent the political landscape. The critical theory project in security studies—committed to the devel­opment of scholarship relating to the in/security of real people in real places—can be translated into the two tasks of critique and reconstruction. Critique entails critical explorations of what is real (ontology), what is reli­able knowledge (epistemology), and what can be done (praxis). Reconstruction requires engagement with concrete issues in world politics, with the aim of maximizing the opportunities for enhancing security, commu­nity, and emancipation in the human interest. Hayward Alker in Chapter 8 showed why, despite everything, there is reason for rational hope. Not only is there Kenneth Boulding's argument about the possibilities revealed by histor­ical actualities, but also Alker's suggestion about the scope for pragmatic concrete projects that are possible across cultures and political theories (what he calls "existential *redemptions* from the violence of the past"). The one world in which we all live is getting smaller, more overheated, and increasingly overcrowded. Meanwhile, the realities of security are becoming more complex as politico-economic and technocultural global­ization interacts with traditional conflicts arising out of international com­petition and mistrust. Runaway science, irrationalities and extremisms of one sort or another, and growing pressures on resources threaten to add more combustible fuel to the already dangerous global situation. Human society in the decades to come is threatened by a future of complex insecu­rity. The outcome for world society is as uncertain as it has ever been—per­haps even more so, given current and future destructive capabilities. Confronted by the threat of complex insecurity, human society needs a the­ory of world security that is ontologically inclusive, epistemologically sophisticated, and praxeologically varied. Old thinking is guaranteed to replicate: Can a critical theory move beyond this and help to emancipate? Security studies will contribute-however remotely or indirectly-to repli­cating or changing peoples' conditions of existence. As students of security, whether one is new to the subject or has been studying it for decades, we have a choice: we can decide to study in ways that replicate a world politics that does not work for countless millions of our fellow human beings; or we can decide to study in ways that seek to help to lift the strains of life- determining insecurity from the bodies and minds of people in real villages and cities, regions and states. The stakes could not be higher.
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5) The alternative creates no change and cedes the political

McClean 1 (McClean, Ph.D. Philosophy: The New School for Social Research, David E, “The Cultural Left And The Limits of Social Hope,” Annual Conference of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. 2001 Conference]

There is a lot of philosophical prose on the general subject of social justice. Some of this is quite good, and some of it is quite bad. What distinguishes the good from the bad is not merely the level of erudition. Displays of high erudition are gratuitously reflected in much of the writing by those, for example, still clinging to Marxian ontology and is often just a useful smokescreen which shrouds a near total disconnect from empirical reality. This kind of political writing likes to make a lot of references to other obscure, jargon-laden essays and tedious books written by other true believers - the crowd that takes the fusion of Marxian and Freudian private fantasies seriously. Nor is it the lack of scholarship that makes this prose bad. Much of it is well "supported" by footnotes referencing a lode of other works, some of which are actually quite good. Rather, what makes this prose bad is its utter lack of relevance to extant and critical policy debates, the passage of actual laws, and the amendment of existing regulations that might actually do some good for someone else. The writers of this bad prose are too interested in our arrival at some social place wherein we will finally emerge from our "inauthentic" state into something called "reality." Most of this stuff, of course, comes from those steeped in the Continental tradition (particularly post-Kant). While that tradition has much to offer and has helped shape my own philosophical sensibilities, it is anything but useful when it comes to truly relevant philosophical analysis, and no self-respecting Pragmatist can really take seriously the strong poetry of formations like "authenticity looming on the ever remote horizons of fetishization." What Pragmatists see instead is the hope that we can fix some of the social ills that face us if we treat policy and reform as more important than Spirit and Utopia. Like light rain released from pretty clouds too high in the atmosphere, the substance of this prose dissipates before it can reach the ground and be a useful component in a discussion of medicare reform or how to better regulate a pharmaceutical industry that bankrupts senior citizens and condemns to death HIV patients unfortunate enough to have been born in Burkina Faso - and a regulatory regime that permits this. It is often too drenched in abstractions and references to a narrow and not so merry band of other intellectuals (Nietzsche, Bataille, Foucault, Lukács, Benjamin) to be of much use to those who are the supposed subject matter of this preternatural social justice literature. Since I have no particular allegiance to these other intellectuals, no particular impulse to carry their water or defend their reputations, I try and forget as much as I can about their writings in order to make space for some new approaches and fresh thinking about that important question that always faces us - "What is to be done?" I am, I think, lucky to have taken this decision before it had become too late. One might argue with me that these other intellectuals are not looking to be taken seriously in the construction of solutions to specific socio-political problems. They are, after all, philosophers engaged in something called philosophizing. They are, after all, just trying to be good culture critics. Of course, that isn't quite true, for they often write with specific reference to social issues and social justice in mind, even when they are fluttering about in the ether of high theory (Lukács, for example, was a government officer, albeit a minister of culture, which to me says a lot), and social justice is not a Platonic form but parses into the specific quotidian acts of institutions and individuals. Social justice is but the genus heading which may be described better with reference to its species iterations- the various conditions of cruelty and sadism which we wittingly or unwittingly permit. If we wanted to, we could reconcile the grand general theories of these thinkers to specific bureaucracies or social problems and so try to increase their relevance. We could construct an account which acts as a bridge to relevant policy considerations. But such attempts, usually performed in the reams of secondary literature generated by their devotees, usually make things even more bizarre. In any event, I don't think we owe them that amount of effort. After all, if they wanted to be relevant they could have said so by writing in such a way that made it clear that relevance was a high priority. For Marxians in general, everything tends to get reduced to class. For Lukács everything tends to get reduced to "reification." But society and its social ills are far too intricate to gloss in these ways, and the engines that drive competing interests are much more easily explained with reference to animal drives and fears than by Absolute Spirit. That is to say, they are not easily explained at all. Take Habermas, whose writings are admittedly the most relevant of the group. I cannot find in Habermas's lengthy narratives regarding communicative action, discourse ethics, democracy and ideal speech situations very much more than I have found in the Federalist Papers, or in Paine's Common Sense, or in Emerson's Self Reliance or Circles. I simply don't find the concept of uncoerced and fully informed communication between peers in a democratic polity all that difficult to understand, and I don't much see the need to theorize to death such a simple concept, particularly where the only persons that are apt to take such narratives seriously are already sold, at least in a general sense. Of course, when you are trying to justify yourself in the face of the other members of your chosen club (in Habermas's case, the Frankfurt School) the intricacy of your explication may have less to do with simple concepts than it has to do with parrying for respectability in the eyes of your intellectual brethren. But I don't see why the rest of us need to partake in an insular debate that has little to do with anyone that is not very much interested in the work of early critical theorists such as Horkheimer or Adorno, and who might see their insights as only modestly relevant at best. Not many self-respecting engaged political scientists in this country actually still take these thinkers seriously, if they ever did at all. Or we might take Foucault who, at best, has provided us with what may reasonably be described as a very
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long and eccentric footnote to Nietzsche (I have once been accused, by a Foucaltian true believer, of "gelding" Foucault with other similar remarks). Foucault, who has provided the Left of the late 1960s through the present with such notions as "governmentality," "Limit," "archeology," "discourse" "power" and "ethics," creating or redefining their meanings, has made it overabundantly clear that all of our moralities and practices are the successors of previous ones which derive from certain configurations of savoir and connaisance arising from or created by, respectively, the discourses of the various scientific schools. But I have not yet found in anything Foucault wrote or said how such observations may be translated into a political movement or hammered into a political document or theory (let alone public policies) that can be justified or founded on more than an arbitrary aesthetic experimentalism. In fact, Foucault would have shuddered if any one ever did, since he thought that anything as grand as a movement went far beyond what he thought appropriate. This leads me to mildly rehabilitate Habermas, for at least he has been useful in exposing Foucault's shortcomings in this regard, just as he has been useful in exposing the shortcomings of others enamored with the abstractions of various Marxian-Freudian social critiques. Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

2AC Security – Long (6/6)

That causes extinction

Boggs 97(Carl Boggs, 1997, National University, Los Angeles, The Great Retreat: Decline of the Public Sphere in Late Twentieth-Century America, [http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/international.olde/mias/readings07/10.pdf](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/international.olde/mias/readings07/10.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

The false sense of empowermentthat comeswith such mesmerizingimpulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change.As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved- perhaps even unrecognized - only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectiousdiseases,technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications.  Paradoxically, thewidespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impo-tence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics,as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime,the fate of the world hangs in the balance.The unyielding truth is that,even asthe ethos ofanti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it isthe vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies.This last point demands further elaboration. Theshrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that socialhierarchieswill somehowdisappear, orthat gigantic state and military structureswilllose their holdover people's lives.Far from it: the space abdicatedby a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, canin fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites - an already familiar dynamic in many lesser-developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world**,** not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat.  In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise - or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec-tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75

6) Perm do the plan and reject all other instances of securitized thought - double bind – either the alt should be able to overcome the residual link to the aff or it can’t solve.

7) Cross apply conditionality bad from above.

2AC Coercion (1/3)

1. Case outweighs, prefer our multiple scenarios of extinction and possibilities of ceding leadership and dominance to other countries-life is prerequisite to having rights and if we cede leadership and power to other countries, we will not be able to enjoy our way of life as it is now.

2. Their moral imperatives revolve around a flawed libertarian method- consequences must be evaluated first to escape the cycle

Friedman 97 (Jefferey, Political Science at Bernard University, "What's Wrong with Libertarianism," Critical Review, Volume: 3, pg 435-436)

The effect of libertarian straddling on libertarian scholarship is suggested by a passage in the scholarly appendix to Boaz’s collection of libertarian essays, The Libertarian Reader. There, Tom G. Palmer (also of the Cato Institute) writes that in libertarian scholarship, “the moral imperatives of peace and voluntary cooperation are brought together with a rich understanding of the spontaneous order made possible by such voluntary cooperation, and of the ways in which coercive intervention can disorder the world and set in motion complex trains of unintended consequences” (Boaz r997b, 416, emphasis added). Palmer’s ambiguous “brought together” suggests (without coming right out and saying) that even if there were no rich understanding of spontaneous order, libertarianism would be sustained by “moral imperatives?’ But in that case, why develop the rich understanding of spontaneous order in the first place, and why emphasize its importance now that it has been developed? Spontaneous order is, on Palmer’s own terms, irrelevant, since even if a rich understanding of it yielded the conclusion that markets are less orderly or less spontaneous than states, or that the quality of the order they produce is inferior to that produced by states, we would still be compelled to be libertarians by moral imperatives. The premise of the philosophical approach is that nothing can possibly trump freedom-cum-private property. But if libertarian freedom is an end in itself and is the greatest of all values, one’s endorsement of it should not be affected in the slightest by such empirical questions as whether libertarianism would spell starvation or warfare. The premise of the empirical approach is, conversely, that such consequences do matter. Why investigate the effects of libertarianism if they could not conceivably outweigh the putative intrinsic value of private property? If a priori reasoning tells us that laissez—faire capitalism is just, come what may, then why should we care to find out what may, in fact, come?

3. Taxes actually redistribute freedom rather than eradicating it.

Will Kymlicka, Professor of Philosophy, University of Toronto, CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY, 1990, p, 147.

As soon as we ask that question, Flew's equation of capitalism with freedom is undermined. For it is the owners of the resource who are made free to dispose of it, while non-owners are deprived of that freedom. Suppose that a large estate you would have inherited (in the absence of an inheritance tax) now becomes a public park, or a low-income housing project (as a result of the tax). The inheritance tax does not eliminate the freedom to use the property, rather it redistributes that freedom. If you inherit the estate, then you are free to dispose of it as you see fit, but if I use your backyard for my picnic or garden without your permission, then I am breaking the law, and the government will intervene and coercively deprive me of the freedom to continue. On the other hand, my freedom to use and enjoy the property is increased when the welfare state taxes your inheritance to provide me with affordable housing, or a public park. So the free market legally restrains my freedom, while the welfare state increases it.

4. Perm do both: do the plan and resist any violation of our rights.
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5. The notion that taxes are enslaving is absurd- taxes are necessary for a free society

John Siegel, former Professor of Law and George Washington University and current Director of Research and Policy of the Administrative Conference of the United States, 2007, “Income Tax is Slavery”, George Washingotn University, http://docs.law.gwu.edu/facweb/jsiegel/Personal/taxes/slavery.htm

Some protestors claim that requiring people to pay income tax amounts to slavery and is therefore forbidden by the 13th Amendment to the Constitution. This argument is absurd. The slavery that was previously practised in the United States, and that is banned by the 13th Amendment, was a far cry from taxation. Under slavery, the master owned the slave, controlled where the slave lived, and controlled what the slave was required to do -- usually work in the master's home or the master's fields. Under taxation, people are free to live wherever they want and do whatever kind of work they want. Yes, they have to pay a portion of their income in taxes, but that's quite different from being told where to live and what work to do. So taxation is very different from slavery. Some protestors nonetheless argue that taxation is slavery because, in their definition, slavery is any "non-ownership of one’s Person and Labor." By this definition, unless you're entitled to keep 100% of the fruits of your labor, you are (at least partially) a slave. The first thing to notice about this definition is that they made it up. That's not what you will find if you look up "slave" or "slavery" in a dictionary. It's certainly not the definition of the term "slavery" as used in the Constitution's 13th Amendment. Of course, if you just make up the definition, you can make slavery anything you want. I could say that "slavery" is "any situation in which I'm forced to do something I don't want to do," in which case having to wait at a red light when I want to keep going amounts to "slavery." Obviously, that definition would be ridiculous. The fundamental problem with these made-up definitions is that they ignore the fact that some restraints on freedom are consistent with, and indeed essential to, the concept of a free society. Because humans live in society, they can never have complete freedom to do absolutely anything they want. For example, society has to decide collectively whether people will drive on the right side of the road or the left side. Imagine what driving would be like if everyone decided this point individually. In order to be free to drive, we have to give up our freedom to decide which side of the road to drive on. Similarly, it would be nice if you could just take anything you wanted. But if everyone else could do the same thing, we'd have to spend all our time guarding our property. To be free to enjoy our property, we have to give up our freedom to take the property of others. So some restraint on freedom is essential to freedom itself. That's why there's a saying that laws are "the wise restraints that make us free." Taxation is one of the restraints that is consistent with a free society. There are some things, such as roads and military defense, that wouldn't get done if we didn't pay for them collectively. They have to be paid for with some kind of tax. That's why taxation has been a hallmark of nearly all societies for a long time. Of course, many people believe that the government takes too much in taxes and spends the money on foolish things. Doubtless that is at least partly true. But that doesn't transform taxation into slavery. And again, it has no bearing on the meaning of the term "slavery" in the Constitution.

6. The private market would never work, NASA is key to its development

Washington Post 6/1 Eric Sterner, Published: July 1, 2011 “Five myths about NASA” http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-nasa/2011/06/09/AGliJgtH\_print.html

In a recent debate, GOP presidential candidate Newt Gingrich said that “NASA ought to be getting out of the way and encouraging the private sector.” In truth, NASA is not an obstacle to the free market. The agency does not prohibit space entrepreneurs from starting businesses. Where a demand for goods and services exists in the space industry — principally in telecommunications, but perhaps soon in suborbital human spaceflight — firms such as the space-transport company Virgin Galactic are trying to provide them. The bulk of NASA’s missions are not commercially viable and are unlikely ever to be. There is not enough demand for robotic missions to Mars, Hubble Space Telescopes and Alpha Magnetic Spectrometers to justify private investment. If NASA worked the way policymakers such as Gingrich want it to — paradoxically “getting out of the way” while providing venture capitalists government money to start space businesses — the agency could actually hurt private enterprise in space. NASA would not be better at picking commercial winners and losers than the rest of the government. By making poor or even politically motivated choices, it could spoil a free market.

2AC Coercion (3/3)

7. Coercion is necessary for US hegemony and international peace

Stephen B. Johnson 2002 “The US in Space: Cooperation and Coercion” www.irpp.org/po/archive/apr02/johnson.pdf

From the dawn of the Space Age in the 1950s, the United States has used space as a vehicle for the projection of American power. The means used have ranged from reconnaissance satellites and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) to overt propaganda efforts such as the Apollo manned lunar project. Many other space programs have helped the United States influence the behavior of other countries and thus contribute to American military and political clout the world round. Science projects have strengthened international ties and promoted cooperation, and commercial space efforts such as the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization (Intelsat) have projected capitalist and democratic values into and through space. U.S. space endeavors began at the peak of the Cold War with the Soviet Union in the 1950s, primarily as a counter- poise to a global communist threat. Throughout the Cold War, space programs grew because they continued to enhance American economic and military power and to project American ideology. With the end of the Cold War, these programs continue to enhance American might, and remain significant assets in the new battle against Islamist radicals worldwide. In this new struggle between two fundamentally irreconcilable political and ideological systems, space assets likely will prove just as critical as they did in the Cold War. According to Webster's\* power is the "possession of control, authority, or influence over others." How influence is best achieved, of course, has been debated by political scientists and philosophers for millennia. Military theorists have focused on the use of coercion to achieve the ends of the Mate. But coercion is only one way to project power In many instances, persuasion can be far more effective. Coercion requires a tremendous effort, whether in fighting a schoolyard bully or a hostile nation. Victory usually goes to the stronger combatant, which mean\* that combatants serious about achieving victory must prepare themselves for the ultimate test. By contrast, persuasion it much more subtle and can succeed even when raw strength fails. Even rulers of the most vicious kind can seldom last long unless they can convince at least some of their citizen\* that their cau»c is just. Coercion of an entire population is simply impossible without the help of at least some individuals who do not need to be coerced. Most of the time, persuasion governs the relationships among people and states. Coercion is a last resort for those few situations in which persuasion fails. Whether projected by persuasion or coercion, the power of a nation-state stems from a number of source\*. At one end of the spectrum is the material basis for power "technology/' Deeply intertwined with the development and application of technology is the economic system of a society. Between them, the technologies and the economic system (what Marx called the "forces of production" and the "relation\* of pro duction," respectively) determine how much the society produce\*, who within the society pro duces what\* and finally who receives and uses the products of production. Communisms collapse was convincing evidence that state directed economies are generally lev\* efficient than capitalist economies in which individuals and non-state organizations seek to fulfill their own needs. Simply put, "post industrial" society is far too complex for any stale bureaucracy to understand and operate. Societies that are more efficient at allocating and distributing resources will in the long run be far more capable of producing the material goods needed for civilian and military uses than a heavy handed state that attempts to regulate all facets of economic life. The political system, which is related to, but not identical with the economic system is also crucial. In complex societies the over centralization of decision making is less effective over the long term, which is one reason why truly demo crutic societies have demonstrated mt;ce long-term stability than their more authoritarian alter natives and enemies. Only with real representation of the many interests within a society can its government meet the society\*\* needs over the long haul In long term competition between lib cral democracies and authoritarian systems, liber &\ democracies will almost invariably win. Finally\* the value system or ideology of a society is a critical factor both in its long term stability and its appeal to it\* own people and to others outside it. In this respect, numbers matter Ideologies that have strung appeal to the vast majority of the population of a society (and to those looking at ttiat society from the outside) will in the long term win out over competing idc olugics that cannot claim such \*m appeal Societies not only need these pillars of power, they need the means to project them. For this they must use some combination of coercion and persuasion. Military and police forces are a society\*s means to project coercive power Persuasion is mure subtle. We typically think of politicians and diplomats negotiating agreement\* between states. But the most persuasive means are often those that are not planned, particularly not planned by the state. Religion remains a force to be reckoned with, but just as powerful, if not more so, is the force of "material culture," spread through books, movies, radio, television, cloth ing, food, technologies, and a host of other mate rial and nun material goods. The great power of the West is exerted most frequently in the form of hamburgers, basketball shoes, movie stars, news broadcasts, and other symbols of material culture and individual freedom. It is not surprising that the Soviet Union tried to isolate its people from these corrupting messages and pruducts, and that non Western countries frequently try to reduce or eliminate these influences today.

2AC Heidegger (1/4)

1. The role of the ballot should be to compare the plan with the status quo or a competing policy option. This is best:

**a. Predictability – the resolution calls for policy options - alternative frameworks are arbitrary and moot the 1AC. Resolutionally-based argument choice is the only way to ensure fair ground for both teams**

**b. They can read it as a CP - they can weigh the kritik as a net benefit to a policy action, allowing aff ground off the negative agent and implementation mechanism while keeping kritik education**

**c. Floating PIKS are a reason to reject the team – moots 1AC kills fairness – moving target never know what they are going to claim kills in depth debate and education**

2. Case outweighs – their K is non-unique, therefore we should act to maximize the number of lives saved – loss of heg leads to nuclear war and warming causes extinction – prefer science and empirics

3. Calculation is good – it represents a responsibility to protect justice and ward off violence in its worst forms

Campbell 99 (David, Prof of Int’l Politics @ Univ. of Newcastle, Moral Spaces, p. 46-7)

That undecidability resides within the decision, Derrida argues, "that justice exceeds law and calculation, that the unpresentable exceeds the determinable cannot and should not serve as alibi for staying out of juridico-political battles, within an institution or a state, or between institutions or states and others."9' Indeed, "incalculable justice requires us to calculate." From where does this insistence come? What is behind, what is animating, these imperatives? It is both the character of infinite justice as a heteronomic relationship to the other, a relationship that because of its undecidability multiplies responsibility, and the fact that "left to itself, the incalculable and giving (donatrice) idea of justice is always very close to the bad, even to the worst, for it can always be reappropriated by the most perverse calculation."92 The necessity of calculating the incalculable thus responds to a duty, a duty that inhabits the instant of madness and compels the decision to avoid "the bad," the "perverse calculation," even "the worst." This is the duty that also dwells with deconstruction and makes it the starting point, the "at least necessary condition," for the organization of resistance to totalitarianism in all its forms. And it is a duty that responds to practical political concerns when we recognize that Derrida names the bad, the perverse, and the worst as those violences "we recognize all too well without yet having thought them through, the crimes of xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism, religious or nationalist fanaticism." Furthermore, the duty within the decision, the obligation that recognizes the necessity of negotiating the possibilities provided by the impossibilities of justice, is not content with simply avoiding, containing, combating, or negating the worst violence-though it could certainly begin with those strategies. Instead, this responsibility, which is the responsibility of responsibility, commissions a "utopian" strategy. Not a strategy that is beyond all bounds of possibility so as to be considered "unrealistic," but one which in respecting the necessity of calculation, takes the possibility summoned by the calculation as far as possible, "must take it as far as possible, beyond the place we find ourselves and beyond the already identifiable zones of morality or politics or law, beyond the distinction between national and international, public and private, and so on."94 As Derrida declares, "The condition of possibility of this thing called responsibility is a certain experience and experiment of the possibility of the impossible: the testing of the aporia from which one may invent the only possible invention, the impossible invention."95 This leads Derrida to enunciate a proposition that many, not the least of whom are his Habermasian critics, could hardly have expected: "Nothing seems to me less outdated than the classical emancipatory ideal. We cannot attempt to disqualify it today, whether crudely or with sophistication, at least not without treating it too lightly and forming the worst complicities."
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4. Perm do both - it’s too late to withdraw from technology – we have to use it to try and fix the system

Zimmerman 89 – Philosophy Professor, Tulane (Michael, Introduction To Deep Ecology, http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC22/Zimmrman.htm)

 A critique I hear often is that deep ecologists want to return to a way of life that's totally tied to the rhythms of the Earth, but at this point we have so disturbed those rhythms that we can't even consider going back. To retreat to a pre-technological state would in fact be dooming the Earth to destruction, whereas what we need now is to be more engaged in trying to repair the damage. How would a deep ecologist respond? Michael: I think deep ecologists have mixed emotions about that, but I would agree with that critique. For example, if we stopped our development at the current level, it would be a catastrophe, because our production methods are so dirty and inefficient and destructive that if we keep this up, we're really in trouble. Some deep ecologists say that it would be all for the best if the industrial world were just to collapse, despite all the human suffering that would entail. If such a thing ever occurs, some people have suggested, we could never revive industrialization again because the raw materials are no longer easily accessible. I hope that doesn't happen, and yet it may happen. Now, social ecologists say that deep ecologists flirt with fascism when they talk about returning to an "organic" social system that is "attuned to nature." They note that reactionary thinkers often contrast the supposedly "natural" way of life - which to them means social Darwinism and authoritarian social systems - with "modernity," which in politial terms means progressive social movements like liberalism and Marxism. But deep ecologists recognize this danger. They call not for a regression to collective authoritarianism, but for the evolution of a mode of awareness that doesn't lend itself to authoritarianism of any kind. So I think the only thing we can do is to move forward. We need to develop our efficiency and production methods so that we'll be able to take some of the pressure off the environment. We also need to develop increasing wealth for the highly populated countries so their populations will go down. [Ed. Note: See Lappé and Schurman, "The Population Puzzle," in IC #21.] There's a necessity for new technology. The question is, can it be made consistent with our growing awareness that the planet is really hurting?

5. Perm do the plan and reject all other instances of calculative thought - double bind – either the alt should be able to overcome the residual link to the aff or it can’t solve.

6. Heidegger’s Nazism informed his theories – his notion of authenticity allows dangerous ideas to creep into seemingly benign philosophy

Cohen 09 (Patricia, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/09/books/09philosophy.html, Nov 8 2009)

For decades the German philosopher Martin Heidegger has been the subject of passionate debate. His critique of Western thought and technology has penetrated deeply into architecture, psychology and literary theory and inspired some of the most influential intellectual movements of the 20th century. Yet he was also a fervent Nazi. Now a soon-to-be published book in English has revived the long-running debate about whether the man can be separated from his philosophy. Drawing on new evidence, the author, Emmanuel Faye, argues fascist and racist ideas are so woven into the fabric of Heidegger’s theories that they no longer deserve to be called philosophy. As a result Mr. Faye declares, Heidegger’s works and the many fields built on them need to be re-examined lest they spread sinister ideas as dangerous to modern thought as “the Nazi movement was to the physical existence of the exterminated peoples.” First published in France in 2005, the book, “Heidegger: The Introduction of Nazism Into Philosophy,” calls on philosophy professors to treat Heidegger’s writings like hate speech. Libraries, too, should stop classifying Heidegger’s collected works (which have been sanitized and abridged by his family) as philosophy and instead include them under the history of Nazism. These measures would function as a warning label, like a skull-and-crossbones on a bottle of poison, to prevent the careless spread of his most odious ideas, which Mr. Faye lists as the exaltation of the state over the individual, the impossibility of morality, anti-humanism and racial purity. The book is the most radical attack yet on Heidegger (1889-1976) and would upend the philosophical field’s treatment of his work in the United States, and even more so in France, where Heidegger has frequently been required reading for an advanced degree. Mr. Faye, an associate professor at the University of Paris, Nanterre, not only wants to drum Heidegger from the ranks of philosophers, he wants to challenge his colleagues to rethink the very purpose of philosophy and its relationship to ethics.At the same time scholars in disciplines as far flung as poetry and psychoanalysis would be obliged to reconsider their use of Heidegger’s ideas. Although Mr. Faye talks about the close connection between Heidegger and current right-wing extremist politics, left-wing intellectuals have more frequently been inspired by his ideas. Existentialism and postmodernism as well as attendant attacks on colonialism, atomic weapons, ecological ruin and universal notions of morality are all based on his critique of the Western cultural tradition and reason. Richard Wolin, the author of several books on Heidegger and a close reader of the Faye book, said he is not convinced Heidegger’s thought is as thoroughly tainted by Nazism as Mr. Faye argues. Nonetheless he recognizes how far Heidegger’s ideas have spilled into
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the larger culture. “I’m not by any means dismissing any of these fields because of Heidegger’s influence,” he wrote in an e-mail message referring to postmodernism’s influence across the academy. “I’m merely saying that we should know more about the ideological residues and connotations of a thinker like Heidegger before we accept his discourse ready-made or

naïvely.”Although the English text published by Yale University Press won’t be out in the United States for a few weeks, it is already making waves, as signaled by an essay in The Chronicle Review, the opinion and ideas journal of The Chronicle of Higher Education. In an essay titled “Heil Heidegger!” Carlin Romano, a critic for The Review, called Heidegger a “Black Forest babbler” and fraud who was “overrated in his prime” and “bizarrely venerated by acolytes even now.”Few people have read the book, but the article has generated more than 150 online comments from vehement advocates and detractors, more than any other piece The Review has printed this year, said Liz McMillen, the editor. Others joined the fray.Ron Rosenbaum, the author of “Explaining Hitler,” even extended the argument to the German Jewish philosopher Hannah Arendt, a former student and lover of Heidegger’s. Citing a recent essay by the historian Bernard Wasserstein, Mr. Rosenbaum wrote in Slate.com that Arendt’s thinking about the Holocaust and her famous formulation, “the banality of evil,” were contaminated by Heidegger and other anti-Semitic writings. Commentators heatedly rejected the notion that significant ideas could not be distilled from vile ones. Writing for The New Republic’s Web site, tnr.com, Damon Linker declared it was “absurd” to “implicate Heidegger’s entire philosophical corpus.” He and others echoed the views of the influential American philosopher Richard Rorty, who once wrote in The New York Times, “You cannot read most of the important philosophers of recent times without taking Heidegger’s thought into account.” Mr. Rorty added, however, that “the smell of smoke from the crematories” will “linger on their pages.” In Mr. Faye’s eyes Heidegger’s philosophy cannot be separated from his politics in the way, say, T.S. Eliot’s poetic skills or D. W. Griffith’s cinematic technique might be appraised independently of his own beliefs. While he doesn’t dispute Heidegger’s place in the intellectual pantheon, Mr. Faye reviews his unpublished lectures and concludes his philosophy was based on the same ideas as National Socialism.Without understanding the soil in which Heidegger’s philosophy is rooted, Mr. Faye argues, people may not realize that his ideas can grow in troubling directions. Heidegger’s dictum to be authentic and free oneself from conventional restraints, for example, can lead to a rejection of morality. The denunciation of reason and soulless modernism can devolve into crude anti-intellectualism and the glorification of “blood and soil.”Passions about Heidegger have simmered for years. He joined the Nazi party in 1933 when he became rector of Freiburg University and oversaw the dismissal of all Jewish professors. After the war Heidegger was banned by a de-Nazification tribunal from teaching. In the 1950s Arendt re-established ties with him and labored to revive his reputation.Heidegger was a critic of modern technological society and of the Western philosophical tradition that gave rise to it. He argued that we must overcome this tradition and rethink the very nature of human existence or being. His prose is so dense that some scholars have said it could be interpreted to mean anything, while others have dismissed it altogether as gibberish. He is nonetheless widely considered to be one of the century’s greatest and most influential thinkers. Theologians have used his critique of reason to explain the leap of faith; architects have been inspired by his rejection of conventional rules to introduce a buffet of new styles, materials and shapes to building design. His criticism of mechanistic technology has attracted environmentalists and planners. A verbal brawl over Heidegger’s theories should not be surprising, though. After all, the classic American position on how liberal societies should treat dangerous ideas is worth more discussion. That is precisely what Mr. Faye says he wants. In his view teaching Heidegger’s ideas without disclosing his deep Nazi sympathies is like showing a child a brilliant fireworks display without warning that an ignited rocket can also blow up in someone’s face.

Calls for internal rethinking rely on assumptions of metaphysical innocence that assumes an authenticity that never existed

Timothy Bewes, Ph.D English Lit @ U. of Sussex, 1997, Cynicism and Postmodernity, New York City: Verso, p. 195-6

Despite the diligence and the sterling efforts of its best theoreti cians, then, it seems that postmodernism has actually become something. Its principal characteristic is the retreat from and disavowal of the violence of representation - both political and semiotic. There are three further aspects to this essentially ignominious cultural operation: (i) a cultivation of stupidity (what I have called Kelvinism, or 'metaphysical innocence') as a means of circumventing the ideational 'brutality' of the political life; (ii) a recourse to the idea of an internal or subjective 'truth of the soul' which transcends political reality, along with the contingencies of representation. Both of these signal an attachment to a surface/ depth model of subjectivity which in each case amounts to a fetishization of authenticity, whether by opting to 'remain' on the surface, or by retreating 'inwards'; (iii) a collapse of faith by individuals and even politicians themselves, not only in the political infrastructure but in the very' concept of political engagement - here it becomes apparent that Tony Blair, for example, is more 'postodern' than any theoretician. .

It should be clear that these three responses stand in an approximately analogous relationship to the archetypal forms in
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which consciousness, in a state of anxiety, shrinks from the violence of determinate negation and 'strives to hold on to what it is in danger of losing'. 59 At various points throughout the present work I have used the terms 'decadence', 'irony' and 'relativism' to refer to these instances of an epistemological loss of nerve, this capitulation to 'things as they are'; it may be as well here to remind ourselves of the terms in which Hegel describes these manifestations of a retreat from truth. Consciousness, he says, at the decisive moment in which it is required to go beyond its own limits, (i) 'wishes to remain in a state' of unthinking inertia'; (ii) gloats over its own understanding, 'which knows how to dissolve every thought and always find the same barren Ego instead of any content'; (iii) 'entrenches itself in sentimentality, which assures us that it finds everything to be good in its kind'. 60 Postmodernism, an empirical social condition - by which I mean that a series of critical-theoretical strategies has attained a certain concrete form - legitimizes these symptoms of cultural anxiety; postmodernism becomes synonymous, therefore, with deceleration, with a sense of cultural and political conclusivity; postmodernism is the principal vehicle of what Baudrillard calls 'the illusion of the end'.

This endless rethinking allows us to debate the finer parts of Heideggerian ethics while gas chambers are built

Timothy Bewes, Ph.D English Lit @ U. of Sussex, 1997, Cynicism and Postmodernity, New York City: Verso, p. 146-7

If it is unreasonable to suppose that the Final Solution was potentiated or even necessarily facilitated by Schmitt's theories, it is certainly the case that this metaphysical structure of domination in the Third Reich, whereby the status of public citizens is reduced to a level determined entirely in the 'natural' or biological realm of necessity, is foreshadowed in his 1927 essay. In an abstract and insidious way Schmitt introduces the idea that the 'transcendent' realm of the political, as a matter of course, will not accommodate a people with insufficient strength to ensure its own participation, and that such a fact is ipso facto justification for its exclusion. 'If a people no longer possesses the energy or the will to maintain itself in the sphere of politics, the latter will not thereby vanish from the world. Only a weak people will disappear.'130 Schmitt's concept of the 'political', quite simply, is nothing of the sort - is instead weighed down by necessity, in the form of what Marshall Berman calls German-Christian interiority - by its preoccupation with

authenticity, that is to say, and true political 'identity'. Auschwitz is a corollary not of reason, understood as risk, but of the fear of reason, which paradoxically is a fear of violence. The stench of burning bodies is haunted always by the sickly aroma of cheap metaphysics.

2AC Zerzan (1/3)

1. Rejection of civilization is overly simplistic. There is no way that humans can ever utterly reject technology or innovation. The innate curiosity of humans is what causes us to continually aspire and create, and even the earliest form of humans were constantly inventing, achieving, and reaching towards civilization. Maintaining a primitivist world is completely impossible.

2. Civilization is not a bad thing. There are plenty of faults to human civilization and disastrous things always do happen as a result of it. However, that is not a reason to reject the civilization that brought seemingly impossible things into everyday circumstances. The bad things that happen because of civilization cannot overturn or even begin to overpower all of the things that civilization has done for human beings.

3. It would be impossible for human beings to go back to an era with no technology, no language, no speech and even no writing. To reject that at our current point is completely implausible.

4. No link – our plan does not specifically cause all of the things that Zerzan is saying is wrong with the world. Also, whether the plan was put into action or not does not affect the current climate that all primitivists hate very much. There is no huge influence in the primitivist’s mind whether there is added exploration in space.

5. Zerzanism is inherently wrong, in its simplistic mind frame and false assumptions.

Murray Bookchin; an American libertarian socialist author, orator, and philosopher, a pioneer in the ecology movement, the founder of the social ecology movement within anarchist, libertarian socialist and ecological thought, the author of two dozen books on politics, philosophy, history, and urban affairs as well as ecology; 1995; Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm

Which brings us, inevitably, to John Zerzan, the anti'civiliza'tional primitivist par excellence. For Zerzan, one of the steady hands at Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed, the absence of speech, language, and writing is a positive boon. Another denizen of the 'Man the Hunter' time warp, Zerzan maintains in his book Future Primitive (FP) that 'life before domestication/agriculture was in fact largely one of a leisure, intimacy with nature, sensual wisdom, sexual equality, and health' [19] -- with the difference that Zerzan's vision of 'primality' more closely approximates four-legged animality. In fact, in Zerzanian paleoanthropology, the anatomical distinctions between Homo sapiens, on the one hand, and Homo habilis, Homo erectus, and the 'much-maligned' Neanderthals, on the other, are dubious; all early Homo species, in his view, were possessed of the mental and physical capacities of Homo sapiens and furthermore lived in primal bliss for more than two million years.

If these hominids were as intelligent as modern humans, we may be naively tempted to ask, why did they not innovate tech'no'logical change? 'It strikes me as very plausible,' Zerzan brightly conjectures, 'that intelligence, informed by the success and satisfaction of a gatherer-hunter existence, is the very reason for the pronounced absence of 'progress.' Division of labor, domestication, symbolic culture -- these were evidently [!] refused until very recently.' The Homo species 'long chose nature over culture,' and by culture here Zerzan means 'the manipulation of basic symbolic forms' (emphasis added) -- an alienating encumbrance. Indeed, he continues, 'reified time, language (written, certainly, and probably spoken language for all or most of this period), number, and art had no place, despite an intelligence fully capable of them' (FP, pp. 23, 24).

In short, hominids were capable of symbols, speech, and writing but deliberately rejected them, since they could understand one another and their environment instinctively, without recourse to them. Thus Zerzan eagerly agrees with an anthropologist who meditates that 'San/Bushman communion with nature' reached 'a level of experience that 'could almost be called mystical. For instance, they seemed to know what it actually felt like to be an elephant, a lion, an antelope'' even a baobab tree (FP, pp. 33-34).

The conscious 'decision' to refuse language, sophisticated tools, temporality, and a division of labor (presumably they tried and grunted, 'Bah!') was made, we are told, by Homo habilis, who, I should note, had roughly half the brain size of modern humans and probably lacked the anatomical capacity for syllabic speech. Yet we have it on Zerzan's sovereign authority that habilis (and possibly even Australopithecus afarensis, who may have been around some 'two million years ago') possessed 'an intelligence fully capable' -- no less! -- of these functions but refused to use them. In Zerzanian
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paleoanthropology, early hominids or humans could adopt or reject vital cultural traits like speech with sublime wisdom, the way monks take vows of silence.

But once the vow of silence was broken, everything went wrong! For reasons known only to God and Zerzan.

The emergence of symbolic culture, with its inherent will to manipulate and control, soon opened the door to the domestication of nature. After two million years of human life within the bounds of nature, in balance with other wild species, agriculture changed our lifestyle, our way of adapting, in an unprecedented way. Never before has such a radical change occurred in a species so utterly and so swiftly. . . . Self-domestication through language, ritual, and art inspired the taming of plants and animals that followed. (FP, pp. 27-28, emphasis added)

There is a certain splendor in this claptrap that is truly arresting. Significantly different epochs, hominid and/or human species, and ecological and technological situations are all swept up together into a shared life 'within the bounds of nature.' Zerzan's simplification of the highly complex dialectic between humans and nonhuman nature reveals a mentality so reductionist and simplistic that one is obliged to stand before it in awe.

To be sure, there is very much we can learn from preliterate cultures -- organic societies, as I call them in The Ecology of Freedom -- particularly about the mutability of what is commonly called 'human nature.' Their spirit of in-group cooperation and, in the best of cases, egalitarian outlook are not only admirable -- and socially necessary in view of the precarious world in which they lived -- but provide compelling evidence of the malleability of human behavior in contrast to the myth that competition and greed are innate human attributes. Indeed, their practices of usufruct and the inequality of equals are of great relevance to an ecological society.

But that 'primal' or prehistoric peoples 'revered' nonhuman nature is at best specious and at worst completely disingenuous. In the absence of 'nonnatural' environments such as villages, towns, and cities, the very notion of 'Nature' as distinguished from habitat had yet to be conceptualized -- a truly alienating experience, in Zerzan's view. Nor is it likely that our remote ancestors viewed the natural world in a manner any less instrumental than did people in historical cultures. With due regard for their own material interests -- their survival and well-being -- prehistoric peoples seem to have hunted down as much game as they could, and if they imaginatively peopled the animal world with anthropomorphic attributes, as they surely did, it would have been to communicate with it with an end toward manipulating it, not simply toward revering it.

Thus, with very instrumental ends in mind, they conjured 'talking' animals, animal 'tribes' (often patterned on their own social structures), and responsive animal 'spirits.' Understandably, given their limited knowledge, they believed in the reality of dreams, where humans might fly and animals might talk -- in an inexplicable, often frightening dream world that they took for reality. To control game animals, to use a habitat for survival purposes, to deal with the vicissitudes of weather and the like, prehistoric peoples had to personify these phenomena and 'talk' to them, whether directly, ritualistically, or metaphorically.

In fact, prehistoric peoples seem to have intervened into their environment as resolutely as they could. As soon as Homo erectus or later human species learned to use fire, for example, they seem to have put it to work burning off forests, probably stampeding game animals over cliffs or into natural enclosures where they could be easily slaughtered. The 'reverence for life' of prehistoric peoples thus reflected a highly pragmatic concern for enhancing and controlling the food supply, not a love for animals, forests, mountains (which they may very well have feared as the lofty home of deities both demonic and benign). [20]

Nor does the 'love of nature' that Bradford attributes to 'primal society' accurately depict foraging peoples today, who often deal rather harshly with work and game animals; the Ituri forest Pygmies, for example, tormented ensnared game quite sadistically, and Eskimos commonly maltreated their huskies. [21] As for Native Americans before European contact, they vastly altered much of the continent by using fire to clear lands for horticulture and for better visibility in hunting, to the extent that the 'paradise' encountered by Europeans was 'clearly humanized.' [22]
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6. Primitivists adamantly reject technology while being hypocritical and not actually following their own principles.

Brian Oliver Sheppard; respected philosopher and writer; 2003; Anarchism vs. Primitivism

Gar Smith, editor of the Earth Island Institute journal, The Edge, and critic of modem technology, recently complained to journalists, "I have seen villages in Africa that had vibrant culture and great communities that were disrupted and destroyed by the introduction of electricity." He added: "I don't think a lot of electricity is a good thing. It is the fuel that powers a lot of multi-national imagery." When asked why lack of electricity - a hallmark of poverty - ought to be considered advantageous, Smith said, "The idea that people are poor doesn't mean that they are not living good lives." He added, "there is a lot of quality to be had in poverty."

John Zerzan, a leading modem primitivist, writes in a similar vein, but claims those living in societies before electricity enjoyed higher standards of mental well-being: "Being alive in nature, before our abstraction from it [through modern civilization], must have involved a perception and contact that we can scarcely comprehend from our levels of anguish and alienation. The communication with all of existence must have been an exquisite play of all the senses, reflecting the numberless, nameless varieties of pleasure and emotion once accessible within us." Zerzan, the Green Anarchy Collective, and other primitivists regularly reminisce over an ideal past where "the wheat and corn, pigs and horses were once freely dancing in the chaos of nature." In fact, through their activism primitivists hope to deliver society into this primal chaos, so that the "wheat and corn, pigs and horses" - and the rest of us, presumably - may freely dance once more.

On web sites like primitivism.com, primitivists tell us how the Internet should not exist. In printed magazines like Green Anarchy, they condemn printing presses and typesetting technology. And in events like the Green Anarchy Tour of 2001, they complain of the roads that enable them to travel, the electricity that powers the instruments of their tour's musical acts, and of the existence of the facilities that host their events. Primitivists enjoin their audience to live like early hominids, though they certainly don't lead by example.

When analyzing primitivist musings, two mysteries immediately confront the reader. The first: how can such ideas be seriously entertained by anyone? Electricity, advanced medical care, information technologies, artificial heating and cooling, water purification, and countless other modem innovations are regarded by primitivists as undesirable. One would think that the lifespan of such notions would be as short as that of a Palaeolithic tribesman's. Yet, primitive thinking is currently enjoying a kind of vogue among the radical left.

7. Primitivists take their rejection of technology way too far, rejecting things that can actually help the human race.

Brian Oliver Sheppard; respected philosopher and writer; 2003; Anarchism vs. Primitivism

No technology above simple tools is to be allowed in the primitivist utopia, either: "Technology is distinct from simple tools in many regards," primitivists claim. Primitivists define technology in a manner that suits their ends, however: it is "more of a process or concept than a static form," they explain. "It is a complex system involving division of labor, resource extraction, and exploitation for the benefit of those who implement its process."

Now, a "system of division of labor, resource extraction, and exploitation for the benefit of those who implement its process" is actually a description of the workings of capitalism. Technology, however, which existed long before capitalism, is defined by most scientists as the practical application of knowledge towards problem solving; alternately, most anthropologists agree, it is a manner of accomplishing a task using technical methods. Despite the protestations of primitivists, most anthropologists also classify stone tools as a type of technology. Other technology includes the construction of crude wells for securing water as well as the most advanced equipment used to save human life. Deprived of such things, countless humans would immediately die.