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#### (A) Interpretation: Infrastructure is defined by specific physical characteristics --- this differentiates transportation from utilities, communication, and energy

Inderst 9

(Georg, Financial Affairs Division – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, “Pension Fund Investment in Infrastructure”, OECD Working Paper, No. 32, January, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/41/9/42052208.pdf)

Definition of infrastructure assets The definition of infrastructure investment seems intuitive. The OECD uses a simple and general definition for infrastructure as the system of public works in a country, state or region, including roads, utility lines and public buildings. A standard dictionary‘s definition is: ―The basic facilities, services, and installations needed for the functioning of a community or society, such as transportation and communications systems, water and power lines, and public institutions including schools, post offices, and prisons.‖ (American Heritage Dictionary). Infrastructure assets are traditionally defined by their physical characteristics. One can split them into two main categories, and a range of sectors within those: Economic infrastructure  transport (e.g. toll roads, airports, seaport, tunnels, bridges, metro, rail systems)  utilities (e.g. water supply, sewage system, energy distribution networks, power plants, pipelines, gas storage)  communication (e.g. TV/ telephone transmitters, towers, satellites, cable networks)  renewable energy Social infrastructure  education facilities  health (hospitals and health care centres)  security (e.g. prisons, police, military stations)  others (e.g. parks). There is a lot of variety within infrastructure if it is defined by its physical nature, and people disagree what exactly should or should not count as infrastructure asset. For example, do utility companies count as infrastructure? When their activities span production, distribution and networks, where is the dividing line? More generally, where does public infrastructure end and private infrastructure start?

(B) Violation: The AFF uses ocean lanes which are not something physical. Lanes are just space in the ocean.

(C) Vote Negative

1. **Limits- The AFF blows out limits by including programs that are not actually infrastructure. This allows the AFF to run thousands of programs that involve any sort of movement or vehicle.**
2. **Grounds- They take away our core links to generic arguments. This destroys topic education by inhibiting clash.**

T – Outside the United States

Interpretation:

In means within a place

Random House Webster’s College Dictionary 96

In: 1)used to indicate inclusion within space, a place or limits 2)used to indicate inclusion within something abstract or immaterial 3)used to indicate inclusion within or occurrence during a period or limit of time 4)used to indicate limitation or qualification, as of situation, condition, relation, manner, action, etc. 5)on the inside; within

United States is a republic made up of 50 states

Dictionary.com, 2012

By Dictionary.com, online dictionary, 2012, "United States” <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/United+States?s=t>

A republic in the N Western Hemisphere comprising 48 conterminous states, the District of Columbia, and Alaska in North America, and Hawaii in the N Pacific. 267,954,767; conterminous United States, 3,022,387 sq. mi. (7,827,982 sq. km); with Alaska and Hawaii, 3,615,122 sq. mi. (9,363,166 sq. km). Capital: Washington, D.C. Abbreviation: U.S., U

Violation – The aff does not increase transportation infrastructure IN the United States. They are creating shipping lanes that cross over to other areas of the world

Standards

a. Limits – In an expansive topic, the area of investment must be controlled or the topic area would exponentially increase the topic area. The topic would then cover all forms of international transportation infrastructure involving the US. Unlimiting the topic makes it *impossible* for the negative to prepare for the debate.

Voter

Topicality is a voting issue for education and fairness.

Elections DA

#### Obama will win --- presidential polling is a good indicator.

**Constitution Daily**, **7/20**/2012 (Historic poll trends give edge to Obama, p. <http://blog.constitutioncenter.org/2012/07/historic-poll-trends-give-edge-to-obama/>)

A review of presidential polling data back to 1948 shows that Barack Obama’s edge in the latest Gallup poll is a positive sign for his re-election chances. But in two past recent elections, candidates with bigger leads than Obama lost hotly contested elections, after their opponents used hard-hitting tactics. Since 1948, candidates who led in early to mid-July polling have won 13 of 16 presidential races in November. Two of the winning candidates who trailed in the mid-summer polls were George W. Bush in 2004 and George H.W. Bush in 1988. Both candidates used aggressive ad campaigns to capitalize on missteps by front runners John Kerry and Michael Dukakis to win the fall election. Recently, some GOP supporters have urged Mitt Romney to adopt harsher attacks on Obama, including more ads that attack Obama’s character and policies. In the most recent Gallup poll, President Obama holds a 47 percent to 45 percent lead over challenger Romney. The third candidate to overcome a mid-summer frontrunner was Harry Truman, who used an old-fashioned grassroots campaign to get past Thomas Dewey in 1948. In two of those three cases, George W. Bush and Truman had “the power of the pulpit” as the incumbent president as an extra way to generate campaign publicity. Also, in 1988 George H.W. Bush was the sitting vice president. ROMNEY MAY NEED TO FIGHT TOUGH But if history is any guide , Romney will have to fight his way past the mid-summer frontrunner.

#### Spending kills support from independent voters

**Zeleny and Sussman 12**

Zeleny and Sussman, Jeff and Dalia, publishers from the NY times, 01/18/12, NY Times, Polls Show Obamas vulnerability with swing voters, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/19/us/politics/poll-shows-obamas-vulnerability-with-swing-voters.html?pagewanted=all

[President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per) opens his re-election bid facing significant obstacles among independent voters, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll, with the critical piece of the electorate that cemented his victory four years ago open to denying him a second term. As Mr. Obama moves toward a full-throated campaign, delivering a [State of the Union address](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/state_of_the_union_message_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) on Tuesday and inching closer to directly confronting his Republican challenger, a majority of independent voters have soured on his presidency, disapprove of how he has dealt with the economy and do not have a clear idea of what he hopes to accomplish if re-elected. The swing voters who will play a pivotal role in determining his political fate are up for grabs, the poll found, with just 31 percent expressing a favorable opinion of Mr. Obama. Two-thirds of independent voters say he has not made real progress fixing the economy. The president, mindful of the headwinds facing him, begins his first major television advertising campaign on Thursday in a handful of battleground states. His targets include independent voters, who the poll found also hold deep skepticism of Republicans. While Republican primary voters say [Mitt Romney](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/primaries/candidates/mitt-romney?inline=nyt-per) stands the best chance of defeating Mr. Obama, nearly half of independents say they have yet to form an opinion of him, creating a considerable opening for Democrats to try to quickly define him if he becomes the nominee. As Mr. Romney and his rivals fight to win the South Carolina primary on Saturday, the poll suggests that Republicans have grown less satisfied with their choices. Nearly 7 in 10 Republican voters across the country said they now want more options, a probable reflection of conservative unease about Mr. Romney and the remaining candidates. But with 10 months remaining until Election Day and the lines of argument coming into view, voters are evenly divided in a matchup between Mr. Obama and Mr. Romney. The president does better against the other Republican candidates. A glimmer of hope may be on the horizon for Mr. Obama, though, as the economy appears to be generating more jobs. The poll found that 28 percent of the public says the economy is getting better, which is the biggest sense of optimism found in a Times/CBS News poll since last February. But Mr. Obama, whose job approval rating remains essentially frozen in the 40s, has considerable work to do rebuilding the coalition of voters who sent him to the White House. Independent voters have concerns about Mr. Obama on a variety of measures, including 6 in 10 who say the president does not share their priorities for the country. “I trusted Obama would bring fresh ideas to the country and improve the economy, even though he was not experienced. It didn’t happen,” said Jay Hernandez, 54, a credit manager from Miami who said that he is not aligned with either party, in a follow-up interview. “If there were another Democratic candidate I might reconsider, but I won’t vote for [Barack Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per).” With the president preparing to address a joint session of Congress next week, which will also be an opportunity to outline his accomplishments to the nation, the poll found that 38 percent of all voters view him favorably, 45 percent unfavorably, and 17 percent have no opinion. The speech will be a chance to draw further distinctions with Congress, whose approval rating remains near record lows of 13 percent. When asked whom they trust, the poll found that Mr. Obama has an advantage over Congressional Republicans in making the right decisions about creating jobs, health care,[Medicare](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/health/diseasesconditionsandhealthtopics/medicare/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) and [Social Security](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/social_security_us/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). Yet the gap narrows on the economy — the chief concern among voters — with 44 percent of Americans saying they trust Mr. Obama and 40 percent saying they trust Republicans in Congress. The public is evenly split on whom they trust to deal with the budget deficit, which the poll found to be the public’s second most important issue.

A close uniqueness debate magnifies the importance of the link --- independent voters are swing close elections.

**Kaufman**, 4/13/**2012** (Stephen, Who Are America’s Independent Voters? Why Are They Crucial?, International Information Program Digital, p. <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/article/2012/04/201204133847.html#axzz1sqNkxizT>)

The United States may have a political system dominated by two parties, Republican and Democratic, but according to a recent poll, more Americans identify themselves as being independent rather than belonging to either party, and the historical record has shown that independents tend to sway the outcome of U.S. elections. According to a Gallup Poll released in January, the number of Americans identifying themselves as independent rose to 40 percent, the highest level ever measured by Gallup, followed by Democrats and Republicans with 31 percent and 27 percent, respectively. But according to Tara McGuinness, a senior vice president at the Washington-based public policy research and advocacy group Center for American Progress, the apparent surge in the number of independents does not mean that most votes in the November presidential election between President Obama and his probable opponent, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, are undecided. Speaking at the Washington Foreign Press Center April 13, McGuinness said perhaps half of independents actually lean toward one of the two parties. In reality, she said, only about 15 percent of American voters are truly independent, voting sometimes for Democrats and sometimes for Republicans, and they are statistically less likely to vote than their partisan counterparts. U.S. presidential elections are often very close in terms of the popular vote. In 2008, President Obama beat Arizona Senator John McCain with 52.9 percent of the popular vote, compared to 45.7 percent for McCain. That figure closely resembles the fact that Obama won 52 percent of independent voters, compared with 44 percent for McCain. “As independents go, frequently elections go,” McGuinness said. “Especially in close elections, you could not win … [by] simply targeting independent voters, but frequently you cannot win an election without targeting some independent voters.”

#### Romney election results in Iran strikes --- Obama reelection defuses the situation with diplomacy

**Daily Kos**, 4/16/**2012** (President Obama versus Romney on Iran, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>)

3. Approach to foreign policy: Romney says he will “not apologize” for America and advocates a return to the Bush cowboy “my way or the highway” approach to dealing with other nations. When John Bolton is an endorser, that scares me. To me, however the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran. Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come. (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia."But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent a needless war. You can be sure that Mitt Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”. As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. Bottom line, if somehow the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a more than likely bombardment of Iran. If the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.

#### Iran strikes escalates to a nuclear world war.

**Chossudovsky**, 12/26/**2011** (Michel, Preparing to attack Iran with Nuclear Weapons, Global Research, p. http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28355)

An attack on Iran would have devastating consequences, It would unleash an all out regional war from the Eastern Mediterranean to Central Asia, potentially leading humanity into a World War III Scenario. The Obama Administration constitutes a nuclear threat. NATO constitutes a nuclear threat Five European "non-nuclear states" (Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Turkey) with tactical nuclear weapons deployed under national command, to be used against Iran constitute a nuclear threat. The Israeli government of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu not only constitutes a nuclear threat, but also a threat to the security of people of Israel, who are misled regarding the implications of an US-Israeli attack on Iran. The complacency of Western public opinion --including segments of the US anti-war movement-- is disturbing. No concern has been expressed at the political level as to the likely consequences of a US-NATO-Israel attack on Iran, using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state. Such an action would result in "the unthinkable": a nuclear holocaust over a large part of the Middle East.

Alaska Fiat CP

Plantext: Alaska should substantially invest in the maintenance of Arctic sea lanes in the United States including the building and deployment of icebreakers.

Alaska will fund icebreakers

DeMarban 4/11/2012 (Alex, Staff Writer for the *Alaska Dispatch.* “Should Alaska take the lead in financing new icebreakers?” 4/11/12. http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/should-alaska-take-lead-financing-new-icebreakers).

Gov. Sean Parnell says the state might be interested in helping finance a new icebreaker so the U.S. can make up lost ground in the race for Arctic dominance. That's the gist of the governor's response to a lengthy letter from Rep. Don Young offering ideas on how Alaska can help the cash-strapped federal government put costly new icebreakers off Alaska's increasingly busy northern coasts. With the nation's icebreaking fleet reduced to a single working ship -- its two large icebreakers are undergoing repairs or being decommissioned -- the state and U.S. government should consider sharing costs to make new icebreakers a reality, Young suggested in a Feb. 7 letter to Parnell. New or refurbished icebreakers will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. More ships are plowing through the Bering Strait as sailing seasons lengthen in the warming but often ice-choked Arctic. The U.S. Coast Guard predicts traffic will continue growing as shipping, resource development and tourism expands. But the Healy, a "medium duty" icebreaker that escorted a Russian fuel tanker to Nome this winter, is the Coast Guard's lone functioning icebreaker.

Security

The affirmative’s obsession with ranking and managing risk is the essence of security logic

Hagmann & Cavelty, 2012 (National risk registers: Security scientism and the propagation of permanent insecurity, John Hagmann and Myriam Dunn Cavelty, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, Sage Journals Feb 15 2012)

With the demise of communism as an overarching organizing principle and crystallization point, Western security doctrines have seen the inclusion of a growing range of different security issues from political, societal, economic and environmental sectors. By the same token, Western security politics has also been prominently infused with risk narratives and logics since the 1990s (Petersen, 2011; Hameiri and Kühn, 2011). Particular to risk-centric conceptualizations of public danger is the understanding that national and international security should take into account a varied set of natural or man-made disaster potentials, as well as other probable disruptions with potentially grave consequences for society. Also, specific to these dangers is the profound uncertainty regarding their exact form and likely impact, and the substantial room for conflicting interpretations surrounding them. However, **precise and ‘actionable’ knowledge of looming danger is quintessential to security politics**, the shift to new security narratives notwithstanding. Without conceptions of existing or upcoming collective dangers, security schemes are neither intelligible nor implementable. Whether the matter at hand concerns the installation of hi-tech body scanners at airports, the construction of avalanche barriers in the Alps or diplomatic initiatives for a global anti-terror alliance, any security agenda is rhetorically and politically grounded in a representation of national or international danger. In recent years, the epistemological foundations of security politics have been addressed by reflexive and critical approaches, a literature that enquires into the formation, contestation and appropriation of (in)security discourses. Situating itself in this broader literature, this article focuses on national risk registers as a particular means for authoritative knowledge definition in the field of national security. National risk registers are fairly recent, comprehensive inventories of public dangers ranging from natural hazards to industrial risks and political perils. Often produced by civil protection agencies, they seek to provide secure foundations for public policymaking, security-related resource allocation and policy planning. Evaluating and ranking all kinds of potential insecurities, from toxic accidents and political unrest to plant diseases, thunderstorms, energy shortages, terrorist strikes, wars and the instability of global financial markets, risk registers stand at the intersection of the broadening of security politics and the adoption of risk logics.

In particular, infrastructure development is the essence of modern securitization – it translates the normal function of life into the discourse of security

Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams, 10 (Tom Lundborg, The Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Nick Vaughan-Williams, University of Warwick, “There’s More to Life than Biopolitics: Critical Infrastructure, Resilience Planning, and Molecular Security,” Paper prepared for the SGIR Conference, Stockholm, 7-10 September, 2010)

While the terrain of security studies is of course fiercely contested, what is common among a range of otherwise often diverse perspectives is the core premise that ‘security’ relates to a realm of activity in some sense beyond the ‘norm’ of political life. Thus, in the language of the Copenhagen School, a securitizing move occurs when an issue not previously thought of as a security threat comes to be produced as such via a speech act that declares an existential threat to a referent object (Buzan et al 1998). A similar logic can be identified in approaches to security that focus on exceptionalism: the idea, following the paradigmatic thought of Carl Schmitt, that sovereign practices rely upon the decision to suspend the normal state of affairs in order to produce emergency conditions in which extraordinary measures—such as martial law, for example—are legitimised. For this reason, a tendency in security studies—even among self-styled ‘critical’ approaches – is to privilege analysis of high-profile ‘speech acts’ of elites, ‘exceptional’ responses to ‘exceptional’ circumstances, and events that are deemed to be ‘extraordinary’. Arguably this leads to an emphasis on what we might call the ‘spectacle of security’, rather than more mundane, prosaic, and ‘everyday’ aspects of security policy and practice. By contrast, the world of CIs necessitates a shift in the referent object of security away from the ‘spectacular’ to the ‘banal’. Instead of high-profile speech-based acts of securitization, we are here dealing with telecommunications and transportation networks, water treatment and sewage works, and so on: ‘semi-invisible’ phenomena that are often taken-for-granted fixtures and fittings of society, yet **vital for the maintenance of** what is considered to be ‘**normal daily life’**. For this reason our subject matter calls for a re-thinking of the very ‘stuff’ considered to be apposite for the study of international security. Indeed, analysing the role of CIs and resilience planning in global security relations adds particular resonance to existing calls within the literature to broaden and deepen the way in which acts of securitization are conceptualised (Bigo 2002; Balzacq 2005; McDonald 2008; Williams 2003). Those adopting more sociologically-oriented perspectives, for example, have sought to emphasise the way in which securitizing moves can be made by institutions (as well as individuals), through repeated activity (as well as one-off ‘acts’), and involve various media (not only ‘speech’, but visual culture, for example). From this reconfigured point of view it is possible to then see how the design, planning, management, and execution of CIs also constitute an arena in which processes of securitization—of physical and cyber networks—takes place.

The dream of security produces apocalypse– *constructions* of existential risk produce the annihilation they are meant to escape

Pever Coviello, Prof. of English @ Bowdoin, 2k [*Queer Frontiers*, p. 39-40]

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

Alternative – Reject the affirmative’s security logic – only resistance to the discourse of security can generate genuine political thought

Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, 2008 [*Critique of Security*, 185-6]

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

Shipping Lanes

Trading is inevitable.

Pope 2000 (Carl, Director of Sierra Club; “IFGers Respond: Is Globalization Inevitable?” >2000. http://www.ifg.org/inevitable.html.)

At the IFG's recent teach-ins in New York and Washington, D.C., as well as in press interviews, a recurring theme has been that opposition to economic globalization may be quixotic. Common wisdom holds that we are already in a global economy, as witnessed by the reach of CNN, the scale of Shell, IBM, Mitsubishi, and many other corporate operations, the increasingly uniform buying and behavior patterns of citizens in Asia, Africa, Europe, and the United States, not to mention the ramifications of the Internet. It is argued that to stand in opposition to such trends is to deny reality. Europeans are so often told by their leaders that "there is no alternative" that they have begun using the acronym TINA to describe the mindset. Truly, there is no denying that economic globalization is advancing rapidly, but most IFGers consider that to accept this advance without resistance is what will finally confirm its inevitability. Presumably, great changes in democratic societies are only augmented after public debate over their consequences. But in the case of economic globalization, secrecy was emphasized, not debate. By such means as "fast track" voting procedures in the United States, and the suppression of the actual trade agreement texts from media, the public and even the legislators who voted on them, democratic debate was surely denied. In some other countries, the situation was even more extreme—no parliamentary votes, merely approval by fiat. But critical questions must still be discussed and settled, such as these: Who gains and who loses? Who works and who does not, and at what level of survivability? Is the process environmentally sustainable? (It is not.) Where will the resources come from to feed the exponential growth of development that is basic to the process? Do we really want to sacrifice community, regional, and national sovereignties for global corporate governance from Geneva? (The headquarters of the World Trade Organization.) How can people's livelihoods be protected—whether workers or farmers or even middle managers? Can a system governed from the global center ever satisfy the needs of real people where they live? In fact, was a global economy ever intended for such purposes, or only for the needs of global corporations? Is this whole line of development a good idea?

Widening Panama Canal exponentially expands shipping lanes.- Solves

Hendricks 12 (David, Staff Writer for the San Antonio Express News, “Panama Canal widening to have global ripple effect.” 05/14/12. http://www.mysanantonio.com/business/article/Panama-Canal-widening-to-have-global-ripple-effect-3557737.php#photo-2935888).

The deepening and widening of the Panama Canal will have a ripple effect on shipping throughout the world, but what happens in Texas depends on the various ports, officials said Monday. When larger ships start routinely crossing the canal in 2015, long-haul container ship routes will change because they will be able to make more all-water deliveries, said Rodolfo Sabonge, the canal's vice president for market research and analysis. He was in San Antonio as a keynote speaker for a conference of the Federation of Freight Forwarders, Logistics Operators and Cargo Agents of Latin America. Ultimately, the canal's influence in reducing costs for consumers will expand because of the widening project, Sabonge said. “With the larger vessels, we are looking at lower costs for importers in San Antonio, like H-E-B,” said Jorge Canavati, Port San Antonio's business development vice president. “The bottom line is better costs.” The efficiencies will come because freight from Asia can move to Texas entirely on water instead of through a combination of ships, rail and trucks. The canal's deepening and widening will allow the passage of container ships carrying 12,600 typical-sized containers, and perhaps as many as 14,500, — up from the previous limit of 4,800, Sabonge said. The canal's enlargement will be completed in 2014, after a recent six-month construction delay. But with another six months needed for testing and to train personnel, the port will open the canal to the larger ships on a routine basis in early 2015, Sabonge told about 175 members of the organizations, which goes by the name ALACAT. In addition to new routes for seafaring cargo ships, the canal's larger capacities will result in new rail lines and roads for ports taking deliveries from the larger ships, new shipping rates and an increase in transshipments, in which cargos of the larger ships will be divided onto smaller ships for delivery to ports not able to accommodate the largest container ships, Sabonge said. The Port of Houston Authority, with a 45-foot-deep channel, is preparing to receive container ships with up to 8,500 containers, which is larger than those now passing through the canal, said Ricky Kunz, Port of Houston's vice president for trade development and marketing. Without a 50-foot channel depth, the Houston port will not be able to accept fully laden container ships carrying more than 8,500 containers, Kunz said. “But 8,500 (containers) will be all the Gulf (of Mexico) can handle anyway,” Kunz said. “Cargo already is being diverted from the West Coast to the Gulf. We are building to meet the market demand,” he added. The Port of Corpus Christi, also with a 45-foot-deep channel, will dredge its channel in about 10 years to get to 52 feet, but not just to accommodate the largest container ships, said John LaRue, the port's executive director. Specifically, the port hopes to use the channel for large ships to export U.S. grain and coal, some of it bound for Asia, through the Panama Canal, LaRue said. “That would be better for the U.S. economy,” he said.

Economic decline doesn’t cause war.

Jervis 11 [Robert, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics in the Department of Political Science, and a Member of the Arnold A. Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Force in Our Times Saltzman Working Paper No. 15 July 2011 http://www.siwps.com/news.attachment/saltzmanworkingpaper15-842/SaltzmanWorkingPaper15.PDF]

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy, and bring back old-fashioned beggar-thy-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a pre-existing high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

There are a lot of shipping lanes right now

(Dai 7/20/12 Serena Dai, 7/20,12, staff writer, The Atlantic Wire, “A Map of the World’s Shipping Lanes,” <http://www.theatlanticwire.com/global/2012/07/see-map-worlds-shipping-lanes/54847/>)

In this map, the commercial relationship between North America and Asia can be seen by the thick collection of lines between the two continents. Europe and North Americas' exchange of goods is also illustrated with dense threads connecting the two via the Atlantic Ocean. Just goes to show, most of us may not traverse the waters much, but the oceans and seas of the world still feel the impact of human life.

There are many shipping lanes to the United States

(Ghose 10 Tia Ghose, 1/25, 10, researcher and reporter at the Center for Investigative Reporting and California Watch, graduate degree from University of California Santa Cruz, Wired, “A Year of Global Shipping Routes Mapped by GPS,” <http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2010/01/global-shipping-map/>)

Scientists have come up with the first comprehensive map of global shipping routes based on actual itineraries. The team pieced together a year’s worth of travel itineraries from 16,693 cargo ships using data from LLoyd’s Register Fairplay and the Automatic Identification System, which tracks vessels using a VHF receiver and GPS. A few hot spots logged the majority of journeys. The busiest port was the Panama Canal, followed by the Suez Canal and Shanghai. “There is a strong similarity of statistical properties between shipping and aviation networks,” lead author Bernd Blasius, a mathematical modeler at Carl von Ossietzky University, wrote in an e-mail. “But different ship types (e.g., container ships vs. bulk carriers or oil tankers) are characterized by different movement patterns.” The study will be published in a forthcoming Journal of the Royal Society: Interface. Factoring in both the volume of ships and the number of other ports each is connected to, these are the top ports in the world: 1 Panama Canal 2 Suez Canal 3 Shanghai 4 Singapore 5 Antwerp 6 Piraeus 7 Terneuzen 8 Plaquemines 9 Houston 10 Ijmuiden 11 Santos 12 Tianjin 13 New York and New Jersey 14 Europoort 15 Hamburg 16 Le Havre 17 St Petersburg 18 Bremerhaven 19 Las Palmas 20 Barcelona

Other countries want to trade with the United States – they respect our democratic power

(McCain 12 Senator John McCain, 3/22/12, The Diplomat, “Why Asia Wants America,” <http://thediplomat.com/2012/05/22/why-asia-wants-america/3/>)

In short, it is because we marry our great power and our democratic values together, and we act on this basis. It’s because, among the community of nations, America still remains unique – exceptional – a democratic great power that uses its unparalleled influence not just to advance its own narrow interests, but to further a set of transcendent values. Above all, this is why so many countries in Asia and elsewhere are drawn to us – because we put our power into the service of our principles. This is why, during my repeated travels through Asia, I meet person after person, leader after leader, who wants America to be their partner of choice. They don’t want less of America. They want more – more of our trade, more of our diplomatic support, and yes, more of our military assistance and cooperation. At a time when most Americans say they are losing faith in our government, we should remember that there are millions of people in the world, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, who still believe in the United States, and who still want to live in a world shaped by American power, American values, and American leadership. With so many people counting on us – and by no means counting us out – the least we can do is endeavor to be worthy of the high hopes they still have in us.

Empirically denied.

Naval Power

US hegemony is high now – economic and military indicators prove.

Kagan 12 (Robert, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post, The New Republic, “Not Fade Away: The Myth of American Decline,” http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism?page=0,1)

The answer is no. Let’s start with the basic indicators. In economic terms, and even despite the current years of recession and slow growth, America’s position in the world has not changed. Its share of the world’s GDP has held remarkably steady, not only over the past decade but over the past four decades. In 1969, the United States produced roughly a quarter of the world’s economic output. Today it still produces roughly a quarter, and it remains not only the largest but also the richest economy in the world. People are rightly mesmerized by the rise of China, India, and other Asian nations whose share of the global economy has been climbing steadily, but this has so far come almost entirely at the expense of Europe and Japan, which have had a declining share of the global economy. Optimists about China’s development predict that it will overtake the United States as the largest economy in the world sometime in the next two decades. This could mean that the United States will face an increasing challenge to its economic position in the future. But the sheer size of an economy is not by itself a good measure of overall power within the international system. If it were, then early nineteenth-century China, with what was then the world’s largest economy, would have been the predominant power instead of the prostrate victim of smaller European nations. Even if China does reach this pinnacle again—and Chinese leaders face significant obstacles to sustaining the country’s growth indefinitely—it will still remain far behind both the United States and Europe in terms of per capita GDP. Military capacity matters, too, as early nineteenth-century China learned and Chinese leaders know today. As Yan Xuetong recently noted, “military strength underpins hegemony.” Here the United States remains unmatched. It is far and away the most powerful nation the world has ever known, and there has been no decline in America’s relative military capacity—at least not yet. Americans currently spend less than $600 billion a year on defense, more than the rest of the other great powers combined. (This figure does not include the deployment in Iraq, which is ending, or the combat forces in Afghanistan, which are likely to diminish steadily over the next couple of years.) They do so, moreover, while consuming a little less than 4 percent of GDP annually—a higher percentage than the other great powers, but in historical terms lower than the 10 percent of GDP that the United States spent on defense in the mid-1950s and the 7 percent it spent in the late 1980s. The superior expenditures underestimate America’s actual superiority in military capability. American land and air forces are equipped with the most advanced weaponry, and are the most experienced in actual combat. They would defeat any competitor in a head-to-head battle. American naval power remains predominant in every region of the world. By these military and economic measures, at least, the United States today is not remotely like Britain circa 1900, when that empire’s relative decline began to become apparent. It is more like Britain circa 1870, when the empire was at the height of its power. It is possible to imagine a time when this might no longer be the case, but that moment has not yet arrived.

No war over arctic.

**Bitzinger and Desker 9** [Why East Asian War is Unlikely Richard A. Bitzinger and Barry Desker Richard A. Bitzinger is a Senior Fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. Barry Desker is Dean of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Director of the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. Survival | vol. 50 no. 6 | December 2008–January 2009 | pp. 105–128 DOI 10.1080/00396330802601883]

Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, espe- cially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, includ- ing the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organi- sation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.

**Impacts empirically denied; Cold War proves. World War is not dependent on the existence of two ice-breakers. DA checks for Russian relations. U.S. has the world’s best military and largest military, which check isolation.**

**Their impact evidence isn’t specific to arctic shipping or ice-breakers—ice-breakers can’t solve.**

Arctic Science

**Researching in the artic makes no sense; ice-caps are melting and**

**Plenty of scientists studying warming- consensus reached**

Harris 11 (Richard Harris, 6/21/11, "Climate Change: Public Skeptical, Scientists Sure," NPR, http://www.npr.org/2011/06/21/137309964/climate-change-public-skeptical-scientists-sure)

Most Americans are unaware that the National Academy of Sciences, known for its cautious and even-handed reviews of the state of science, is firmly on board with climate change. It has been for years. Ralph Cicerone, president of the National Academy, paraphrased its most recent report on the subject. "The consensus statement is that climate changes are being observed, are certainly real, they seem to be increasing, and that humans are mostly likely the cause of all or most of these changes," he said. That's not just the view of the U.S. National Academies. There's also a consensus statement from the presidents of science academies from around the world, including the academies of China, the United Kingdom, India, Japan, Russia, France, Brazil, the list goes on. Cicerone also points to strong statements about climate change from the leading professional organizations in the United States, including from the American Chemical Society, the American Physical Society and others. Of course, it's still possible to find a few scientists who reject the consensus. Cicerone says it is appealing to think they are right when they say there's no need to worry about complicated cap-and-trade policies or otherwise fuss about climate change.

#### Current Icebreakers capable of necessary scientific research

Canney 99 (Donald, Writer and Historian for the USCG, author of several military books. “Icebreakers and the U.S. Coast Guard.” 1999. <http://www.uscg.mil/history/webcutters/Icebreakers.asp>.)

Meanwhile, the icebreaker Healy was launched in 1998, designed by both the Navy and Coast Guard. This new vessel is designated a Polar icebreaker/Research vessel and will have significant capacity for both roles. Measuring 420 feet long by 82 feet in beam, the 16,000 ton ship will have the power to break 4.5 feet of ice at three knots - continuously - or up to eight feet by ramming. Her diesel electric powerplant will produce some 30,000 horsepower and enable a range of 16,000 miles at over twelve knots. On board, Healy will have quarters for the crew as well as over 35 scientists, whose work will be facilitated by six laboratories. Additionally, there will be sophisticated communications and computer systems and six science lab-vans. Large cargo holds, heavy-duty winches and cranes, dive lockers, and substantial open working decks will enable all types of scientific endeavors, both at sea, and in the Polar regions, particularly Antarctica. Healy, of course, is named for "Hell-roaring Mike" Healy, the most famous captain of the old Revenue Service, and the man most remembered for his Alaskan and Arctic operations in the old cutter Bear. This will be the first vessel in the service named for him, and plans are now to have her commissioned in late 2000, after a trial run on the Northwest Passage.

Arctic Science not key- Other ways to study warming

NOAA and NESDIS 08 (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service. “How do we study "Global Warming?" 08/20/12. <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/globalwarming/howdo.html>.)

Paleoclimatic data, generated from the study of things like tree rings, corals, fossils, sediment cores, pollens, and ice cores, and cave stalactites, both provide an independent confirmation of this recent warming, and place the 19th to 20th century (1860 to present day) warming in a long term context. The paleoclimatic record not only allows us to look at global temperature fluctuations over the last several centuries, it also permits scientists to examine past climate even further back in time over the course of millennia and longer. This perspective is an important capability in our quest to understand the possible causes of the 20th century global warming. We can look at hypothesized warm periods in the distant past (e.g., 1,000; 6,000; 125,000; and even 165,000,000 years ago) to see if they provide clues for natural processes that could be causing the global warming we are now experiencing. So far, paleoclimatologists have been unable to find any natural climatic explanations for our present-day warming.

Humans are already adapting to climate change

Biello (Environmental specialist staff writer for the Scientific American) 2012

(David, “How to Adapt to Climate Change,” 60-Second Earth, Energy & Sustainability, May 6, 2012, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode.cfm?id=how-to-adapt-to-climate-change-12-05-06>) //CL

For want of a mangrove, the village was lost. In fact, the loss of coastal mangroves made even a costly dyke along the Vietnamese seashore inadequate to cope with a recent typhoon. Plus, the absence of mangroves hit livelihoods—less seafood to catch. But one village had painstakingly replanted mangroves, scraping barnacles off the seedlings to ensure they took root. In return, those mangroves protected the village from the typhoon that devastated the rest of the coast. This is not a fable, it's a tale of how people are already adapting to climate change, as revealed at the International Institute for Environment and Development's sixth conference on community-based adaptation to climate change held in Vietnam in April. Farmers are trying to adapt, too. Whether by growing ginger in the shade of banana fronds in Southeast Asia or planting millet beneath new trees in the Sahel region of Africa. Those who can't adapt have to move, like Alaskans whose coastal towns have been undermined by severe winds or waves. Or whose water sources have been infiltrated by brine.

****Affirmative Can’t solve. There’s no correlation between arctic science and increased crop yields. Adaptation is occurring in the status quo and warming is unsolvable.****

And, it is completely ridiculous to go to the Arctic to study global warming. IT IS THE COLDEST PLACE ON EARTH, why would you study global WARMING, in the coldest place?

Oil

#### Non-Unique- Oil Spill research at an all time high.

Curwin 4/23 (Trevor, Staff Writer for CNBC, frequently writing about cleantech and renewables. “Hope After an Oil Spill: Breakthrough Cleanup Technology.” 4/23/12. <http://www.cnbc.com/id/46222428/Hope_After_an_Oil_Spill_Breakthrough_Cleanup_Technology>.)

“There’s a tremendous amount of work being done,” says Ken Lee, executive director of the Centre for Offshore Oil, Gas and Energy Research with Canada’s Department of Fisheries and Oceans. An oil spill veteran since the 1980s, Lee spent four months in the Gulf of Mexico after the BP spill at the request of the U.S. government. He says it spurred research that has “opened a whole new window” in cleanup. In fact, the Coast Guard and Environmental Protection Agency received tens of thousands of submissions for new spill-killer products in 2010 after the BP disaster was on its way to becoming the nation's largest offshore spill. Cleanup technologies range from “old school” booms and dispersants to cutting-edge absorbents and bio-remediation. The most famous piece of new technology from the BP spill at Transocean’s Deepwater Horizon was actor Kevin Costner’s oil-skimming centrifuge, designed to spin oil out the contaminated water it collected. The actor said he’d spent $16 million developing the skimmer, and spent $10 million deploying it in the 2010 spill. Compare that to the cost of the workhorse of oil spill cleanup products, the “contractor boom” — typically composed of a foam-material float, a polypropylene skirt that can also bind oil, and a weighting chain that together contain the spread of oil — which can run $4-$10 per foot. The Coast Guard later said Costner’s equipment couldn’t handle the weathered oil of the spill, and failed field tests. Skimmers and oil separators can costs tens to hundreds of thousands of dollars, depending on their capacity and operating environment. “The goal is still to get to the spill fast enough to get the oil off the surface,” says Leo Rimanic, managing director of oil spill tech firm Canadyne Technologies. The bulk of oil collected in these spills — 90 percent, according to Rimanic — comes from first booming the spill to contain the oil for removal. This stage includes using dispersants, or even fire, to destroy the oil, as well as various ship-borne and on-land hardware to remove the oil from collected water. But it’s that last 10 percent that’s the most expensive, and this final stage requires the use of more absorbents or biotech solutions to get at oil trapped in sensitive shoreline ecosystems. These products can be eight to 10 times more expensive per amount of oil removed, and getting oil cleanup firms to spend money on a premium product like his has always been tough, says Glenn Rink, CEO of AbTech Industries Since cleanup companies get paid for the amount of time they work on the spill, Rink says they "prefer the billable hours,” although insurance firms like AIG are now pushing for cleanups to be faster and more complete. That means having the right equipment at the right time, despite high upfront costs, because overall costs skyrocket once oil reaches land. According to data from research group Oil Spill Intelligence Report, cleaning up spills that never reach shore can cost over $3,000 per metric ton of oil.

Planes more effective at cleaning up spills-solves for ice breakers

Phillips 10 (Steve, Staff Writer for WLOX, News group in Mississippi. “Planes flying oil spill clean-up mission from Stennis International Airport.” 4/27/12. http://www.wlox.com/global/story.asp?s=12386067.)

HANCOCK COUNTY, MS (WLOX) - Stennis International Airport in Hancock County is playing an important role in the ongoing clean-up of the oil spill in the gulf. Marine Spill Response Corporation is using large planes to drop thousands of gallons of oil dispersant chemicals onto the oil slick. MSRC is a non-profit group, funded by the big oil companies, which responds to oil spills and accidents. Its staging area for the eastern Gulf of Mexico is Stennis Airport. This large oil spill has prompted the largest clean-up response in the company's 20 year history. "Get ready to start the pump," shouts an operations worker to the crew manning the pump equipment. Crews begin loading a C-130A with five thousand gallons of oil dispersant. Marine Spill Response Corporation is attacking the giant oil slick from the air. Donald Toenshoff, Jr. is the executive vice president for the company. "We are mobilizing a massive response, given the circumstances at hand. And we're bringing in dispersants from as far away as Seattle, Washington and up in the Baltimore, Maryland area," he explained. The large planes fly 35 minutes south into the gulf, then start dispersing the clean-up chemical through large nozzles, much like a crop duster. "And will fly down and basically lay down a layer at 75 feet above the water and 150 miles an hour, a cleaning gel. And this cleaning agent will basically break up the oil slick, not unlike the soap you use when you wash dishes at home," says Toenshoff. That chemical dispersant is delivered to the site in large plastic barrels. BP has contacted the manufacturer about increasing supplies. "And they'll be ramping up production, recognizing that we may be needing dispersants for some time into the future. This is the largest response that we as a company have worked on. We have been active for the past 20 years and responded to over 500 spills," said Toenshoff. Stennis International is considered an ideal location for these marine spill responders. It's close to the Gulf of Mexico, has the transportation support of nearby I-10, and has the available jet fuel to keep these planes in the air. "MSRC is a base customer here at Stennis International Airport. They support the field with a single aircraft on a day to day basis. That aircraft can go out, make immediate response, then they bring in the larger aircraft out of Arizona, as in this situation," said airport director, Bill Cotter. How long will this airlift clean-up last? "On behalf of the customer, we'll be here until the job is done," said Toenshoff. The marine spill responders are flying nine flights a day from Stennis to the oil slick. They're using two C-130 airplanes, along with a King Air that's also used as the "spotter" plane.

Planes can land on ice

(GoGetter JetSetter 10 GoGetter JetSetter, 2010, <http://www.gogetterjetsetter.com/how-safe-is-flying.php>)

Ice is safe because of modern “deicing” practices a) new warm water and glycol deicing fluid used as of 1993 b) post-deicing, planes are coated with fluid to keep ice from forming c) the time between deicing and takeoff has been reduced.

Amphibious aircraft can land on ice

(Encyclopaedia Britannica 12 Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2012, “seaplane,” <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/530961/seaplane>)

The addition of a retractable landing wheel gear to a float seaplane or flying boat, also accomplished by Curtiss, created the amphibian aircraft capable of operating from land runways or water. A post-World War II development was the pantobase, or all-base, airplane incorporating devices for operating from water or from a variety of unprepared surfaces such as snow, ice, mud, and sod.

And, it is proven that planes can land in the arctic, they have been landing on Antarctic ice for years.

**No impact. Empirically denied. Gulf ecosystems are still thriving after the oil spill. Icebreakers still take**

Arctic biodiversity loss is inevitable due to the continued melting of ice.

Shah 12, Anup Shah, writer for Global Issues, 03-04-12, “Climate Change Affects Biodiversity,” http://www.globalissues.org/article/172/climate-change-affects-biodiversity

The Arctic, Antarctic and high latitudes have had the highest rates of warming, and this trend is projected to continue, as the above-mentioned Global Biodiversity Outlook 3 notes (p. 56). In the Arctic, it is not just a reduction in the extent of sea ice, but its thickness and age. Less ice means less reflective surface meaning more rapid melting. The rapid reduction exceeds even scientific forecasts and is discussed further on this site’s climate change introduction. The polar bear depends on sea ice. (Image source) In terms of biodiversity, “the prospect of ice-free summers in the Arctic Ocean implies the loss of an entire biome”, the Global Biodiversity Outlook notes (p. 57). In addition, “Whole species assemblages are adapted to life on top of or under ice — from the algae that grow on the underside of multi-year ice, forming up to 25% of the Arctic Ocean’s primary production, to the invertebrates, birds, fish and marine mammals further up the food chain.” The iconic polar bear at the top of that food chain is therefore not the only species at risk even though it may get more media attention.

Biodiversity loss in the Arctic escalating due climate change

UNEP 07th, United Nations Environment Programme, communicates environmental information to policymakers and facilitates environmental decision-making for change, 05-22-07, “The Arctic Experience: Arctic Biodiversity Beyond Polar Bears,” http://www.grida.no/polar/news/2393.aspx?p=5

Climate Change is impacting biodiversity at a global and unprecedented scale. The Arctic region is hit particularly hard. It is already warming 2 – 2,5 times faster than the global average, due to a thinner atmosphere and several positive feedback responses. Changes in the Arctic will have major repercussions for all other global regions through changes in the hydrological cycle, the weather cycle, the carbon cycle or atmospheric changes, but also by impacting its unique biodiversity. Many Arctic species are migratory, connecting the entire globe by its annual migration routes of billions of migratory birds, marine mammals and fish. As the Arctic is the origin of all major flyways and also most strongly affected by climate change it has been the focus of the portfolio of UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) and UNEP/GRID-Arendal jointly with the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) for more than 10 years. CMS and AEWA are the major international agreements concerned with the conservation and sustainable use, and monitoring of migratory species. The changes in the Arctic region will determine the future of its major wealth in ecosystem goods and services, mostly its natural resources, marine and freshwater fish and terrestrial reindeer to name a few. They all provide vital income for the peoples of the North and to a large extent to the global community as a whole. Its unique location in still largely pristine wilderness and little direct human impacts allow the Arctic region for monitoring the impact of climate change and industrial development on biodiversity in a less complex ecosystem, providing us with an early warning system of what is likely to happen to our near future. Arctic biodiversity and ecosystems are an ideal test case for measuring progress towards the Convention on Biological Diversity’s (CBD) 2010 target to significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010, a barometer for the state of biodiversity. UNEP-WCMC and UNEP/Grid-Arendal have joined up with the Arctic Council’s biodiversity programme Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) to launch and implement the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP) to monitor the rapidly changing Arctic ecosystems and provide a sound basis for decision making in the Arctic region and on a global stage. The CBMP is part of the International Polar Year (IPY) initiative, which creates a huge scientific focus on the Polar regions, generating the attention to the vulnerable status of both poles. More than 100 projects focus on the Arctic region. The monitoring of Arctic biodiversity through CBMP is a valuable contribution to the CBD 2010 target and the implementation of the Convention.

Climate change causes a loss of biodiversity – loss of species inevitable.

CBD 10. Convention on Biological Diversity, Global Biodiversity Outlook is the flagship publication of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Drawing on a range of information sources, including National Reports, biodiversity indicators information, scientific literature, and a study assessing biodiversity scenarios for the future [4MB], the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3) summarizes the latest data on status and trends of biodiversity and draws conclusions for the future strategy of the Convention, 2010, “Global Biodiversity Outlook 3,” http://www.cbd.int/gbo3/?pub=6667&section=6711

Climate change is already having an impact on biodiversity, and is projected to become a progressively more significant threat in the coming decades. Loss of Arctic sea ice threatens biodiversity across an entire biome and beyond. The related pressure of ocean acidification, resulting from higher concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, is also already being observed. Ecosystems are already showing negative impacts under current levels of climate change (an increase of 0.74ºC in global mean surface temperature relative to pre-industrial levels), which is modest compared to future projected changes (2.4-6.4 ºC by 2100 without aggressive mitigation actions). In addition to warming temperatures, more frequent extreme weather events and changing patterns of rainfall and drought can be expected to have significant impacts on biodiversity. Impacts of climate change on biodiversity vary widely in different regions of the world. For example, the highest rates of warming have been observed in high latitudes, around the Antarctic peninsula and in the Arctic, and this trend is projected to continue. The rapid reduction in the extent, age and thickness of Arctic sea ice, exceeding even recent scientific forecasts, has major biodiversity implications [See Box 15 and Figure 14]. Already, changes to the timing of flowering and migration patterns as well as to the distribution of species have been observed worldwide. In Europe, over the last forty years, the beginning of the growing season has advanced by 10 days on average. These types of changes can alter food chains and create mismatches within ecosystems where different species have evolved synchronized inter-dependence, for example between nesting and food availability, pollinators and fertilization. Climate change is also projected to shift the ranges of disease-carrying organisms, bringing them into contact with potential hosts that have not developed immunity. Freshwater habitats and wetlands, mangroves, coral reefs, Arctic and alpine ecosystems, dry and subhumid lands and cloud forests are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Some species will benefit from climate change. However, an assessment looking at European birds found that of 122 widespread species assessed, about three times as many were losing population as a result of climate change as those that were gaining numbers. The specific impacts of climate change on biodiversity will largely depend on the ability of species to migrate and cope with more extreme climatic conditions. Ecosystems have adjusted to relatively stable climate conditions, and when those conditions are disrupted, the only options for species are to adapt, move or die. It is expected that many species will be unable to keep up with the pace and scale of projected climate change, and as a result will be at an increased risk of extinction, both locally and globally. In general climate change will test the resilience of ecosystems, and their capacity for adaptation will be greatly affected by the intensity of other pressures that continue to be imposed. Those ecosystems that are already at, or close to, the extremes of temperature and precipitation tolerances are at particularly high risk. Over the past 200 years, the oceans have absorbed approximately a quarter of the carbon dioxide produced from human activities, which would otherwise have accumulated in the atmosphere. This has caused the oceans (which on average are slightly alkaline) to become more acidic, lowering the average pH value of surface seawater by 0.1 units. Because pH values are on a logarithmic scale, this means that water is 30 per cent more acidic. The impact on biodiversity is that the greater acidity depletes the carbonate ions, positivelycharged molecules in seawater, which are the building blocks needed by many marine organisms, such as corals, shellfish and many planktonic organisms, to build their outer skeletons. Concentrations of carbonate ions are now lower than at any time during the last 800,000 years. The impacts on ocean biological diversity and ecosystem functioning will likely be severe, though the precise timing and distribution of these impacts are uncertain.

Solvency

Arctic shipping routes require passage into other countries’ arctic areas – shipping routes are unreliable and dangerous

GTS 10, The Geography of Transport Systems, provides multimedia information about transport information and transport geography, 07-06-10 “Polar Shipping Routes,” http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch1en/conc1en/polarroutes.html

In 2007 the Northwest Passage was open during the summer months for the first time in recorded history, but it remains to be seen how stable this opening is. In 2009, two German ships, Beluga Fraternity and Beluga Foresight, completed the first commercial journey across the Northern Sea Route (or Northeast Passage) linking Busan to Rotterdam with several stopovers. The consideration of arctic routes for commercial navigation purposes remains a very speculative endeavor, mainly for three reasons: First, it is uncertain to what extent the receding perennial ice cover is a confirmed trend or simply part of a long term climatic cycle. Even if the Artic routes became regularly open during the summer, the medium terms underlines that that Arctic would still remain closed to commercial navigation during the winter months. Since maritime shipping companies are looking for regular and consistent services, this seasonality has limited commercial appeal. Second, there is very limited economic activity around the Arctic Circle, implying that shipping services crossing the Arctic have almost no opportunity to drop and pick-up cargo as they pass through. Thus, unlike other long distance commercial shipping routes there is limited revenue generation potential for shipping lines along the Arctic route, which forbids the emergence of transshipment hubs. This value proposition could improve if resources (oil and mining) around the Arctic are extracted in greater quantities. The Arctic remains a frontier in terms of charting and building a navigation system, implying uncertainties and unreliability for navigation. This implies that substantial efforts have to be made to insure that navigation can take in place in a safe manner along well defined navigation routes. In view of all of the above maritime shipping companies are not yet considering seriously the commercial potential of the Arctic as a navigation shortcut. Still, the rise in bunker fuel prices and slow steaming practices can be considered incentives for the development of niche services that could use the Arctic as a shortcut between major markets of the northern hemisphere.

Shipping lanes in the Arctic require the passage into other countries’ territory.

Macalistar 11, Terry Macalistar, energy editor of the Guardian, 07-05-11, “Thawing Arctic opens up new shipping routes on the ‘roof of the world,’” http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jul/05/arctic-shipping-trade-routes

The gathering interest in the Northern Sea Route is being generated by a political as well as a physical thaw. Global warming is reducing the thickness and immovability of the ice but Moscow is changing too. Russia under Dmitry Medvedev is an increasingly outward-looking country willing to compromise and co-operate. Last week in Murmansk, the Russian president signed a bilateral agreement with Norway after a 40-year row over sea boundaries. It started with arguments over fish but has become a negotiation largely driven by prospects for oil and gas in the Barents Sea and beyond. Wider political changes are happening as the Arctic increasingly becomes a hunting ground for minerals rather than the seals of the past. The shipowners believe that this route could gradually be open for transit up to four months per year as air and sea temperatures increase. But they also foresee a world ahead when vessels can take a direct east-west route right across the north pole. Viktor Basargin, Russian regional development minister, has said that cargo shipments via the North Sea Route could rise from its current level of 3m tonnes annually to 30m "in the near future." Canadian and American maritime experts say 2% of global shipping could be diverted to the Arctic by 2030, rising to 5% by 2050. Already cruise ships are bringing tourists and income to countries such as Greenland. But they are also raising concerns about safety and pollution from oil spills. There is a widespread view that it is only a matter of time before there is a potential emergency: a passenger ship in trouble and potential evacuation into freezing seas.

The United Sates needs 10 new icebreakers.

AND 12, Anchorage Daily News, 06-15-12, “Coast Guard Icebreaker gets reprieve from demolition,” http://www.adn.com/2012/06/15/2506218/coast-guard-to-keep-seattle-based.html

SEATTLE -- The Coast Guard has postponed plans to scrap the Seattle-based icebreaker Polar Sea this year. Coast Guard Commandant Adm. Robert Papp made the decision Thursday after meeting with Sens. Maria Cantwell of Washington and Mark Begich and Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, the senators said Friday. "The Polar Sea's hull is still in sound condition," Cantwell said. "Postponing its scrapping allows the administration and Congress more time to consider all options for fulfilling the nation's critical icebreaking missions." The United States needs more icebreakers in the Arctic, the Alaska senators said. "While this may only be a six-month respite for the Polar Sea, I will use this period to work through my role on the Appropriations Committee to make America's icebreaking capacity a top priority," Murkowski said. The 399-foot Polar Sea is 35 years old and has been out of service since an engine failure in 2010. It had been scheduled to be dry-docked on Monday for the first steps in demolition. Its 36-year-old sister ship, the Polar Star, has been on caretaker status since 2006 and is undergoing a $57 million upgrade. The rehabbed Polar Star is expected to return to service next year. The United States currently has only one working icebreaker, the Healy. It was used last winter to escort a Russian tanker to Nome for an emergency fuel delivery after a fuel barge failed to arrive before the Bering Sea froze. The Healy is a medium-duty icebreaker designed to crush ice about 5 feet thick. The Polar Sea is designed to break through ice up to 21 feet thick. One Coast Guard study determined the agency and the Navy need six heavy duty icebreakers and four medium icebreakers, the senators said. The reduction in Arctic ice has created more opportunities for Northwest Passage trade, fishing and oil exploration, as well as more environmental and security concerns. The icebreakers also travel to Antarctica to resupply McMurdo Station. The hull is the costliest part of an icebreaker to build, said Brian Baird, a former Washington congressman who is now vice president of Vigor Industrial, formerly Todd Shipyards, which repairs the icebreakers. Building a new icebreaker could take 10 years and cost more than $800 million, Baird told The Seattle Times.

Warming solves shipping lanes, Northwest passage already open

Roach 07 (John, writer for National Geographic from Middlebury College. “Arctic Melt Opens Northwest Passage.” 09/17/07. http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/09/070917-northwest-passage.html.)

The famed Northwest Passage—a direct shipping route from Europe to Asia across the Arctic Ocean—is ice free for the first time since satellite records began in 1978, scientists reported Friday. The passage is a shortcut between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans through the Canadian Arctic. It would save valuable time and fuel for ships that now travel through the Suez Canal in Egypt or the Panama Canal in Central America. Climate models had projected the passage would eventually open as warming temperatures melted the Arctic sea ice—but no one had predicted it would happen this soon. "We're probably 30 years ahead of schedule in terms of the loss of the Arctic sea ice," said Mark Serreze, a senior scientist at the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) in Boulder, Colorado. "We're on this fast track of change." That rapid melting is ratcheting up international competition for control over the newly accessible shipping lanes and exposed natural resources. Canada, for example, claims it has full rights over the parts of the passage that pass its territory. The U.S. and European Union say the passage is in international waters. Meanwhile Russia laid claim to the sea floor at the North Pole this August, planting a flag there in the hopes of securing the Arctic's potential bonanza of oil and minerals.

Northwest passage key to trade- solves for their impacts

Mayer 07 (Chris, editor of *Mayer's Special Situations and Capital and Crisis,* veteran of the banking industry; “Northwest Passage Reopens Shipping Routes With Global Economic Impact.” 10/10/07. <http://www.dailyreckoning.com.au/northwest-passage/2007/10/10/>.)

The Arctic thaw’s more immediate and bigger impact will be as a shipping lane. Since Aug. 21, the Northwest Passage has been open to navigation and free of ice for the first time. “Analysts… confirm that the passage is almost completely clear and that the region is more open than it has ever been since the advent of routine monitoring in 1972,” reports the U.S. National Snow and Ice Data Center. The fabled passage through the Arctic Ocean connects the Pacific and Atlantic oceans along the northern coast of North America. To pass through here from China on your way to Europe is about 5,000 miles shorter than going through the Panama or Suez canals. As the Financial Times observes, “A ship traveling at 21 knots between Rotterdam and Yokohama takes 29 days if it goes via the Cape of Good Hope, 22 days via the Suez Canal and just 15 days if it goes across the Arctic Ocean.” An oil tanker could make the trip from the Russian port city of Murmansk to the east coast of Canada in a week by crossing the Arctic Ocean. That is about half the time it takes to get an oil tanker from Abu Dhabi to Galveston, Texas. In the early 1900s, it took the famed Norwegian explorer Roald Amundsen and his team nearly two years to pick their way through the ice and narrow waterways. Now the Northwest Passage could revolutionize shipping. More than 90% of all goods in the world, measured by tonnage, make their way by sea. And as I’ve noted in the past, the rapid surge in trade with China and India is putting a lot of strain on ports around the world. In recent years, the volume of container shipments has grown 5-7% annually - basically, doubling every 10-15 years. The ships carrying those containers are getting bigger, and the old canals can’t hold these new seafaring beasts of burden as they once did. The Suez Canal can still handle the largest current container ships, but not the next generation. The Panama Canal is even smaller. It’s too small for ships that are now common on longer shipping routes. Panama plans to deepen its channels and make them wider. But even so, the new Panama Canal won’t be able to service the next generation of ships. So it looks like the world will have a new navigable ocean with the Northwest Passage. The effects on trade could be immense. Much shorter shipping distances and quicker shipping times will lower the cost of doing business. It could lead to big increases in trade and, certainly, a major shift in sea lanes. A freer-flowing Arctic Ocean would also bring fish stocks north - with fishing fleets not far behind. It could mean a new boom in fishing for salmon, cod, herring and smelt. It could also mean that sleepy old ports could become important new hubs in international trade. As the Financial Times recently wrote, “Leading world powers have an unprecedented chance to win navigation rights and ownership of resources in the Arctic seabed untouched since its emergence during the twilight of the dinosaurs.” The U.S. alone could lay claim to more than 200,000 square miles of additional undersea territory. The specific investment implications of this are still too early to say. But the cracking open of new trade routes or reopening of old ones - and their impact on global trade - always has ripple effects across financial markets. As for the Arctic, the Northwest Passage has got to be one of the most important new developments on that front in a long time.

**The whole point of this affirmative is to clear pathways in the arctic. The arctic is already clearing, therefore the aff has no solvency.**

Timeframe

The new implementations of icebreakers are a decade away.

Hirsh 12, Steve Hirsh, director of communications at Vigor Industrial, March 2012, “Breaking Ice,” http://www.uscgf-kmi.com/cgf-home/388-cgf-2012-volume-4-issue-1-march/5281-protecting-the-last-frontier.html

A new class of Coast Guard icebreaker is welcome but is estimated to be a decade and a billion dollars away. Until Congress and the administration can provide such funding and the replacements are actually in the water, we must have the capability to complete the vital missions our polar icebreakers have performed for decades. The hulls and frames of both the Polar Star and Polar Sea are perfectly sound and capable of continuing to perform icebreaking while new vessels are designed, constructed and commissioned. As Alaska’s Lieutenant Governor Mead Treadwell told Congress even before the Healy escorted the Russian tanker-load of fuel to Nome, “The changes in the Arctic are presenting tremendous game-changing opportunities. Other Arctic and non-Arctic nations are seeing this potential, but America is missing the boat.” There are near-term and longer-term solutions to restore American capacity while still minding the cost. Polar Star will be ready to go by the end of this year. Polar Sea could be rolling a year or so later. Both can serve a decade or so while our nation carefully moves ahead towards the next generation of U.S. icebreakers. We can and must continue to support the Coast Guard’s mission to safeguard our nation’s interests in ports, at sea and around the world so that the service and the nation are always ready. ♦

The construction of a new icebreaker could take a decade

Song 11, Kyung M. Song, writer for Anchorage Daily News, “Lawmakers confront reality of need for expensive icebreakers,” http://www.adn.com/2011/10/10/v-printer/2113279/lawmakers-confront-cold-reality.html

Cantwell argues that with a fleet containing only one currently working icebreaker, the Coast Guard can't afford to junk the Polar Sea, as decrepit as it may be. Constructing a new icebreaker could take a decade and as much as $1 billion, money that Congress is unlikely to approve anytime soon. Until that happens, Cantwell said, yanking the Polar Sea from service would leave the Coast Guard with no backup heavy icebreaker. The 60,000-horsepower Polar Sea was refurbished in 2006 but its engines failed in June 2010. The Coast Guard hasn't fixed the engines because it would cost $22 million and wouldn't extend the Polar Sea's current service-end date of 2014, said Cmdr. Christopher O'Neil, a Coast Guard spokesman in Washington, D.C. The Coast Guard, which is part of the Department of Homeland Security, has asked for $39 million in fiscal 2012 for its polar icebreaking program.

Building a new icebreaker could take 10 years.

AND 12, Anchorage Daily News, 06-15-12, “Coast Guard Icebreaker gets reprieve from demolition,” http://www.adn.com/2012/06/15/2506218/coast-guard-to-keep-seattle-based.html

SEATTLE -- The Coast Guard has postponed plans to scrap the Seattle-based icebreaker Polar Sea this year. Coast Guard Commandant Adm. Robert Papp made the decision Thursday after meeting with Sens. Maria Cantwell of Washington and Mark Begich and Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, the senators said Friday. "The Polar Sea's hull is still in sound condition," Cantwell said. "Postponing its scrapping allows the administration and Congress more time to consider all options for fulfilling the nation's critical icebreaking missions." The United States needs more icebreakers in the Arctic, the Alaska senators said. "While this may only be a six-month respite for the Polar Sea, I will use this period to work through my role on the Appropriations Committee to make America's icebreaking capacity a top priority," Murkowski said. The 399-foot Polar Sea is 35 years old and has been out of service since an engine failure in 2010. It had been scheduled to be dry-docked on Monday for the first steps in demolition. Its 36-year-old sister ship, the Polar Star, has been on caretaker status since 2006 and is undergoing a $57 million upgrade. The rehabbed Polar Star is expected to return to service next year. The United States currently has only one working icebreaker, the Healy. It was used last winter to escort a Russian tanker to Nome for an emergency fuel delivery after a fuel barge failed to arrive before the Bering Sea froze. The Healy is a medium-duty icebreaker designed to crush ice about 5 feet thick. The Polar Sea is designed to break through ice up to 21 feet thick. One Coast Guard study determined the agency and the Navy need six heavy duty icebreakers and four medium icebreakers, the senators said. The reduction in Arctic ice has created more opportunities for Northwest Passage trade, fishing and oil exploration, as well as more environmental and security concerns. The icebreakers also travel to Antarctica to resupply McMurdo Station. The hull is the costliest part of an icebreaker to build, said Brian Baird, a former Washington congressman who is now vice president of Vigor Industrial, formerly Todd Shipyards, which repairs the icebreakers. Building a new icebreaker could take 10 years and cost more than $800 million, Baird told The Seattle Times.
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Elections 2NC

#### Romney’s economic plan causes economic collapse --- kills the housing market and consumer spending

**Waldron**, 1/12/**2012** (Travis, Economists: Romney’s Economic Plan Fails to Deal With ‘Main Drags’ On U.S. Economy, Think Progress, p. http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/12/403210/economists-romneys-draconian/)

Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney’s (R) economic plan has become the centerpiece of his presidential campaign. Though his proposals are often vague, analyses of the plan shows that it would provide huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans while raising taxes on low-income families. And though Romney claims to be concerned about the federal budget deficit, his plan would add more than $6 trillion in deficits over 10 years. Romney, who touts his experience as a job creator, has suggested laying off thousands of public sector workers. He wants to slash vital programs for the poor and middle-classes, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and gut Medicare and Social Security. His embrace of the radical Cut, Cap, and Balance plan pushed by House Republicans would, in effect, shrink the federal government to pre-Ronald Reagan era sizes. But for all his talk about the plan on the campaign trail, economists surveyed by Reuters say Romney’s plan **likely wouldn’t deal with the main drags on the American economy**, while the cuts to vital programs would be “utterly draconian“: These steps would shrink the federal government’s role more than even former president Ronald Reagan managed 30 years ago when he turned many social programs over to the states. That scenario concerns liberal economists. “If applied, these fiscal measures would be utterly draconian. The attacks on Medicare and Social Security would throw large portions of the population into poverty,” said Jamie Galbraith, business professor at the University of Texas in Austin. Mainstream economists worry more that neither Romney nor his Republican opponents are addressing the main drag on the U.S. economy – weak demand from American consumers still weighed down by debt. Among the “main drags” highlighted in the Reuters piece is the housing crisis, which has placed “a big drag on consumer spending which drives two thirds of the U.S. economy.” But the GOP candidates have offered little in the way of solutions for the crisis, and Romney’s own prescription involves **letting the housing market hit rock bottom** — further damaging millions of homeowners. “Markets work,” Romney told moderators at a debate in November when asked what he would do to address the housing crisis. According to former Wall Street economist Thomas Gallagher, addressing demand should be at the top of the list when it comes to speeding the recovery. Instead, Romney is focused on budget deficits and tax reform — the types of austerity measures that are pushing Europe toward another recession. Perhaps that’s why a survey of economics professors found that the Republican proposals were so bad, they wouldn’t pass an Econ 101 class.

#### The Gallup poll is accurate

**Wharton**, 11/14/**2007** (Polling the Polling Experts, Knowledge at Wharton (University of Pennsylvania), p. http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=1843)

When it comes to polls, not all are created equal. The most reliable? "Surveys conducted by professional polling organizations on a periodic basis which repeatedly ask the same question -- such as, 'Do you intend to buy a car in the next three months?' -- are fully scientific and useful," says J. Michael Steele, Wharton professor of statistics. "Even though we really don't know what a person means when he says 'yes,' we can make hay out of the fact that last year, 15% said 'yes' and this year only 5% said 'yes.'" An example of a polling company that fits this profile is the Gallup organization and the Gallup Poll, considered a leading barometer of public opinion.

#### Obama will win – he is ahead in the swing states.

**US Daily Review 7-21** (“ Super Professor Predicts 2012 Presidential Winner” lexisnexis, dw: 7-21-2012, da: 7-21-2012, lido)

FacultyRow Super Professor David Schultz predicted today that President Obama will win a re-election by securing between 272 to 300 electoral votes. (He needs 270 to win). Schultz places the odds of a President Obama re-election at 55%. Professor Schultz is known during election time for his expertise in U.S. elections. Currently a professor at Hamline University, Schultz has accurately predicted U.S. Presidents for the past 5 elections. Super Professor Schultz has also authored Politainment: The Ten Rules of Contemporary Politics: A citizens guide to understanding campaigns and elections. According to Schultz, the presidential race comes down to three simple numbers: 10, 10, 270. The presidential race is essentially over in 40 states, with the race for the presidency to be determined by the swing voters in ten states. In those ten states, ten percent of the voters are undecided and they will determine who wins the presidency with 270 electoral votes. Thus, ten percent of the voters in these ten states will determine who gets 270 electoral votes. Schultz says Barack Obama is currently holding on to slight but steady leads in many of the swing states, doing a better job than Mitt Romney in convincing swing voters to support him.

#### Obama will win – already has 265 electoral votes, will win Michigan

**Marshall 7-20** (John, Talking Points Memo Editors' Blog, Virginia is the Prize, lexisnexis, dw: 7-20-2012, da: 7-21-2012)

You can't draw a lot from a single poll. But today's Quinnipiac poll showing Romney and Obama dead even in Virginia pushed it back into toss-up territory in the TPM Electoral Scoreboard. And I flag it now because for a while now I've thought that Virginia is the pivotal state in this year's election. Obama can definitely win without Virginia. Not by a lot. But he can win. Our Scoreboard currently shows Obama with 265 electoral votes at least loosely in his column with Michigan, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida and Colorado as toss-ups. Toss in Michigan and he's got it. So it's not so much that Obama has to win Virginia. It's more that it's very hard for me to see how Obama loses if he does win Virginia. Here's my basic argument. I'm pretty confident that Obama will win Michigan both because it's been a blue state for 20 years and because of the Romney/auto bailout issue, although at the moment the PollTracker Average gives him a mere 1 point edge. The key to the last three presidential cycles is that you've got to win Ohio or Florida and probably both to win the presidency. In both 2000 and 2004 it all came down to Bush eking out victories in those two states. Both continue to look extremely tight this year -- with Florida basically dead-even for months and Ohio only slightly leaning to Obama. But if Obama wins Virginia he can lose both Florida and Ohio and he'll almost certainly still going to win. Another way of putting it is that Virginia is one state where 2008 really seemed to change the map rather than just being another state -- like Indiana, for instance -- that just got swept up in the tide. My sense is that the demography of the state really has passed a tipping point. And the economy in the state is relatively strong. So I think Obama still has a very solid shot. But for my money, Virginia really is the state to watch.

States 2NC

1. Key to civic education – state vs. federal power is THE MOST IMPORTANT Constitutional issue and a huge question in the literature

2. Key to limits – a federal key warrant is the only check against thousands of tiny cases that build any kind of infrastructure anywhere

3. Tests the United States federal government – it is resolutionally predictable and leads to good decisions.

4. Reciprocal – the aff can use all branches of the federal government and all members of Congress – this is equally utopian

5. Not utopian – our solvency evidence proves there’s literature on states enacting infrastructure banks and cooperating on banking

6. Doesn’t kill aff ground – they just need a federal key warrant – port security, NextGen, and military can’t be done by states – the military alone is enough for a huge topic

7. Reject the argument not the team – at worst, kick the counterplan and revert to the status quo – making it a voting issue over-incentivizes bad theory debates

8. States adopt uniform laws all the time

Pryor, 01

(C. Scott, Associate Prof – Regent U. School of Law, American Bankruptcy Institute Law Review, Spring)

NCCUSL is a national organization of practicing lawyers, judges, law professors, and others appointed by the governors of each of the states. NCCUSL drafts uniform laws in various fields and then proposes them to the various state legislatures for adoption. See Edward J. Janger, Predicting When the Uniform Law Process Will Fail: Article 9, Capture, and the Race to the Bottom, 83 IOWA L. REV. 569, 586 (1998) (describing problem of "capture" in drafting process); Alan Schwartz & Robert E. Scott, The Political Economy of Private Legislatures, 143 U. PA. L. REV. 595, 651 (1995) (stating that problems stemming from reliance on "ill-informed generalists" and influence of interest groups may be unavoidable for any official organization whose goal is to foster uniformity of state laws).

Security 2NC

Alaska CP Ext

Perm fails – Alaska should implement icebreakers independently

Epler 11, Patti Epler, writer for Alaska Dispatch, 06-21-11, “Should Alaska build its own Arctic icebreaker?” http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/should-alaska-build-its-own-arctic-icebreaker

GIRDWOOD -- Anchorage Sen. Lesil McGuire thinks the state should build its own Polar-class icebreaker, much like the U.S. Coast Guard uses for Arctic patrols. The Coast Guard's two "heavy" icebreakers are out of commission right now, and the service is relying on one "medium" icebreaker -- primarily a scientific research vessel -- for anything that's needed in the Arctic. The problem? Repairing or retrofitting an icebreaker costs hundreds of millions of dollars. Building a new one? Even more. Congress has been reluctant to commission a new ship due to the high cost. An April report by the Congressional Research Service put the pricetag of a new icebreaker at about $1 billion, $500 million to fix up one of the existing ships enough to last another 25 years. The heavy icebreakers have been in service more than 30 years. McGuire, addressing the Arctic Imperative Conference that ended Tuesday night, called the icebreaker a "key part of the Arctic," saying the Alaska Legislature should pay for one itself, using some of the billions of dollars the state has socked away in various budget reserve accounts. The ship could be used for search and rescue operations and help in oil spill response, among other things. It's one of those big Alaska dreams, the kind Wally Hickel used to propose. McGuire didn’t address who would operate the ship or what exactly it would do when it wasn't needed to save a tour boat trapped in the

Alaska supports funding the construction of new icebreakers for the U.S. Coast Guard

ANWTF 12, Alaska Northern Waters Task Force, 2012, “Marine Transportation,” article on the Alaska Northern Waters Task Force Findings and Recommendations, http://housemajority.org/joule/pdfs/27/hjr0034\_anwtf\_recommendations.pdf

At present, the United States has only one Polar Class ice-breaker in service, the Coast Guard's Healy. A second Polar Class icebreaker, the Polar Star, is undergoing extensive re-pairs in Seattle and is not expected to return to service until 2013. Its sister ship, the Polar Sea, was decommissioned in 2011. Meanwhile, Russia has a fleet of eight service-ready nucle-ar powered icebreakers, including an ice-breaking container ship. A ninth is under construction and will join their fleet in 2015. (:hina owns the world's largest non-nuclear icebreaker and plans to launch a second by 2013. Canada has commit-ted $38 billion to a 30-year plan to build additional icebreak-ers and other ice-strengthened ships suitable for Arctic ser-vice. Sweden, Finland, South Korea, and japan are adding icebreakers to their fleets.2 The United States Coast Guard Cutter Healy is a medium strength vessel used most recently as a platform for scien-tific research. Its design is less suited to military missions. Congress has appropriated $60 million for repairs to the Polar Star. At this level of funding, its overhaul is estimated to provide for seven to ten years of additional service—the same length of time the Coast Guard estimates is required to design and construct a new Polar Class icebreaker, at a cost of about $860 million. This limited number of icebreakers presents a major chal-lenge to the Coast Guard mission in Alaska. Having ice-ca-pable vessels is vital to maintain sovereignty, continue scien-tific research, and provide emergency and oil spill response. Overreliance on the Healy, which was not designed to meet all these challenges, poses risks for the United States and Alaska. The ANWIT urges the state of Alaska to prevail upon the U.S. government to fund the construction of new heavy ice-breakers and additional cutters for the U.S. Coast Guard. The Coast Guard is developing a long term vessel asset plan. but so far it has been unable to secure funding. It is expected that additional vessels will be required in support of oil spill response; these vessels must be capable of year-round Arctic operations. Immediate steps should be taken to begin con-struction of these assets. Further, the ANWTF supports planning for other necessary facilities for search and rescue responsibilities, spill clean-up equipment and response vessels, and research. The Coast Guard needs this infrastructure to fulfill its mission.

Links

Link – Shipping Lanes

Investment is neoliberal concern that empowers the state

Duane Swank Department of Political Science Marquette University “The Spread of Neoliberalism: U.S. Economic Power and the Diffusion of Market-Oriented Tax Policy” December 2004 http://www.ces.fas.harvard.edu/publications/docs/pdfs/Swank.pdf

Neoliberal reforms in public policies and economic institutions have proliferated across the developed democracies and the globe in the latter decades of the twentieth century. 1 National structures of taxation have not been immune to neoliberalism. Beginning in the early 1980s, policymakers throughout the OECD significantly altered the content of tax policies. The relative priority accorded equity and growth goals, the use of investment and behavioral incentives, and the level of tax rates were all notably changed: marginal income and corporate profits tax rates were scaled back, the number of brackets were cut and inflation-indexed, and tax-based investment incentives were eliminated or reduced to broaden the tax base. Why have nearly all developed nations enacted this set of market-conforming tax policies? To answer this question, I build on my recent work on the determinants of change in tax policy in the developed democracies and explore the dynamics of diffusion of the neoliberal tax policy paradigm. 2 I advance the case that the highly visible 1986 market-conforming tax policy reform by the United States creates a set of costs and benefits surrounding adoption and non-adoption of these tax policy reforms by policymakers in other polities. As I detail below, asymmetric competition for mobile assets and the substantial demonstration effects and information externalities associated with U.S. reforms significantly influence national policymakers in other polities in their assessments of how to achieve their efficiency, revenue, and political goals. My central argument is, however, that while the incentives to adopt U.S. tax reform are substantial, the relative weight assigned the costs and benefits of reform and, in turn, the pace and degree of adoption by individual nations of the market-conforming tax paradigm is fundamentally dependent on features of the domestic political economy. Economics should matter: levels of general international openness, linkage with U.S. markets, and the magnitude of domestic economic stress should significantly influence policy maker assessments of reform. Domestic politics should also be important: the degrees to which the median depth of tax policy change. The character of a nation’s production regime is also crucially important: the extent to which the domestic political economy is composed of coordinated or uncoordinated market institutions should shape the assessment by national policymakers of the benefits and costs of adoption and non-adoption of the new tax policy regime. I organize my analysis of these hypotheses as follows. First, I briefly discuss recent trends in taxation, review theories about contemporary tax policy change, and elaborate my arguments about why tax policy reform is likely to be an interdependent process where innovations are diffused—subject to domestic political economic factors—across the developed democratic world. I then develop empirical models of statutory and effective tax rates on capital and assess these with 1981 to 1998 data from sixteen nations. I conclude with a summary of what we know about the forces driving tax policy change and a discussion of the implications of the present research for understanding of the diffusion of neoliberal policies in an era of globalization. Tax Policy Change in the Developed Democracies Beginning in the early 1980s, incumbent governments significantly altered national policies on the taxation of corporate profits and capital income. The near universal system of relatively high marginal statutory tax rates and extensive use of tax instruments to target investment (and otherwise shape the behavior of economic agents in accord with national policy goals) was significantly reformed in nearly all nations. Table 1 summarizes the most significant features of changes in corporate voter has shifted right and right-of-center parties have governed in recent years should be consequential for the pace and and capital taxation. Policymakers reduced statutory corporate tax rates on average from 45 percent in 1981 to 34 percent in 1998. They also commonly eliminated or reduced various investment credits, exemptions, and grants that 1 See, among others, Campbell and Pedersen 2001 and the introduction to this volume. 2 Swank 1998; Swank and Steinmo 2002. 4 had significantly lowered effective corporate tax rates on reinvested profits. As Table 1 illustrates, the general investment tax credit was eliminated by 1992 in all nations that had employed it. 3

Link to Arctic Science

Construction of environmental threats produces securitizing measures but no real change- no solvency

Buzan et al, 1998 (Barry Buzan, Montague Burton Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and honorary professor at the University of Copenhagen and Jilin University, Ole Waever, a professor of International Relations at the Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen Jaap de Wilde,  Professor of International Relations and World Politics at the University of Groningen., 1998 “Security: A New Framework for Analysis” p.73-74 )

It should be emphasized that the political agenda does not only address the more sensational, emotion manifestations of environmental issues but has also become a part of ordinary politics. Political parties, departments, and many firms must formulate environmental polities as a part of their ordinary activities, regardless of whether they believe in them. This situation constitutes politicization rather than securitization. As long as environmental concerns fall outside established economic and political practices and routines, their advocates tend to- and probably must- overemphasize the overwhelming importance of those values and issues. Many securitizing moves can be found in the reports that bridge both agenda, ranging from the Club of Rome reports to the work of the Brudtland Commission. These reports present Silent Spring-type lessons (de Wilde 1994: Carson 1962): It is not the actual disasters but their predictions that lead to securitization. Concepts such as resource scarcity and sustainability have successfully mobilized public concern. when picked up by governments and firms, however, these concerns are often merely politicized: they constituted a subagenda within the larger political context. The environmental sector displays more clearly than any other the propensity for dramatic securitizing moves but with comparatively little successful securitization effects (i.e. those that lead to extraordinary measures). this finding points to the unsettled standing of the environmental discourse as such within public debate.

Link to Naval Power

The U.S. military strategy of creating a perfect safe world through its power is impossible. It futile attempts just create more violence in the name of liberty and peace.

Der Derian 2003 [James Der Derian, Associate Professor of Political Science at University of Massachusetts Amherst, “Decoding The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, boundary, 2 30.3, 19-27]

Regardless of authorial (or good) intentions, the NSS reads more like late—very late—nineteenth-century poetry than a strategic doctrine for the twenty-first century. The rhetoric of the White House favors and clearly intends to mobilize the moral clarity, nostalgic sentimentality, and uncontested dominance reminiscent of the last great empires against the ambiguities, complexities, and messiness of the current world disorder. However, the gulf between the nation's stated cause ("to help make the world not just safer but better" [1]) and defensive needs (to fight "a war against terrorists of global reach" [5]) is so vast that one detects what Nietzsche referred to as the "breath of empty space," that void between the world as it is and as we would wish it to be, which produces all kinds of metaphysical concoctions.¶ ¶ In short shrift (thirty pages), the White House articulation of U.S. global objectives to the Congress elevates strategic discourse from a traditional, temporal calculation of means and ends, to the theological realm of monotheistic faith and monolithic truth. Relying more on aspiration than analysis, revelation than reason, the NSS is not grand but grandiose strategy. In pursuit of an impossible state of national security against terrorist evil, soldiers will need to be sacrificed, civil liberties curtailed, civilians collaterally damaged, regimes destroyed. But a nation's imperial overreach should exceed its fiduciary grasp: what's a full-spectrum dominance of the battle space for?¶ ¶ Were this not an official White House doctrine, the contradictions of the NSS could be interpreted only as poetic irony. How else to comprehend the opening paragraph, which begins with "The United States possesses unprecedented—and unequaled—strength and influence in the world" and ends with "The great strength of this nation must be used to promote a balance of power that favors freedom" (1)? Perhaps the cabalistic Straussians that make up the defense intellectual brain trust of the Bush administration (among them, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, and William Kristol) have come up with a nuanced, indeed, anti-Machiavellian reading of Machiavelli that escapes the uninitiated. But so fixed is the NSS on the creation of a world in America's image that concepts such as balance of power and imminent threat, once rooted in historical, juridical, as well as reciprocal traditions, [End Page 20] become free-floating signifiers. Few Europeans, "old" or "new," would recognize the balance of power principle deployed by the NSS to justify preemptive, unilateral, military action against not actual but "emerging" imminent threats (15). Defined by the eighteenth-century jurist Emerich de Vattel as a state of affairs in which no one preponderant power can lay down the law to others, the classical sense of balance of power is effectively inverted in principle by the NSS document and in practice by the go-it-alone statecraft of the United States. Balance of power is global suzerainty, and war is peace.

**Link to Oil**

Catastrophic depictions of the environment embody the logic of security – they produce one-shot governmental solutions that utterly fail to resolve the underlying harm

Roe, 12 (Paul Roe, Associate Professor in the Department of International Relations and European Studies at Central European University, Budapest, “Is securitization a ‘negative’ concept? Revisiting the normative debate over normal versus extraordinary politics,” Security Dialogue vol. 43 no. 3, June 2012)

For the Copenhagen School, and particularly for Wæver, desecuritization (politicization) might be ‘more effective than securitizing problems’ (Wæver, 1995: 57; emphasis added). This is not just a matter of the context within which problems are dealt with, but also has to do with the long-term thinking that normal politics arguably brings with it. Although Wæver is by no means categorical in the claim that securitization is invariably worse than politicization, his thinking nevertheless suggests that securitizing problems may not always result in better outcomes.5 For example, Wæver (1995: 65) restates Barry Buzan’s assertion that some environmental issues might be tackled more effectively ‘by the process-type remedies of economics, than by the statist solutions of security logic’. Similarly, Daniel Deudney (1990: 465–7) has warned of the logic of security being appropriated to create a sense of urgency in relation to the need to address ecological problems: how some environmentalists endeavour to find a ‘moral equivalence to war’. In particular, Deudney draws attention to how national security’s propensity for short-term strategizing – the desire that affairs are quickly returned to normal – ‘is not likely to make much of a contribution to establishing patterns of environmentally sound behaviour’. Because ‘conventional national security organizations have short-term horizons’, the tendency not to operate on the basis of long-term thinking represents a ‘poor model for environmental problem solving’. Stefan Elbe has also raised questions over the efficacy of securitizing certain public health concerns.6 In Elbe’s treatment of (the more specific) normative debate over the linking of HIV/AIDS and security, he notes how framing the issue of HIV/AIDS as security ‘pushes responses to the disease away from civil society toward the much less transparent workings of military and intelligence organizations, which also possess the power to override human rights and civil liberties’ (Elbe, 2006: 128).7

AT: Perm

The plan cannot be detached from its discursive underpinnings. The noble effort to restrict violence is enframed by a larger structure of security logic that writes the effort into a broader system of hegemonic power and economic domination.

Anthony Burke, Senior Lecturer @ School of Politics & IR @ Univ. of New South Wales, ‘7 [*Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence*, p. 3-4]

These frameworks are interrogated at the level both of their theoretical conceptualisation and their practice: in their influence and implementation in specific policy contexts and conflicts in East and Central Asia, the Middle East and the 'war on terror', where their meaning and impact take on greater clarity. This approach is based on a conviction that the meaning of powerful political concepts cannot be abstract or easily universalised: they all have histories, often complex and conflictual; their forms and meanings change over time; and they are developed, refined and deployed in concrete struggles over power, wealth and societal form. While this should not preclude normative debate over how political or ethical concepts should be defined and used, and thus be beneficial or destructive to humanity, it embodies a caution that the meaning of concepts can never be stabilised or unproblematic in practice. Their normative potential must always be considered in relation to their utilisation in systems of political, social and economic power and their consequent worldly effects. Hence this book embodies a caution by Michel Foucault, who warned us about the 'politics of truth . . the battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays', and it is inspired by his call to 'detach the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time'.1

It is clear that traditionally coercive and violent approaches to security and strategy are both still culturally dominant, and politically and ethically suspect. However, the reasons for pursuing a critical analysis **relate not only to the** most destructive or controversial approaches, such as the war in Iraq, **but also to their available** (and generally preferable) alternatives. There is a necessity to question not merely extremist versions such as the Bush doctrine, Indonesian militarism or Israeli expansionism, **but also their mainstream critique**s - whether they take the form **of liberal policy approaches** in international relations (IR), just war theory, US realism, optimistic accounts of globalisation, rhetorics of sensitivity to cultural difference, or centrist Israeli security discourses based on territorial compromise with the Palestinians. The surface appearance of lively (and often significant) debate masks a deeper agreement **about major concepts**, forms of political identity and the imperative to secure them. Debates about when and how it may be effective and legitimate to use military force in tandem with other policy options, for example, mask a more fundamental discursive consensus about the meaning of security, the effectiveness of strategic power, the nature of progress, the value of freedom or the promises of national and cultural identity. As a result, political and intellectual debate about insecurity, violent conflict and global injustice can become hostage to a claustrophic structure of political and ethical possibility that systematically **wards off critique.**

Reconstructing security discourse fails. They change the content but maintain the imperialist form. Identifying current policy as a threat to stability strengthens the exlusionary constructions of security.

Anthony **Burke**, Senior Lecturer @ School of Politics & IR @ Univ. of New South Wales, **‘7** [*Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence*, p. 30-1]

Second, the force of such critiques shattered Realism's claim to be a founding and comprehensive account of security: scattering its objects, methods, and normative aims into an often contradictory and antithetical dispersal. What was revealed here was not a universality but a field of conflict - as much social as conceptual. This creates some serious problems for a more radical and inclusive language of security, however important its desire for justice. This was recognised later by Walker, who argued in 1997 that 'demands for broader accounts of security risk inducing epistemological overload'." Indeed Simon Dalby argues that security, as a concept, may no longer be viable. He thinks that radical reformulations suggest that: 'the political structures of modernity, patriarchy and capitalism are the sources [rather than the vulnerable objects] of insecurity ... [are] so different as to call into question whether the term itself can be stretched to accommodate such reinterpretations. Inescapably, it puts into question the utility of the term in political discourse after the Cold War."'

Thus humanist critiques of security uncover an aporia within the concept of security. An aporia is an event that prevents a metaphysical discourse from fulfilling its promised unity: not a contradiction which can be brought into the dialectic, smoothed over and resolved into the unity of the concept, but an untotalisable problem at the heart of the concept, disrupting its trajectory, emptying out its fullness, opening out its closure. Jacques Derrida writes of aporia being an 'impasse', a path that cannot be travelled; an 'interminable experience' that, however, 'must remain if one wants to think, to make come or to let come any event of decision or responsibility' 14

As an event, Derrida sees the aporia as something like a stranger crossing the threshold of a foreign land: yet the aporetic stranger 'does not simply cross a given threshold' but 'affects the very experience of the threshold to the point of annihilating or rendering indeterminate all the distinctive signs of a prior identity, beginning with the very border that delineated a legitimate home and assured lineage, names and language •'•1 With this in mind, we can begin to imagine how a critical discourse (the 'stranger' in the security state) can challenge and open up the self-evidence of security, its self- and boundary-drawing nature, its imbrication with borders, sovereignty, identity and violence. Hence it is important to open up and focus on aporias: they bring possibility, the hope of breaking down the hegemony and assumptions of powerful political concepts, to think and create new social, ethical and economic relationships outside their oppressive structures of political and epistemological order - in short, they help us to think new paths. Aporias mark not merely the failure of concepts but a new potential to experience and imagine the impossible. This is where the critical and life-affirming potential of genealogy can come into play.

My particular concern with humanist discourses of security is that, whatever their critical value, they leave in place (and possibly strengthen) a key structural feature of the elite strategy they oppose: its claim to embody truth and to fix the contours of the real. In particular, the ontology of security/threat or security/insecurity which forms the basic condition of the real for mainstream discourses of international policy - remains powerfully in place, and security's broader function as a defining condition of human experience and modern political life **remains invisible and unexamined**. This is to abjure a powerful critical approach that is able to question the very categories in which our thinking, our experience and actions remain confined. This chapter remains focused on the aporias that lie at the heart of security, rather than pushing into the spaces that potentially lie beyond. This is another project, one whose contours are already becoming clearer and which I address in detail in Chapters 2 and 3•16 What this chapter builds is a genealogical account of security's origins and cultural power, its ability to provide what Walker calls a 'constitutive account of the political' - as he says, 'claims about common security, collective security, or world security do little more than fudge the contradictions written into the heart of modem politics: we can only become humans, or anything else, after we have given up our humanity, or any other attachments, to the greater good of citizenship' .17 Before we can rewrite security we have to properly understand how security has written us how it has shaped and limited our very possibility, the possibilities for our selves, our relationships and our available images of political, social and economic order. This, as Walker intriguingly hints, is also to explore the aporetic distance that modernity establishes between our 'humanity' and a secure identity defined and limited by the state. In short, security needs to be placed alongside a range of other economic, political, technological, philosophic and scientific developments as one of the central constitutive events of our modernity, and it remains one of its essential underpinnings.

AT: Cede the Political

Turn – our poststructuralist stance is the only effective political strategy – the political has already been ceded to the right – broadening the scope of politics is key to effective engagement.

Grondin 4 [David, master of pol sci and PHD of political studies @ U of Ottowa “(Re)Writing the “National Security State”: How and Why Realists (Re)Built the(ir) Cold War,” http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/ieim/IMG/pdf/rewriting\_national\_security\_state.pdf]

A poststructuralist approach to international relations reassesses the nature of the political. Indeed, it calls for the **repoliticization of** practices of world **politics** that have been treated as if they were not political. For instance, limiting the ontological elements in one’s inquiry to states or great powers is a political choice. As Jenny Edkins puts it, we need to “bring the political back in” (Edkins, 1998: xii). For most analysts of International Relations, the conception of the “political” is **narrowly restricted to politics as practiced by politicians**. However, from a poststructuralist viewpoint, the “political” acquires a **broader meaning,** especially since practice is not what most theorists are describing as practice. Poststructuralism sees theoretical discourse not only as discourse, but also as political practice. Theory therefore becomes practice. The political space of poststructuralism is not that of exclusion; it is the political space of postmodernity, a dichotomous one, where one thing always signifies at least one thing and another (Finlayson and Valentine, 2002: 14). **Poststructuralism** thus **gives primacy to the political**, sinceit acts on us, while we act in its name, and leads us to identify and differentiate ourselves from others. This political act is never complete and celebrates undecidability, whereas decisions, when taken, express the political moment. It is a critical attitude which encourages dissidence from traditional approaches (Ashley and Walker, 1990a and 1990b). It does not represent one single philosophical approach or perspective, nor is it an alternative paradigm (Tvathail, 1996: 172). It is a nonplace, a border line falling between international and domestic politics (Ashley, 1989). The poststructuralist analyst questions the borderlines and dichotomies of modernist discourses, such as inside/outside, the constitution of the Self/Other, and so on. In the act of definition, difference – thereby the discourse of otherness – is highlighted, since one always defines an object with regard to what it is not (Knafo, 2004). As Simon Dalby asserts, “It involves the social construction of some other person, group, culture, race, nationality or political system as different from ‘our’ person, group, etc. Specifying difference is a linguistic, epistemological and, most importantly, a political act; it constructs a space for the other distanced and inferior from the vantage point of the person specifying the difference” (Dalby, cited in Tvathail, 1996: 179). Indeed, poststructuralism offers no definitive answers, but leads to new questions and new unexplored grounds. This makes the commitment to the incomplete nature of the political and of political analysis so central to poststructuralism (Finlayson and Valentine, 2002: 15). As Jim George writes, “It is postmodern resistance in the sense that while it is directly (and sometimes violently) engaged with modernity, it seeks to go beyond the repressive, closed aspects of modernist global existence. It is, therefore, not a resistance of traditional grand-scale emancipation or conventional radicalism imbued with authority of one or another sovereign presence. Rather, in opposing the large-scale brutality and inequity in human society, it is a resistance active also at the everyday, community, neighbourhood, and interpersonal levels, where it confronts those processes that **systematically exclude people from making decisions about who they are and what they can be**” (George, 1994: 215, emphasis in original). In this light, poststructural practices are used critically to investigate how the subject of international relations is constituted in and through the discourses and texts of global politics. Treating theory as discourse opens up the possibility of historicizing it. It is a myth that theory can be abstracted from its socio-historical context, from reality, so to speak, as neorealists and neoclassical realists believe. It is a political practice which needs to be contextualized and stripped of its purportedly neutral status. It must be understood with respect to its role in **preserving and reproducing the structures and power relations present in all language forms.** Dominant theories are, in this view, dominant discourses that shape our view of the world (the “subject”) and our ways of understanding it.

The political has already been ceded – try or die for the alternative.

Grondin 4 [David, master of pol sci and PHD of political studies @ U of Ottowa “(Re)Writing the “National Security State”: How and Why Realists (Re)Built the(ir) Cold War,” http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/ieim/IMG/pdf/rewriting\_national\_security\_state.pdf]

As American historian of U.S. foreign relations Michael Hogan observes in his study on the rise of the national security state during the Truman administration, “the national security ideology framed the Cold War discourse in a system of symbolic representation that defined America’s national identity by reference to the un-American ‘other,’ usually the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, or some other totalitarian power” (Hogan, 1998: 17). Such a binary system made it difficult for any domestic dissent from U.S. policy to emerge – it would have “amounted to an act of disloyalty” (Hogan, 1998: 18).15While Hogan distinguishes advocates from critics of the American national security state, his view takes for granted that there is a given and fixed American political culture that differs from the “new” national security ideology. It posits an “American way”, produced by its cultural, political, and historical experience. Although he stresses that differences between the two sides of the discourse are superficial, pertaining solely to the means, rather than the ends of the national security state, Hogan sees the national security state as a finished and legitimate state: an American state suited to the Cold War context of permanent war, while stopping short of a garrison state: Although government would grow larger, taxes would go up, and budget deficits would become a matter of routine, none of these and other transformations would add up to the crushing regime symbolized in the metaphor of the garrison state. The outcome instead would be an American national security state that was shaped as much by the country’s democratic political culture as it was by the perceived military imperatives of the Cold War (Hogan, 1998: 22). I disagree with this essentialist view of the state identity of the United States. The United States does not need to be a national security state. If it was and is still constructed as such by many realist discourses, it is because these discourses serve some political purpose. Moreover, in keeping with my poststructuralist inclinations, I maintain that **identity need not be, and indeed never is, fixed**. In a scheme in which “to say is to do”, that is, from a perspective that accepts the performativity of language, culture becomes a relational site where identity politics happens rather than being a substantive phenomenon. In this sense, culture is not simply a social context framing foreign policy decision-making. Culture is “a signifying part of the conditions of possibility for social being, […] the way in which culturalist arguments themselves secure the identity of subjects in whose name they speak” (Campbell, 1998:221). The Cold War national security culture represented in realist discourses was constitutive of the American national security state. There was certainly a conflation of theory and policy in the Cold War military-intellectual complex, which “were observers of, and active participants in, defining the meaning of the Cold War. They contributed to portray the enemy that both reflected and fueled predominant ideological strains within the American body politic. As scholarly partners in the national security state, they were instrumental in defining and disseminating a Cold War culture” (Rubin, 2001: 15). This national security culture was “a complex space where various representations and representatives of the national security state compete to draw the boundaries and dominate the murkier margins of international relations” (Der Derian, 1992: 41). The same Cold War security culture has been maintained by political practice (on the part of realist analysts and political leaders) through realist discourses in the post-9/11 era and once again **reproduces the idea of a national security state.** This (implicit) state identification is neither accidental nor inconsequential. From a poststructuralist vantage point, the identification process of the state and the nation is always a negative process for it is achieved by exclusion, violence, and margina-lization. Thus, a deconstruction of practices that constitute and consolidate state identity is **necessary:** the writing of the state must be revealed through the analysis of the discourses that constitute it. The state and the discourses that (re)constitute it thus frame its very identity and impose a fictitious “**national unity” on society**; it is from this fictive and arbitrary creation of the modernist dichotomous discourses of inside/outside that the discourses (re)constructing the state emerge. It is in the creation of a Self and an Other in which the state uses it monopolistic power of legitimate violence – a power socially constructed, following Max Weber’s work on the ethic of responsibility – to construct a threatening Other differentiated from the “unified” Self, the national society (the nation).16 It is through this very practice of normative statecraft,17 which produces threatening Others, that the international sphere comes into being. David Campbell adds that it is by constantly articulating danger through foreign policy that the state’s very conditions of existence are generated18.

\*\*\*Shipping Lanes\*\*\*

**Ext. That trading is inevitable, that’s our Pope Evidence. Cross apply our Roach 07 that shipping lanes aren’t necessary because the ice is melting. The Northwest passage solves, and the Panama canal does also. The squo and CP solve ENTIRELY for the Adv.**

\*\*\*Naval Power\*\*\*

**Ext. Kagan that Heg is currently high now. Prefer our Kagan evidence that specifically states that any ground other countries have gained has come at the expense of Europe and Japan, and that our military is the best detterent. Also extend that the Aff cannot solve for this anyway. Icebreakers are not key. The argument the affirmative is making is that the ONLY thing between us and war with Russia are two ice breakers.**

Obama loses Alaska

Recent polls indicate loss for Obama in Alaska

Hudson 12, Audrey Hudson, an award winning investigative journalist, a Congressional Correspondent for HUMAN EVENTS, worked inside the Beltway on Capitol Hill as a Senate and House spokeswoman, and at the Washington Times covering Congress, “Obama Polls Below 50 Percent in 37 States,” http://www.humanevents.com/2012/08/02/obama-polls-below-50-percent-in-37-states/

The telephone survey was conducted from January to June and included 90,000 adults with a margin of error for individual states of three to eight percent. Obama was most popular in the District of Columbia with an 83 percent approval rating, followed by Hawaii with 63 percent, Rhode Island with 58 percent, Vermont with 56 percent, and New York, Massachusetts and Maryland with 55 percent. Utah Democratic Chairman Jim Dabakis told the Salt Lake Tribune that he believes the president’s dismal approval rating in his state can be attributed almost exclusively to the Romney factor. “He’s part of the tribe for many Utahans,” Dabakis said. But that doesn’t explain Obama’s low ratings in Wyoming with 28 percent, Alaska with 29 percent and West Virginia and Idaho with 31 percent.

Politics link

Congress is unlikely to approve building new icebreakers

Song 11, Kyung M. Song, writer for Anchorage Daily News, “Lawmakers confront reality of need for expensive icebreakers,” http://www.adn.com/2011/10/10/v-printer/2113279/lawmakers-confront-cold-reality.html

Cantwell argues that with a fleet containing only one currently working icebreaker, the Coast Guard can't afford to junk the Polar Sea, as decrepit as it may be. Constructing a new icebreaker could take a decade and as much as $1 billion, money that Congress is unlikely to approve anytime soon. Until that happens, Cantwell said, yanking the Polar Sea from service would leave the Coast Guard with no backup heavy icebreaker. The 60,000-horsepower Polar Sea was refurbished in 2006 but its engines failed in June 2010. The Coast Guard hasn't fixed the engines because it would cost $22 million and wouldn't extend the Polar Sea's current service-end date of 2014, said Cmdr. Christopher O'Neil, a Coast Guard spokesman in Washington, D.C. The Coast Guard, which is part of the Department of Homeland Security, has asked for $39 million in fiscal 2012 for its polar icebreaking program.