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###

# The Resolution:

#### RESOLVED: THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE ITS NON-MILITARY EXPLORATION AND/OR DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARTH’S OCEANS.

# 1AC – Policy Version – Climate

### Contention 1 – Inherency

#### Congress currently prohibits Army Corps of Engineers from working with coastal states on Climate Adaption strategies – Costal states are vulnerable.

Cosgrove of the Conservation Law Foundation, Dec. 2013 [Sean Cosgrove is CLF’s Director of Campaigns. Sean has over twenty years of experience as a conservation advocate and came to CLF from the Sierra Club where he directed its National Forest Protection and Restoration Campaign in Washington, D.C, http://www.clf.org/blog/tag/national-ocean-policy/, Congress Can Let New England States Plan for Future Storms, or Not, access 5/7/14]
The US Army Corps of Engineers works on many coastal projects in Texas. Will Congress let them coordinate with states in New England? A little over a year ago Superstorm Sandy barreled up the east coast and wreaked havoc on coastal communities and in many states inland. The impacts were notably fierce in New Jersey and areas in and around New York City, but Rhode Island and other states also suffered serious impacts. Homes, businesses and the local infrastructure which creates communities – phone and electrical lines, roads and highways, drinking water and sewage systems, and TV and mass communication systems – were knocked out for days. Some folks couldn’t return to their homes for weeks and thousands of people along the east coast lost their homes completely. It’s estimated that 285 people were killed. The significant challenges that coastal states face with increasingly large storms in the era of climate change are clear. Luckily, we have excellent policy tools designed specifically to help address the uncertainties of climate change in the National Ocean Policy, and ocean user groups across our region support its use. The National Ocean Policy uses regional ocean planning, improved science and data, requires better agency coordination and relies on deep involvement by stakeholders – all of which are needed to tackle these types of management challenges now. As one state official said, “We can either plan now or we can let nature plan for us.” This is especially true when the anticipated future increase in the number and severity of storms will make these challenges larger and more difficult. We have the tools of the National Ocean Policy at hand, but if some in Congress get their way the New England states could be barred from working with the federal agencies necessary to plan for coastal storm impacts. The House of Representatives has recently passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, also known as WRRDA. The House bill contains a harmful additional provision, known as a rider, which would prohibit the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from coordinating with coastal states to implement any ecosystem-based management or regional ocean planning program. This provision, led by a Congressman from land-locked Waco, Texas, seeks to prohibit the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a key coastal and ocean management agency, from coordinating with coastal states. This means that even though many states are conducting planning efforts to help protect their ocean resources and support their state’s ocean economy, they would not be able to coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps on any projects under the National Ocean Policy. While driven by an anti-federal sentiment, the Flores rider actually weakens the ability of states to carry out ocean planning and coastal management for the welfare and health of its own citizens. On the bright side, the Senate passed a version of the WRRDA bill containing the National Endowment for the Oceans (NEO), which would establish a beneficial fund for improving coastal management and resilience. Championed by energetic Rhode Island Senator Sheldon Whitehouse, NEO will help set up an endowment supporting work by state, regional, tribal and federal entities, as well as nonprofit organizations and academic institutions to fund the baseline science, monitoring, and observation data needed to improve ocean use management, including economic development that will create jobs and support coastal economies. We need ocean planning and we need all federal agencies — including the US Army Corps of Engineers – to be closely engaged with states and other federal agencies. We can’t be held hostage to the whims of a nonsensical political agenda when we have real work to get done; the difference could be destroyed communities and lost lives. Thankfully, large numbers of Senators and Representatives from New England and other states have spoken out in support of the National Ocean Policy and a National Endowment for the Oceans. Now the Congress needs to let states prepare for their own future by rejecting the irresponsible Flores Rider and enacting the National Endowment for the Oceans.

## Contention 2 – Harms

### **Scenario 1 – Climate Catastrophe**

#### The consensus of scientists, using the best, most recent evidence, prove that we’re past the tipping point – mass disasters are inevitable

Munday and Nelson, May 6, 2014 [By ALICIA MUNDY and COLLEEN MCCAIN NELSON, http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303417104579545510182551226#printMode, access 5/8/14]

Climate change is creating problems for American citizens coast to coast and costing the economy billions of dollars, as extreme weather brings flooding, droughts and other disasters to every region of the country, a federal advisory panel concluded in a report released Tuesday. The congressionally mandated National Climate Assessment, produced by more than 300 experts overseen by a panel of 60 scientists, pins much of the increase in climate change on human behavior. The report says, however, that it isn't too late to implement policies to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide and methane, and calls on governments at all levels to find ways to lower carbon emissions, particularly from energy production. The document, considered the most comprehensive analysis of the effects of climate change on the U.S., was released by the climate panel after a final vote by the authors Tuesday morning. President Barack Obama is promoting it in a series of events this week that call for action to combat the trend, starting with interviews on Tuesday with television meteorologists. "This national climate assessment is the loudest and clearest alarm bell to date signaling the need to take urgent action," said John Holdren, assistant to the president for science and technology, during a press call on the report. Authors of the report, by the Federal National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee, said that since the last climate assessment was released in 2009, newer scientific approaches have emerged that have allowed them to improve data collection. The weather service's latest monitoring satellites can track ice sheets melting, and scientists have newer information on soil moisture, an extensive amount of new climate modeling and methodology, and a greater ability to slice the data by geographic region, a White House official said. The new assessment is based in part on a compilation of thousands of pages of peer-reviewed climate science published over several years, with an analysis of many overlapping scientific reports that allow readers to see specific regional effects and the impact on certain sectors. "This is an entirely new assessment that accounts for all of the observations, scientific analyses and the latest results from models of the physics, chemistry, and biology affecting the Earth's climate," said one of the lead authors, Donald Wuebbles, a professor of atmospheric science at the University of Illinois. The assessment, he said, shows how further shifts in each area could hurt sectors of the economy such as transportation or force local populations to move. The report highlights problems at the community level, detailing the effects from rapidly receding ice in Alaska, to wildfires in the West, to heat waves and coastal flooding in the Northeast. Rising seas in the South put major cities such as Miami at risk, it said. It noted an increase in extreme weather events such as superstorm Sandy, which destroyed much of northern New Jersey's beaches in 2012, and heat waves in the Midwest the same year. "Every American will find things that matter to them in this report," Mr. Wuebbles said. The emphasis on local events was a clear attempt to bring home the issue of climate change to Americans at a time when polls show it isn't a priority for them. But some experts question that connection, saying it is a tenuous proposition to connect a localized disaster to a global trend. To predict local impacts of climate change, the researchers combined and averaged several different kinds of physical and statistical computer models for the report.
Every computer climate simulation has its shortcomings, experts say, but taken together they can provide a plausible range of possibilities. Even so, some climate scientists said that regional climate models are too unreliable to make these local projections with any certainty. "When looking at the regional results of climate models, as we have done, we find the models have essentially no skill," said climate scientist John Christy at the University of Alabama at Huntsville, who tracks global temperature trends using satellite sensors. "The models are well off track in demonstrating accuracy in something as basic as the global atmospheric temperature, much less local events," he said. "Yet the report does not bring out in clear view for the public to see how poorly models have performed. Some conservatives, even if they don't deny the existence of climate change, feel the White House's emphasis is wrongheaded and will be used as a justification for regulations that will impose new costs on businesses. In the Senate, Republicans took to the floor to criticize the administration. "I'm sure he'll get loud cheers from liberal elites—from the kind of people who leave a giant carbon footprint and then lecture everybody else about low-flow toilets," said Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell. White House spokesman Jay Carney declined to respond to the GOP leader's jab but said that denying science is "foolhardy." "I understand that there is an inclination upon some to doubt the science, despite the overwhelming evidence and the overwhelming percentage, in the 97% range, of scientists who study this issue who agree that climate change is real and that it is the result of human activity," he said.

#### Warming destroys the environment and causes extinction – only immediate action can prevent its impacts

Morgan 9– professor at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies (Dennis Ray, “World on Fire: Two Scenarios of the Destruction of Human Civilization and the Possible Extinction of the Human Race”, Futures, Volume 41, Issue 10, December 2009, Pages 683-693 2009)

As horrifying as the scenario of human extinction by sudden, fast-burning nuclear fire may seem, the one consolation is that this future can be avoided within a relatively short period of time if responsible world leaders change Cold War thinking to move away from aggressive wars over natural resources and towards the eventual dismantlement of most if not all nuclear weapons. On the other hand, another scenario of human extinction by fire is one that may not so easily be reversed within a short period of time because it is not a fast-burning fire; rather, a slow burning fire is gradually heating up the planet as industrial civilization progresses and develops globally. This gradual process and course is long-lasting; thus it cannot easily be changed, even if responsible world leaders change their thinking about ‘‘progress’’ and industrial development based on the burning of fossil fuels. The way that global warming will impact humanity in the future has often been depicted through the analogy of the proverbial frog in a pot of water who does not realize that the temperature of the water is gradually rising. Instead of trying to escape, the frog tries to adjust to the gradual temperature change; finally, the heat of the water sneaks up on it until it is debilitated. Though it finally realizes its predicament and attempts to escape, it is too late; its feeble attempt is to no avail— and the frog dies. Whether this fable can actually be applied to frogs in heated water or not is irrelevant; it still serves as a comparable scenario of how the slow burning fire of global warming may eventually lead to a runaway condition and take humanity by surprise. Unfortunately, by the time the politicians finally all agree with the scientific consensus that global warming is indeed human caused, its development could be too advanced to arrest; the poor frog has become too weak and enfeebled to get himself out of hot water. The Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) was established in 1988 by the WorldMeteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environmental Programme to ‘‘assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of humaninduced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation.’’[16]. Since then, it has given assessments and reports every six or seven years. Thus far, it has given four assessments.13 With all prior assessments came attacks fromsome parts of the scientific community, especially by industry scientists, to attempt to prove that the theory had no basis in planetary history and present-day reality; nevertheless, as more and more research continually provided concrete and empirical evidence to confirm the global warming hypothesis, that it is indeed human-caused, mostly due to the burning of fossil fuels, the scientific consensus grew stronger that human induced global warming is verifiable. As a matter of fact, according to Bill McKibben [17], 12 years of ‘‘impressive scientific research’’ strongly confirms the 1995 report ‘‘that humans had grown so large in numbers and especially in appetite for energy that they were now damaging the most basic of the earth’s systems—the balance between incoming and outgoing solar energy’’ their findings have essentially been complementary to the 1995 report – a constant strengthening of the simple basic truth that humans were burning too much fossil fuel.’’ [17]. Indeed, 12 years later, the 2007 report not only confirms global warming, with a stronger scientific consensus that the slow burn is ‘‘very likely’’ human caused, but it also finds that the ‘‘amount of carbon in the atmosphere is now increasing at a faster rate even than before’’ and the temperature increases would be ‘‘considerably higher than they have been so far were it not for the blanket of soot and other pollution that is temporarily helping to cool the planet.’’ [17]. Furthermore, almost ‘‘everything frozen on earth is melting. Heavy rainfalls are becoming more common since the air is warmer and therefore holds more water than cold air, and ‘cold days, cold nights and frost have become less frequent, while hot days, hot nights, and heat waves have become more frequent.’’ [17]. Unless drastic action is taken soon, the average global temperature is predicted to rise about 5 degrees this century, but it could rise as much as 8 degrees. As has already been evidenced in recent years, the rise in global temperature is melting the Arctic sheets. This runaway polar melting will inflict great damage upon coastal areas, which could be much greater than what has been previously forecasted. However, what is missing in the IPCC report, as dire as it may seem, is sufficient emphasis on the less likely but still plausible worst case scenarios, which could prove to have the most devastating, catastrophic consequences for the long-term future of human civilization. In other words, the IPCC report places too much emphasis on a linear progression that does not take sufficient account of the dynamics of systems theory, which leads to a fundamentally different premise regarding the relationship between industrial civilization and nature.

### Scenario 2 – Economy

#### Warming threatens US coasts – this risks massive economic devastation from flooding and storms

Conathan, et al, Center for American Progress, April 2014 [The Economic Case for Restoring Coastal Ecosystems**,** By Michael Conathan, Jeffrey Buchanan, and Shiva Polefka April 2014**,** WWW.AMERICANPROGRESS.ORG]

As then NOAA Administrator Dr. Jane Lubchenco put it, “Storms today are different. Because of sea-level rise, [Sandy’s] storm surge was much more intense, much higher than it would have been in a non-climate changed world.”78 Sea-level rise is also driving an increase in the frequency and intensity of destructive coastal floods. According to a September 2013 report from the American Meteorological Society, sea-level rise caused by global warming is significantly reducing the time between major coastal flood events.79 In 1950, the more than 8-foot-high storm surge caused by Sandy in New Jersey would have been considered a once-in-435-years event. But given the accelerating rate of sea-level rise, scientists now predict that Sandy-scale flooding will occur there every 20 years by 2100.80 The problem is not going away any time soon. Scientists warn that global green- house gas emissions have already locked in a significantly greater risk from coastal hazards such as storms and flooding. Even if we cease emitting fossil-fuel-based greenhouse gases today, sea levels will continue to rise for the next several centuries. According to the geologic record, the last time the atmosphere was as carbon rich as we have made it today, seas were 20 meters higher.81 Our increasing economic dependence on our coasts and the greater risks they face from climate change and sea-level rise mean that any discussion of coastal land use must address the question of how we reconcile these conflicting trends. In other words, how do we affordably adapt our coasts so that our coastal com- munities, assets, and infrastructure become safer and more secure, while also continuing to invest in the coastal ecosystem restoration needed to ensure that our coasts are ecologically healthy? Research, especially in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, has revealed that healthy coastal ecosystems play a vital role in reducing risks from coastal hazards. First, as mentioned in the previous section, coastal wetlands with healthy plant com- munities, such as salt marshes, mangroves, and estuaries, serve as highly effective buffers against storm surge. These ecosystems soak up and hold floodwaters similar to a sponge and shield landward areas from inundation. Estimates of the hurricane protection value of existing coastal wetlands in the Gulf and eastern seaboard have shown that the absence of healthy coastal ecosystems explains as much as 60 percent of the damage suffered by communities along the Gulf Coast that are struck by hurricanes. The researchers concluded that “coastal wetlands function as valuable, self-maintain- ing ‘horizontal levees’ for storm protection ... their restoration and preservation is an extremely cost-effective strategy for society” to mitigate the damage from tropical storms.82 These studies found that the Gulf Coast’s remaining coastal wetlands pro- vide around $23.2 billion per year in storm protection services. 83 More recently, scientists have begun to account for future trends in sea-level rise and socioeconomic data in their examination of the relationship between healthy coastal ecosystems and the most vulnerable members of society—primarily the poor, communities of color, and the elderly. A new body of research on social vul- nerability, led by organization such as the University of South Carolina’s Hazard Vulnerability Research Institute, combines data on physical risk with social and economic data sets.84 This robust literature explains how socioeconomic dynamics contribute to com- munities facing greater challenges in responding to, recovering from, and prepar- ing for climate-related hazards.85 Researchers from Stanford University and The Nature Conservancy overlaid a map of coastal wetlands with data on the spatial distribution of individuals most likely to be harmed or killed during catastrophic storm events. Then, they modeled several scenarios in which sea-level rise and coastal ecosystem degradation continue at current rates. Relative to the most likely scenarios, the scientists reported in Nature Climate Change that: The likelihood and magnitude of losses may be reduced by intact reefs and coastal vegetation, especially when those habitats fringe vulnerable communities and infrastructure. The number of people, poor families, elderly and total value of residential property that are most exposed to hazards can be reduced by half if existing coastal habitats remain fully intact.86

#### Independently, even a small risk of warming impacts devastates global trade – that makes it try or die for the aff

WTO and the UN Environmental Program ’09 (World Trade Organization and United Nations Environment Programme WTO and UNEP, “Trade and Climate Change” http://www.wto.org/english/res\_e/booksp\_e/trade\_climate\_change\_e.pdf)

As greenhouse gas emissions and temperatures increase, the impacts from climate change are expected to become more widespread and to intensify. For example, even with small increases in average temperature, the type, frequency and intensity of extreme weather – such as hurricanes, typhoons, floods, droughts, and storms – are projected to increase. The distribution of these weather events, however, is expected to vary considerably among regions and countries, and impacts will depend to a large extent on the vulnerability of populations or ecosystems. Developing countries, and particularly the poorest and most marginalized populations within these countries, will generally be both the most adversely aff ected by the impacts of future climate change and the most vulnerable to its eff ects, because they are less able to adapt than developed countries and populations. In addition, climate change risks compound the other challenges which are already faced by these countries, including tackling poverty, improving health care, increasing food security and improving access to sources of energy. For instance, climate change is projected to lead to hundreds of millions of people having limited access to water supplies or facing inadequate water quality, which will, in turn, lead to greater health problems. Although the impacts of climate change are specific to location and to the level of development, most sectors of the global economy are expected to be affected and these impacts will often have implications for trade. For example, three trade-related areas are considered to be particularly vulnerable to climate change. Agriculture is considered to be one of the sectors most vulnerable to climate change, and also represents a key sector for international trade. In low-latitude regions, where most developing countries are located, reductions of about 5 to 10 per cent in the yields of major cereal crops are projected even in the case of small temperature increases of around 1° C. Although it is expected that local temperature increases of between 1° C and 3° C would have benefi cial impacts on agricultural outputs in mid- to high-latitude regions, warming beyond this range will most likely result in increasingly negative impacts for these regions also. According to some studies, crop yields in some African countries could fall by up to 50 per cent by 2020, with net revenues from crops falling by as much as 90 per cent by 2100. Depending on the location, agriculture will also be prone to water scarcity due to loss of glacial meltwater and reduced rainfall or droughts. Tourism is another industry that may be particularly vulnerable to climate change, for example, through changes in snow cover, coastal degradation and extreme weather. Both the fisheries and forestry sectors also risk being adversely impacted by climate change. Likewise, ix Part IV Part III Part II Part I there are expected to be major impacts on coastal ecosystems, including the disappearance of coral and the loss of marine biodiversity. Finally, one of the clearest impacts will be on trade infrastructure and routes. The IPCC has identified port facilities, as well as buildings, roads, railways, airports and bridges, as being dangerously at risk of damage from rising sea levels and the increased occurrence of instances of extreme weather, such as flooding and hurricanes. Moreover, it is projected that changes in sea ice, particularly in the Arctic, will lead to the availability of new shipping routes.

#### US Trade leadership is critical to multilateral trade – accesses every impact

Panitchpakdi ‘4 (February 26, 2004 Supachai Panitchpakdi, secretary-general of the UN Conference on Trade and Development American Leadership and the World Trade Organization, http://www.wto.org/english/news\_e/spsp\_e/spsp22\_e.htm)
The second point is that strengthening the world trading system is essential to America's wider global objectives. Fighting terrorism, reducing poverty, improving health, integrating China and other countries in the global economy – all of these issues are linked, in one way or another, to world trade. This is not to say that trade is the answer to all America's economic concerns; only that meaningful solutions are inconceivable without it. The world trading system is the linchpin of today's global order – underpinning its security as well as its prosperity. A successful WTO is an example of how multilateralism can work. Conversely, if it weakens or fails, much else could fail with it. This is something which the US – at the epicentre of a more interdependent world – cannot afford to ignore. These priorities must continue to guide US policy – as they have done since the Second World War. America has been the main driving force behind eight rounds of multilateral trade negotiations, including the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round and the creation of the WTO. The US – together with the EU – was instrumental in launching the latest Doha Round two years ago. Likewise, the recent initiative, spearheaded by Ambassador Zoellick, to re-energize the negotiations and move them towards a successful conclusion is yet another example of how essential the US is to the multilateral process – signalling that the US remains committed to further liberalization, that the Round is moving, and that other countries have a tangible reason to get on board. The reality is this: when the US leads the system can move forward; when it withdraws, the system drifts. The fact that US leadership is essential, does not mean it is easy. As WTO rules have expanded, so too has as the complexity of the issues the WTO deals with – everything from agriculture and accounting, to tariffs and telecommunication. The WTO is also exerting huge gravitational pull on countries to join – and participate actively – in the system. The WTO now has 146 Members – up from just 23 in 1947 – and this could easily rise to 170 or more within a decade. Emerging powers like China, Brazil, and India rightly demand a greater say in an institution in which they have a growing stake. So too do a rising number of voices outside the system as well. More and more people recognize that the WTO matters. More non-state actors – businesses, unions, environmentalists, development NGOs – want the multilateral system to reflect their causes and concerns. A decade ago, few people had even heard of the GATT. Today the WTO is front page news. A more visible WTO has inevitably become a more politicized WTO. The sound and fury surrounding the WTO's recent Ministerial Meeting in Cancun – let alone Seattle – underline how challenging managing the WTO can be. But these challenges can be exaggerated. They exist precisely because so many countries have embraced a common vision. Countries the world over have turned to open trade – and a rules-based system – as the key to their growth and development. They agreed to the Doha Round because they believed their interests lay in freer trade, stronger rules, a more effective WTO. Even in Cancun the great debate was whether the multilateral trading system was moving fast and far enough – not whether it should be rolled back. Indeed, it is critically important that we draw the right conclusions from Cancun – which are only now becoming clearer. The disappointment was that ministers were unable to reach agreement. The achievement was that they exposed the risks of failure, highlighted the need for North-South collaboration, and – after a period of introspection – acknowledged the inescapable logic of negotiation. Cancun showed that, if the challenges have increased, it is because the stakes are higher. The bigger challenge to American leadership comes from inside – not outside – the United States. In America's current debate about trade, jobs and globalization we have heard a lot about the costs of liberalization. We need to hear more about the opportunities. We need to be reminded of the advantages of America's openness and its trade with the world – about the economic growth tied to exports; the inflation-fighting role of imports, the innovative stimulus of global competition. We need to explain that freer trade works precisely because it involves positive change – better products, better job opportunities, better ways of doing things, better standards of living. While it is true that change can be threatening for people and societies, it is equally true that the vulnerable are not helped by resisting change – by putting up barriers and shutting out competition. They are helped by training, education, new and better opportunities that – with the right support policies – can flow from a globalized economy. The fact is that for every job in the US threatened by imports there is a growing number of high-paid, high skill jobs created by exports. Exports supported 7 million workers a decade ago; that number is approaching around 12 million today.
CONTINUES …↓

Continued…And these new jobs – in aerospace, finance, information technology – pay 10 per cent more than the average American wage. We especially need to inject some clarity – and facts – into the current debate over the outsourcing of services jobs. Over the next decade, the US is projected to create an average of more than 2 million new services jobs a year – compared to roughly 200,000 services jobs that will be outsourced. I am well aware that this issue is the source of much anxiety in America today. Many Americans worry about the potential job losses that might arise from foreign competition in services sectors. But it’s worth remembering that concerns about the impact of foreign competition are not new. Many of the reservations people are expressing today are echoes of what we heard in the 1970s and 1980s. But people at that time didn’t fully appreciate the power of American ingenuity. Remarkable advances in technology and productivity laid the foundation for unprecedented job creation in the 1990s and there is no reason to doubt that this country, which has shown time and again such remarkable potential for competing in the global economy, will not soon embark again on such a burst of job-creation. America's openness to service-sector trade – combined with the high skills of its workforce – will lead to more growth, stronger industries, and a shift towards higher value-added, higher-paying employment. Conversely, closing the door to service trade is a strategy for killing jobs, not saving them. Americans have never run from a challenge and have never been defeatist in the face of strong competition. Part of this challenge is to create the conditions for global growth and job creation here and around the world. I believe Americans realize what is at stake. The process of opening to global trade can be disruptive, but they recognize that the US economy cannot grow and prosper any other way. They recognize the importance of finding global solutions to shared global problems. Besides, what is the alternative to the WTO? Some argue that the world's only superpower need not be tied down by the constraints of the multilateral system. They claim that US sovereignty is compromised by international rules, and that multilateral institutions limit rather than expand US influence. Americans should be deeply sceptical about these claims. Almost none of the trade issues facing the US today are any easier to solve unilaterally, bilaterally or regionally. The reality is probably just the opposite. What sense does it make – for example – to negotiate e-commerce rules bilaterally? Who would be interested in disciplining agricultural subsidies in a regional agreement but not globally? How can bilateral deals – even dozens of them – come close to matching the economic impact of agreeing to global free trade among 146 countries? Bilateral and regional deals can sometimes be a complement to the multilateral system, but they can never be a substitute. There is a bigger danger. By treating some countries preferentially, bilateral and regional deals exclude others – fragmenting global trade and distorting the world economy. Instead of liberalizing trade – and widening growth – they carve it up. Worse, they have a domino effect: bilateral deals inevitably beget more bilateral deals, as countries left outside are forced to seek their own preferential arrangements, or risk further marginalization. This is precisely what we see happening today. There are already over two hundred bilateral and regional agreements in existence, and each month we hear of a new or expanded deal. There is a basic contradiction in the assumption that bilateral approaches serve to strengthen the multilateral, rules-based system. Even when intended to spur free trade, they can ultimately risk undermining it. This is in no one's interest, least of all the United States. America led in the creation of the multilateral system after 1945 precisely to avoid a return to hostile blocs – blocs that had done so much to fuel interwar instability and conflict. America's vision, in the words of Cordell Hull, was that “enduring peace and the welfare of nations was indissolubly connected with the friendliness, fairness and freedom of world trade”. Trade would bind nations together, making another war unthinkable. Non-discriminatory rules would prevent a return to preferential deals and closed alliances. A network of multilateral initiatives and organizations – the Marshal Plan, the IMF, the World Bank, and the GATT, now the WTO – would provide the institutional bedrock for the international rule of law, not power. Underpinning all this was the idea that freedom – free trade, free democracies, the free exchange of ideas – was essential to peace and prosperity, a more just world. It is a vision that has emerged pre-eminent a half century later. Trade has expanded twenty-fold since 1950. Millions in Asia, Latin America, and Africa are being lifted out of poverty, and millions more have new hope for the future. All the great powers – the US, Europe, Japan, India, China and soon Russia – are part of a rules-based multilateral trading system, greatly increasing the chances for world prosperity and peace. There is a growing realization that – in our interdependent world – sovereignty is constrained, not by multilateral rules, but by the absence of rules.

#### Trade collapse causes global nuclear war

Panzner 8 – (2008, Michael, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse,” p. 136-138)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

### Plan Text

#### Thus the plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its climate resiliency development of the Earth’s oceans.

*PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ABOVE PLAN FITS CURRENT NORMS OF PLAN TEXTS. IF YOU HAVE A MORE TRADITIONAL JUDGE, I SUGGEST USING VERSION 2.*

### Plan version 2

#### THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE ITS PUBLIC-PRIVATE INVESTMENTS IN COASTAL RESTORATION PROJECTS. THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON FUNDING CLIMATE RESILIENCE AND FULLY INVEST IN NATURAL ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION BY THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS. FUNDING SHOULD COME FROM FEDERAL TAXES ON COASTAL ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES.

## Contention 3 - Solvency

#### 1st – Federal climate adaptation policy in the oceans protects against environmental disasters and ensures US economic security

Center for American Progress, April 2014 [For citations and references, please see Michael Conathan, Jeffrey Buchanan, and Shiva Polefka, “The Economic Case for Restoring Coastal Ecosystems”(Washington: Center for American Progress and Oxfam America, 2014), available at http://ampr.gs/coastalrestoration. http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/CoastalRestoration-factsheet.pdf]//SY

Healthy coastal ecosystems provide critical social and environmental benefits. While the existence of these benefits is not in dispute, estimating their economic value is challenging. Yet calculating these dollar values is crucial for the efficient management of coastal resources. The Center for American Progress and Oxfam America collaborated with researchers from Abt Associates to analyze the economic benefits provided by 3 of the 50 coastal restoration projects that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, funded with grants from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, or ARRA, of 2009. These three projects are located in the Seaside Bays of Virginia’s Atlantic coast; Mobile Bay, Alabama; and South San Francisco Bay, California. Previous research established that a $1 million investment in coastal restoration creates, on average, 17.1 jobs. 1 In comparison, offshore oil and gas development creates approximately 8.9 jobs per $1 million investment. 2 In low-income coastal communities, these restoration jobs can create significant pathways out of poverty. Although one of the sites yielded insufficient data to determine a reliable estimate, the analysis shows that the ecological restoration resulting from these projects can provide long-term economic benefits that far exceed project cost, in addition to the initial economic stimulus. Averaging the benefit-cost ratios across the three restoration projects studied, each dollar invested by taxpayers returns more than $15 in net economic benefits. Society has long recognized that physical capital such as factories and roads can create value for the economy through the production of goods and provision of transport. The full report shows that reefs, estuaries, and other wetlands represent natural capital that also provides long-term support for economic activity. These ecological assets continue to generate value over time for critical coastal industries, including commercial and recreational fishing, real estate, recreation, and tourism, as well as other benefits such as pollution filtration and protection against extreme weather and coastal flooding. The sum of these benefits–including both goods and environmental services—can far exceed the total investment needed to generate them. Investing in coastal restoration is good policy. It’s not just the right thing to do for the environment; it’s the right thing to do for coastal communities, vulnerable coastal populations, and the U.S. economy. Recommendations for future action
• Public and private sector entities should increase their investment in coastal restoration projects and fund ongoing monitoring of restored areas.
• Congress should enact and fund the National Endowment for the Oceans to provide a steady revenue stream for restoration.
• The state and federal agencies distributing BP oil spill related funds should invest in recovery projects that create employment and support long-term ecosystem recovery.
• Federal, state, and local coastal planners should give greater weight to natural solutions such as wetland restoration to help protect at-risk developed areas.
• The Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of the Interior, and NOAA should work with the Economic Development Administration and the U.S. Department of Labor to develop new pathways into crafts, trades, and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or STEM, careers related to ecosystem restoration.
• NOAA and its partners should seek funding to apply the evaluation techniques used in this report to the other ARRA coastal restoration projects in order to provide a stronger foundation for future coastal land use decisions.

#### Federal government is key – Army Corps has expertise that empirically works

Howland 4 [Dr. William G. Howland 4 is the Basin Program Manager of Lake Champlain, Grand Isle, VT, “U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS ROLE IN THE NATION'S WATER RESOURCE NEEDS IN THE 21ST CENTURY, Capitol Hill Testimony, March 31, http://www.epw.senate.gov/hearing\_statements.cfm?id=219907]

Our partnership involves the states of Vermont and New York, the Province of Quebec, and numerous federal agencies, including the USEPA, the USDA, USDI, and the USACE. This partnership is highly effective and through our work to restore the lake ecosystem, we also are ensuring an economic future for citizens in our region. This work is of vital importance to the regional economy, including the tourism and recreation economy for which we are well known, and which depends so fundamentally upon this great and wonderful lake. One of the great discoveries in my work with the Lake Champlain Basin Program's federal agency partners is the good faith and dedication that they bring to the task of cleaning up and restoring America's waterways. I have great admiration and appreciation for all of our federal partners. Today, my testimony will focus on the essential work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and particularly their role in Environmental Restoration projects. Cleaning up pollution in a lake is exceedingly difficult and costly. And it always includes interrupting the flow of pollutants into the drainage system to prevent further contamination. Pollution prevention requires changing the way things work in the landscape that drains into the lake. In Lake Champlain, as in the Great Lakes and other parts of the nation, ecosystem restoration efforts often require advanced engineering design expertise and leadership that communities and **states simply can not provide.** The competence and engineering expertise of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a vital resource for planning, designing and executing restoration plans. The stature of the Corps, its track record with large projects and its quality control protocols provide the leadership that is essential to maintain and improve the water quality of our rivers and lakes. The U.S. Army Corps is currently facilitating several restoration projects in the Lake Champlain watershed. With the Corp's support, an infestation of water chestnut, an invasive aquatic plant that has dominated the entire southern part of the lake for years is now nearly under control. This program, run in partnership with the states of Vermont and New York, has lead us out of an almost hopeless situation and we are seeing a return to public enjoyment of shoreline areas in the southern part of Lake Champlain. This summer we expect to begin work on projects to intercept storm water runoff into Lake George, part of the Lake Champlain ecosystem, and to stabilize eroding streambanks in the Missisquoi watershed, with expertise, oversight and funding by the U.S. Army Corps. Without their leadership and support, this vital work could not happen. The role of the U.S. Army Corp's Environmental Restoration authority is a vital nationwide asset; getting projects done - and done professionally - all across America. Dam removal projects, wetland restoration, fish passages and streambank stabilization projects restore degraded ecosystems, improve American lives, strengthen our nation's economy and ensure that we will be able to provide clean drinking water to ourselves, our children and their children. Lake St. Clair, and the St. Clair River, located between Lake Huron and Lake Erie, faces massive problems of nutrient loading, invasive species and the challenges of a busy waterway. It is in desperate need of pollution prevention and ecosystem restoration action. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has taken the lead role in drawing together federal agencies and communities in the U.S. and Canada to address this international challenge. The stature and expertise of the Corps, and its mandate to develop a management plan, under Section 246 of WRDA 1999, placed it in the logical lead in this important effort. One of the greatest restoration programs in the history of our nation is underway in the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem, with U.S. Army Corps leadership. The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan approved by Congress in WRDA 2000 is the key to the future of the huge everglades ecosystem and the vitality of a significant sector of the Florida economy. Coordination of the work of eight federal agencies and more than a hundred local stakeholder governments, regional councils and state agencies, **could only be managed by** an agency with the engineering capacity, traditions and commitment of **the U.S. Army Corps**. From Texas to Mississippi in the Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem, wetlands are disappearing at the rate of nearly 22,000 acres per year. The U.S. Army Corps is a partner with the State of Louisiana on a feasibility study that will enable us to better understand this problem, and how to mitigate and minimize losses, to restore a future for this region. Similar case histories, of projects large and small, could be cited from across the nation, with the accolades and gratitude of millions of American citizens. America today faces unprecedented challenges of ecosystem damage and resultant declines in water quality, contaminated and weed- infested waterways, and polluted lakes and estuaries across the nation. These problems have compromised drinking water supplies for millions of Americans, caused desperate struggles for survival in the tourism and recreation industries, and created an alarming trend towards more and greater problems in the near future. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a vital part of our military service that works directly in the homeland to meet these challenges with the world's best professional expertise. Its stature and traditions of service to America have turned to environmental restoration projects that require engineering solutions. The Corps brings the best tools in the nation to guide the engineering problem-solving that these special ecosystems require. I would like to direct your attention to the challenges we face regarding the Corp's Continuing Authorities programs and Sections 206 and 1135. The existing program limits of $25 million for each have simply not kept pace with current needs, and are now a fraction of what America needs them to be. In the Lake Champlain watershed, this means that several ongoing projects are being suspended due to a national shortfall. Suspending good projects partway through their implementation, whether in Lake Champlain or elsewhere across the nation, neither saves money nor avoids expense. The problems in each case will get far more costly, not less costly. The opportunities to prevent or contain pollution will be lost if a shortfall like this persists. The most cost-effective solution to large ecosystem problems is to invest adequately in their restoration at the earliest possible date. Any alternative is likely to be a false economy in the short term and result a burgeoning burden of additional accrued contamination and sharply increased costs of restoration in the long term. Finally, the work of the U.S. Army Corps on environmental restoration is not only about conservation philosophy or environmental ethics. It is also about our nation's economic engines. As we know so well in the northeast, it is about the vitality of the tourism economy and the quality of life that keeps the recreation businesses in business. It is about trucks on the highway, the pulse of commerce and trade. It is about reducing bankruptcies and maintaining jobs. It is about smell of the tap water in the cities and towns across the nation; it is about the health of our own human habitat throughout this nation that is our future. In the final analysis, ecosystem restoration and water quality is about insuring the quality of life for citizens across America, and the health of our children and their children for generations to come. I hope the members of this Committee will continue to recognize, appreciate and support the vital role of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in service to the American homeland and, in particular, will fully support their Environmental Restoration programs. Thank you for the invitation to testify before you today. I look forward to answering your questions.

# 1AC – Critical Version

## Contention 1 – Inherency

#### Congress currently prohibits Army Corps of Engineers from working with coastal states on Climate Adaption strategies – Costal states are vulnerable.

Cosgrove of the Conservation Law Foundation, Dec. 2013 [Sean Cosgrove is CLF’s Director of Campaigns. Twenty years of experience as a conservation advocate previously at the Sierra Club http://www.clf.org/blog/tag/national-ocean-policy/, Congress Can Let New England States Plan for Future Storms, or Not, access 5/7/14]

The US Army Corps of Engineers works on many coastal projects in Texas. Will Congress let them coordinate with states in New England? A little over a year ago Superstorm Sandy barreled up the east coast and wreaked havoc on coastal communities and in many states inland. The impacts were notably fierce in New Jersey and areas in and around New York City, but Rhode Island and other states also suffered serious impacts. Homes, businesses and the local infrastructure which creates communities – phone and electrical lines, roads and highways, drinking water and sewage systems, and TV and mass communication systems – were knocked out for days. Some folks couldn’t return to their homes for weeks and thousands of people along the east coast lost their homes completely. It’s estimated that 285 people were killed. The significant challenges that coastal states face with increasingly large storms in the era of climate change are clear. Luckily, we have excellent policy tools designed specifically to help address the uncertainties of climate change in the National Ocean Policy, and ocean user groups across our region support its use. The National Ocean Policy uses regional ocean planning, improved science and data, requires better agency coordination and relies on deep involvement by stakeholders – all of which are needed to tackle these types of management challenges now. As one state official said, “We can either plan now or we can let nature plan for us.” This is especially true when the anticipated future increase in the number and severity of storms will make these challenges larger and more difficult. We have the tools of the National Ocean Policy at hand, but if some in Congress get their way the New England states could be barred from working with the federal agencies necessary to plan for coastal storm impacts. The House of Representatives has recently passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, also known as WRRDA. The House bill contains a harmful additional provision, known as a rider, which would prohibit the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from coordinating with coastal states to implement any ecosystem-based management or regional ocean planning program. This provision, led by a Congressman from land-locked Waco, Texas, seeks to prohibit the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a key coastal and ocean management agency, from coordinating with coastal states. This means that even though many states are conducting planning efforts to help protect their ocean resources and support their state’s ocean economy, they would not be able to coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps on any projects under the National Ocean Policy. While driven by an anti-federal sentiment, the Flores rider actually weakens the ability of states to carry out ocean planning and coastal management for the welfare and health of its own citizens. On the bright side, the Senate passed a version of the WRRDA bill containing the National Endowment for the Oceans (NEO), which would establish a beneficial fund for improving coastal management and resilience. Championed by energetic Rhode Island Senator Sheldon Whitehouse, NEO will help set up an endowment supporting work by state, regional, tribal and federal entities, as well as nonprofit organizations and academic institutions to fund the baseline science, monitoring, and observation data needed to improve ocean use management, including economic development that will create jobs and support coastal economies. We need ocean planning and we need all federal agencies — including the US Army Corps of Engineers – to be closely engaged with states and other federal agencies. We can’t be held hostage to the whims of a nonsensical political agenda when we have real work to get done; the difference could be destroyed communities and lost lives. Thankfully, large numbers of Senators and Representatives from New England and other states have spoken out in support of the National Ocean Policy and a National Endowment for the Oceans. Now the Congress needs to let states prepare for their own future by rejecting the irresponsible Flores Rider and enacting the National Endowment for the Oceans.

## Contention 2 – Harms of Disposability

#### First, climate change is already happening and will continue into the foreseeable future. Katrina and Sandy showed how abandoned populations will continue to be devastated without federal action. These disasters have created a moment for political change that must be seized.

Solnit 12,[ Rebecca, “The Name of the Hurricane Is Climate Change”, The Nation, November 6, http://www.thenation.com/article/171058/name-hurricane-climate-change# writer of 13 books who lives in San Francisco. She has written on a variety of subjects including the environment, politics, place, and art. Masters Journalism UC Berkeley, in ‘12]

The first horseman was named Al Qaeda in Manhattan, and it came as a message on September 11, 2001: that our meddling in the Middle East had sown rage and funded madness. We had meddled because of imperial ambition and because of oil, the black gold that fueled most of our machines and our largest corporations and too many of our politicians. The second horseman came not quite four years later. It was named Katrina, and this one too delivered a warning.
 Katrina’s message was that we needed to face the dangers we had turned our back on when the country became obsessed with terrorism: failing infrastructure, institutional rot, racial divides, and poverty. And larger than any of these was the climate—the heating oceans breeding stronger storms, melting the ice and raising the sea level, breaking the patterns of the weather we had always had into sharp shards: burning and dying forests, floods, droughts, heat waves in January, freak blizzards, sudden oscillations, acidifying oceans.
The third horseman came in October of 2008: it was named Wall Street, and when that horseman stumbled and collapsed, we were reminded that it had always been a predator, and all that had changed was the scale—of deregulation, of greed, of recklessness, of amorality about homes and lives being casually trashed to profit the already wealthy. And the fourth horseman has arrived on schedule.
 We called it Sandy, and it came to tell us we should have listened harder when the first, second, and third disasters showed up. This storm’s name shouldn’t be Sandy—though that means we’ve run through the alphabet all the way up to S this hurricane season, way past brutal Isaac in August—it should be Climate Change. If each catastrophe came with a message, then this one’s was that global warming’s here, that the old rules don’t apply, and that not doing anything about it for the past 30 years is going to prove far, far more expensive than doing something would have been.
 That is, expensive for us, for human beings, for life on Earth, if not for the carbon profiteers, the ones who are, in a way, tied to all four of these apocalyptic visitors. A reasonable estimate I heard of the cost of this disaster was $30 billion, just a tiny bit more than Chevron’s profits last year (though it might go as high as $50 billion). Except that it’s coming out of the empty wallets of single mothers in Hoboken, New Jersey, and the pensions of the elderly, and the taxes of the rest of us. Disasters cost most of us terribly, in our hearts, in our hopes for the future, and in our ability to lead a decent life. They cost some corporations as well, while leading to ever-greater profits for others.
 Disasters Are Born Political
 It was in no small part for the benefit of the weapons-makers and oil producers that we propped up dictators and built military bases and earned the resentment of the Muslim world. It was for the benefit of oil and other carbon producers that we did nothing about climate change, and they actively toiled to prevent any such action.
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 If you wanted, you could even add a fifth horseman, a fifth disaster to our list, the blowout of the BP well in the Gulf of Mexico in the spring of 2010; cost-cutting on equipment ended eleven lives and contaminated a region dense with wildlife and fishing families and hundreds of thousands of others. It was as horrendous as the other four, but it took fewer lives directly and it should have but didn't produce political change.
 Each of the other catastrophes has redirected American politics and policy in profound ways. 9/11 brought us close to dictatorship, until Katrina corrected course by discrediting the Bush administration and putting poverty and racism, if not climate change, back on the agenda. Wall Street's implosion was the 2008 October Surprise that made Americans leave Republican presidential candidate John McCain's no-change campaign in the dust—and that, three years later, prompted the birth of Occupy Wall Street.
 The Wall Street collapse did a lot for Barack Obama, too, and just in time another October surprise has made Romney look venal, clueless, and irrelevant. Disaster has been good to Obama—Katrina’s reminder about race may have laid the groundwork for his presidential bid, and the financial implosion in the middle of the presidential campaign, as well as John McCain’s disastrous response to it, may have won him the last election.
 The storm that broke the media narrative of an ascending Romney gave Obama the nonpartisan moment of solidarity he always longed for—including the loving arms of New Jersey Governor Chris Christie. But it’s not about the president; it’s about the other seven billion of us and the rest of the Earth’s creatures, from plankton to pikas.
 Hope in the Storm
 Sandy did what no activist could have done adequately: put climate change back on the agenda, made the argument for reasonably large government, and reminded us of the colossal failures of the Bush administration seven years ago. (Michael “heckuva job” Brown, FEMA's astonishingly incompetent director under George W. Bush, even popped up to underscore just how far we've come.)
 Maybe Sandy will also remind us that terrorism was among the least common, if most dramatic, of the dangers we faced then and face now. Though rollercoasters in the surf and cities under water have their own drama—and so does seawater rushing into the pit at Ground Zero.
 Clearly, the game has changed. New York City’s billionaire mayor, when not endorsing police brutality against Wall Street’s Occupiers, has been a huge supporter of work on climate change. He gave the Sierra Club $50 million to fight coal last year and late last week in Sandy’s wake came out with a tepid endorsement of Obama as the candidate who might do something on the climate. Last week as well, his magazine, Bloomberg Businessweek, ran a cover that could’ve run anytime in the past few decades (but didn’t) with the headline: “It’s global warming, stupid.”
 There are two things you can hope for after Sandy. The first is that every person stranded without power, running water, open grocery stores, access to transportation, an intact home, and maybe income (if work isn’t reachable or a job has been suspended) is able to return to normal as soon as possible. Or more than that in some cases, because the storm has also brought to light how many people were barely getting by before. (After all, we also use the word “underwater” for people drowning in debt and houses worth less than what’s owed on their mortgages.) The second is that the fires and the water and the wind this time put climate change where it belongs, in the center of our most pressing issues.
 We Have Power! How Disasters Unfold
 A stranger sent me a widely circulated photograph of a front gate in Hoboken with a power strip and extension cord and a little note that reads, “We have power! Please feel free to charge your phone.” We have power, and volunteers are putting it to work in ways that count. In many disasters, government and big bureaucratic relief organizations take time to get it together or they allocate aid in less than ideal ways. The most crucial early work is often done by those on the ground, by the neighbors, by civil society—and word, as last week ended, was that the government wasn’t always doing it adequately.
 Hurricane Sandy seems to be typical in this regard. Occupy Wall Street and 350.org got together to create Occupy Sandy and are already doing splendid relief work, including for those in the flooded housing projects in Red Hook, Brooklyn. My friend Marina Sitrin, a scholar and Occupy organizer, wrote
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 Amazing and inspiring work by community and Occupy folks! Hot nutritious meals for many hundreds. Supplies that people need, like diapers, baby wipes, flashlights etc., all organized. Also saw the first (meaning first set up in NYC—only tonight) scary FEMA site a few blocks away. Militarized and policed entrance, to an area fenced in with 15-foot fences, where one gets a sort of military/astronaut ration with explanations of how to use in English that I did not understand. Plus Skittles?
 Occupy, declared dead by the mainstream media six weeks ago, is shining in this mess. Kindness, solidarity, mutual aid of this kind can ameliorate a catastrophe, but it can’t prevent one, and this isn’t the kind of power it takes to pump out drowned subway stations or rebuild railroad lines or get the lights back on. There is a role for government in disaster, and for mobilizing all available forces in forestalling our march toward a planet that could look like the New Jersey shore all the time.
 When Occupy first began, all those tents, medical clinics, and community kitchens in the encampments reminded me of the aftermath of an earthquake. The occupiers looked like disaster survivors—and in a sense they were, though the disaster they had survived was called the economy and its impacts are usually remarkably invisible. Sandy is also an economic disaster: unlimited release of carbon into the atmosphere is very expensive and will get more so.
 The increasingly turbulent, disaster-prone planet we’re on is our beautiful old Earth with the temperature raised almost one degree celsius. It’s going to get hotter than that, though we can still make a difference in how hot it gets. Right now, locally, in the soaked places, we need people to aid the stranded, the homeless, and the hungry. Globally we need to uncouple government from the Big Energy corporations, and ensure that most of the carbon energy left on the planet stays where it belongs: underground.
 After the Status Quo
 Disasters often unfold a little like revolutions. They create a tremendous rupture with the past. Today has nothing much in common with yesterday—in how the system works or doesn’t, in what people have in common, in how they see their priorities and possibilities. The people in power are often most interested in returning to yesterday, because the status quo was working for them—though Mayor Bloomberg is to be commended for taking the storm as a wake-up call to do more about climate change. For the rest of us, after such a disaster, sometimes the status quo doesn’t look so good.
 Disasters often produce real political change, not always for the better (and not always for the worse). I called four of the last five big calamities in this country the four horsemen of the apocalypse because directly or otherwise they caused so much suffering, because they brought us closer to the brink, and because they changed our national direction. Disaster has now become our national policy: we invite it in and it directs us, for better and worse.
 As the horsemen trample over all the things we love most, it becomes impossible to distinguish natural disaster from man-made calamity: maybe the point is that there is no difference anymore. But there’s another point: that we can prevent the worst of the impact in all sorts of ways, from evacuation plans to carbon emissions reductions to economic justice, and that it’s all tied up together.
 I wish Sandy hadn’t happened. But it did, and there have been and will be more disasters like this. I hope that radical change arises from it. The climate has already changed. May we change to meet the challenges.

#### Second, the national security state has warped America’s response to natural disasters. Military securitization is prioritized over the real needs of racial minorities and low income populations that are threatened by climate – new investments are key to preventing harm to the most vulnerable.

Graham ’05 [Professor of Human Geography at Newcastle and noted vandal, 2005; Stephen, “Cities Under Siege,” http://understandingkatrina.ssrc.org/Graham/]

Secondly, and relatedly, the Katrina disaster revealed the stark politics that surround ‘security’ in post 9/11 United States. A dark irony emerges here. On the one hand, a large proportion of Bush’s rhetoric since 9/11 has emphasised the fragile exposure of US urbanites to purported ‘terrorist’ risks. These have been endlessly stressed to legitimise Bush’s overseas military invasions and massive spending hikes to feed the burgeoning military-security-corrections complex. On the other hand, US cities’ preparedness for much more devastating and likely impacts of catastrophic ‘natural’ events like Katrina have actually been undermined because of fiscal cuts and the construction of the vast ‘homeland security’ and anti-terror drive which tends to ignore or downplay such risks.
 The risks of ‘cyberterrorism,’ bioterrorism, chemical terrorism and nuclear ‘dirty bombs’ have been a particularly recurrent feature of Bush’s ‘war on terror’ discourse. On the back of these, multi-billion dollar investments have been made to further inflate an emerging complex of correctional-security-military industries (which have very close personal and financial links to key members of the Bush inner core). Closely linked to the major defense contractors and universities, they have started to develop and install a whole range of high-tech anti-terrorist sensors and systems in and around strategic US metropolitan areas. At the same time, these corporations have benefited from the defense, research and reconstruction budgets associated with the US military’s invasion and occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan.
 Ironically, these budgets and programs are all about ‘urban security’. But here they obsess only with the lucrative business of ‘security’ that involves vast new anti-terrorist surveillance and ‘urban combat’ systems. The prosaic business of securing increasingly perilous US cities from a whole range of other, less profitable, risks is downplayed. Rather, the aggressive, militarised paradigm spreads to encompass such risks and events. However, it brings ‘combat operations’ rather than mitigation, and authoritarian heavy-handedness of the sort seen in Iraq, rather than compassionate humanitarianism towards fellow citizens. Even in response to Katrina, US Army commanders talked about the need to launch ‘urban combat’ operations to ‘take back’ the city from ‘insurgents’ who had bred anarchy and violence.
 Much of the funding for Bush’s homeland security drive has been achieved through the cuts in broad-scale urban funding mentioned above. Elsewhere, however, resources have been stripped from essential infrastructure maintenance and other hazards research budgets. Given the age and decrepit nature of much of the infrastructural fabric of metropolitan America – a function of the long-standing neglect of public works in US politics – such cuts are extremely problematic. They threaten to bring with them a whole slew of increased risks in the face of volatile climatic change, rising temperatures and sea-level rises. But because such risks seem far from the ubiquitous discourses of the ‘war on terror’, they have increasingly been ignored – until Katrina, that is.
 Such a policy shift may have directly contributed to the scale and devastation of Katrina. In early 2004 the Federal government withdrew moneys from levee maintenance around New Orleans to pay for the homeland security and the Iraq war budgets. With levees sinking, local US Army Corps of Engineers actually had to go around to local funders begging for small donations to contribute towards maintaining their level against the wider, sinking, city. As the 2006 budgets were drawn up, a $35 million programme of levee maintenance was identified. But scheduled funding for the year was cut from $5.7m to $2.9m, which barely
CONTINUES …↓

CONTINUED FROM↑
covered the salaries of existing engineers. Just as damaging, the costs of the Iraq war led to the abandonment of an important research project tracing the dynamics of hurricane risk, levee maintenance and urban sinking in the New Orleans area.
 More worrying still is the saga of the key US government organisation tasked with responding to events like Katrina – the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). A world-class model of disaster mitigation before 2001, FEMA was a shadow of its former self as Katrina hit because of cuts and cronyism. Expert managers had been replaced by Bush’s friends and allies who had no relevant skills and experience whatsoever. National disaster mitigation plans had been abandoned. Many demoralised experts have left. An increasingly privatized contract culture had replaced core, in-house competences, with localities increasingly competing for central money. And FEMA had been bundled into the Department of Homeland Security behemoth which concentrated its resources and discussions overwhelmingly towards terrorist risk. The Federal Government increasingly stressed that hazard mitigation and disaster response should be dealt with at state level. But the states, suffering huge deficits because of reduced central support, have been unable to replicate FEMA services.
 Whether a full levee maintenance and research program and a world-class FEMA would have ameliorated Katrina’s devastating impact we will never know. But the broader denial of non-terrorist risks, combined with the wider anti-urbanism and anti-public service ethos of the Bush administration, must surely be contributing to a growing vulnerability of US cities to catastrophic weather and seismic events. The September 2004 words of hazards expert William Waugh, a Professor at Georgia State University, now seem eerily prescient. “If you talk to FEMA people and emergency management people around the country,” he remarked, “people have almost been hoping for a major natural disaster like a hurricane, just to remind the Department of Homeland Security and the Bush administration that there are other big things – even bigger things – than al Qaeda”.

#### Those populations left to swim through flood-waters are deemed disposable, a life without meaning. The violence of mass suffering is invisible as the elderly, the poor, racial minorities and others who are excluded from privilege

Giroux ‘12, [Henry, “Hurricane Sandy in the Age of Disposability and Neoliberal Terror,” http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/13025-hurricane-sandy-in-the-age-of-disposability#XXXVIGlobal TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department, in 12]

The winners in the disposable society circulate close to the top of the power pyramid.... Those who can't afford to be on the move stand little chance.... Market freedom means few people have a hold on the present and that everyone is expendable. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, shocking images of dead bodies floating in the flood waters of New Orleans appeared on national TV against a sound track of desperate cries for help by thousands of poor, black, brown, elderly and sick people. These disturbing pictures revealed a vulnerable and destitute segment of the nation's citizenry that conservatives not only refused to see as such, but had spent the better part of three decades demonizing. But the haunting images of the abandoned, desperate and vulnerable would not go away and for a moment imposed themselves on the collective conscience of Americans, demanding answers to questions that were never asked about the existence of those populations excluded from the American dream and abandoned to their own limited resources in the midst of a major natural disaster. But that moment soon passed as the United States faced another disaster: The country plunged into an economic turmoil ushered in by finance capital and the apostles of Wall Street in 2008.1 Consequently, an additional instance of widespread hardship and suffering soon bore down on lower-middle and working-class people who would lose their jobs, homes, health care and their dignity. Hurricane Sandy not only failed to arouse a heightened sense of moral outrage and call for justice, it has quickly, if not seamlessly, been woven into a narrative that denied those larger economic and political forces, mechanisms and technologies by which certain populations when exposed to a natural catastrophe are rendered human waste. One reason for this case of historical amnesia and ethical indifference may lie in the emerging vicissitudes of an era eager to accommodate rather than challenge global warming, an era in which freakish weather events have become such commonplace occurrences that they encourage the denial of planetary destruction. These days Americans are quickly fatigued by natural catastrophe. Major natural disasters and their consequences are now relegated to the airborne vocabulary of either fate or the unyielding circumstance of personal tragedy, conveniently allowing an ethically cleansed American public to ignore the sordid violence and suffering they produce for those populations caught in the grip of poverty, deprivation and hardship. It gets worse. Catastrophes have not only been normalized, they have been reduced to the spectacle of titillating TV. Rather than analyzed within broader social categories such as power, politics, poverty, race and class, the violence produced by natural disasters is now highly individualized, limited to human interest stories about loss and individual suffering. Questions concerning how the violence of Hurricane Sandy impacted differently those groups marginalized by race, age, sickness and class, particularly among poor minorities, were either downplayed or ignored. Lost in both the immediacy of the recovery efforts and the public discourse in most of the mainstream media were the abandoned fates and needless suffering of residents in public-housing apartments from Red Hook to the Lower East Side, to the poorest sections of the Rockaway Peninsula and other neglected areas along the east coast of New Jersey. These are populations ravaged by poverty, unemployment and debt. Even though inequality has become one of the most significant factors making certain groups vulnerable to storms and other types of disasters, matters of power and inequality in income, wealth and geography rarely informed the mainstream media's analysis of the massive destruction and suffering caused by Sandy. 2 And yet, out of 150 countries, the United States has the fourth highest wealth disparity.3 As Joseph Stiglitz points out, "Nowadays, these numbers show that the American dream is a myth.
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There is less equality of opportunity in the United States today than there is in Europe - or, indeed, in any advanced industrial country for which there are data."4 Inequality and social disparity are not simply about the concentration of wealth and income into fewer hands, they are also about the unequal use of power, the shaping of policies and the privileging of a conservative wealthy minority who have accumulated vast amounts of wealth. America is paying a high price for its shameful levels of inequality and this became particularly clear when certain populations in Manhattan received aid more quickly than others in the post-Hurricane Sandy reconstruction efforts. Not surprising, given that Manhattan, one of the epicenters of the storm's savagery, has a level of inequality that not only stands out but rivals parts of sub-Saharan Africa.5 Within this geography of massive income and wealth inequality, 20 percent of Manhattan residents made $392,022 a year on average [and] the poorest made $9,681. Yet, even though lower Manhattan was a low priority for receiving government and private relief efforts, neither its vulnerability nor the iniquitous treatment it was accorded was factored into post-Sandy media coverage.6 Sandy lay bare what many people did not want to see: a throwaway society that not only endlessly created material waste, but one all too willing to produce and dispose of what it interprets as human waste. What is clear in this case is that while some attention was focused on the first responders who lost their homes in Breezy Point and the poor elderly trapped for days in housing projects, "facing cold temperatures, food shortages," electrical failures and lack of proper medical care, these are populations whose lives are for the most part considered "unreal," occupying a space of invisibility where hardships are rarely seen or heard.7 But more was revealed in this disaster than the painful registers of exclusion, mass suffering and the inability of government to provide timely help to those most vulnerable and in need of aid. Hurricane Sandy also revealed the gaping and dystopian fault lines of those disasters exacerbated by human actions in a society wracked by vast differences in power, income, wealth, resources and opportunities. In this instance a natural catastrophe merged with forms of sustained moral/social neglect and a discourse of symbolic violence to reveal a set of underlying determinants, a grammar of human suffering.

## Plan Text

#### Thus the plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its oceanic climate resiliency development to protect vulnerable populations.

## Contention 3 – Solvency

#### 1st – The United States federal government should increase its climate resiliency development - this can provide pathways out of poverty while preventing catastrophic harm

Center for American Progress, April 2014 [For citations and references, please see Michael Conathan, Jeffrey Buchanan, and Shiva Polefka, “The Economic Case for Restoring Coastal Ecosystems”(Washington: Center for American Progress and Oxfam America, 2014), available at http://ampr.gs/coastalrestoration. http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/CoastalRestoration-factsheet.pdf]//
Healthy coastal ecosystems provide critical social and environmental benefits. While the existence of these benefits is not in dispute, estimating their economic value is challenging. Yet calculating these dollar values is crucial for the efficient management of coastal resources. The Center for American Progress and Oxfam America collaborated with researchers from Abt Associates to analyze the economic benefits provided by 3 of the 50 coastal restoration projects that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, funded with grants from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, or ARRA, of 2009. These three projects are located in the Seaside Bays of Virginia’s Atlantic coast; Mobile Bay, Alabama; and South San Francisco Bay, California. Previous research established that a $1 million investment in coastal restoration creates, on average, 17.1 jobs. 1 In comparison, offshore oil and gas development creates approximately 8.9 jobs per $1 million investment. 2 In low-income coastal communities, these restoration jobs can create significant pathways out of poverty. Although one of the sites yielded insufficient data to determine a reliable estimate, the analysis shows that the ecological restoration resulting from these projects can provide long-term economic benefits that far exceed project cost, in addition to the initial economic stimulus. Averaging the benefit-cost ratios across the three restoration projects studied, each dollar invested by taxpayers returns more than $15 in net economic benefits. Society has long recognized that physical capital such as factories and roads can create value for the economy through the production of goods and provision of transport. The full report shows that reefs, estuaries, and other wetlands represent natural capital that also provides long-term support for economic activity. These ecological assets continue to generate value over time for critical coastal industries, including commercial and recreational fishing, real estate, recreation, and tourism, as well as other benefits such as pollution filtration and protection against extreme weather and coastal flooding. The sum of these benefits—including both goods and environmental services—can far exceed the total investment needed to generate them. Investing in coastal restoration is good policy. It’s not just the right thing to do for the environment; it’s the right thing to do for coastal communities, vulnerable coastal populations, and the U.S. economy. Recommendations for future action
• Public and private sector entities should increase their investment in coastal restoration projects and fund ongoing monitoring of restored areas.
• Congress should enact and fund the National Endowment for the Oceans to provide a steady revenue stream for restoration.
• The state and federal agencies distributing BP oil spill related funds should invest in recovery projects that create employment and support long-term ecosystem recovery.
• Federal, state, and local coastal planners should give greater weight to natural solutions such as wetland restoration to help protect at-risk developed areas.
• The Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of the Interior, and NOAA should work with the Economic Development Administration and the U.S. Department of Labor to develop new pathways into crafts, trades, and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or STEM, careers related to ecosystem restoration.
• NOAA and its partners should seek funding to apply the evaluation techniques used in this report to the other ARRA coastal restoration projects in order to provide a stronger foundation for future coastal land use decisions.

#### 2nd – Best studies indicate plan can reduce casualties by half. Ocean policy is key

Conathan, et al, Center for American Progress, April 2014 [The Economic Case for Restoring Coastal Ecosystems**,** By Michael Conathan, Jeffrey Buchanan, and Shiva Polefka April 2014**,** WWW.AMERICANPROGRESS.ORG]

As then NOAA Administrator Dr. Jane Lubchenco put it, “Storms today are differ- ent. Because of sea-level rise, [Sandy’s] storm surge was much more intense, much higher than it would have been in a non-climate changed world.”78 Sea-level rise is also driving an increase in the frequency and intensity of destruc- tive coastal floods. According to a September 2013 report from the American Meteorological Society, sea-level rise caused by global warming is significantly reducing the time between major coastal flood events.79 In 1950, the more than 8-foot-high storm surge caused by Sandy in New Jersey would have been considered a once-in-435-years event. But given the accelerating rate of sea-level rise, scientists now predict that Sandy-scale flooding will occur there every 20 years by 2100.80 The problem is not going away any time soon. Scientists warn that global green- house gas emissions have already locked in a significantly greater risk from coastal hazards such as storms and flooding. Even if we cease emitting fossil-fuel-based greenhouse gases today, sea levels will continue to rise for the next several centu- ries. According to the geologic record, the last time the atmosphere was as carbon rich as we have made it today, seas were 20 meters higher.81 Our increasing economic dependence on our coasts and the greater risks they face from climate change and sea-level rise mean that any discussion of coastal land use must address the question of how we reconcile these conflicting trends. In other words, how do we affordably adapt our coasts so that our coastal com- munities, assets, and infrastructure become safer and more secure, while also continuing to invest in the coastal ecosystem restoration needed to ensure that our coasts are ecologically healthy? Research, especially in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, has revealed that healthy coastal ecosystems play a vital role in reducing risks from coastal hazards. First, as mentioned in the previous section, coastal wetlands with healthy plant com- munities, such as salt marshes, mangroves, and estuaries, serve as highly effective buffers against storm surge. These ecosystems soak up and hold floodwaters similar to a sponge and shield landward areas from inundation. Estimates of the hurricane pro- tection value of existing coastal wetlands in the Gulf and eastern seaboard have shown that the absence of healthy coastal ecosystems explains as much as 60 percent of the damage suffered by communities along the Gulf Coast that are struck by hurricanes. ￼The researchers concluded that “coastal wetlands function as valuable, self-maintain- ing ‘horizontal levees’ for storm protection ... their restoration and preservation is an extremely cost-effective strategy for society” to mitigate the damage from tropical storms.82 These studies found that the Gulf Coast’s remaining coastal wetlands pro- vide around $23.2 billion per year in storm protection services. 83 More recently, scientists have begun to account for future trends in sea-level rise and socioeconomic data in their examination of the relationship between healthy coastal ecosystems and the most vulnerable members of society—primarily the poor, communities of color, and the elderly. A new body of research on social vul- nerability, led by organization such as the University of South Carolina’s Hazard Vulnerability Research Institute, combines data on physical risk with social and economic data sets.84 This robust literature explains how socioeconomic dynamics contribute to com- munities facing greater challenges in responding to, recovering from, and prepar- ing for climate-related hazards.85 Researchers from Stanford University and The Nature Conservancy overlaid a map of coastal wetlands with data on the spatial distribution of individuals most likely to be harmed or killed during catastrophic storm events. Then, they modeled several scenarios in which sea-level rise and coastal ecosystem degradation continue at current rates. Relative to the most likely scenarios, the scientists reported in Nature Climate Change that: The likelihood and magnitude of losses may be reduced by intact reefs and coastal vegetation, especially when those habitats fringe vulnerable communities and infrastructure. The number of people, poor families, elderly and total value of residential property that are most exposed to hazards can be reduced by half if existing coastal habitats remain fully intact.86

#### 3rd Ending zones of sacrifice reasserts the political voices of those lives currently rendered unlivable. The affirmative adapts to the inevitable impacts of climate change in order to preserve critical infrastructure based on notions of shared public space and the need for new democratic possibilities, undermining the neoliberal consensus that certain lives can be calculated into irrelevance.

Giroux, in ‘12 Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department, [Henry, “Hurricane Sandy in the Age of Disposability and Neoliberal Terror,” http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/13025-hurricane-sandy-in-the-age-of-disposability#XXXVI]

Within this regime of neoliberal violence, the politics of disposability is shored up by the assumption that some lives and social relationships are not worthy of a meaningful social existence, empathy and social protections. Lacking social protections, such populations increasingly are addressed within the growing reach of the punishing state, as a source of entertainment, or are relegated to what Etienne Balibar calls the "death zones of humanity," where they are rendered superfluous and subject to a mode of "production for elimination."9 In a culture defined by excessive inequality, suffering and cruelty, the protective covering of the state, along with the public values and the formative culture necessary for a democracy is corrupted.10 And the disposable are not merely those populations caught in extreme poverty. Increasingly, they are individuals and groups now ravaged by bad mortgages, poor credit and huge debt. They are the growing army of the unemployed forced to abandon their houses, credit cards and ability to consume - a liability that pushes them to the margins of a market society. These are the groups whose homes will not be covered by insurance, who have no place to live, no resources to fall back on, no way to imagine that the problems they will be facing are not just personal, but deeply structural, built into a system that views the social contract and the welfare state as a lethal disease.
 A callous indifference to the plight of the poor was made clear in the remarks of former presidential candidate Mitt Romney in his derogatory reference to the 47 percent of adult Americans who don't pay income taxes for one reason or another as "people who believe that they are victims, who believe the government has a responsibility to care for them, who believe that they are entitled to health care, to food, to housing, to you-name-it."11In a post-election comment, Romney reproduced this logic when telling a group of his financial backers that Obama won the election because he gave policy gifts to specific interest groups, "especially the African-American community, the Hispanic community and young people."12 In this instance, Romney simply affirmed Newt Gingrich's more overtly racist claim that President Obama was a "food stamp president ... who was comfortable sending a lot of people checks for doing nothing."13 Right-wing pundits such as Bill O'Reilly, Rush Limbaugh, Sarah Palin, and Sean Hannity, offered up additional examples of the discourse of disposability and culture of cruelty by claiming that 47 percent "want things" and are welfare moochers and "wards of the state."14 In this economic Darwinist measure of value, those marginalized by race and class, who might detract from, rather than enlarge another's wealth are not only demonized, but are also viewed as problematic in that they become burdens to be disposed of, rather a valuable and treasured human resource in which to invest. But the discourse of disposability is not limited to right-wing politicians, pundits, conservative media apparatuses or a Republican Party that is now in the hands of extremists; it is also built into the vocabulary of liberal governmental policy.
This culture of cruelty and disposability was particularly visible as Mayor Michael Bloomberg initially was willing to divert scarce resources for storm relief such as food, power generators, police and fire personnel and public services to the New York Marathon rather than to the hardest hit victims of the killer hurricane, especially those residents in Staten Island. In the face of a public anger, Bloomberg eventually cancelled the event but not before he had made obvious the message that, as Chris Hedges points out, those who are poor and voiceless are expendable, "a drain on efficiency and progress. They are viewed as refuse. And as refuse ... have no voice and no freedom .... This is a world where only corporate power and profit are sacred. It is a world of barbarism."15 The ideology of hardness and cruelty unleashed by neoliberal policy formulations was further highlighted as a number of right-wing policy advocates who argued in various mainstream news sources that the destruction wreaked by Sandy provided an excellent opportunity for privatizing the Natural Flood Insurance Program and eliminating labor protections and other regulations that hampered the superrich from using the disaster to rake in big profits. In one brazen, if not ruthless, suggestion written by right-wing economist Russell S. Sobel in a New York Times online forum, he argued that in the most devastated areas caused by Hurricane Sandy, "FEMA should create 'free trade zones - in which all normal regulations, licensing and taxes [are] suspended.' This corporate free-for-all would, apparently, 'better provide the goods and services victims need.'"16 This was somewhat at odds with an earlier suggestion by Mitt Romney that FEMA should actually be abolished in order to allow the private sector to take over disaster control.17
 The lessons of Hurricane Sandy not only raise serious questions about the class and racial divides that characterize the United States and the seriousness of the ecological dangers that are reshaping weather patterns and destroying the globe, but also about forms of neoliberal power that escape any sense of moral responsibility and are answerable only to those who have power and seek profit at any cost. As neoliberalism spreads across the globe, there seems to be little that governments can do in fulfilling a broad central commitment to their citizens. This suggests that the American public become all the more attentive to what populations are dehumanized and considered excess, who is on the chopping block, who is being protected and who is being ignored. Zones of terminal exclusion, social death and what Hedges calls "sacrifice zones" are proliferating at a rapid pace in the United States.18 These are the forgotten zones of interminable exclusion and social abandonment where Americans are trapped in never ending cycles of poverty, powerlessness, and hopelessness as a direct result of neoliberal policies that embrace capitalistic greed, while producing "areas that have been destroyed for quarterly profit. We're talking about environmentally destroyed, communities destroyed, human beings destroyed, families destroyed."19
 The growing legions of disposable populations cannot be separated from the ongoing attack by the apostles of neoliberalism on workers' freedoms, women's civil rights, public schools, the welfare state and other groups and institutions that get in the way of the extremely wealthy bankers, hedge fund managers and corporate CEOs who want to reshape America in the image of casino capitalism. America is awash in neoliberal culture of violence, which becomes all the more dangerous as the notion of moral conscience, like the notion of social agency, seems all but forgotten as moral obligations are reduced to the realm of self-obligations. Trapped in an unwillingness to translate private troubles into broader social considerations, the discourse of social protections is reduced to the vocabulary of charity and individual giving. In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy, the overly washed elite have been discovering poverty while exoticizing the poor. Sarah Maslin Nir points critically to the elites' immersion into poverty porn by noting their "voyeuristic interest in the plight of the poor, treating [their trip into disaster areas] as an exotic weekend outing."20 She also notes the complaint of a female resident of a Rockaway project who stood by "as volunteers snapped iPhone photos of her as she waited in line for donated food and clothing."21 The message was not lost on her as revealed by her comment that she and her friends felt as if they were "in a zoo."22
 Privatized discourses and a war-against-all ethos increase the likelihood of the disappearance of those considered disposable and are reinforced by a stripped-down notion of responsibility, which alleviates the weight of moral conscience and social obligations. It undermines and destroys, when possible, those modes of social agency, collective structures and bonds of sociality capable of holding power accountable, resisting the anti-democratic pressures of neoliberalism and imagining visions that prioritize an investment in the public good over visions of happiness characterized by an endless search for immediate gratification. In a society in which "markets are detached from morals" and a market economy is transformed into a market society, market values increasingly shape areas of everyday life where they do not belong.23 As markets provide the only template by which to address all of society's needs, money and expanding profit margins become the ultimate measure of one's worth, and consuming the ultimate index of what it means to invest in one's identity, relations with others and the larger society.
Social rights and nonmarket values no longer matter and consequently an increasing number of individuals and groups are removed from any kind of ethical grammar that would acknowledge those economic, political and social forces that produce their suffering and marginalization. Such groups are increasingly punished if they are homeless, poor, unemployed or in debt. Institutions once meant to abolish human suffering now produce it.24 Three strikes sentencing laws have "created a cruel, Kafkaesque criminal justice system that lost all sense of proportion, doling out life sentences disproportionately to back defendants."25 We are living through what psychologist Robert Jay Lifton rightly calls a "death-saturated age" in which matters of violence, survival and trauma inescapably saturate everyday life.26 Such anti-democratic forces are not new, but they have been intensified and deepened under expanding neoliberal policies. They have also been reconfigured in more powerful and lethal ways through a frontal assault on the social contract, the welfare state and social protections.27 Positive visions of the good society and the importance of public values and civic life are being destroyed under the dominance of regressive and reactionary neoliberal institutions, ideologies, values and social relations. Market fundamentalism is the driving force of our times and it has destroyed the formative culture, rules of law, economic institutions, public spheres and governing structures necessary for a democracy to survive.

#### Marginalized groups must appeal to the state, the alt creates violent backlash leading to nuclear war and genocide

Shaw 1, Martin, Professor of International Relations at Sussex University, The unfinished global revolution: intellectuals and the new politics of international relations,

Since ‘worldwide’, ‘international’ and ‘global’ are often held to mean the same thing, let me propose ways of distinguishing them. Worldwide relations connect people around the world: they cross boundaries but do not necessarily negate them.13 International relations are between national units of state and society. Global relations, in contrast, are based on the consciousness of living in a common social sphere. Their ﬁrst form is the understanding that we share a common natural environment.The second is that we live in a highly interconnected world.14The third is that we share basic common values.Much argument fails to move beyond the ﬁrst and especially the second of these meanings. However only with the recognition of all three elements has globality arrived at its fullest meaning, of human commonality.15 The roots of globality lie, therefore, in increasingly common world experiences. Globality is not, as commonly suggested, about how we all consume the same dross of worldwide commerce, Cokes and Big Macs. It is fundamentally about how experiences like world wars, the Holocaust and the threat of nuclear annihilation have made us aware of the common fragility of human existence. It is about how standards of democratic accountability and human rights are coming to be seen not as exclusive preserves of rich Westerners, but entitlements of all. Out of these concerns has come a more concrete reinforcement of the universalistic tendency of modern thought, hitherto fundamentally compromised by the national rivalries of racially based Western empires. The growing sense of common values has informed global consciousness and institutions ever since the last major turning point in 1945, but it has been deformed up till now by the rivalries of Cold War blocs. It took the overthrow of the Cold War order, therefore, to turn this consciousness from an abstract into a more practical form. It is in this sense that the democratic revolution is now becoming global. Where people seek democratic change, they appeal in an increasingly concrete way to common standards and institutions. Many (if not all) who ﬁght for accountability and freedoms at a national level now locate these ends within a global context: universal values and world political and legal institutions. Globality does not make the national or international redundant: indeed the nation, and its place in inter- national order, remains one of the universals to which marginalized groups appeal. However our understandings of the nation and international relations are beginning to be transformed by seeing them in a global context. International links and ‘cosmopolitan nations’16can then be seen as building blocks of globality. Some reject the idea of common global values because their expressions are mostly Western in origin. However, all world religions contain recognitions of human commonality. The attempt to assert that there is a ‘clash of civilizations’17, stronger than those things pulling us together, is not supported by worldwide evidence. Go to Teheran, ﬁrst centre of the Islamic revolution: our counterparts in universities there are trying to connect to global, even Western, politics and culture. Go to Beijing, Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur or Rangoon, and see whether students and academics will give up ideals of democracy and human rights for the ‘Asian values’ proclaimed by their rulers. Of course, people interpret common values in the contexts of nationality and religion, and they often have justiﬁed suspicions of Western leaders and world institutions. But none of this negates the strong drive towards commonality, which means that we can talk of the wave of global- democratic revolution. These points are not merely of abstract importance. They have a life-or-death meaning for many people in non-Western regions. If you are Timorese and have endured a quarter of a century of oppression, your national aspirations and global values are not divisible. The people who will tell you about national as opposed to Western values are those who will burn down your village, kill members of your family, and disregard your vote. The same is true, of course, for the Kosovo Albanians or the Iraqi Kurds. For the most oppressed peoples, like the student campaigners in the capital cities, the democratic revolution is framed within a global commonality of values.18 *….continued...* The new politics of international relations require us, therefore, to go beyond the anti-imperialism of the intellectual left as well as of the semi-anarchist traditions of the academic discipline. We need to recognize three fundamental truths. CONTINUES …↓
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First, in the twenty-ﬁrst century people struggling for democratic liberties across the non- Western world are likely to make constant demands on our solidarity. Courageous academics, students and other intellectuals will be in the forefront of these movements.They deserve the unstinting support of intellectuals in the West.Second, the old international thinking in which democratic movements are seen as purely internal to states no longer carries conviction—despite the lingering nostalgia for it on both the American right and the anti-American left. The idea that global principles can and should be enforced worldwide is ﬁrmly established in the minds of hundreds of millions of people. This consciousness will become a powerful force in the coming decades. Third, global state-formation is a fact. International institutions are being extended, and (like it or not) they have a symbiotic relation with the major centre of state power, the increasingly internationalized Western conglomerate. Thesuccess of the global- democratic revolutionary wave depends ﬁrst on how well it is consolidated in each national context—but second, on how thoroughly it is embedded in international networks of power, at the centre of which, inescapably, is the West. From these political fundamentals, strategic propositions can be derived. First, democratic movements cannot regard non-governmental organizations and civil society as ends in themselves. They must aim to civilize local states, rendering them open, accountable and pluralistic, and curtail the arbitrary and violent exercise of power. Second, democratizing local states is not a separate task from integrating them into global and often Western-centred networks. Reproducing isolated local centres of power carries with it classic dangers of states as centres of war.84 Embedding global norms and integrating new state centres with global institutional frameworks are essential to the control of violence. (To put this another way: the proliferation of purely national democracies is not a recipe for peace.) Third, while the global revolution cannot do without the West and the UN, neither can it rely on them unconditionally. We need these power networks, but we need to tame them too, to make their messy bureaucracies enormously more accountable and sensitive to the needs of society worldwide. This will involve the kind of ‘cosmopolitan democracy’argued for by David Held.85It will also require us to advance a global social-democratic agenda, to address the literally catastrophic scale of world social inequalities. This is not a separate problem: social and economic reform is an essential ingredient of alternatives to warlike and genocidal power; these feed off and reinforce corrupt and criminal political economies. Fourth, if we need the global-Western state, if we want to democratize it and make its institutions friendlier to global peace and justice, we cannot be indifferent to its strategic debates. It matters to develop international political interventions, legal institutions and robust peacekeeping as strategic alternatives to bombing our way through zones of crisis. It matters that international intervention supports pluralist structures, rather than ratifying Bosnia-style apartheid.86 As political intellectuals in the West, we need to have our eyes on the ball at our feet, but we also need to raise them to the horizon. We need to grasp the historic drama that is transforming worldwide relationships between people and state,as well as between state and state. We need to think about how the turbulence of the global revolution can be consolidated in democratic, pluralist, international networks of both social relations and state authority. We cannot be simply optimistic about this prospect. Sadly, it will require repeated violent political crises to push Western and other governments towards the required restructuring of world institutions.87What I have outlined is a huge challenge; but the alternative is to see the global revolution splutter into partial defeat, or degenerate into new genocidal wars—perhaps even nuclear conflicts. The practical challenge for all concerned citizens, and the theoretical and analytical challenges for students of international relations and politics, are intertwined.

# 2AC

## 2AC Case Debate – Policy

### 2AC – Harms – Warming

#### 1ST – Extend the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ evidence from the 1AC – the consensus of scientists prove its happening proven by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*{please note you should read through the 1AC cards and write down the warrants that the evidence makes in your own words. Be efficient or you will not be able to cover}*

#### We are on track for mass warming- will result in environmental and ecosystem change

Dyer 7/2 [Gywnne Dyer, Journalist for Journal Star, http://journalstar.com/news/opinion/editorial/columnists/gwynne-dyer-how-bad-could-global-warming-get/article\_670c924c-b25e-59aa-9276-87d381c51c2e.html#ixzz20H28jEXb (7/2/12)]

The scientific consensus is that we are still on track for 3 degrees Celsius of warming (5 degrees Fahrenheit) by 2100, but that’s just warming caused by human greenhouse-gas emissions. The problem is that 3 degrees is well past the point where the major feedbacks kick in: natural phenomena triggered by our warming, like melting permafrost and the loss of Arctic sea-ice cover, that will add to the heating and that we cannot turn off. The trigger actually is about 2 degrees C (3.5 degrees F) higher average global temperature. After that, we lose control of the process: ending our own carbon-dioxide emissions no longer would be enough to stop the warming. We may end up trapped on an escalator heading up to plus-6 degrees C (plus-10.5 degrees F), with no way of getting off. And plus-6 degrees C gives you the mass extinction.

*See Also “Climate Aff Warming Bad File!”*

### 2AC - Harms - Climate change Real

#### Warming is occurring- hot summer outliers in Moscow and Texas

**Hansen et al, 12** (James Hansen heads the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and is a Professor in the Dept of Earth and Environmental Studies at Columbia University. He is the winner of the 2009 Carl- Gustaf Rossby Research Medal which is the highest honor bestowed by the American Meteorological Society, and was elected to the National Academy of Sciences; Makiko Sato works for Columbia University’s Center for Climate Systems Research and has a PhD in physics from Yeshive University. She currently works at the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies; Dr. Reto Ruedy, TRINNOVIM Program Manger at NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies was the recipient of the prestigious NASA Exceptional Public Service Medal; “Perception of Climate Change” written for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Institute for Space Studies, published online before print August 6, 2012 by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (the official journal of the United States National Academy of Science). Available online at http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/07/30/1205276109.abstract)

\*Time period between 1951-80 was chosen because it was a time of relatively stable global temperature

“Climate dice,” describing the chance of unusually warm or cool seasons, have become more and more “loaded” in the past 30 y, coincident with rapid global warming. The distribution of seasonal mean temperature anomalies has shifted toward higher temperatures and the range of anomalies has increased. An important change is the emergence of a category of summertime extremely hot outliers, more than three standard deviations (3σ) warmer than the climatology of the 1951–1980 base period. This hot extreme, which covered much less than 1% of Earth’s surface during the base period, now typically covers about 10% of the land area. It follows that we can state, with a high degree of confidence, that extreme anomalies such as those in Texas and Oklahoma in 2011 and Moscow in 2010 were a consequence of global warming because their likelihood in the absence of global warming was exceedingly small. Wediscuss practical implications of this substantial, growing, climate change.

#### Ice sheets decreasing and sea level increasing-

**Hansen et al, 12** (James Hansen heads the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and is a Professor in the Dept of Earth and Environmental Studies at Columbia University. He is the winner of the 2009 Carl- Gustaf Rossby Research Medal which is the highest honor bestowed by the American Meteorological Society, and was elected to the National Academy of Sciences; Makiko Sato works for Columbia University’s Center for Climate Systems Research and has a PhD in physics from Yeshive University. She currently works at the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies; Dr. Reto Ruedy, TRINNOVIM Program Manger at NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies was the recipient of the prestigious NASA Exceptional Public Service Medal; “Perception of Climate Change” written for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Institute for Space Studies, published online before print August 6, 2012 by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (the official journal of the United States National Academy of Science). Available online at http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/07/30/1205276109.abstract)

\*Time period between 1951-80 was chosen because it was a time of relatively stable global temperature

We choose 1951–1980 as the base period for most of our illustrations, for several reasons. First, it was a time of relatively stable global temperature, prior to rapid global warming in recent decades. Second, it is recent enough for older people, especially the “baby boom” generation, to remember. Third, global temperature in 1951–1980 was within the Holocene range, and thus it is a climate that the natural world and civilization are adapted to. In contrast, global temperature in at least the past two decades is probably outside the Holocene range (7), as evidenced by the fact that the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets are both losing mass rapidly (8, 9) and sea level has been rising at a rate [3 m∕millennium, (10); updates available at http://sealevel.colorado.edu/] well above the average rate during the past several thousand years. Fourth, we have used this base period in scores of publications for both observational and model analyses, so it is the best period for comparisons with prior work. Below we will illustrate the effect of alternative choices for base period. We will show that a fixed base period prior to the period of rapid global warming allows the effects of that warming to be discerned more readily. This brings to light a disadvantage of the practice of continually shifting the base period to the most recent three decades, which is a common practice of meteorological services.

*See Also “Climate Aff Warming Bad File!”*

#### We have the most conclusive, real world data- no flawed models here

**Hansen et al, 12** (James Hansen heads the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and is a Professor in the Dept of Earth and Environmental Studies at Columbia University. He is the winner of the 2009 Carl- Gustaf Rossby Research Medal which is the highest honor bestowed by the American Meteorological Society, and was elected to the National Academy of Sciences; Makiko Sato works for Columbia University’s Center for Climate Systems Research and has a PhD in physics from Yeshive University. She currently works at the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies; Dr. Reto Ruedy, TRINNOVIM Program Manger at NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies was the recipient of the prestigious NASA Exceptional Public Service Medal; “Perception of Climate Change” written for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Institute for Space Studies, published online before print August 6, 2012 by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (the official journal of the United States National Academy of Science). Available online at http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2012/07/30/1205276109.abstract)

\*Time period between 1951-80 was chosen because it was a time of relatively stable global temperature

Although we were motivated in this research by an objective to expose effects of human-made global warming as soon as possible, we use an empirical approach that does not require knowledge of the causes of observed climate change. We also avoid any use of global climate models, instead dealing only with real world data. Moreover, although the location, extent, and duration of regional temperature anomalies is affected by atmospheric blocking situations, El Niños, La Niñas, and other meteorological events, there is no need to understand and analyze the role of these phenomena in our purely empirical approach. Theories for the cause of observed global temperature change are thus separated as an independent matter.

*See Also “Climate Aff Warming Bad File!”*

### 2AC - AT: You don’t solve – other countries -

#### China pursuing adaptation policies now

ISET-N ’08 (“Climate Adaptation in Asia: Knowledge Gaps and Research Issues in China Final Report to IDRC and DFID” http://www.i-s-e t.org/images/pdfs/Climate%20Adaptation%20CHINA%20Sept08.pdf)

China Model Climate research has attracted considerable attention in China, in part because of the strategic importance of food production and the historical exposure of large rural and ourban populations to extreme events (droughts, floods, typhoons). There is reasonable consensus on the broad nature of future climate change in different regions of the country under various global emission scenarios, but high uncertainty as to how these trends will be expressed locally. A great deal of research has dealt with impacts on agricultural production, particularly in the highly productive North China Plain and floodplain regions of the south. There are divergent views about the implications of climate change on overall national grain production (partly reflecting different methodological approaches to this assessment), but recent work suggests effects attributable to climate change will vary regionally, with some regions benefiting and others losing. The principal agricultural areas of China are unlikely to be severely affected: they are also reasonably prosperous, dynamic and well served by infrastructure and agricultural inputs. In the northern plains, where water constrains agricultural productivity, the future effects of the South-North water transfer scheme, already committed by the national government, will far outweigh the impacts of climate change on water supply in drought years. For these reasons, from the perspective of vulnerability, other regions of the country were of greater interest to our study. Scientific research capacity in China is strong. Most research attention continues to be devoted to assessing the effects of climate change, including issues of data collection (which remains weak in many mountainous and remote areas of the country), modelling and climate forecasting. These are important areas for continuing research effort, particularly when results can be better linked to decision-making through user oriented information products. There is also growing attention to the impacts of forecast changes on ecosystems and biodiversity, and to assessment of aggregate costs of climate change impacts and adaptation. However, adaptation as a specific domain of research effort in China is a new concept.

### 2AC Harms – Growth Good/Econ Collapse Bad

#### Collapse is worse for all their impacts---causes extinction of every other species and then humans

Monbiot 9 – George Monbiot, columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science, August 17, 2009, “Is there any point in fighting to stave off industrial apocalypse?,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change

The interesting question, and the one that probably divides us, is this: to what extent should we welcome the likely collapse of industrial civilisation? Or more precisely: to what extent do we believe that some good may come of it?
I detect in your writings, and in the conversations we have had, an attraction towards – almost a yearning for – this apocalypse, a sense that you see it as a cleansing fire that will rid the world of a diseased society. If this is your view, I do not share it. I'm sure we can agree that the immediate consequences of collapse would be hideous: the breakdown of the systems that keep most of us alive; mass starvation; war. These alone surely give us sufficient reason to fight on, however faint our chances appear. But even if we were somehow able to put this out of our minds, I believe that what is likely to come out on the other side will be worse than our current settlement.
Here are three observations: 1 Our species (unlike most of its members) is tough and resilient; 2 When civilisations collapse, psychopaths take over; 3 We seldom learn from others' mistakes.
From the first observation, this follows: even if you are hardened to the fate of humans, you can surely see that our species will not become extinct without causing the extinction of almost all others. However hard we fall, we will recover sufficiently to land another hammer blow on the biosphere. We will continue to do so until there is so little left that even Homo sapiens can no longer survive. This is the ecological destiny of a species possessed of outstanding intelligence, opposable thumbs and an ability to interpret and exploit almost every possible resource – in the absence of political restraint.

#### Err aff---their authors fetishize collapse---the transition would kill billions and fail to shift mindsets---causes more environmental destruction

Monbiot 9 – George Monbiot, columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science, August 17, 2009, “Is there any point in fighting to stave off industrial apocalypse?,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change

If I have understood you correctly, you are proposing to do nothing to prevent the likely collapse of industrial civilisation. You believe that instead of trying to replace fossil fuels with other energy sources, we should let the system slide. You go on to say that we should not fear this outcome.
How many people do you believe the world could support without either fossil fuels or an equivalent investment in alternative energy? How many would survive without modern industrial civilisation? Two billion? One billion? Under your vision several billion perish. And you tell me we have nothing to fear.
I find it hard to understand how you could be unaffected by this prospect. I accused you of denial before; this looks more like disavowal. I hear a perverse echo in your writing of the philosophies that most offend you: your macho assertion that we have nothing to fear from collapse mirrors the macho assertion that we have nothing to fear from endless growth. Both positions betray a refusal to engage with physical reality.
Your disavowal is informed by a misunderstanding. You maintain that modern industrial civilisation "is a weapon of planetary mass destruction". Anyone apprised of the palaeolithic massacre of the African and Eurasian megafauna, or the extermination of the great beasts of the Americas, or the massive carbon pulse produced by deforestation in the Neolithic must be able to see that the weapon of planetary mass destruction is not the current culture, but humankind.
You would purge the planet of industrial civilisation, at the cost of billions of lives, only to discover that you have not invoked "a saner world" but just another phase of destruction.
Strange as it seems, a de-fanged, steady-state version of the current settlement might offer the best prospect humankind has ever had of avoiding collapse. For the first time in our history we are well-informed about the extent and causes of our ecological crises, know what should be done to avert them, and have the global means – if only the political will were present – of preventing them. Faced with your alternative – sit back and watch billions die – Liberal Democracy 2.0 looks like a pretty good option.

### 2AC – Growth Good - Environment

#### Growth solves environmental damage and decline accelerates it

Adler 8 – Jonathan H. Adler, Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Business Law and Regulation at Case Western Reserve University School of Law, Fall 2008, “Green Bridge to Nowhere,” The New Atlantis, online: http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/green-bridge-to-nowhere

According to Speth, “most environmental deterioration is a result of systemic failures of capitalism.” This is an odd claim, as the least capitalist nations of the world also have the worst environmental records. The ecological costs of economic statism are far worse than those of economic liberty. The environmental record of the various Soviet regimes amply bears this out: The West’s ecological nightmares were the Soviet bloc’s environmental realities. This is not due to any anomaly of the Soviet system. Nations with greater commitment to capitalist institutions experience greater environmental performance.
While Speth occasionally acknowledges pockets of environmental progress, he hardly stops to consider the reasons why some environmental resources have been conserved more effectively than others. Fisheries are certainly declining throughout much of the world—some 75 percent of fisheries are fully or over-exploited—but not everywhere. It is worth asking why. Tropical forests in less-developed nations are declining even as most temperate forests in industrialized nations are rebounding. Recognizing these different trends and identifying the key variables is essential to diagnosing the real causes of environmental deterioration and prescribing a treatment that will work. Speth acknowledges that much of the world is undergoing “dematerialization,” such that economic growth far outpaces increases in resource demand, but seems not to appreciate how the capitalist system he decries creates the incentives that drive this trend.
Were it not for market-driven advances in technological capability and ecological efficiency, humanity’s footprint on the Earth would be far greater. While modern civilization has developed the means to effect massive ecological transformations, it has also found ways to produce wealth while leaving more of the natural world intact. Market competition generates substantial incentives to do more with less—thus in market economies we see long and continuing improvements in productive efficiency. This can be seen everywhere from the replacement of copper with fiber optics (made from silica, the chief component in sand) and the light-weighting of packaging to the explosion of agricultural productivity and improvements in energy efficiency. Less material is used and disposed of, reducing overall environmental impacts from productive activity.
The key to such improvements is the same set of institutional arrangements that Speth so decries: property rights and voluntary exchange protected by the rule of law—that is, capitalism. As research by Wheaton College economist Seth Norton and many others has shown, societies in which property rights and economic freedoms are protected experience superior economic and environmental performance than those societies subject to greater government control. Indeed, such institutions have a greater effect on environmental performance than the other factors, such as population growth, that occupy the attention of Speth and so many other environmental thinkers.

### 2AC – Trade Good – Extensions

#### Even if trade generically doesn’t solve conflict, free trade does—protectionism is a try or die

McDonald 04 (Patrick, Professor at UT Austin, International relations theory, Author of, The Invisible Hand of Peace: Capitalism, the War Machine, and International Relations Theory, previously- postdoctoral fellow at the Christopher H. Browne Center for International Politics at the University of Pennsylvania, “Peace through Trade or Free Trade?”, Journal of Conflict Resolution 2004 48: 547, SagePub, Hemanth)

Theoretically, this shift enables the incorporation of important aspects of state society interactions that shape any link between trade and conflict. Although it is yet to be fully integrated into the commercial peace debate, standard trade theory illustrates that international commerce increases the aggregate income of an economy and simultaneously alters the relative distribution of income across society. Groups that see their incomes decline from international trade, namely, import-competing sectors, are unlikely to lobby the state for a pacific foreign policy that promotes expanding transnational economic ties. Moreover, the state is not a neutral arbiter in the domestic battle over commercial and foreign policies. It can use economic regulation to co-opt societal support for its public policies, including those that lead to war. A focus on free trade or the extent to which states regulate commerce in response to societal demands shifts theoretical attention toward the domestic level of analysis and allows me to generate hypotheses linking these distributional consequences of commerce to peace. This shift also carries important empirical implications. Most of the literature relies on bilateral trade to gross domestic product (GDP) ratios to operationalize such concepts as the relative dependence of an economy on trade and test the claims of commercial liberalism.1 Here I add more direct measures of the level of regulatory barriers on trade to standard statistical models of conflict. Their inclusion allows me to separate out the respective effects of free trade and trade on conflict while comparing the domestic explanation presented here with alternative hypotheses more commonly referred to in the literature. More broadly, this study argues that a neglected version of commercial liberalism— rooted in standard trade theory and the classical writings of Cobden (1868, 1870) and Schumpeter (1919/1951)—sheds new light on how international commerce generates peace between states. Free trade, and not just trade, promotes peace by removing an important foundation of domestic privilege—protective barriers to trade—that enhances the domestic power of societal groups likely to support war, reduces the capacity of free-trading interests to limit aggression in foreign policy, and creates a mechanism by which the state can build supportive coalitions for war. A series of statistical tests supports these claims by showing that lower regulatory barriers to trade were associated with a reduction in military conflict between states during the post– World War II era.

#### Increasing exports solves conflicts—best statistics

Polachek et al 06 (Solomon, Solomon W. Polachek is Distinguished Professor at Binghamton University (SUNY) in Economics and Political Science. Ph.D. is from Columbia; Carlos Seiglie is Professor of Economics - faculty of the Division of Global Affairs at Rutgers-Newark where he served as Program Director until July of 2011. Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, “Trade, Peace and Democracy: An Analysis of Dyadic Dispute”, ftp://repec.iza.org/RePEc/Discussionpaper/dp2170.pdf, Hemanth)

Using this methodology and concentrating on manufactures shows the trade conflict relationship holds. All the empirical work finds the signs are consistent with expectations. In addition, this research has shown that the export and the import elasticities continue to be important determinants of net conflict. Yet, under this specification exports appear to be more important to reducing conflict than imports. The results for the trade-conflict relationship using bilateral elasticities for raw materials show less variation in these elasticities than for manufactures. As before, all signs are consistent with the trade-conflict hypothesis. A doubling of exports leads to a 43% decrease in conflict. GDP differences are associated with less conflict and the Armington coefficients are consistent with less conflict when bilateral import demand curves are more inelastic.

### 2AC – Solvency Army Corps & Fed. Gov.

#### Federal government is key – Army Corps has expertise that empirically works

Dr. William G. **Howland 4** is the Basin Program Manager of Lake Champlain, Grand Isle, VT, “U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS ROLE IN THE NATION'S WATER RESOURCE NEEDS IN THE 21ST CENTURY, Capital Hill Testimony, March 31, lexis

Our partnership involves the states of Vermont and New York, the Province of Quebec, and numerous federal agencies, including the USEPA, the USDA, USDI, and the USACE. This partnership is highly effective and through our work to restore the lake ecosystem, we also are ensuring an economic future for citizens in our region. This work is of vital importance to the regional economy, including the tourism and recreation economy for which we are well known, and which depends so fundamentally upon this great and wonderful lake. One of the great discoveries in my work with the Lake Champlain Basin Program's federal agency partners is the good faith and dedication that they bring to the task of cleaning up and restoring America's waterways. I have great admiration and appreciation for all of our federal partners. Today, my testimony will focus on the essential work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and particularly their role in Environmental Restoration projects. Cleaning up pollution in a lake is exceedingly difficult and costly. And it always includes interrupting the flow of pollutants into the drainage system to prevent further contamination. Pollution prevention requires changing the way things work in the landscape that drains into the lake. In Lake Champlain, as in the Great Lakes and other parts of the nation, ecosystem restoration efforts often require advanced engineering design expertise and leadership that communities and states simply can not provide. The competence and engineering expertise of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a vital resource for planning, designing and executing restoration plans. The stature of the Corps, its track record with large projects and its quality control protocols provide the leadership that is essential to maintain and improve the water quality of our rivers and lakes. The U.S. Army Corps is currently facilitating several restoration projects in the Lake Champlain watershed. With the Corp's support, an infestation of water chestnut, an invasive aquatic plant that has dominated the entire southern part of the lake for years is now nearly under control. This program, run in partnership with the states of Vermont and New York, has lead us out of an almost hopeless situation and we are seeing a return to public enjoyment of shoreline areas in the southern part of Lake Champlain. This summer we expect to begin work on projects to intercept storm water runoff into Lake George, part of the Lake Champlain ecosystem, and to stabilize eroding streambanks in the Missisquoi watershed, with expertise, oversight and funding by the U.S. Army Corps. Without their leadership and support, this vital work could not happen. The role of the U.S. Army Corp's Environmental Restoration authority is a vital nationwide asset; getting projects done - and done professionally - all across America. Dam removal projects, wetland restoration, fish passages and streambank stabilization projects restore degraded ecosystems, improve American lives, strengthen our nation's economy and ensure that we will be able to provide clean drinking water to ourselves, our children and their children. Lake St. Clair, and the St. Clair River, located between Lake Huron and Lake Erie, faces massive problems of nutrient loading, invasive species and the challenges of a busy waterway. It is in desperate need of pollution prevention and ecosystem restoration action. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has taken the lead role in drawing together federal agencies and communities in the U.S. and Canada to address this international challenge. The stature and expertise of the Corps, and its mandate to develop a management plan, under Section 246 of WRDA 1999, placed it in the logical lead in this important effort. One of the greatest restoration programs in the history of our nation is underway in the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem, with U.S. Army Corps leadership. The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan approved by Congress in WRDA 2000 is the key to the future of the huge everglades ecosystem and the vitality of a significant sector of the Florida economy. Coordination of the work of eight federal agencies and more than a hundred local stakeholdergovernments, regional councils and state agencies, could only be managed by an agency with the engineering capacity, traditions and commitment of the U.S. Army Corps. From Texas to Mississippi in the Louisiana Coastal Area Ecosystem, wetlands are disappearing at the rate of nearly 22,000 acres per year. The U.S. Army Corps is a partner with the State of Louisiana on a feasibility study that will enable us to better understand this problem, and how to mitigate and minimize losses, to restore a future for this region. Similar case histories, of projects large and small, could be cited from across the nation, with the accolades and gratitude of millions of American citizens. America today faces unprecedented challenges of ecosystem damage and resultant declines in water quality, contaminated and weed- infested waterways, and polluted lakes and estuaries across the nation. These problems have compromised drinking water supplies for millions of Americans, caused desperate struggles for survival in the tourism and recreation industries, and created an alarming trend towards more and greater problems in the near future. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a vital part of our military service that works directly in the homeland to meet these challenges with the world's best professional expertise. Its stature and traditions of service to America have turned to environmental restoration projects that require engineering solutions. The Corps brings the best tools in the nation to guide the engineering problem-solving that these special ecosystems require. I would like to direct your attention to the challenges we face regarding the Corp's Continuing Authorities programs and Sections 206 and 1135. The existing program limits of $25 million for each have simply not kept pace with current needs, and are now a fraction of what America needs them to be. In the Lake Champlain watershed, this means that several ongoing projects are being suspended due to a national shortfall. Suspending good projects partway through their implementation, whether in Lake Champlain or elsewhere across the nation, neither saves money nor avoids expense. The problems in each case will get far more costly, not less costly. The opportunities to prevent or contain pollution will be lost if a shortfall like this persists. The most cost-effective solution to large ecosystem problems is to invest adequately in their restoration at the earliest possible date. Any alternative is likely to be a false economy in the short term and result a burgeoning burden of additional accrued contamination and sharply increased costs of restoration in the long term. Finally, the work of the U.S. Army Corps on environmental restoration is not only about conservation philosophy or environmental ethics. It is also about our nation's economic engines. As we know so well in the northeast, it is about the vitality of the tourism economy and the quality of life that keeps the recreation businesses in business. It is about trucks on the highway, the pulse of commerce and trade. It is about reducing bankruptcies and maintaining jobs. It is about smell of the tap water in the cities and towns across the nation; it is about the health of our own human habitat throughout this nation that is our future. In the final analysis, ecosystem restoration and water quality is about insuring the quality of life for citizens across America, and the health of our children and their children for generations to come. I hope the members of this Committee will continue to recognize, appreciate and support the vital role of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in service to the American homeland and, in particular, will fully support their Environmental Restoration programs. Thank you for the invitation to testify before you today. I look forward to answering your questions.

## 2AC –Case Debate - Critical

### AT: Warming Not Real

#### Climate denialism is 21st century invisible racism at its finest – the Politics of denial act to preserve the interests of the rich white male, ignoring the impact borne by minorities.

Mooney ’11, Chris, science and political journalist specializing in science in politics, the psychology of denialism, Knight Science Journalism Fellow, MIT; Visiting Associate, Center for Collaborative History, Princeton U; 8/2/11 (“What’s Up With Conservative White Men and Climate Change Denial?,” http://www.desmogblog.com/what-s-conservative-white-men-and-climate-change-denial)

They’re the conservative white men (CWM) of climate change denial, and we’ve all gotten to know them in one way or another. But we haven’t had population-level statistics on them until recently, courtesy of a new paper in Global Environmental Change (apparently not online yet, but live in the blogosphere as of late last week) by sociologists Aaron McCright and Riley Dunlap. It’s entitled “Cool Dudes: The denial of climate change among conservative white males in the United States.” Among other data, McCright and Dunlap show the following: — 14% of the general public doesn’t worry about climate change at all, but among CWMs the percentage jumps to 39%. — 32% of adults deny there is a scientific consensus on climate change, but 59% of CWMs deny what the overwhelming majority7of the world’s scientis have ts said. — 3 adults in 10 don’t believe recent global temperature increases are primarily caused by human activity. Twice that many – 6 CWMs out of every ten – feel that way. What’s more, and in line with a number of post I’ve written in the past, McCright and Dunlap also find among these CWMs a phenomenon I sometimes like to call “smart idiocy.” Even as they deny mainstream climate science, conservative white males are also more likely than average U.S. adults to think they understand the science they deny—that they’re right, the scientists are wrong, and they can prove it. Indeed, they’re just dying to debate you and refute you. The authors bring up two possible explanations for the broad CWM phenomenon, both based on literature in the social sciences. The first is “identity-protective cognition” theory (or what I would call motivated reasoning). The second is “system justification” theory, which is just what it sounds like: the study of why people, often implicitly and subconsciously, are motivated to ratify and reaffirm the status quo—why their default position is against, rather than for, progressive change. Motivated reasoning suggests that men who have “hierarchical” values—resisting reforms to increase economic or social equality, believing that some people should be running things and some should be taking orders, or that it’s perfectly okay and normal that some will succeed and some will fail—will be more inclined [to] defend a social system that’s structured in this way. Such a tendency has been used in the past to explain the “white male effect”: White men tend to downplay all manner of risks, especially environmental ones, but also risks posed by things like the vast proliferation of guns in America. This, presumably, is both because they’re less harmed by such risks overall (the burden often falls more on the disadvantaged), but also because they have trouble personally conceiving of the reality of these risks (they don’t see the current state of things as being very bad or objectionable). But why do men downplay climate risks in particular? Here’s where “system justification” theory comes in: If climate change is real and human caused, it potentially threatens the whole economic order and those who have built it and benefited from it. It is the most inconvenient of truths. So the idea is that the men who benefit from the fossil-fuel based energy system will rationalize and defend that system from challenge—and the science of climate change is, in some ways, the ultimate challenge. (More on this here.) This, by the way, may help to explain why conservatives so often liken the promotion of mainstream climate science, and advocacy for greenhouse gas emission controls, to a secret agenda to advance global socialism or communism. It isn’t—we’re so far from a left wing revolution in this country that the whole idea is laughable—but you can see how this wild claim might make more sense to them than it does to you and me. There’s also a strong element of groupthink here, write McCright and Dunlap. Conservative white male elites like Rush Limbaugh disseminate the climate denial message, and then their followers come to associate with it and build identities around it: To the extent that conservative white males in the general public view their brethren within the elite sectors as an ingroup, then we expect that the former also will tend to reject the global warming claims of the scientific community, the environmental movement, and environmental policy-makers. In short, they will espouse climate change denial to defend the information disseminated within their in-group and to protect their cultural identity as conservative white males. Honestly, while we’re cranking out all these theories, I am surprised the authors didn’t bring up what may be the most biologically grounded of them: “social dominance orientation,” or SDO. This refers to a particular personality type—usually male and right wing—who wants to dominate others, who sees the world as a harsh place (metaphorically, a “jungle”) where it’s either eat or be eaten, and who tends to really believe in a Machiavellian way of things. Fundamentally, this identity is all about testosterone firing and being an alpha male. SDOs are fine with inequality and in favor of hierarchy because frankly, they think some people (e.g., them) are just better than others, and therefore destined to get ahead. What are we to make of all of these theories? Certainly they’re more than just hand-waving: They’re all based on actual survey measurements of various tendencies within the population. So there is clearly some truth to all of them. They’re also overlapping, rather than mutually exclusive. My sense is that they’re all taking a nibble at something real; some, like “social dominance” theory, may describe certain individuals but not others. But if there’s a central theme uniting them all, it’s the idea that some people, perhaps especially conservative men, will be more comfortable with, and more inclined to rationalize, hierarchy. Now, do I think conservative white men consciously wake up in the morning and say to themselves, “I’m going to go on blogs and attack climate science today so I can screw over the little guy?” Certainly not. Rather, I simply think they experience modern climate science and climate advocacy as an affront, an attack on them and what they believe. They were brought up in a certain way, they believe certain things, and they have no reason to think of themselves as bad people—and indeed, mostly they’re not bad people. They give to charity. They go to church. They provide for a family. And so on. But then they perceive all these attacks on their values coming from outsiders—hippie environmentalists and ivory tower climate scientists. If you didn’t do anything wrong, and you consider yourself as reasonable and intelligent—but people are attacking you and your values—you maybe get kind of outraged and worked up. From there, the attacks on climate science and climate scientists may begin—and the affirmation of the in-group by attacking the out-group. Needless to say, Fox News, Rush Limbaugh’s radio show, and various climate denial blogs serve to fan the flames.

### 2AC – HARMS – Structural Violence

#### Critical infrastructure is just as vulnerable as it was during Hurricane Katrina—the lack of resilience disproportionately impacts the socially vulnerable and victims of structural violence. Without the plan, Katrina will repeat itself again and again

Renne et al., 08 (Renne is a PhD from the University of New Orleans, Sanchez is a PhD from the University of Utah, and Litman is a director at the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (John Renne, Thomas Sanchez, and Todd Litman, “National Study on Carless and Special Needs Evacuation Planning: A Literature Review”, October 2008)

The objective of this study is to research how state departments of transportation (state DOTs), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), transit agencies, and local governments are considering, in the context of their emergency preparedness planning, the unique needs of minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, and limited English proficient (LEP) persons, especially for households without vehicles (referred to as “carless” in this report). The evacuations of New Orleans and Houston in fall 2005 due to hurricanes Katrina and Rita were two of the largest evacuations in U.S. history. One of the main shortcomings was the lack of planning to evacuate carless residents, particularly minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, and LEP persons. In a report to Congress, the U.S. Department of Transportation and U.S. Department of Homeland Security revealed that [m]ethods for communicating evacuation options by modes other than personal vehicles are not well developed in most cases. A number of jurisdictions indicate locations where public transportation may be obtained, but many have no specific services identified to assist persons in getting to those designated locations. This situation is a particular problem for people with various disabilities (U.S. Department of Transportation in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security 2006, p. ES - 5) New Orleans is not unique. In fact, according to the 2000 U.S. Census, seven cities had carless populations higher than the 27 percent in New Orleans, including New York (56 percent), Washington, D.C. (37 percent), Baltimore (36 percent), Philadelphia (36 percent), Boston (35 percent), Chicago (29 percent), and San Francisco (29 percent). Nationally, approximately ten percent of the population is disabled and many of these individuals cannot drive, even if a car exists within their household. As the population ages, more and more people will become mobility-restricted. Even the elderly who have cars may be reluctant to drive them during a mandated long-distance evacuation. These groups face disproportionate risk and suffered loss of life in the flood of New Orleans. For example, 71% of those who died in Katrina in New Orleans were over the age of 60, and 47% over the age of 75 (AARP 2006a and 2006b). Perhaps, more alarming than the scope of emergency transport for low-mobility populations is the persistence of the problem. The extra risks that carless households face during an evacuation are well-recognized and have been documented in numerous reports and papers (Bourne, 2004; Fischett 2001). Despite this attention, relatively little has been done to improve the situation and only recently has a concerted effort been made to address this problem. Although some plans call for the use of local resources for the movement of indigent and elderly populations during times of emergency, the strategies remain questionable. Based on the current level of preparedness, it is quite likely that the tragedies seen in New Orleans during and after Hurricane Katrina are bound to be repeated unless best practices can be understood and adopted widely (Jenkins, Laska and Williamson 2007).

#### Who lives and dies in a disaster is a social calculus, not just a random exception. Decades of immiseration and the undermining of disaster preparedness paved the way for mass death and institutionalized racism.

Smith 06(Distinguished Professor of Anthropology and Geography at the CUNY Graduate Center where he also directs the Center for Place, Culture and Politics (Neil, “There’s No Such Thing as a Natural Disaster” March 2006, http://www.ladeltacorps.org/uploads/4/3/8/1/4381788/cg-ar-packet.pdf )

It is generally accepted among environmental geographers that there is no such thing as a natural disaster. In every phase and aspect of a disaster – causes, vulnerability, preparedness, results and response, and reconstruction – the contours of disaster and the difference between who lives and who dies is to a greater or lesser extent a social calculus. Hurricane Katrina provides the most startling confirmation of that axiom. This is not simply an academic point but a practical one, and it has everything to do with how societies prepare for and absorb natural events and how they can or should reconstruct afterward. It is difficult, so soon on the heels of such an unnecessarily deadly disaster, to be discompassionate, but it is important in the heat of the moment to put social science to work as a counterweight to official attempts to relegate Katrina to the historical dustbin of inevitable “natural” disasters. First, causes. The denial of the naturalness of disasters is in no way a denial of natural process. Earthquakes, tsunamis, blizzards, droughts and hurricanes are certainly events of nature that require a knowledge of geophysics, physical geography or climatology to comprehend. Whether a natural event is a disaster or not depends ultimately, however, on its location. A large earthquake in the Hindu Kush may spawn no disaster whatsoever while the same intensity event in California could be a catastrophe. But even among climatic events, natural causes are not entirely divorced from the social. The world has recently experienced dramatic warming, which scientists increasingly attribute to airborne emissions of carbon, and around the world Katrina is widely seen as evidence of socially induced climatic change. Much as a single hurricane such as Katrina, even when followed by an almost equally intense Hurricane Rita, or even when embedded in a record 2005 season of Atlantic hurricanes, is not in itself conclusive evidence of humanly induced global warming. Yet it would be irresponsible to ignore such signals. The Bush administration has done just that, and it is happy to attribute the dismal record of death and destruction on the Gulf Coast – perhaps 1200 lives by the latest counts – to an act of nature. It has proven itself not just oblivious but ideologically opposed to mounting scientific evidence of global warming and the fact that rising sea-levels make cities such as New Orleans, Venice, or Dacca immediately vulnerable to future calamity. Whatever the political tampering with science, the supposed “naturalness” of disasters here becomes an ideological camouflage for the social (and therefore preventable) dimensions of such disasters, covering for quite specific social interests. Vulnerability, in turn, is highly differentiated; some people are much more vulnerable than others. Put bluntly, in many climates rich people tend to take the higher land leaving to the poor and working class land more vulnerable to flooding and environmental pestilence. This is a trend not an iron clad generalization: oceanfront property marks a major exception in many places, and Bolivia’s La Paz, where the wealthy live in the cooler valley below 13,000 feet, is another. In New Orleans, however, topographic gradients doubled as class and race gradients, and as the Katrina evacuation so tragically demonstrated, the better off had cars to get out, credit cards and bank accounts for emergency hotels and supplies, their immediate families likely had resources to support their evacuation, and the wealthier also had the insurance policies for rebuilding. Not just the market but successive administrations from the federal to the urban scale, made the poorest population in New Orleans most vulnerable. Since 2001, knowing that a catastrophic hurricane was likely and would in all probability devastate New Orleans, the Bush administration nonetheless opened hundreds of square miles of wetland to development on the grounds that the market knows best, and in the process eroded New Orleans’ natural protection; and they cut the New Orleans Corps of Engineers budget by 80%, thus preventing pumping and levee improvements. At the same time, they syphoned resources toward tax cuts for the wealthy and a failed war in Iraq (Blumenthal 2005). Given the stunned amazement with which people around the world greeted images of a stranded African American populace in the deadly sewage pond of post-Katrina New Orleans, it is difficult not to agree with Illinois senator Barack Obama: “the people of New Orleans weren’t just abandoned during the hurricane,” but were “abandoned long ago” (DailyKos 2005). After causes and vulnerability comes preparedness. The incompetence of preparations for Katrina, especially at the federal level, is well known. As soon as the hurricane hit Florida, almost three days before New Orleans, it was evident that this storm was far more dangerous than its wind speeds and intensity suggested. Meteorologists knew it would hit a multi-state region but the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), overseen by a political appointee with no relevant experience and recently subordinated to the Homeland Security Administration, assumed business as usual. They sent only a quarter of available search and rescue teams to the region and no personnel to New Orleans until after the storm had passed (Lipton et. al. 2005). Yet more than a day before it hit, Katrina was described by the National Weather Service as a “hurricane with unprecedented strength” likely to make the targeted area “uninhabitable for weeks, perhaps longer” (NYT 2005). Days afterward, as the President hopped from photo-op to photo-op the White House, not given to listening to its scientists, seemed still not to understand the prescience of that warning or the dimensions of the disaster. The results of Hurricane Katrina and responses to it are as of this writing still fresh in our memory but it is important to record some of the details so that the rawness of what transpired not be rubbed smooth by historical rewrite. The results can be assessed in thousands of lives unnecessarily lost, billions of dollars of property destroyed, local economies devastated and so forth, but that is only half the story. The images ricocheting around the world of a crippled United States, unconcerned or unable to protect its own population, receiving offers of aid from more than 100 countries, only reaffirmed for many the sense, already crystalizing from the debacle in Iraq, of a failing superpower. The level of survivors’ amply televised anger, bodies floating in the background, shocked the world. Reporters were not “embedded” this time, and so the images were real, uncensored, and raw. As the true horror unfolded, the media were working without a script, and it took almost a week before pre-existing absorptive news narratives regained control. But by then it was too late. Distraught refugees, 1 mostly African American, concluded that they were being left in the New Orleans Superdome and Convention Center to die; they pleaded for help, any help, as they angrily demanded to know why, if reporters could get in and out, they could not. When the National Guard did arrive, it was quickly apparent that they were working under orders to control the city militarily and protect property rather than to bring aid to the desperate. Angry citizens, who waded through the fetid city looking for promised buses that never came, were prevented, at gunpoint, from getting out. “We are not turning the West Bank [a New Orleans suburb] into another Superdome,” argued one suburban sheriff. Groups of refugees who tried to organize water, food and shelter collectively were also broken up at gunpoint by the national guard. Numerous victims reported being besieged and the National Guard was under orders not to distribute their own water (Bradshaw and Slonsky, 2005; Whitney 2005). As late as four days after the hurricane hit New Orleans, with government aid still largely absent, President Bush advised refugees that they ought to rely on private charities such as the Salvation Army (Breed 2005). When the first federal aid did come, stunned recipients opening boxes asked why they were being sent anthrax vaccine. “These are the boxes Homeland Security told us to send,” came the reply. Unfortunately, shocking as it was, the tragedy of New Orleans is neither unique nor even especially unexpected, except perhaps in its scale. The race and class dimensions of who escaped and who was victimized by this decidedly unnatural disaster not only could have been predicted, and was, but it follows a long history of like experiences. In 1976, a devastating earthquake eventually killed 23,000 people in Guatemala and made 1.5 million people homeless. I say “eventually,” because the vast majority of deaths were not the direct result of the physical event itself but played out in the days and weeks that followed. Massive international relief flooded into Guatemala but it was not funneled to the most affected and neediest peasants, who eventually came to call the disaster a “classquake” (O’Keefe et. al. 1976). In communities surrounding the Indian Ocean, ravaged by the tsunami of December 2004, the class and ethnic fissures of the old societies are re-etched deeper and wider by the patterns of response and reconstruction. There, “reconstruction” forcibly prevents local fishermen from re-establishing their livelihoods, planning instead to secure the oceanfront for wealthy tourists. Locals increasingly call the reconstruction effort the “second tsunami.” In New Orleans there are already murmurings of Katrina as “Hurricane Bush.” It is not only in the so-called Third World, we can now see, that one’s chances of surviving a disaster are more than anything dependent on one’s race, ethnicity and social class.

### 2AC – Harms Extension - Disposability

#### The uneven distribution of vulnerability to disaster is a new modality of racialized state terror. It is the ultimate expression of a biopolitics of disposability—certain populations are marked for death. Complicity ensures creeping fascism.

**Giroux 06** (Professor of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, previous professors at BU, Miami U, and Penn State, “Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability”, JSTOR)

Hurricane Katrina may have reversed the self-imposed silence of the media and public numbness in the face of terrible suffering. Fifty years after the body of Emmett Till was plucked out of the mud-filled waters of the Tallahatchie River, another set of troubling visual representations has emerged that both shocked and shamed the nation. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, grotesque images of bloated corpses floating in the rotting waters that flooded the streets of New Orleans circulated throughout the mainstream media. What first appeared to be a natural catastrophe soon degenerated into a social debacle as further images revealed, days after Katrina had passed over the Gulf Coast, hundreds of thousands of poor people, mostly blacks, some Latinos, many elderly, and a few white people, packed into the New Orleans Superdome and the city’s convention center, stranded on rooftops, or isolated on patches of dry highway without any food, water, or any place to wash, urinate, or find relief from the scorching sun.1 Weeks passed as the flood water gradually receded and the military gained control of the city, and more images of dead bodies surfaced in the national and global media. TV cameras rolled as bodies emerged from the flood waters while people stood by indifferently eating their lunch or occasionally snapping a photograph. Most of the bodies found “were 50 or older, people who tried to wait the hurricane out” (Frosch 2005, 1-4). Various media soon reported that over 154 bodies had been found in hospitals and nursing homes. The New York Times wrote that “the collapse of one of soci-ety’s most basic covenants—to care for the helpless—suggests that the elderly and critically ill plummeted to the bottom of priority lists as calamity engulfed New Orleans (Jackson 2005). Dead people, mostly poor African- Americans, left uncollected in the streets, on porches, hospitals, nursing homes, in electric wheelchairs, and in collapsed houses prompted some people to claim that America had become like a “Third World country” while others argued that New Orleans resembled a “Third World Refugee Camp (Brooks 2005, 1-2).There were now, irrefutably, two Gulf crises.The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) tried to do damage control by forbidding journalists to “accompany rescue boats as they went out to search for storm victims.” As a bureau spokeswoman told Reuters News Agency, “We have requested that no photographs of the deceased be made by the media” (Neal 2005). But questions about responsibility and answerability would not go away. Even the dominant media for a short time rose to the occasion of posing tough questions about accountability to those in power in light of such egregious acts of incompetence and indifference. The images of dead bodies kept reappearing in New Orleans, refusing to go away. For many, the bodies of the poor, black, brown, elderly, and sick came to signify what the battered body of Emmett Till once unavoidably revealed, and America was forced to confront these disturbing images and the damning questions behind the images. The Hurricane Katrina disaster, like the Emmett Till affair, revealed a vulnerable and destitute segment of the nations citizenry that conservatives not only refused to see but had spent the better part of two decades demonizing. But like the incessant beating of Poes tell-tale heart, cadavers have a way of insinuating themselves on consciousness, demanding answers to questions that aren’t often asked. The body of Emmett Till symbolized overt white supremacy and state terrorism organized against the threat that black men (apparently of all sizes and ages) posed against white women. But the black bodies of the dead and walking wounded in New Orleans in 2005 revealed a different image of the racial state, a different modality of state terrorism, marked less by an overt form of white racism than by a highly mediated displacement of race as a central concept for understanding both Katrina and its place in the broader history of U.S. racism.2 That is, while Till s body insisted upon a public recognition of the violence of white supremacy, the decaying black bodies floating in the waters of the Gulf Coast represented a return of race against the media and public insistence that this disaster was more about class than race, more about the shameful and growing presence of poverty, “the abject failure to provide aid to the most vulnerable” (Foner 2005, 8).Tills body allowed the racism that destroyed it to be made visible, to speak to the systemic character of American racial injustice. The bodies of the Katrina victims could not speak with the same directness to the state of American racist violence but they did reveal and shatter the conservative fiction of living in a color-blind society. The bodies of the Katrina victims laid bare the racial and class fault lines that mark an increasingly damaged and withering democracy and revealed the emergence of a new kind of politics, one in which entire populations are now considered disposable, an unnecessary burden on state coffers, and consigned to fend for themselves. At the same time, what happened in New Orleans also revealed some frightening signposts of those repressive features in American society, demanding that artists, public intellectuals, scholars, and other cultural workers take seriously what Angela Davis insists “are very clear signs of. . . impending fascist policies and practices,” which not only construct an imaginary social environment for all of those populations rendered disposable but also exemplify a site and space “where democracy has lost its claims” (2005, 122,124).

### 2AC - Solvency Exts - Critical – USFG

#### The federal government is key to disaster preparedness—arguments against infrastructural expansion boil down to sacrificing parts of the population to benefit an elite few. Vote affirmative for politically responsible federal action.

Giroux, 2006 **(**Professor of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, previous professors at BU, Miami U, and Penn State, “Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability”, JSTOR)

In a May 25, 2001 interview, Grover Norquist, head of the right-wing group Americans for Tax Reform, told National Public Radios Mara Liasson: “I don’t want to abolish government. I simply want to reduce it to the size where I can drag it into the bathroom and drown it in the bathtub” (Qtd. in Hertmann 2005). As a radical right-wing activist and practical strategist, Norquist has been enormously instrumental and successful in shaping tax policies designed to “starve the beast,” a metaphor for policies designed to drive up deficits by cutting taxes, especially for the rich, in order to paralyze government and dry up funds for many federal programs that offer protection for children, the elderly, and the poor. Norquist saw his efforts pay off when thousands of people, most of them poor and black, drowned in the basin of New Orleans and upwards of one million were displaced. Under such circumstances, a decades-long official policy of benign neglect became malign neglect, largely rationalized through a market fundamentalism in which the self-interested striving of individuals becomes the cornerstone of both freedom and democracy. This is a politics that wages war against any viable notion of the democratic social. And as Lawrence Grossberg points out, “The free market in neoliberalism is fundamentally an argument against politics, or at least against a politics that attempts to govern society in social rather than economic terms” (117). The neoliberal efforts to shrink big government and public services must be understood both in terms of those who bore the brunt of such efforts in New Orleans and in terms of the subsequent inability of the government to deal adequately with Hurricane Katrina. Reducing the federal governments ability to respond to social problems is a decisive element of neoliberal policymaking, as was echoed in a Wall Street Journal editorial that argued without irony that taxes should be raised for low-income individuals and families, not to make more money available to the federal government for addressing their needs but to rectify the possibility that they “might not be feeling a proper hatred for the government” (Qtd. in Krugman 2002, 31). If the poor can be used as pawns in this logic to further the political attack on big government, it seems reasonable to assume that those in the Bush administration who hold such a position would refrain from using big government as quickly as possible to save the very lives of such groups, as was evident in the aftermath of Katrina. The vilification of the social state and big government—really an attack on non-military aspects of government—has translated into a steep decline of tax revenues, a massive increase in military spending, and the growing immiseration of poor Americans and people of color. Under the Bush administration, Census Bureau figures reveal that “since 1999, the income of the poorest fifth of Americans has dropped 8.7 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars . . . [and in 2005] 1.1 million were added to the 36 million already on the poverty rolls” (Scheer 2005).While the number of Americans living below the poverty line is comparable to the combined populations of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, and Arkansas, the Bush administration chose to make in the 2006 budget $70 billion in new tax cuts for the rich while slashing programs that benefit the least fortunate (Legum et al 2005). Similarly, the projected $2.7 trillion budget for 2007 includes a $4.9 billion reduction in health funds for senior citizens (Medicare) and the State Children s Health Insurance Program; a $17 million cut in aid for child- support enforcement; cutbacks in funds for low-income people with disabil ities; major reductions in child-care and development block grants; major defunding for housing for low-income elderly; and an unprecedented rollback in student aid. In addition, the 2007 budget calls for another $70 billion dollars in tax cuts most beneficial to the rich and provides for a huge increase in military spending for the war in Iraq (Weisman 2006, A10). While President Bush endlessly argues for the economic benefits of his tax cuts, he callously omits the fact that 13 million children are living in poverty in the United States, “4.5 million more than when Bush was first inaugurated” (Scheer 2005). And New Orleans had the third highest rate of children living in poverty in the United States (Legum et al 2005).The illiteracy rate in New Orleans before the flood struck was 40 percent; the embarrassingly ill-equipped public school system was one of the most underfunded in the nation. Nearly 19 percent of Louisiana residents lacked health insurance, putting the state near the bottom for the percentage of people without health insurance. Robert Scheer, a journalist and social critic, estimated that one-third of the 150,000 people living in dire poverty in Louisiana were elderly, left exposed to the flooding in areas most damaged by Katrina (2005). It gets worse. In an ironic twist of fate, one day after Katrina hit New Orleans, the U.S. Census Bureau released two important reports on poverty, indicating that “Mississippi (with a 21.6 percent poverty rate) and Louisiana (19.4 percent) are the nations poorest states, and that New Orleans (with a 23.2 percent poverty rate) is the 12th poorest city in the nation. [Moreover,] New Orleans is not only one of the nation’s poorest cities, but its poor people are among the most concentrated in poverty ghettos. Housing discrimination and the location of government-subsidized housing have contributed to the city’s economic and racial segregation” (Dreier 2005). Under neoliberal capitalism, the attack on politically responsible government has only been matched by an equally harsh attack on social provisions and safety nets for the poor. And in spite of the massive failures of market-driven neoliberal policies—extending from a soaring $420 billion budget deficit to the underfunding of schools, public health, community policing, and environmental protection programs—the reigning right-wing orthodoxy of the Bush administration continues to “give precedence to private financial gain and market determinism over human lives and broad public values” (Greider 2005). The Bush administration’s ideological hostility towards the essential role that government should play in providing social services and crucial infra-structure was particularly devastating for New Orleans in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Prior to 9/11, the Federal Emergency Management Agency listed a hurricane strike on New Orleans as one of the three most likely catastrophic disasters facing America. The Houston Chronicle wrote in December 2001 that “[t]he New Orleans hurricane scenario may be the deadliest of all” (Krugman 2005). And yet the Bush administration consistently denied repeated requests for funds by the New Orleans Army Corps of Engineers. Ignoring such requests, the Bush administration cut the Army Corps’ funding by more than a half-billion dollars in its 2002 budget, leaving unfinished the construction for the levees that eventually burst. And in spite of repeated warnings far in advance by experts that the existing levees could not withstand a Category 4 hurricane, the Bush administration in 2004 rejected the Southeast Louisiana Urban Flood Control Project’s request for $100 million, offering instead a measly $16.5 million. Huge tax cuts for the rich and massive cuts in much-needed programs continued unabated in the Bush administration, all the while putting the lives of thousands of poor people in the Gulf Basin in jeopardy. As David Sirota has reported, this disastrous underfunding of efforts to build the levee infrastructure, coupled with even more tax cuts for the rich and less revenue for the states, continued right up to the time that Hurricane Katrina struck, making it almost impossible for governments in the Gulf region either to protect their citizens from the impact of a major hurricane or to develop the resources necessary for an adequate emergency response plan in the event of a flood.

## 2AC- Solvency Ext – Both

### 2AC – Solvency – Army Corps – AT: Edward’s indicts

#### We will present framework for evaluating evidence – assign their think tank research no weight – it leads to erroneous conclusions and policy failure – this is an independent reason to reject the CP

Yeager 2010 (Holly, Peterson Fellow, Columbia Journalism Review, “Bartlett on Shallow Think Tanks—and How the Press Jumps in Them. The Audit April 20, 2010 www.cjr.org/the\_audit/bartlett\_on\_shallow\_think\_tank.php?page=all)

Think tanks are in Washington’s DNA. But despite their outsized role in our politics and policy debates, the press rarely gives the institutions themselves the scrutiny they deserve. That’s why it’s good to see Bruce Bartlett lift the curtain a bit, with a Forbes piece that declares, “The End Of The Think Tank.”
 We hear the term “think tank” quite often, but it’s doubtful that very many people know what it means. They may not need to because the term is increasingly devoid of meaning. At least in Washington, think tanks are becoming so political that they are more like lobbyists than academic institutions.
 Bartlett, a renegade conservative economist, certainly has a dog in the think tank fight. A domestic policy aide in the Reagan White House and a Treasury Department official during the first Bush administration, he was fired in 2005 from the National Center for Policy Analysis, a conservative Dallas-based think tank, over his criticism of President George W. Bush.
 But Bartlett has also had a front row seat for the growth of Washington’s think tank culture, and the arc he’s tracing applies pretty well to all parts of the political spectrum. It’s also useful that, before he explains their demise, Bartlett provides a smart summary of how think tanks came to claim their place in the capital.
 It all starts with the Brookings Institution, which was “established as a degree-granting graduate school in the 1920s,” but eventually morphed, Bartlett writes, “into the quintessential think tank, a sort of university without students; all research, no teaching.”
 The American Enterprise Institute came next, a conservative counterpart to the “moderately liberal perspective” at Brookings. And this is when the story gets really interesting. As the appetite for conservative ideas started to increase in the 1970s, so did frustration with what Bartlett calls “the slow, plodding style of AEI and Brookings, which tended to publish their research in books that often took years to complete.” Enter Ed Feulner, a Republican staffer on the Hill.
 From Feulner’s vision the Heritage Foundation was established in 1973. Rather than fill its staff with aging Ph.D.s, he hired people with master’s degrees who had perhaps studied with the small number of conservatives in academia. Their job wasn’t to do original research, but to take the research that had already been done by conservative academics, summarize it and apply it to the specific legislative issues Congress was considering. Instead of writing books of several hundred pages, Heritage studies were typically 10 pages or less.
 Bartlett’s experience in the trenches really pays off for readers when he describes the massive Xerox machine in the basement of Heritage, where he worked in the 1980s.
 Often, Heritage staffers would grab handfuls of studies as they came out of the machine and literally run to the House or Senate to start distributing them. I know there were occasions when I wrote a quick one-pager on some hot topic and it was in congressional offices the same day. In the Internet era we take such speed for granted, but in the 1970s and 1980s Heritage was operating at light speed, while AEI and Brookings were still using horses and buggies, so to speak.
 The need for speed still exists. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the liberal-leaning-but-very-serious think tank, entered the fray last week with a new blog, promising “sharp and timely commentary” on the issues of the day.
 Back in the 90s, the competition caught up with Heritage, and, as Bartlett explains it, “The increasing impact of think tanks brought in new money as corporations realized that think tank studies were highly effective ways of influencing legislation. They had a certain cachet that had more impact than the same document would have if produced by a lobbying or public relations shop.”
 The new money, usually in the form of tax-exempt contributions, he writes, came with “increased donor pressure to produce bottom line results—getting bills passed or defeated—and had a corrupting effect on the think tanks,” which moved ever closer to politics.
 This is where Bartlett starts to call the end.
 It’s one thing to promise a donor some research that would be produced and distributed much faster than could be done by a university professor, the traditional producers of serious policy research—but it was quite another to promise the sort of immediate impact on legislation that a congressman or senator could offer. The result was even more pressure on think tanks to work with congressional offices and coordinate their activities. Now every Washington think tank has congressional liaisons on their staff.
 There’s lots more good stuff here, about Hill offices coming to rely on think tanks, Heritage’s new explicitly political arm (Bartlett doesn’t mention it, but the liberal Center for American Progress has made a similar move), and pressure on think tankers to avoid criticism of their political allies.
 No need to point that out to David Frum, the former Bush speechwriter who lost his job at AEI last month after criticizing the GOP’s strategy on healthcare—a nice reminder of that earlier conservative dissatisfaction with AEI that led to the creation of Heritage.
 And it’s hard to overstate how central think thanks have become to Washington, and the press. Just look at this National Journal story, based on a Brookings study:
 The five largest banks have a stranglehold on trading in credit default swaps, a type of security that was at the center of the financial crisis, and those banks will be able to foil congressional reform plans unless the government takes antitrust action, according to a new report.
 Doesn’t that sound like the kind of gravity usually reserved for a final report from some sort of government-appointed special commission?
 Mark Thoma, a University of Oregon economics professor and blogger, weighed in strongly on Bartlett’s side of the think tank argument, lamenting the damage done to economics by the “blurring of lines between academic research and think tank research—some of which is simply not honest—that has made it appear that there are divisions within the profession that simply do not exist, or that there is stronger support for some ideas than actually exists.”
 But Thoma also pointed the finger at the press:
 The main problem, I think, is the he said - she said presentation of academic work in the media alongside the papers that think tanks put out as though there is an equivalence (or a similarly structured debate on, say, CNN). Much of the think tank work (but not all) is junk and no such equivalence exists, but the work is often given equal footing in the press. One of the reasons I started this blog was the frustration of hearing what economists “believe” (e.g. “tax cuts pay for themselves”), when those beliefs were anything but widely held. But you wouldn’t know that reading the paper or watching the news.
 We’re obviously not fans of the he-said/she-said form, and it’s nice to see Bartlett pick up the media critique in a subsequent post:
 One consequence of Heritage’s breakthrough in developing short, readable, time-sensitive policy analyses is that they were just as useful to the media as they were on Capitol Hill. Reporters had the same need for predigested studies written in plain English, as opposed to the sorts of books written in academese that were the stock-in-trade of traditional think tanks like Brookings.
 Conservatives also realized that putting out a study saying the exact opposite of a liberal study was sufficient to muddy the water and prevent a reporter from drawing a clear conclusion from the liberal study. It didn’t matter that the liberal study was done by a preeminent scholar in the field and the conservative study was done by a glorified intern. All that mattered is that they came to opposite conclusions, thus leading to on-the-one-hand/on-the-other-hand stories that everyone hates but the media won’t stop writing.
 Bartlett’s analysis of think tanks past and present is an important one, and shows that there’s plenty more to be written about these Washington institutions. In the meantime, it’s a good idea for the press to pause a sec, and give those studies and reports a second thought before diving in the tank.

#### Now, here come the author-specific indicts

#### First – Reject Edwards – he’s a neocon hack

**Daniel, 11** (Jim Daniel, Las Vegas Review Journal, “Washing does just fine on infrastructure” Nov. 2, 2011, Online @ http://www.lvrj.com/opinion/washington-does-just-fine-on-infrastructure-133058883.html)

In his Sunday opinion essay, the Cato Institutes's Chris Edwards railed against federal infrastructure spending. That's no surprise. His piece, however, was so full of misinformation and innuendo that some response is needed. Mr. Edwards says states and private industry do a better job. Yet he omits mention of the locally built Hell Hole Dam failure in California. He implies only federal blame for the San Joaquin's Kesterson Reservoir toxicity, which is directly tied not just to the federal government, but also to the California State Water Plan and myriad local irrigation districts. The Yuma desalination plant fulfills an international treaty obligation with Mexico made necessary by the state-negotiated Colorado River Compact. Private toll roads in Virginia provide a mechanism whereby corporations can push costs onto the working class instead of contributing their share -- corporations don't pay tolls, commuting workers do. Levee failure in New Orleans was primarily caused by decades-long lack of maintenance by local levee districts after turnover from the Army Corps of Engineers. No, all projects aren't perfect, but Mr. Edwards' piece is misleading, if not just wrong.

#### Second – Edwards is straight up wrong – he ignores empirical successes – abolishing the fed fails because local actors still succumb to special interests – the CP links to any internal net benefit

**London, 11** (Paul A. London, former deputy undersecretary of commerce for economics and statistics from 1993 to 1997, “The case for a large, federal public works program” October 29 2011, Online @ http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-case-for-a-large-federal-public-works-program/2011/10/25/gIQAFQ1NTM\_story.html)

Chris Edwards of the Cato Institute says that federal infrastructure spending hurts more than it helps [“A jobs plan we shouldn’t bank on,” Outlook, Oct. 23]. Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay, Dwight Eisenhower and other builders of America must be turning over in their graves. Mr. Edwards cites problematic infrastructure projects of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Aviation Administration. Fair enough. He does not mention successes, however, such as the federal highway system, the canals, the harbors, the much-loved Tennessee Valley Authority and western dams, the Internet, and the land grant colleges that over 200 years have created opportunities for millions of Americans. Many of the most costly and “anti-free market” messes related to U.S. infrastructure are the result of uncoordinated and inconsistent state approaches to the electric grid, telecommunications and natural gas distribution. Mr. Edwards’s call for a bigger state role ignores this and the closely related fact that interest group domination at the state level is far greater than interest group power in Washington. The United States needs a large, federal public works program to modernize our second-rate infrastructure, improve productivity and create jobs. A big infrastructure bank mobilizing private and public money seems to have the best chance. There is plenty of room for the public-private partnerships and incentives for better management in such a federal program, but Mr. Edwards’s critique of federal infrastructure investment is profoundly ideological and ahistorical.

#### Third, Reject any evidence from the CATO Institute: it is admittedly ideological and dedicated to undermining the state at any instance.

Gary Weiss 2012 (investigative journalist, columnist and author Ayn Randroids and Libertarians Join Forces: Will Her Noxious Philosophy Further Infect America? http://www.alternet.org/story/156231/ayn\_randroids\_and\_libertarians\_join\_forces%3A\_will\_her\_noxious\_philosophy\_further\_infect\_america)

Ayn Rand is a toxic figure to many people in America today, even on the right. Look how Paul Ryan, chairman of the House Budget Committee, backpedaled [4]furiously (and unconvincingly) to deny that he was an acolyte of the Russian-born novelist. Though her extremist, atheistic vision of laissez-faire capitalism has gained traction from the Heartland to the intelligentsia, she remains a controversial figure. That's why this recent bit of news is so startling: John Allison, a former bank CEO and a leader of the Rand movement, has just become president of the Cato Institute, the oldest and most influential libertarian think tank. This received only a modest amount of attention when it surfaced late last month, and you had to be a real political junkie to even be aware of it. But it is a seminal event in recent political history—a dramatic indication of the mainstreaming of the radical right. What it means is that the Rand movement, which was little more than a cult when the Atlas Shrugged author died thirty years ago, has effectively merged with the vastly larger libertarian movement. While many differences are likely to remain—particularly as far as Ron Paul’s fading candidacy is concerned, given the Randers' support for abortion and opposition to his foreign policy views —this means that Objectivism, Rand’s quasi-religious philosophy, is going to permeate the political process more than ever before. Allison, former CEO of North Carolina’s BB&T Bank, is not just going to be the Cato Institute’s sugar daddy. He replaces Ed Crane as president, meaning that he will have day-to-day control over the most significant libertarian organization in the country. Allison is a board member of the Ayn Rand Institute, the orthodox, no-compromise Randian organization, and is best known for his foundation donating free Rand books to thousands of schoolchildren across the nation—a crass exploitation of the fiscal troubles besetting primary schools. Ayn Rand hated libertarians, so it would be easy to suggest that Rand would be rolling over in her grave at this news. But I don’t think so. I think she’d exult at the news, because it means that the Randers have effectively gained control over what had once been the “enemy.” Rand despised others on the right who didn’t march in lockstep with her extremist brand of no-government capitalism, laced as it was (and is) with strident atheism and rejection of humanist and Western values. Her most bitter enemy was the pious Catholic William F. Buckley Jr. She sneered at the John Birch Society for failing to promote capitalism with sufficient aggressiveness, and was contemptuous toward Barry Goldwater (even though she endorsed him). But she reserved some of her most heated invective for libertarians. In 1971, she wrote in her newsletter: “I disapprove of, disagree with and have no connection with, the latest aberration of some conservatives, the so-called ‘hippies of the right’ who attempt to snare the younger or more careless ones of my readers by claiming simultaneously to be followers of my philosophy and advocates of anarchism.” The libertarian economist Murray Rothbard , once a Rand acolyte, became a fierce critic of Rand, and the antagonism toward Rothbard lingers today among Randians, 17 years after Rothbard’s death. But as far as the Rand movement is concerned, the libertarians have reformed in a serious way since then. The reason for that boils down to one factor: foreign policy. Rand herself was very much an isolationist during the 1930s, and opposed U.S. entry into World War II. You can always tell a Randian True Believer because he or she will always agree with Rand on that, or at least not disagree, and Allison passed that test with flying colors when I interviewed him for Ayn Rand Nation. Allison explained to me that Rand argued that if we hadn’t entered the war, “the Germans and Russians would have killed each other off, and we would have been better off. Which is possible.” “That goes back to this premise that we’ve all been told that being in World War II was a good thing,” he continued. “I’m not sure we shouldn’t have gotten in World War II but I think her argument is a very—you know, would these bad guys have killed each other off?” “And the answer is, they might have,” he said. He chuckled at the prospect. Allison was careful not to contradict Rand on that point. “It’s hard to know if it’s true or not,” he said.”We helped the Russians a lot, and set ourselves up for a lot of cost and risk after World War II.” True, Germany declared war on the U.S., but “she would argue that we helped set up Pearl Harbor by how we treated the Japanese.” Such controversial views were as much a part of the Rand persona as her foreign policy transformation late in life, in which she became a strong supporter of Israel. Many libertarians agree with her on Israel—but not the Libertarian Party and Ron Paul. When I interviewed Yaron Brook, president of the Ayn Rand Institute, he described Paul and the Libertarian Party as “anti-American” in their foreign policy views. But Brook made it clear to me that he felt that the libertarians in general had changed significantly, and for the better, since the old days. Allison can be expected to bring Randers into key positions at Cato, and I expect that his formidable financial resources will also brought to bear on behalf of the think tank. True, he’s not anywhere near as wealthy as the Koch brothers, and I am sure the left will be rejoicing at departure of the Kochs. Don’t be. Allison is more than just a deep pockets. He is a committed ideologue who is Randian to the core, even sharing her atheism. He understands that the fight over capitalism is at bottom a moral fight, between the Rand vision of morality, which embraces greed and selfishness, and the opposing view held by most Americans. In a statement to Forbes, [5] Alison made it clear that he’s seeking just that kind of ideological battle. “One of the things that I really want to do is make this a moral fight instead of a fight around the technical aspects of economics. The libertarian vision is a moral vision and we own the moral high ground. A free society is the only society in which people can think for themselves and pursue their rational self-interest.” Randers have been seeking for years not just to defend laissez-faire capitalism, but to make the rest of us embrace it—to fall in love with the Randian Big Brother, a world in which corporations of limitless size would run roughshod over the rest of society, restrained only by their “rational self-interest” (a favorite Randian catchphrase which Allison faithfully parroted). In other worse, restrained by nothing. Although CATO is poles apart from the religious right, its alliance with a stone-cold atheistic movement, one that embraces the right to abortion, is a serious potential irritant.

### AT: Data Cooking

#### Fiat solves – it’s a question of not putting enough resources into studies

Remington, 2 **–** civil engineer (Roger, “Estimation Process Misunderstood:  Discussion of Bent Flyvbjerg and others, Underestimating Costs in Public Works Projects: Error or Lie?”, :Journal of the American Planning Association 68 no4 451 Aut 2002, Ebsco)

 I believe more needs to be asked of the consultants, forecasters, and advisors (to the clients, promoters, and government departments), as it is generally they who seek to encourage acceptance of their estimates, which are often unrealistic given the level of detail available at the crucial early decision points in the life of a project. Clients need to realise that it costs money to gather the detailed information required for more accurate forecasts. And what promoter or client is prepared to spend money for something which may never be constructed, particularly when the cost of obtaining the information is likely to be significant? The problem of poor estimates and the need to be involved in the key estimating and pricing decision processes was recognised in the UK in the late 1980s, particularly by some water utility clients. The need for certainty of cost and time for construction projects as new EEC quality standards were introduced led to a number of new contracting practices, in particular the use of Target Cost contracting, where close cooperation with the contractors improved outturn costs and the completion of projects on time. Unfortunately, such new concepts have not been readily understood, particularly by advisors who are loathe to involve their clients in any form of risk sharing, although providing poor or low estimates, as the article indicates, is the greatest risk the client takes, and usually without knowing it until too late.

#### Independent Army Corps evaluations solve data cooking

Blair 2009 (Daniel, Principal Deputy Assistant Inspector General, Defense Business Operations, Department of Defense, “U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Data Quality Review Process for Civil Works Programs”, http://www.recovery.gov/Accountability/inspectors/Documents/MEMORANDUM%20NO%20%20%20D-2010-RAM-001compliant.pdf, Hemanth)

Data Quality Review Headquarters, USACE, has developed and provided its subordinate organizations with a process to assist in performing limited data quality reviews of reports filed by recipients on www.FederalReporting.gov. USACE had access to reports filed by recipients beginning October 11, 2009. On October 14, 2009, and again on October 19, 2009, Headquarters, USACE, issued instructions on the use of a data validation tool developed to assist contracting personnel in reviewing and validating data reported by contractors. The tool compared contract data from the Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation to data reported by recipients on www.FederalReporting.gov. The tool generated reports that identified contract recipients that had not registered, recipients that had not filed a report on a contract award, and discrepancies in selected contract data elements reported in the two systems. The instructions stated that the validation tool was to complement, not to replace, the review of individual recipient reports. To conduct quality reviews of data reported by grant and PPA recipients, Headquarters, USACE, gave its subordinate organizations a spreadsheet showing data reported to www.FederalReporting.gov so that they could manually compare grants and PPAs.

#### Even if the Corps Fudged Data in the Past, Multiple Recent Acts and Requirements Prevent that From Happening Again

**GAO, 12** (“ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS Peer Review Process for Civil Works Project Studies Can Be Improved” March 2012 http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/589133.pdf Humza)

Through its civil works program, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) constructs, operates, and maintains thousands of civil works projects related to water resources across the United States. 1 These projects aim to provide safe and reliable waterways; reduce risk to people, homes, and communities from flooding and coastal storms; restore and protect the environment; and address water resources challenges. A Corps civil works project generally starts with a study of a water resources issue and the development of various alternatives to address it. Such studies can span the full range of Corps civil works projects, and can include those that are small and low impact and others that are large and complex, with potentially significant economic and environmental impacts. Through its civil works program, the Corps operates 50 centers of expertise and seven research laboratories that assist its eight divisions and 38 district offices in the planning, design, and technical review of civil works projects. 2 Through its civil works projects, the Corps provides vital public engineering services in peace and war to strengthen the nation’s security, Six of these centers are focused on the quality and effectiveness of water resources planning and are referred to as “planning centers of expertise.” energize the economy, and reduce risks from disasters. These projects involve navigation and flood control activities, environmental restoration, and emergency response—most recently including emergency response to Missouri River flooding and rebuilding after Hurricane Katrina. Technical errors in past studies of Corps projects, however, had raised concerns about the effectiveness of the Corps’ internal review processes and the quality of the studies that the Corps used as a basis for its civil works projects. 3 For example, in March 2006, we reported that certain studies completed by the Corps from 1992 through 2002 were fraught with errors, mistakes, and miscalculations and used invalid assumptions and outdated data. 4 In the wake of these reports, Congress passed section 2034 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007, which requires that studies for certain Corps projects undergo independent peer review. We also reported that these Corps studies understated costs, overstated benefits, and did not provide a reasonable basis for decision making. Similar findings have been documented in reviews by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and other organizations, which concluded that the Corps’ review processes needed to be strengthened. 5 To conduct such peer review, the Corps hires a contractor to select a panel of independent experts, who assess the adequacy and acceptability of the economic, engineering, and environmental methods, models, and analyses used in a Corps’ project study. Upon completion of the peer review, the Corps is to consider recommendations from the review before making a final decision on the project. 6

### 2AC - Solvency – Ocean Policy

#### Oceans Resilience Key

The Toronto Star, May 7, 2014 [p.lexis, SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A1]

Climate change, no longer a distant worry, now "threatens human health and well-being," U.S. scientists warn in a new, comprehensive report released Tuesday.

Climatologists in Canada caution the impacts are the same here.

"Climate change threatens human health and well-being in many ways, including through more extreme weather events and wildfire, decreased air quality, and diseases transmitted by insects, food, and water," says the more than 800-page report without mincing any words.

The National Climate Assessment, compiled by 300 experts south of the border, deals specifically with the impact on the U.S. and was formally released by the White House.

But the climate system doesn't know the 49th parallel, said Andrew Weaver, a Green Party MLA in British Columbia and Lansdowne professor at the School of Earth and Ocean Sciences at the University of Victoria.

Most of the Canadian population lives within 100 miles of the U.S. border, Weaver pointed out.

"You can look at what is being said for the northwest region, the great plains region, the Midwest region and the northeast region and extend it 100 miles and you get pretty close to what is happening where all the Canadian population lives."

Every part of the report can easily be applied to Canada, said John Smol, a researcher on environmental change at Queen's University in Kingston, Ont., adding that "in some cases, the impact (of climate change) will be amplified."

Three oceans - the Pacific, the Arctic and the Atlantic - envelop Canada, he said. "Sea-level rise will impact those who live near the coast and ocean acidification will severely affect food supply."

The report examines the impact of climate change by regions and states but singles out sea-level rise, especially in Miami, drought and wildfires in the southwest, and heavy downpours as major threats confronting Americans today. Some changes are already having a significant impact on food production and public health, the report noted.

It also warns that unless dependence on fossil fuels is drastically cut, things could get out of control.

In many ways, this report echoes the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the UN-sponsored climate panel. U.S. scientists said that the climate is changing in the United States, and the warming of the past five decades is chiefly due to the emissions of heat-trapping gases released by human beings.

The findings of the report should prompt us to cut emissions, and to plan for the future consequences of climate change, said Smol.

## 2AC - Topicality

### The Resolution

#### RESOLVED: THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE ITS NON-MILITARY EXPLORATION AND/OR DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARTH’S OCEANS.

### 2AC T – Substantial

#### Counter-interpretation – substantial is in the main, to a large extent – that’s Merriam Webster

#### Numerical definitions of the word “substantial” are bad…

#### First – ground – none of their links are based on increases of x percentage – our interpretation ensures ground because it assumes how authors qualify link evidence

#### Second – arbitrary – multiple authors using the word “substantial” proves there can be no single value assigned to the word in the context of the resolution

#### Third – Percentage Definitions of Substantial are Bad

Leo, 2k8 (Kevin Leo J.D. Candidate, Spring 2008, Hastings College of the Law. Hastings Business Law Journal Spring, 2008 4 Hastings Bus. L.J. 297 LEXIS)In contrast, the court in Haswell v. United States held that spending over sixteen percent of an organization's time on lobbying was substantial. n83 The court found that applying a strict percentage test to determine whether activities are substantial would be inappropriate, since[\*308]  such a test "obscures the complexity of balancing the organization's activities in relation to its objectives and circumstances in the context of the totality of the organization."." n84

#### Fourth. Infinitely regressive – allows them to change their interpretation by one percent to exclude the 1ac – creates a race to the bottom and arbitrarily over limits the topic

#### Other words check – plan is still a net increase in infrastructure investment and will not spike your links

#### Competing interpretations bad – causes race to bottom – default to reasonability based on literature basis

#### “Substantial Investment” is at Least 20%

**Foreign Subsidiary Tax Equity Act 89** “H.R.2489 -- Foreign Subsidiary Tax Equity Act (Introduced in House - IH)”, 5-24, http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c101:H.R.2489.IH:

SEC. 2. INCOME FROM RUNAWAY PLANTS OR FROM MANUFACTURING OPERATIONS LOCATED IN A COUNTRY WHICH PROVIDES A TAX HOLIDAY INCLUDED IN SUBPART F INCOME. (a) FOREIGN BASE COMPANY MANUFACTURING RELATED INCOME ADDED TO CURRENTLY TAXED AMOUNTS- Subsection (a) of section 954 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining foreign base company income) is amended by striking `and' at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting `, and', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph: `(6) the foreign base company manufacturing related income for the taxable year (determined under subsection (h) and reduced as provided in subsection (b)(5)).' (b) DEFINITION OF FOREIGN BASE COMPANY MANUFACTURING RELATED INCOME- Section 954 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection: `(h) FOREIGN BASE COMPANY MANUFACTURING RELATED INCOME`(1) IN GENERAL- For purposes of this section, the term `foreign base company manufacturing related income' means income (whether in the form of profits, commissions, fees, or otherwise) derived in connection with the manufacture for or sale to any person of personal property by the controlled foreign corporation where the property sold was manufactured by the controlled foreign corporation in any country other than the United States if such property or any component of such property was manufactured-`(A) in a tax holiday plant, or `(B) in a runaway plant. `(2) OTHER DEFINITIONS; SPECIAL RULES- For purposes of this subsection-`(A) TAX HOLIDAY PLANT DEFINED- The term `tax holiday plant' means any facility-`(i) operated by the controlled foreign corporation in connection with the manufacture of personal property, and `(ii) with respect to which any economic benefit under any tax law of the country in which such facility is located accrued-`(I) to such corporation, `(II) for the purpose of providing an incentive to such corporation to establish, maintain, or expand such facility, and `(III) for the taxable year of such corporation during which the personal property referred to in paragraph (1) was manufactured. `(B) RUNAWAY PLANT DEFINED- The term `runaway plant' means any facility-`(i) for the manufacture of personal property of which not less than 10 percent is used, consumed, or otherwise disposed of in the United States, and `(ii) which is established or maintained by the controlled foreign corporation in a country in which the effective tax rate imposed by such country on the corporation is less than 90 percent of the effective tax rate which would be imposed on such corporation under this title. `(C) ECONOMIC BENEFIT UNDER ANY TAX LAW DEFINED- The term `economic benefit under any tax law' includes-`(i) any exclusion or deduction of any amount from gross income derived in connection with-`(I) the operation of any manufacturing facility, or `(II) the manufacture or sale of any personal property, which would otherwise be subject to tax under the law of such country; `(ii) any reduction in the rate of any tax which would otherwise be imposed under the laws of such country with respect to any facility or property referred to in clause (i) (including any ad valorem tax or excise tax with respect to such property); `(iii) any credit against any tax which would otherwise be assessed against any such facility or property or any income derived in connection with the operation of any such facility or the manufacture or sale of any such property; and `(iv) any abatement of any amount of tax otherwise due and any other reduction in the actual amount of tax paid to such country. `(D) MANUFACTURE DEFINED- The term `manufacture' or `manufacturing' includes any production, processing, assembling, or finishing of any personal property or any component of property not yet assembled and any packaging, handling, or other activity incidental to the shipment or delivery of such property to any buyer. `(E) CORPORATION INCLUDES ANY RELATED PERSON- The term `controlled foreign corporation' includes any related person with respect to such corporation. `(F) SPECIAL RULE FOR DETERMINING WHICH TAXABLE YEAR AN ECONOMIC BENEFIT WAS OBTAINED- An economic benefit under any tax law shall be treated as having accrued in the taxable year of the controlled foreign corporation in which such corporation actually obtained the benefit, notwithstanding the fact that such benefit may have been allowable for any preceding or succeeding taxable year and was carried forward or back, for any reason, to the taxable year. `(3) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (1) IN CERTAIN CASES- For purposes of this section-`(A) IN GENERAL- The term `foreign base company manufacturing related income' shall not include any income of a controlled foreign corporation from the manufacture or sale of personal property if-`(i) such corporation is not a corporation significantly engaged in manufacturing, `(ii) the investment in the expansion of an existing facility which gave rise to a tax holiday for such facility was not a substantial investment, or `(iii) the personal property was used, consumed, or otherwise disposed of in the country in which such property was manufactured. `(B) CORPORATION SIGNIFICANTLY ENGAGED IN MANUFACTURING DEFINED`(i) GENERAL RULE- A corporation shall be deemed to be significantly engaged in manufacturing if the value of real property and other capital assets owned or controlled by the corporation and dedicated to manufacturing operations is more than 10 percent of the total value of all real property and other capital assets owned or controlled by such corporation. `(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR ASSESSING PROPERTY VALUE- The value of any property owned by the corporation is the basis of such corporation in such property. The basis of the corporation in any property which was acquired other than by purchase shall be the fair market value of such property at the time of such acquisition. Any property controlled but not owned by such corporation under any lease (or any other instrument which gives such corporation any right of use or occupancy with respect to such property) shall be treated as property acquired other than by purchase in the manner provided in the preceding sentence. `(C) **SUBSTANTIAL INVESTMENT DEFINED- The term `substantial investment' means any amount which-**`(i) was added to the capital account for an existing facility during the 3-year period ending on the last day of any taxable year with respect to which such facility is a tax holiday plant, and `(ii) **caused the sum of all amounts added to such account** during such period **to** exceed 20 percent **of the total value of such facility** (determined in the manner provided in subparagraph (B)(ii)) on the first day of such period.'

#### That Means the Plan Must Spend 9 Billion Dollars –

#### We Meet – extend our inherency that indicates the bill is being held up because of substantial budgetary concerns

#### Prefer Our Definition of the Word Substantial – It Comes from the Government with the Intent to Define – That’s Key to Predictability on a Domestic Topic

#### Potential Abuse is Not a Voter – Not Quantifiable and Does Not Set a Precedent

### 2AC – T - “Development”

#### 1st – We meet – plan develops ecosystem protections in the oceans that protect against climate change – that’s \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ from the 1ac.

#### 2. Counter-interpretation

#### “Development” in the context of infrastructure means the following

**National Infrastructure Development Bank Act 11** H.R. 402 http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/F?c112:1:./temp/~c112StL2nY:e4739:

(10) DEVELOPMENT- The terms `development' and `develop' mean, with respect to an infrastructure project, any-- (A) preconstruction planning, feasibility review, permitting, design work, and other preconstruction activities; and (B) construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, replacement, or expansion.

#### Which we meet because we create infrastructure for climate resiliency – that’s \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ from 1AC

#### Prefer it – our interpretation is from the federal government –which is most predictable on this topic – predictability is a prerequisite to limits and ground based arguments because you have to know what you’re debating before you can debate it – we have the most precise definition

#### Extra T inevitable – every aff will inevitably do something outside of the bounds of the resolution, and this increases negative ground by increased links to disads and competition to CPs

#### Functional limits check – there are only so many transportation programs – and, sustainable advantage areas prevent topic explosion – also, the aff has to be prepared to defeat states CP

#### Potential abuse is not a voting issue—there’s no bright-line and it’s impossible to quantify

#### Prefer reasonability – competing interpretation cause a race to the bottom – their interpretation artificially excludes mass transit and rail systems affs which are clearly topical on a transportation topic

### 2AC Framework

#### We meet – the aff is a policy action and all of our advantages are based on plan action and nothing else – our solvency advocates defend transportation infrastructure investment in the form of mass transit

#### However, affirmatives are responsible for their discourse and the desirability of the plan

**Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary, 1996** (dictionary.com)

Resolved means “To determineor decidein purpose; **to** make ready in mind; to fix;to settle; as, he **[or she]** was resolved by an unexpected event,**”**

#### Prefer it---

#### Increases ground--- Defending discourse increases negative K ground and counter-advocacies and is the most immediately relevant education on timeframe because we can control how we speak about the world well before we can implement policy

#### Solves switch-side debate: they still get any claims as to why the substance of our topical plan is bad, including mass transit bad, neoliberalism good, urban politics bad, energy disads, and state-oriented politics bad.

#### No in-round abuse –we don’t spike any of your links

#### Potential abuse is not a voting issue – there’s no bright-line and it’s impossible to quantify

#### Effective democratic deliberation about environmental justice is critical to community participation

**Sanchez 8** [Thomas W. Sanchez, Ph.D Environmental Studies, “An Equity Analysis of Transportation Funding”, http://urbanhabitat.org/node/2812, Fall 2008] SV

Decisions about community and regional development are most successful within a democratic framework. Effective outcomes are achieved when those participating have “a full awareness of their interests and have sufficient power to assure representativeness and equity in outcomes.”[1] However, in order to express those desires and preferences in a meaningful way, the public must be provided with the capacity to participate. A crucial component of any democratized planning process is the demystification of the decision-making process and transparency in communication of alternatives to and consequences of proposed policies.

### 2AC T Should = Past Tense of Shall

#### C/I – Should means desirable or recommended

**Words & Phrases 2** (“Words and Phrases: Permanent Edition” Vol. 39 Set to Signed. Pub. By Thomson West. P. 372-373)

Or. 1952. Where safety regulation for sawmill industry providing that a two by two inch guard rail should be installed at extreme outer edge of walkways adjacent to sorting tables was immediately preceded by other regulations in which word “shall” instead of “should” was used, and word “should” did not appear to be result of inadvertent use in particular regulation, use of word “should” was intended to convey idea that particular precaution involved was desirable and recommended, but not mandatory. ORS 654.005 et seq.----Baldassarre v. West Oregon Lumber Co., 239 P.2d 839, 193 Or. 556.---Labor & Emp. 2857

#### Prefer it---

#### Aff ground---there is a large negative literature base, and they read specific strategies – destroys aff innovation and flexibility killing critical thinking and it disincentives participation

#### Intent to define---dictionary definitions solve predictability

#### Limits---past is more infinite than the future

#### Functional limits check --- there are only so many transportation programs --- and, sustainable advantage areas prevent topic explosion --- also, the aff has to be prepared to defeat states CP

#### Potential abuse is not a voting issue—there’s no bright-line and it’s impossible to quantify

#### Other Words Check – We Still Defend a Substantial Increase in Investment and Will Not Spike Your Links Based on Implementation

#### Prefer reasonability—the community voted for the transportation topic and competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and kills topic specific education

### 1AR T Should = Past Tense of Shall – AT Grammar

#### 1. We have a grammatical interpretation – arguing what is technically more consistent is irrelevant – formal grammar is rarely used and every day ungrammatical constructions prove it doesn’t spiral into the destruction of all meaning

#### 2. Massive fairness issues supersede – a mangled but fair resolution would probably produce some good debates – people will find ways to stop the slide into ungrammatical hell but an interpretation the structurally wires in unfairness like theirs inherently precludes the possibility of good debates

#### 3. You are not grammatical – traditional rules governing should have been abandoned – it is just used for future obligation

**American Heritage Dictionary 2k** (4th Edition, p. 1612)

Usage Note Like the rules governing the use of shall and will on which they are based, the traditional rules governing the use of should and would are largely ignored in modern American practice. Either should or would can now be used in the first person to express conditional futurity: If I had known that, I would (or somewhat more formally, should) have answered differently. But in the second and third persons only would is used: If he had known that, he would (not should) have answered differently. Would cannot always be substituted for should, however. Should is used in all three persons in a conditional clause: if I (or you or he) should decide to go. Should is also used in all three persons to express duty or obligation (the equivalent of ought to): I (or you or he) should go. On the other hand, would is used to express volition or promise: I agreed that I would do it. Either would or should is possible as an auxiliary with like, be inclined, be glad, prefer, and related verbs: I would (or should) like to call your attention to an oversight. Here would was acceptable on all levels to a large majority of the Usage Panel in an earlier survey and is more common in American usage than should. Should have is sometimes incorrectly written should of by writers who have mistaken the source of the spoken contraction should’ve.

#### 4. This straight up makes no sense – if the resolution was a past-tense it would have said “should have” – they should have to come up with a coherent recognizable sentence using should in the context they talk about before you accept this interpretation

### 2AC T Its

#### We meet---USFG has the Army Corps of engineers build and maintain the resiliency programs – it would continue to belong to the USFG

#### C/I---Its means associated with---that’s Oxford Dictionaries Online, No Date

#### Prefer it---

#### Aff ground---there is a large negative literature base, and they read specific strategies – destroys aff innovation and flexibility killing critical thinking and it disincentives participation

#### Intent to define---dictionary definitions solve predictability

#### Functional limits check --- there are only so many transportation programs --- and, sustainable advantage areas prevent topic explosion --- also, the aff has to be prepared to defeat states CP

#### Potential abuse is not a voting issue—there’s no bright-line and it’s impossible to quantify

#### Other Words Check – We Still Defend a Substantial Increase in Investment and Will Not Spike Your Links Based on Implementation

#### Prefer reasonability—the community voted for the transportation topic and competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and kills topic specific education

### 2AC Vagueness

#### Specification is bad

#### Infinitely regressive—justifies specification on any part of the topic—destroys predictability

#### Aff ground—PICs moot the entire 1AC and force the 2AC to fight an uphill battle---we defend the plan for the purposes of disads not CP

#### Education—puts the debate on the project every round—destroys topic specific education

#### Limits—multiplies the number of affs and forces the neg to have specific strategies

#### No specification increases ground---you can read a DA to any part of transportation and we are forced to defend it

#### Vagueness is real world and strategic

Plautz, 10 (9/22/2010, Jason, Environment & Energy Daily, “DEVELOPMENT; Backers say infrastructure bank wouldn't repeat Fannie, Freddie mess,” Factiva, JMP)

"Americans have always been builders," Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) testified at the hearing. "But for too long, we have lacked adequate investments in our infrastructure and what building we have done has been without a long-term strategic plan. A national infrastructure bank will change that. A national infrastructure bank will make Americans builders again."

The plans put out by the administration were vague -- deliberately so, according to Roy Kienitz, undersecretary for policy at the Department of Transportation. He said that given DOT's involvement, many of the projects funded would likely be transportation related, ranging from high-speed rail to bridge construction. But other witnesses said the funding could be expanded to fund initiatives like expansion of broadband Internet or upgrading the electric grid. The latter statements helped ease the concerns of some senators from rural states, who worried that the NIB would only go to roads in busy urban areas. Sen. Jon Tester (D) said his home state of Montana probably would not see a lot of infrastructure investment, though Kienitz noted that every state would benefit from, say, cheaper goods on a better freight line.

#### Potential abuse is not a voting issue—there’s no bright-line and it’s impossible to quantify

#### Prefer reasonability—the community voted for the transportation topic and competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and kills topic specific education

### 2AC Plan Flaw

#### 1. Reasonability- our text is reasonably understandable, basically no impact.

#### 2. Not real world- real world policies are checked through by other branches, and are pages and pages long- our 1 line plan text just represents that, its not the final version. The only way they can get links to disads is if we assume all proper plan mechanisms meaning our interp is key to neg ground.

#### 3.CX checks abuse (obvious warrants)

**4. the entire 1AC determines intent – we read specific authors that say the plan would include \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ which provides predictable ground and fair debate.**

### 2AC ASPEC

#### ASPEC is bad

#### Infinitely regressive—justifies specification on any part of the topic—destroys predictability

#### Aff ground—agent CPs moot the entire 1AC and force the 2AC: to fight an uphill battle

#### Education—puts the debate on the actor every round—destroys topic specific education

#### Limits—multiplies the number of affs and forces the neg to have agent specific strategies

#### C/I—be as specific as the resolution—key to predictability b/c the resolution is the starting point for all debates

#### Cross-x checks abuse—ask us and we’ll specify—the aff defines the intent of the plan-text

#### Potential abuse is not a voting issue—there’s no bright-line and it’s impossible to quantify

#### Prefer reasonability—the community voted for the transportation topic and competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and kills topic specific education

#### Time Suck—ASPEC makes the debate lose it’s value b/c we waste time talking about irrelevant issues—don’t vote on it

#### Don’t vote neg on presumption---the federal government can work together as one to enact policies

## 2AC - Counterplan

### 2AC States CP

#### 1ST - Federal accountability is key to restoring community participation in politics –

#### 2nd Fights over jurisdiction ensures continued racism and the collapse of the environment.

Robert W. **Collin and** Robin Morris **Collin 2005** (Environmental Reparations in THE QUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE POLITICS OF POLLUTION, Robert D. Bullard,)

Antiurban attitudes, covert and institutionalized or normalized racism, and conscious ignorance can undo efforts to resolve nearly any contemporary environmental problem. Cities are where waste streams meet and accumulate. Cities are also becoming increasingly brown and black in their demographic composition. And cities are where the voters necessary for changing governmental policies are located. The profoundly antiurban messages of many U.S. environmentalists and their grounding in racist ideology; parochial land use practices; and the resistance of scientific elites to confronting the phenomenon of multiple, chronic, cumulative, and bioaccumulative toxins in the risk decisions they make, all threaten human health and living systems on which we depend. Largely without support from the mainstream environmental groups and scientific elites, environmental justice communities are struggling against these barriers to build the framework for a reparative, restorative environmental policy based on justice first, then sustainability. Antiurban and racist values have left critical gaps in our approaches to environmental justice, protection, and sustainability. This antiurban attitude within mainstream environmentalism masks an unconscious racism that threatens to replicate racist outcomes even without conscious intent. All environmental problems are local in some sense. They can be local in terms of the cause, source, or impact of the waste stream, including all emissions, discharges, and pollution. As waste streams increase and accumulate, environmental problems have begun to affect areas outside of the immediate locations where waste streams are created. This is particularly true of urban environments. Urban environments are complex. They became the sites of industrialism years before any governmental regulation, and the main sites for human habitat years before knowledge about the human health risks of industrialism. They are also important aspects of ecosystems and bioregions. As wastes, emissions, discharges, and pollution have accumulated in our cities, they have begun to affect air sheds and watersheds of ecosystems near and far from the sources of the pollution. As both wastes and human population increase, they are brought closer together, increasing conflict over environmental decisions. This conflict can take many different forms, such as land use disputes, industrial permitting decisions, court cases, or conflicts over public mass transit projects. In addition, urban dwellers increasingly are people of color who define environment and environmental concern much more holistically than the general population does. This broader approach to environmentalism is at odds with the approaches of mainstream environmental groups, which evolved out of a wilderness-conservation political agenda. 1 The U.S. environmental movement has operated to exclude the concerns of urban dwellers and people of color from the environmental movement and to exclude urban dwellers and people of color from the traditional posts within government devoted to environmental concerns.2 The exclusion of people of color is repeated over and over again, as government and environmentalists react to social concerns about the deteriorating environment. Urban environments in particular have been ignored in the U.S. environmental movement and in governmental policies developed to address the environment.3 Traditionally, mainstream environmental activists, public policy officials, and researchers have narrowly conceptualized environmental concerns. Their vision tends to be limited to the media of pollution-air, water, and land-and it ignores public health indicators. This vision shaped the form of current environmental protection agencies, creating artificial barriers to protection with racist and antiurban consequences. According to Robert Bullard, "When we restrict the boundary conditions of 'environmental concern' to include only environmental impacts related to air, water, land, ... we tend to ignore critical impacts to sociocultural and cultural systems. "4 Further, assigning public health and the various environmental indicators to different federal, state, and local agencies decreases our ability to look at the picture of environmental and community health indicators together. It introduces turf battles between agencies into the basic activities of gathering data and making risk management decisions regarding this fragmented data. This disconnection between public health and environmental indicators is repeated at all levels of government. Environmentalists themselves have not seriously examined their own negative attitudes toward cities generally and toward African Americans specifically. From the very beginning of our history in the United States, our political leaders thought of cities as having negative effects on people and as having a corrupting force on democracy. Thomas Jefferson thought of cities as "pestilential to the morals, the health and the liberties of man."5 He went on to write, The mobs of great cities add just so much to the support of pure government, as sores do to the strength of the human body. It is the manner and spirit of a people which preserve a republic in vigor. A degeneracy in these [cities] is a canker which so eats to the heart of its laws and constitution.6 In the early 190os, people began to refer to cities as "jungles" and "wilderness." Later, whites were called "urban pioneers" when they moved back into the cities they had abandoned for suburbs. This potent metaphor of the city as frontier or jungle reveals a certain attitude toward African Americans. It implies that cities can become civilized only when whites are the majority population. This attitude pervades the contemporary environmental movement in countless unexamined ways. Waste sites called "brownfields" are the domain of brown and black city dwellers, while "greenfields" remain predominantly white, suburban, nonindustrialized spaces. Zero population activists and anti-immigration environmental policies continue to promote a vision of land dominated by white culture as the standard and as worthy of having environmental protection. In their discourses, most advocates of sustainability segregate communities of color and ignore them, making exceptions only for token references to Native Americans as the only people of color possessing an authentic environmental ethic. Sustainable policies must be the first exception to the normative rule of exclusionary environmental decision making.

#### 3 - FEMA was a shadow of itself because of cuts and cronyism; states suffered mass deficits and lack of central support which prevented them from filling in for FEMA – fed is key – that’s Graham

#### 4 - Federal key- have to coordinate emergency planning and evacuation.

Renne ‘08 – Renne is a PhD from the University of New Orleans, Sanchez is a PhD from the University of Utah, and Litman is a director at the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (John Renne, Thomas Sanchez, and Todd Litman, “National Study on Carless and Special Needs Evacuation Planning: A Literature Review”, October 2008, accessed 7/3/12)

Much of the current evacuation literature focuses on automobile-based evacuations. Some studies focus on traffic models and the pros and cons of various strategies for dealing with massive volumes of congestion during an emergency (Wolshon 2001; Dow and Cutter 2002; Wilmot and Mei 2004). Other studies focus on the decision to evacuate or not (Lindell, Lu and Prater 2005; Willgen, Edwards, Lormand, and Wilson 2005; Bateman and Edwards 2002; Chakraborty, Tobin and Montz 2005) while others call for a more comprehensive model that includes alternative modes of evacuating (Litman 2006; Hess and Gotham 2007). A national survey of hurricane evacuation found that state departments of transportation (DOTs) largely ignored low mobility and special needs groups (Wolshon et al. 2001). States may view evacuation as a local issue and not own transport assets, buses, etc. The report notes that most cities do not have a sufficient number of buses to evacuate all low-mobility evacuees. Ironically, hundreds of transit and school buses were flooded in New Orleans during Katrina. The survey also found that no plans were in place to use rail as a means of evacuation. Historically, trains and buses have played an important role in the evacuation of cities. In an international study, trains and buses were important modes in 20 of the 27 evacuations. In ten of these, the majority of people used trains and buses (see Table 1) (Zelinsky and Kosinski 1991). The *Report to Congress on Catastrophic Hurricane Plan Evacuation* (USDOT & USDHS 2006) found that **most evacuation plans were underdeveloped and ineffective,** especially with respect to persons with special mobility needs. Multiple **federal agencies**, including the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, as well as Senate and House Committees found that transportation planners, providers, health care agencies, and emergency management officials **need to be better coordinated and communicating on this issue long before any disaster.** In an examination of the evacuation failures during Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Litman suggests that many of these failures can be attributed to a lack of resilience; the ability to absorb unexpected circumstances through redundancy within the transportation system. Littman notes that the tragedies of Katrina are “simply extreme examples of the day-to-day problems facing non-drivers due to inadequate and poorly integrated transportation services” (Litman 2006, p.18). Many evacuation plans simply suggest that during evacuations, carless residents should seek assistance with friends or neighbors who do own cars. Raphael and Berube (2006) point out, however, that due to the socioeconomic and racial segregation existing in most American cities, the lack of an automobile is often a condition shared among neighbors. Cameron (2006) also suggests that emergency planning should involve the disabled community, and recommends that local governments create a registry of all members of the community with special needs. Many examples and case studies show the importance of multimodal emergency response planning. For example, one of the main lessons learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita is the importance of deploying buses to evacuate large numbers of people, including those who lack automobile transport (Litman 2006). It is therefore important that emergency response and evacuation plans be multimodal.

#### 5 - Federal leadership is needed to maintain the political will to continue adaptation.

Smith et al.10, Stratus consulting and Pew Center for Global Climate Change, in ’10 [Joel B. , Jason M. Vogel, Terri L. Cruce, Stephen Seidel, Heather A. Holsinger, Adapting to Climate Change: A Call for Federal Leadership, http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/adaptation-federal-leadership.]

The value of leadership in initiating an adaptation program has been illustrated in a number of the countries, states, and municipalities that have already started adaptation programs (see Box 4 for examples). Once a chief executive in government makes adaptation a clear priority, it increases attention and resources available to the issue and provides clear policy direction. In many cases, executive leadership is the only way to elevate adaptation as a government priority, but formal organization, funding, or legislative action may be necessary to maintain an adaptation program after the initial leadership push. The sustained leadership necessary to create an adaptation program typically consists of five main components. These components and their implications for a National Adaptation Program are highlighted below: 1. Clear public commitment by a chief executive. A public commitment, perhaps in the form of a formal statement to explain the national strategy and program sends a clear signal that adaptation is important. 2. Executive branch action to formally initiate the program and fund its activities. Administrative actions can take many forms, including issuing executive orders, leveraging executive authorities (e.g., the federal OMB requiring multiagency budget crosscuts), and creating new executive offices or positions. For example, the Executive Order on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and sustainability by federal agencies signed by President Obama on October 5, 2009, called for federal agencies to “evaluate agency climate-change risks and vulnerabilities to manage the effects of climate change on the agency’s operations and mission in both the short and long term” (The White House, 2009). Furthermore, this Executive Order requires agencies to “participate actively in the interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, which is already engaged in developing the domestic and international dimensions of a U.S. strategy for adaptation to climate change” (The White House, 2009). Appendix B presents a draft Executive Order that would build upon existing federal action by establishing a National Adaptation Program. 3. Multiagency coordination and participation to carry out the program requirements. Climate change impacts cut across U.S. political, jurisdictional, and geographic boundaries. Adaptive strategies, plans, and actions sometimes require federal departments and agencies to work together to coordinate areas of shared responsibility. At the federal level, an office in the Executive Office of the President (EOP), such as the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) or the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), would be best positioned to coordinate multiple agencies and encourage participation in the program. 4. Sustained program support. After the momentum has been developed to begin a National Adaptation Program, implementation support must be maintained. Adapting to a changing climate will require constant reassessment and adjustment. This requires sustained leadership and program support by an office with appropriate authority, funding, resources, and substantive expertise. 5. Legislative action to build on the lessons learned, to mandate funding, and to make necessary changes in statutes. Legislation on adaptation may ultimately be necessary because it builds broader support for the program, makes it permanent across administrations, and provides funding for the program. In some cases, changes to existing legislation may be needed to remove barriers and create incentives for adaptation.

#### 6- Only the federal government has the technical capability to forecast wealth and track climate change to make adaptation effective

Smith et al., Stratus consulting and Pew Center for Global Climate Change, in ’10 [Joel B. , Jason M. Vogel, Terri L. Cruce, Stephen Seidel, Heather A. Holsinger, Adapting to Climate Change: A Call for Federal Leadership, http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/adaptation-federal-leadership.]

Federal technical support is critical to successful adaptation. The federal government provides technical and research support to help manage climate-sensitive natural resources and human systems. For example, NOAA forecasts weather, tracks hurricanes and other storms, and produces information on droughts; and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) develops information on the state of water resources and ecosystems nationwide. This technical support is crucial to organizations addressing adaptation. For example, the state of Alaska drew upon the expertise of the federal government to help navigate the complicated web of overlapping mandates and jurisdictions involving relocating at-risk coastal communities. They also relied on federal technical support to assess protect-in-place alternatives. Without this technical support, state decision-makers would have found it very difficult to make significant progress in protecting or relocating at-risk villages (Alaska Immediate Action Workgroup, 2009).

#### 7- State fiat is a voting issue

#### 1. Not real world – neg has no evidence saying that the 50 states should act in unison

#### 2. Kills ground – steals the aff and 50 state fiat avoids lit based arguments such as jurisdictional conflicts

#### 3. If neg can fiat that the states would change political views and work in unison, then we shouldn’t link to politics.

#### 4. Counter-interpretation – the counterplan must compete off an explicit mandate of the plan – otherwise it justifies perm do the CP.

#### 5. No logical decision-maker can choose between the federal and state governments Jurisdictions

#### 8 - Only federal coordination can overcome significant barriers to adaptation now

Smith et al., Stratus consulting and Pew Center for Global Climate Change, in ’10 [Joel B. , Jason M. Vogel, Terri L. Cruce, Stephen Seidel, Heather A. Holsinger, Adapting to Climate Change: A Call for Federal Leadership, http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/adaptation-federal-leadership.]

Federal laws, programs, regulations, and guidelines affect the decisions made by individuals, companies, and others outside the federal government. These programs can encourage adaptation measures or can be barriers or maladaptations when they prevent or discourage reductions in climate vulnerability. For example, existing pollution control laws such as the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act regulate air and water quality, both of which will be affected by a changing climate. Where such regulations are based on historic climate information, they can serve as a barrier to adaptation if not updated to reflect changing climate conditions. In addition, authorities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) could require consideration of climate change impacts on all major federal projects. Federal financial support can encourage adaptation. The federal government financially supports many activities that will be affected by climate change, including funds for highways and other transportation infrastructure (e.g., Kafalenos et al., 2008), crop subsidies and insurance for farmers, federal flood insurance programs, tax deductions or credits for home building, and funding for research and development. Fiscal policies can support both positive and negative incentives for adaptation. For example, subsidizing flood insurance often encourages building in vulnerable areas, but the right kind of incentives could encourage homeowners to take cost-effective measures to reduce their vulnerability to floods.

### 1AR - Solvency – Federal Government Key

#### An increase in federal readiness to address climate change is key – deferring to state action will leave the federal government and FEMA unprepared and incapable of reacting to crises

Campbell et. al. 7 CEO and co-founder of the Center for a New American Security and former deputy assistant secretary of defense for Asia and the Pacific, in ‘7 | Kurt M., Jay Gulledge, J.R. McNeill, John Podesta, Peter Ogden, Leon Fuerth, R. James, Woolsey, Alexander T.J. lennon, Julianne Smith, Richard Weitz, and Derek Mix, “The Age of Consequences: The Foreign Policy and National Security Implications of Global Climate Change”, CSIS & Center for a New American Security, November|

The United States’ federal system may also experience stress. As noted above, one possible consequence of severe climate change will be greatly increased frequency of region-wide disasters as the result of an increasing number of especially violent storms. At some level, even a well-prepared Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) system might be overwhelmed. As the cumulative magnitude of such damage increases, the federal government would likely leave state governments to shoulder more and more of the burden. The effect would be to strain the ligaments that hold the federal system together. State governments are already pulling away from federal leadership on the environment. California is the leading example but others are coming along, mainly in the form of regional groupings.256 The federal government is already fiscally compromised by defense costs in competition with escalating costs for maintaining the social contract. The additional costs entailed by climate change will make these problems unmanageable without drastic tradeoffs. At some point the government’s ability to plan and act proactively will break down because the scale of events begins to overwhelm policies before they can generate appreciable results.

### 2AC – Solvency – Federal Government key

#### Katrina proves that without federal investments, low income populations will be devastated.

Gaines-Ross 12 (Dr. Leslie Gaines-Ross is a chief reputation strategist and leads public relations firm Weber Shandwick’s global reputation consulting services and proprietary thought leadership development. Dr. Gaines-Ross is also the author of two books, CEO Capital: A Guide to Building CEO Reputation and Company Success (2003) and Corporate Reputation: 12 Steps to Safeguarding and Recovering Reputation (2008). 2012. “Reputation Matters” http://www.europeanbusinessreview.com/?p=356

Hurricane Katrina will forever stand as an example of how the American government failed to address one of the country’s most serious modern-day catastrophes. Most every American agreed that assistance for Hurricane Katrina victims was received too little, too late. The majority of Americans (58 percent) in a CBS News poll disapproved of the government’s handling of relief efforts one week after the hurricane hit. Response to Katrina by the federal government, FEMA, and state and local government was regarded by most Americans as poor (77, 70, and 70 percent, respectively). Equally disturbing, Americans believed that the disaster’s response had worsened the already battered overseas image of the United States. Worse still, the American public was left with the impression that the administration’s response to the deadly hurricane reflected a lack of compassion and management ability.

Hurricane Katrina had a powerfully negative impact on perceptions of President Bush and his cabinet. The government’s missteps served as a negative tipping point for the Bush administration’s reputation. Its poor handling of the disaster took on epic proportions and was viewed as intrinsic to the core of the administration’s character. Each mistake generated a whole new set of problems. It was not just the administration’s failure to anticipate and react in time to the deadly hurricane, but also the magnitude of this failure that led to a material loss in the president’s and his administration’s reputation.

## 2AC – Disadvantage Ans

### 2AC – Politics – General Advice

#### In general, there are several different approaches that I suggest taking when answering politics.

#### First, and most importantly, prove why the affirmative case outweighs. This can occur in several ways –

**Traditional Impact calculus (policy making)** – the 2AC must leverage the 1AC as offense against the disadvantage. I suggest making impact claims in terms of why the magnitude (sheer quantity of impact) and time-frame (affirmative harms happen prior to the indeterminate impact scenario) are reasons the judge should affirm. It would be awesome if you can prove why your affirmative harms makes their disad impact inevitable. If possible, read an additional advantage (2AC Add on) that can solve the disadvantage.

**Traditional impact calculus (critical affirmatives)** – Critical affirmatives should deploy the same policy tricks. Magnitude and time-frame arguments are a must, racism and structural violence are daily events that outweighs because its on going violence and affects more people. Critical affirmatives get the additional ability to critique’s the negative’s characterization of the political process and to provide indicts against the biased negative authors.

#### 2nd General indicts to the negative scholarship – plenty of qualified authors say that political capital is a fantasy contrived by the media and that issues are compartmentalized. The likelihood that the affirmative would derail the 1NC’s specific scenario is impossible because issues don’t spill over.

#### 3rd – Issue specific uniqueness – this can occur in several ways –

**Agenda specific** – 2ACs can read evidence why their particular agenda item is ‘dead in the water’ and will not pass legislative scrutiny.

**Affirmative General Uniqueness**- 2ACs can read general evidence in their area of your 1AC that makes the link empirically denied – so for example, for the climate adaptation affirmative, you could research evidence about Obama’s recent executive order that he passed over global warming – this would likely make the disadvantage inevitable at the link level.

**Read impact uniqueness** – if they say you hurt the economy, the affirmative can always say why economic decline is inevitable for other reasons, say warming or double dip recession or manufacturing or war with Russia. The better researched you are on the affirmative, the better you will be.

#### Finally, affirmatives can always read additional advantages. These can provide the benefit of outweighing the disadvantage or solving it.

**A final piece of advice.** 2ACs should ALWAYS, ALWAYS, ALWAYS read the 1NC evidence. Most affirmatives can dismantle the disadvantage in cross examination by pointing out evidentiary inconsistencies or showing leaps in logic. The arguments must be made in the 2AC to provide consistency between speeches.

### 2AC No Internal Link – Political Capital not Real

#### No spillover—issues in Congress are compartmentalized—PC is irrelevant

Dickinson 9[\*professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, 5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/]

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ **ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not** – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

### 2AC – Non-Unique congress can’t control sanctions

#### No risk of Iran sanctions – Congress has no say.

Daily Beast May 16, 2014 (Key Senator Wants To Force Vote On Iran Deal http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/05/16/key-senator-wants-the-right-to-block-a-deal-with-iran.html)

The top Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is making a final bid to compel the Obama administration to submit any deal on Iran’s nuclear program to Congress for a vote.Next week, Sen. Bob Corker (R-TN) will try one last time to pass legislation giving Congress the right to vote on a deal that the Obama administration is currently negotiating with the Iranian government.
 On Thursday Corker introduced an amendment that would give Congress the right to hold a “vote of disapproval” on a U.S.-Iran deal over Iran’s nuclear program within days of the Obama administration striking such a deal. The amendment would also provide for Congress to hold hearings on a deal. It would not carry the force of law, but would express the opinion of Congress on the matter.
 Corker intends to offer the amendment during next Tuesday’s Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on a bill addressing the security relationship between the U.S. and Israel. Corker spoke about his effort in an exclusive interview with The Daily Beast.
 “Let’s face it, Congress has been totally iced out on this issue since its inception. I cannot imagine an issue that’s more important to Israel than these negotiations with Iran over nuclear weapons,” Corker said. “Hopefully many Democrats would agree that we should at least have an opportunity to weigh in on the final agreement… after its negotiated."

### 2AC – Uniqueness overwhelms the Link

#### Obama’s veto threat makes the disad structurally unlikely.

Tobin 3-3-14 [Jonathan, Senior Online Editor of Commentary magazine, AIPAC Will Survive While Obama Fails, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2014/03/03/aipac-will-survive-while-obama-fails-middle-east-peace-iran-nuclear/]

As Lee Smith writes today in Tablet magazine, AIPAC’s reliance on the bipartisan coalition it has forged in support of the U.S.-Israel alliance has rendered it unable to punish those who cross it. Smith writes persuasively that President Obama has effectively checkmated AIPAC with a series of moves that demonstrated he couldn’t be constrained by its stands on either the Israel-Palestinian conflict or the Iran nuclear threat. Judged by that standard, he’s right to claim the group “flopped” on Iran sanctions this year. Given that the prospects of AIPAC mobilizing sufficient Democratic support in the Senate for a revived effort to pass a new sanctions bill in the face of Obama’s veto threats are poor, it’s hard to argue with Smith’s belief that the group has been isolated and its power exposed as more a figment of the overheated imaginations of anti-Semitic conspiracy mongers than reality. But before we join Smith’s musings about AIPAC having to do “some hard thinking about its survival,” some perspective is needed. As bad as things look for the pro-Israel community today, the lobby’s business is in taking the long view of both Washington politics and the Middle East. President Obama may have gotten the upper hand over both AIPAC and Netanyahu in recent months, but any assumption that this situation is permanent rests on the idea that the administration’s diplomatic efforts on both the Palestinian and Iranian fronts will not falter or that these failures can be blamed on Israel and its supporters. As with the fights Obama has picked with Israel earlier in his administration, events have a way of eclipsing his temper tantrums. While it may be entirely in character for the president to choose the weekend when AIPAC is convening and Russia is invading the Ukraine to be issuing ultimatums to Israel, the collapse of U.S. influence abroad due to Obama’s weakness and delusions will make his victory over the lobby a short-lived triumph. Smith is right to claim that AIPAC was thoroughly outmaneuvered by the administration in the last year. The group’s failure to oppose the nomination of Chuck Hagel for secretary of defense was seen as a sign of weakness by the re-elected president. Smith believes AIPAC was set up by the administration when it agreed to lobby on behalf of the president’s efforts to get Congress to authorize the use of force in Syria. The writer believes Obama was never serious about striking the Assad regime in defense of the “red line” he enunciated about the use of chemical weapons and that the administration’s humiliating retreat from those threats was designed to strengthen its ties with Assad’s Iranian ally and to make AIPAC look foolish. That may be giving the president a little too much credit since Obama’s humiliation at the hands of the Russians and Congressional critics was far greater than any experienced by AIPAC. But Smith is correct that the episode damaged the lobby. There’s also no arguing with the verdict that AIPAC was undone in the campaign for new Iran sanctions by its reliance on support from both sides of the aisle. There was never any chance that the group would be able to muscle sanctions through a Democratic-controlled Senate once the president issued a veto threat and falsely framed the debate as one between supporters of diplomacy and those who want war. Nor can AIPAC seek to punish Democrats who have cowardly retreated in the face of pressure from the White House. Combined with the president’s bizarre attack on Israel and his almost total mischaracterization of the Palestinian position on the peace talks, there’s no disputing that this administration has defied supporters of Israel on their two most important issues and there’s nothing they can do about it at the moment.

### 2AC No Link – Not Perceived

#### Spending is not perceived: lettermarking solves

New York Times May 7, 2014 (With Stealth, Congressional Spending on Pet Projects Persists, Report Says By DAVID S. JOACHIM MAY 7, 2014)

WASHINGTON — Congress may have banned earmarks to pay for pet projects in the districts of powerful lawmakers, but pork continues to find its way into spending legislation, though in smaller amounts and with more stealth, a fiscal watchdog group said on Wednesday.
 Some 109 projects worth a total of $2.7 billion were included in the 2014 budget at the request of individual lawmakers, according to an analysis by Citizens Against Government Waste, a fiscally conservative group, which calls the report the Pig Book.
 These projects included $130 million for a program to promote democracy around the world, which the Obama administration did not ask for; $90 million for a highly mobile tank that the Defense Department does not want; and $45 million meant to stop cross-border drug trafficking that was directed mostly to nonborder states.
 The dollar figures are down considerably from a record $29 billion in 2006 and $16.5 billion in 2010, the year before Congress placed a moratorium on earmarks’ use.
 Earmarks account for a tiny percentage of total federal spending, but they are valuable to lawmakers who want to curry favor in their districts or states. Congress placed a moratorium on their use in early 2011 after a series of ethical violations involving earmark deals between lawmakers and lobbyists.¶ Since then, some lawmakers have resorted to a practice known as lettermarking or phonemarking, in which money is included in a bill without a specific program attached to it but is then directed to a specific program by a government agency at the request of a lawmaker.

### 2AC Aff Impact Defense – No Iran Strikes

#### No strike – institutional and political checks

Keck, 13- Zachary Keck is associate editor of The Diplomat (“Five Reasons Israel Won't Attack Iran”, The National Interest, 11/28, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/five-reasons-israel-wont-attack-iran-9469

4. Israel’s Veto Players Although Netanyahu may be ready to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities, he operates within a democracy with a strong elite structure, particularly in the field of national security. It seems unlikely that he would have enough elite support for him to seriously consider such a daring and risky operation. For one thing, Israel has strong institutional checks on using military force. As then vice prime minister and current defense minister Moshe Yaalon explained last year: “In the State of Israel, any process of a military operation, and any military move, undergoes the approval of the security cabinet and in certain cases, the full cabinet… the decision is not made by two people, nor three, nor eight.” It’s far from clear Netanyahu, a fairly divisive figure in Israeli politics, could gain this support. In fact, Menachem Begin struggled to gain sufficient support for the 1981 attack on Iraq even though Baghdad presented a more clear and present danger to Israel than Iran does today. What is clearer is that Netanyahu lacks the support of much of Israel’s highly respected national security establishment. Many former top intelligence and military officials have spoken out publicly against Netanyahu’s hardline Iran policy, with at least one of them questioning whether Iran is actually seeking a nuclear weapon. Another former chief of staff of the Israeli Defense Forces told The Independent that, “It is quite clear that much if not all of the IDF [Israeli Defence Forces] leadership do not support military action at this point…. In the past the advice of the head of the IDF and the head of Mossad had led to military action being stopped.”

### 1AR Israel Impact Defense

#### Relations are thawing between Iran and Israel—no strikes

Al-Monitor 2/2(“Israeli security officials recognize change in Iran” http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/02/iran-israel-historic-developments-hope-defense-officials.html#)

On Feb. 3, Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif astounded Israel when he said in an interview on a German TV network: “If the Palestinians are happy with the solution [an Israel-Palestinian peace deal] then nobody outside Palestine could prevent that from taking place.” Though his statement was initially mistranslated as allowing for Iranian recognition of Israel, the corrected translation is still one of the mildest statements by any Iranian official since the start of the Iranian revolution. Dubbed by Tehran the “Little Satan,” second only to the “Great Satan” — the United States — Israel is an enemy whose name has been unmentionable and whose obliteration had to be declared necessary at least once every couple of weeks. Although Israel is keeping its military option on the table, Israeli defense officials privately acknowledge that Iran is undergoing a "historic" change Simon Pompan Zarif’s statement took the Israeli media and public by surprise, but not the country’s decision-makers. In a recent closed meeting, a senior Israeli military official told Al-Monitor that a “dramatic development is taking place in Iran.” A seasoned Israeli defense official took it a step further, calling the developments in Iran “historic.” Using high-quality intelligence, Israel’s defense establishment has been monitoring Iran closely, analyzing it in the context of an intimate acquaintance with its background, circumstances and history. No one in the Israel Defense Forces, the military’s Intelligence Directorate, the Mossad or the Ministry of Defense plans to go dancing in the streets just yet. However, the sounds and images coming out of Tehran are inspiring great hope among defense officials. Something real is going on there, they say, adding that this is no act. Searching for a path, Iran is deliberating and struggling in a way we have not been accustomed to seeing. This article does not deal with Israel’s official political and diplomatic stances. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu continues to issue warnings and sound alarms, and he will not cease to do so until Iran and the world powers reach a final agreement on the Iranian nuclear program. This is his historic calling. When all is said and done, only the quality and meticulousness of the agreement will determine whether Iran will cement its position as a nuclear-threshold state or forgo this dream. Up until now, what Israeli defense officials expected had remained an open question. Based on many talks in recent weeks with the highest-ranking officials in Israel’s defense establishment, the following is a glimpse into what they think.

## 2AC – Kritik Ans

### 2AC - AT: Kritiks – State Good

#### 1st - Plan solves the reasons why the state is bad---incorporates low-income minorities into decision-making---we have empirical solvency – (INSERT REFERENCE TO YOUR SPECIFIC 1AC AUTHORS HERE)

#### 2nd - The state is key---we must use institutional politics to prevent the marginalization of neglected others, the kritik abdicates this responsibility reifiying exclusion

Guenther 6 - professor of philosophy at Vanderbilt(Lisa, “The Gift of the Other: Levinas and the politics of reproduction,” State University of New York Press, August 10, 2006)

While ethics remain first philosophy for Levinas, there is nevertheless a place- and a vital one- for a politics that defends against violence: especially against the violation of one’s neighbors, but also against the violation of oneself. It is not primarily for my own sake, but for the sake of the other Other- the third party, who might otherwise be excluded from the face-to-face encounter- that such an approach to politics becomes necessary.
Because there is more than just one Other in the world, even my infinite responsibility for the Other is not enough. I must also attend in some way to the other Others both near and far, both those with whom I share a home and whose faces I will never encounter in my lifetime. This attention to the third party requires a negotiation of duties, a calculation of resources, a measurement of that which resists all measure. Given the existence of more than one Other in the world, “It is consequently necessary to weigh, to think, to judge, in comparing the incomparable. The interpersonal relation I establish with the Other, I must also establish with other men” (Levinas 1985, 90). Because there is always a multiplicity of Others whom I will never encounter face-to-face, we need a politics of discourse through which rights and responsibilities can be balanced and negotiated. Without an ethical imperative that displaces the centrality of the I and questions its identity, politics might become nothing more than a calculation of more or less enlightened self-interest. But without the mutual negotiation of political life, the ethics of radical responsibility could become an obsession with the first Other who gets under my skin, to the point of blotting out the world and leaving me blind to anyone else. For Levinas, political justice is necessary for the sake of these otherwise neglected Others who would be left without a response if the self should collapse, or if it should remain narrowly obsessed with the Other who gets under my skin. The demand for justice introduced by the third party does not emerge as a mere afterthought or addendum to my ethical responsibility for the Other, but rather in the midst of this responsibility. As Levinas writes in Totality and Infinity: “The third party looks at me in the eyes of the Other- language is justice. It is not that there first would be the face, and then the being it manifests or expresses would concern himself with justice; the epiphany of the face qua face opens humanity” (Tal 213; Tel 234).

### 2AC - Deep Ecology/Anthro

#### Turn – warming - The alternative’s refusal of scenario planning/futurism dooms us to extinction at the hands of climate change.

**Constance Lever-Tracy, professor of sociology, Flinders University 2008** (2008; 56; 445 *Current Sociology* “Global Warming and Sociology”)

I conducted a web search for the words ‘climate change’, ‘global warming’ or ‘greenhouse gas’ in articles in eight major Anglophone, main- stream sociology journals (*Acta Sociologica*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *British Journal of Sociology*, *Current Sociology*, *International Sociology*, *Journal of Sociology* and*Sociology*) as well as the influential Marxist journal *New Left Review,* from January 2000 to mid- 2005. There was not a single finding in titles or abstracts, not one article focused on the subject. There were 29 examples in a whole text search of articles,8of which only seven appeared after January 2003, and in most of these the terms featured, without comment, in a list of assorted, generally unrelated environmental issues.
Stephen Crooke’s presidential address to the Australian Sociological Association (TASA) in 2000 had contained a call to re-engage with the substantive knowledge of the natural sciences: ‘The relations between natural, technical and social processes lies at the heart of fundamental issues from climate change to genetic engineering . . . we must place the same issues at the top of our agendas’ (Crooke, 2003: 11). There is little evidence this call was heeded, and Pakulski and Trantor’s (2004) eulogy on Crooke’s death included no reference to such multidisciplinarity nor to his belief that sociologists should become familiar with debates in the sciences and ‘more comfortable with the culture of the natural sciences generally’ (Crooke, 2003: 11).
In the core Marxist journal *New Left Review*, the concerns of eco-Marxists have been similarly ignored (with no mention of global warming in the text of any article this century). Giovanni Arrighi, in two major articles in 2005, traced the history of capitalism through a *longue durée*of four sys- temic cycles of overaccumulation, with shifting hegemony between rising and declining political powers and capitalist sectors (Arrighi, 2005a, 2005b). Now that globalization had incorporated the whole world into capitalist production chains and global markets, there were no longer any new spaces to absorb the surplus. Throughout, he never once mentions any environmental problems, nor the possibility (canvassed by some eco- Marxists) that tackling global warming, through massive investment in sustainable development and new energy forms, might be the frontier for a new period of accumulation.
Why this Silence?
There is a mystery in this lack of interest in developments that could conceivably open the door to chaos and barbarism later this century, or whose prevention might require a transformation in the core processes of industrial society. A contingent reason for the silence may lie in the status structure of the discipline. Writers on the subject often come from the field of environmental sociology, originating in rural sociology. Given the classical focus on urbanization, rural sociology has tended to be marginalized from prestigious journals or degree courses. There are, however, more essential reasons for the silence.
Arguably, it derives from the interaction of two factors. The first is our recently acquired suspicion of teleology and our mirroring of an indifference we find in contemporary society towards the future. The second factor is our continuing foundational suspicion of naturalistic explanations for social facts, which has often led us to question or ignore the authority of natural scientists, even in their own field of study. Together, these two have often blinded us to the predicted, fateful convergence of social and natural time, in a new teleological countdown to possible disaster, coming towards us from the future.
While the rate of change of natural processes is shrinking towards the time scales of human society, **social scientists have been theorizing a further shrinking in cultural horizons, with an emphasis on immediate gratification, and a decline in long-term** direction or **plans, so that** even **threats just decades away would now scarcely register**. In his history of the 20th century, Eric Hobsbawm complained how men and women, at the century’s end, live in a ‘permanent present’ where a discounting of the past parallels inattention to the future. The editors of *What the Future Holds: Insights from Social Science*, note in their introduction the sharp decline, since 1980, of academic discussions on future scenarios (Cooper and Layard, 2002: 4). For those of us brought up on C. Wright Mills, historical grand narratives have seemed to be at the very foundation of our discipline, yet no sociologist contributed to this volume. To grasp this, we can contrast the classic sociological paradigms of modern society with ours. Marx and Weber were motivated to understand both the origins and the distinctive nature of modern, capitalist, industrial, urban society, and its future shape and likely trajectory. Marx expected contradictions in the society to work themselves out dialectically, through polarizing class conflict leading either to barbarism or an era of freedom and plenty, while Weber, more pessimistically, foresaw a linear trajectory, with the uninterrupted advance of the calculating, depersonalized ‘cosmos of the modern economic order .bound to the technical and economic conditions of machine production which today determine the lives of all individuals. .Perhaps it will so determine them until the last ton of fossilised coal is burnt’ (Weber, 1930: 181). Neither, however, expected any major interruption to strike suddenly from outside society.
**Sociologists have** more recently sought to describe and understand a new social reality, resulting from the dissolution of these expectations, and have **come to reject any long-term future orientation as ‘teleology’**. We have no expectation now of socialist transformation, while both the progressive polarization of a collectively organized working class and an increasingly concentrated capital has been reversed. The iron cage and the onward march of rationality and bureaucracy have also been countered. In their place we see a rise in entrepreneurial small businesses and religious fundamentalisms and in mantras of competition, individualism and flexibility. This foreshortening of time horizons has often been made central to soci- ological theorizing in the late 20th century. Giddens saw the ‘dissolution of evolutionism’ and the ‘disappearance of teleology’ as two of the most conspicuous features of his new stage of reflexive, radicalized modernity (Giddens, 1990: 52). Lash and Urry (1987) described and theorized a transi- tion, taking place from the 1970s, from ‘organized’ to ‘disorganized’ capital- ism. As deregulation and globalization ratcheted up competition, the capacity of corporations, unions and governments to coordinate the national economy and society was undermined. Short-term, ‘flexible’ responsiveness replaced long-term planning. The French *regulation*school spoke of a transi- tion from a *Fordist* to a *flexible, post-Fordist* regime of accumulation. In Britain, Harvey wrote in 1989 of the new wave of ‘space–time com- pression’, in which a crisis of profitability was overcome by accelerating the turnover time of capital and technology. The half-life of a Fordist product, of five to seven years, was cut by half or more, and ‘the post- modern aesthetic celebrated difference, spectacle, ephemerality and fash- ion’ (Harvey, 1989: 156). ‘The temporary contract in everything is the hallmark of postmodern living’ (Harvey, 1989: 291). The dominance of stock options and share turnover has increasingly subjected investment decisions everywhere to a very short-term profit motive.9 Japanese capitalism, distinctively and, for a time, successfully based on corporate pla ning, made possible by reinvested profits, managerial power and lifetime employment, entered a long period of stagnation after 1991, undermining its relevance as an alternative model. The collapse of communism similarly removed another such alternative.
Baumann (1988) extended the idea of *postmodernity* from culture to soci- ety. He described postmodern art as the paradigm of postmodern culture and of a postmodern world view that rejected historical thinking, and cited Deleuze and Guattari’s metaphor of the rhizome: ‘that peculiar rootstock which . . . seems to possess no sense of privileged direction, expanding instead sideways, upwards and backwards with the same frequency’ (Baumann, 1988: 791). However, he warned against a ‘postmodern sociol- ogy’ that would itself take on these attributes, advocating instead a ‘sociol- ogy of postmodernity’. This could study postmodernity as ‘a fully fledged comprehensive and viable type of social system’, a historical stage in which consumer freedom had been substituted for work ‘as the hub around which the life world rotates. . . . **Having won the struggle for control over produc- tion . . . capitalism can now afford the free reign of the pleasure principle’** (Baumann, 1988: 808). **It should not,** we can add, **pre-empt an awareness that a later stage might replace this rhizome-like postmodern social system by a countdown to a** **natural catastrophe.** Where do such changes lead us? Is there life after information/ consumer/post whatever society? Too often, one suspects, Baumann’s warning has not been heeded, and sociology has taken on some of the colouration of its subject matter. Without admitting it, many sociologists have acted as if Lyotard’s postmodern evaporation of the historical ‘grand narratives’ or Fukuyama’s ‘end of history’ were in fact upon us, as suit- able guides to our own practice.
Sociologists have thus described at length how contemporary **society has turned its eyes away from the future, its people focusing on immediate con- sumption** and ephemeral fashions, **its politicians on the next election** and its industrial leaders on the next annual report. To take global warming seri- ously involves asking the kinds of questions about future directions that most sociologists believe they have now put behind them. **Preoccupied with analysing these ‘social facts’, sociologists are unwilling to be disturbed by the voices of natural scientists, reporting from inaccessible upper atmos- pheres, ancient ice cores or deep oceans, where no social facts exist. Unable themselves to judge the validity of the evidence, and** increasingly **uncom- fortable with predictions** and teleologies, **they prefer to avoid the subject**. For the classics (Marx, Weber, Durkheim), as for most sociologists since, nature, for practical purposes, was an unproblematic, stable background constant, increasingly understood and controlled by science and technol- ogy. The role of sociology was to study social processes, trends and con- tradictions independently from the natural sciences. Such an insulation of society from nature has, indeed, become a major subject of debate between realists and social constructivists within environmental sociol- ogy, since Catton and Dunlap first counterposed their ‘New Ecological Paradigm’ to what they called the ‘Human Exemptionalist Paradigm’ in the late 1970s (Dunlap, 2002; Yearley, 2002).
Since then, environmental sociologists have worked out an accommoda- tion, enabling them to take seriously the findings of natural scientists. See, for example, Mol and Spaagaren’s (2000: 27) claim that ‘What is conceived of as “social”...cannot be explained without reference to the natural.’ Mainstream sociologists, on the other hand, have remained much closer to the social constructivist paradigm of nature. At best a middle road could be claimed for the idea that science and society are ‘partially independent lev- els’, but this led to the same conclusion as constructivism: that knowledge of science is rarely relevant for sociologists (Lidskog, 2001). Such a ‘partial independence’ of the levels is, however, dramatically called into question by the time convergence that has become manifest in the last decades. **Social processes that impact on nature in unintended ways, such as emissions caused by economic growth and the destruction of carbon sink forests, have been speeding up exponentially** since the industrial revolution. The result has been an unexpected and unprece- dented speeding up also of changes in natural processes. Natural change is usually very slow. It used to be believed, for example, that it would take 10,000 years to melt an ice sheet,10but we can no longer assume that, for practical purposes, changes in natural processes are not relevant to social analysis. Global climate **changes are** now **likely to impact within our own lives** or those of our children. **The urgency for** remedial **action is now** measured in decades**, not able to be postponed to some indefinite future. But** even decades have now receded out of sight. The fact that macro **theorists** of late 20th century society, from Daniel Bell to Ulrich Beck, **continue to see nature as either irrelevant or as socially con- trolled or even constructed, contributes to sociology’s marginal contribu- tion to the discussions about global warming**. In this case, where the concepts and the evidence have been entirely the product of natural scien- tists, and beyond the expertise of social scientists to evaluate, the latter have found themselves on uncomfortable ground and have tended to shy away. Daniel Bell, in his influential *Post Industrial Society*, proposed a three- part schema, comprising pre-industrial (or traditional), industrial and post-industrial stages. The third would be based on information technol- ogy, rather than on the use of energy and raw materials, and on the dis- placement of the secondary, manufacturing sector by what we now call ‘services’. In his schema, the ‘game against nature’ was relegated to the ‘pre-industrial stage’ (with no hint that it might return), and the ‘game against fabricated nature’ of the industrial stage was now also about to be displaced by the post-industrial ‘game between persons’ (Bell, 1974: 117). Others later added theories of ‘information society’ and of ‘demate- rialized production’ (Stehr, 2001: 77) to the concept of a post-industrial society – often ignoring the fact that energy-intensive material produc- tion has been globalized rather than displaced, and continues to grow absolutely despite large increases in efficiency.
Giddens has been dismissive of the relevance of direct studies of natural ‘facts’, remarking that ‘Although ecology seems to be wholly about “nature”, nature in the end has very little to do with it’ (Giddens, 1994: 189). Perhaps for this reason, he has written little about global warming: it is not mentioned in his book on *Reflexive Modernization*(Beck et al., 1994) or in his introduction to the more recent *AProgressive Manifesto*(Giddens, 2003). In *Beyond Left and Right*(Giddens, 1994), he did include global warming in his list of the ‘high consequence, manufactured risks’ of reflexive modernity, but devoted to it only a few lines (Giddens, 1994: 3–4, 203). He understood such ‘manufac- tured risks’ as essentially a product of human intervention (Giddens, 1994: 3–4, 203, 206–7) rather than (as this article argues) resulting from an, only partly understood, interaction of social and natural systems each with their own dynamic, and therefore requiring both social and natural expertise. He argued global warming was ‘not undisputed’, and rather than referring to the collective conclusions of most climatologists since 1988, or the IPCC report of 1990 (expressing the views of 700 specialist scientists) or that of the Rio Earth Summit of 1992, he preferred to cite Deepak Lal, the neoliberal economist, from his 1990 Wincott Memorial Lecture for the Institute of Economic Affairs. ‘According to Lal,’ wrote Giddens, ‘the evidence about global warming is ambiguous and scientists disagree about its interpretation. Depending on which scientist is consulted, “we could frizzle or we could freeze or there may be no change”’ (Giddens, 1994: 203);11easier then to ignore them all. Ulrich Beck’s concept of ‘Risk Society’ is the only grand social theory with a major explicit focus on the interface of society and nature, but on closer examination it too proves inappropriate to the question of climate change. In fact, Beck does not discuss the application of his concept to the greenhouse effect, but concentrates instead on such issues as toxicity, nuclear hazards or genetic engineering, and this is not surprising given how inappropriate his analysis is for the former purpose.12
 Beck claims that ‘risks’ are products of today’s new stage of ‘high industri- alism’ and its advanced ‘science/technology’ (he rarely distinguishes the two), which often seem to be his primary enemy. But global warming does not fit, being a long-term cumulative effect, finally manifest, of the whole history of modern society. The worst impact on climate comes not from advanced technology but from the burning of fossil fuels by basic industrial production. ‘The source of danger is no longer ignorance but knowledge’, Beck (1992: 183) argues. One could counter that it is our ignorance of the risks that allowed them to accumulate. His solution to risk is often to attack the ‘dominance’ of science/technology and to seek its subjection to common experience and democratic control (e.g. Beck, 1992: 223, 1995: 46). Beck usually hedges his bets, but in one exceptionally constructionist moment, admitted he was mainly interested in cultural perceptions and definitions of risk, not in their reality. Indeed, he suggested that they ceased to count as ‘risks’ once they had became manifest (Beck, 2000: 213). Whatever his intention, this would conveniently absolve sociologists from having an opinion on the validity and implications of scientists’ factual findings. Unfortunately, this would leave sociology as an agnostic on the sidelines, continually withdrawing its concern about crucial issues dividing society, just as they become salient. But **global warming has been revealed by scientific studies of ice cores, ocean depths and stratospheres, beyond the range of daily experience. In fact, we do desperately need more and better knowledge** of this kind, **and to protect the professional autonomy of natural scientists, under threat from capitalist interests and religious fun- damentalists, well equipped to lobby democratic institutions**.13
**The anti-science arguments of** such **neoliberals** as Deepak Lal (moti- vated by a dogmatic opposition to any kind of government intervention) **have** not only **been taken up by** the paid **sceptics of the fossil fuel lobby**, but have also thus evoked an echo in the prejudices of sociologists, who should be more careful of the company they keep. In contrast, it seems to me that a respectful division of labour is essential now that natural and social change are operating in tandem, on the same time scales. Since we are not ourselves competent to evaluate the debate between climatolo- gists and sceptics, w**e have no option but to accept the professional authority and integrity of the accredited experts, on questions of natural processes**, as a basis for our own analyses of social causes, consequences and choices. **The alternative is irrelevance or worse** – **an effective com- plicity with the vested interests of fossil fuel corporations.** I recently read Jared Diamond’s (2005) fascinating book *Collapse: How Some Societies Choose to Fail or Survive*,surely an ideal starting point for a sociolog- ical debate and research programme about how an approaching ecological crisis could impact on society, and about the possibilities, likely agents and implications of alternative responses. With a broad brush, he compares and draws lessons from the failure of some past societies (including Greenland, Easter Island and Haiti) to reverse their catastrophic relationship with nature, while others (including Tokugawa, Japan and Dominica) were able to pull back from the brink by a range of measures. How sad for our discipline that it was written by an ornithologist rather than a sociologist!

### 2AC - Cede the Political

#### Deep ecology’s focus on creating a new psyche alienates the public.

De-Shalit, 2000. Professor of Political Theory at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Associate Fellow at the Oxford Centre for Environment, Ethics, and Society, Mansfield College, Oxford University. “The Environment: Between Theory and Practice,” p. 49-50, Avner, Questia.

One may ask: so what? Does it matter that Deep Ecology uses the term 'environment' differently from science? My answer is: it may not matter, as long as we recognize that this is indeed the case, that Deep Ecology is a political (or psychological) theory whose goals do not always seek to reform our attitudes about the environment, but rather seek to replace politics by a non-political system. If, however, Deep Ecology claims to respect the environment and treat it 'as it is', then this claim may be deceptive because environmental attitudes become a means of changing the 'system'. Their theory, then, is not about the moral grounds for respecting the environment, but about non-environmental goals. 19 If we understand this, it is clear at least why Deep Ecology has rarely, if at all, served as a rationale for environmental policies. The general public, including activists, may have sensed that, when they want to justify recycling or the treatment of sewage, talks about the new psyche will not do. The deeper problem, I fear, is that, since Deep Ecology is rather dominant in environmental philosophy, many people in the general public conclude that 'this is environmental philosophy' and therefore that 'arguments taken from environmental philosophy in general will not suffice in real cases'.

### 2AC: Population Fascism Turn

#### The alternative embraces inhumane forms of population control—this is an endorsement of mass murder.

Karen **Warren and** Barbara **Wells-Howe**, **94**. Professor of Philosophy at Macalester College. “Ecological Feminism,” p. 93, Google Scholar.

From a Deep Ecological perspective, thinking humanely is problematic insofar as doing so is human centered. Of course, if humaneness is merely kindness and compassion, it is not anthropocentric to reflect or act humanely. Naess seems here to conflate humaneness with human-centeredness, as though application of the ethics of human interactions with each other (such as being kind) is anthropocentric. Is this merely a matter of interpretation? Is it true that the overall tone of Naess’s work evidences benevolent foundations; his reader would find that he would condone inhumane methods of population reduction. My point is to identify a vagueness, or lack of clarity in Deep Ecological thinking concerning human interactions with each other. Despite Naess’ apparent benevolent sensibilities, the writings and recommendations of a number of Deep Ecologists have sometimes verged on the inhumane, and others have put forth the view that phenomena such as the global AIDS epidemic and Third World famine are “necessary solutions” to the “population problem.”

### 2AC Anthro

#### They need to prove why our structure and framework for disrupting economies of blackness doesn’t encompass their alt

#### We’ve indicted your methodology – you can’t define what it means to be human means you should lose the round because disposable populations are socially dead in the SQ – they don’t have agency and aren’t human – the 1AC is a stance against the eurocentricity of anthropocentrism that their authors critique – make them explain how anthropocentrism has created economies of blackness

#### The current order is founded on the overrepresentation of man—bourgeois white males have been substituted for the generic referent of human. They ignore this historical process by flattening out the category of human without actually consider who or what it includes. An insurrection at the level of racial ontology is a necessary starting point for actually articulating the alternative.

Gagne 2007 (Karen, Professor of Philosophy at SUNY Binghamton, On the Obsolescence of the Disciplines: Frantz Fanon and Sylvia Wynter Propose a New Mode of Being Human, http://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1196&context=humanarchitecture)

That we have been unable to reach “another landscape”—as proposed by Amiri Baraka (Leroi Jones) in the 1960s—in order to “exoticize” Western thought to make visible its laws whereby we would be able to unfix the sign of blackness from the sign of evil, ugliness, and the negation of whiteness, has been for two reasons. These are, according to Wlad Godzich (1986) as quoted by Wynter, first, “the imperviousness of our present disciplines to phenomena that fall outside their pre-defined scope” and, second, “our reluctance to see a relationship so global in reach—between the epistemology of knowledge and the liberation of the people—a relationship that we are not properly able to theorize” (Wynter 2006a: 113).
 The shift out of our present conception of Man, out of our present “World System”—the one that places people of African descent and the ever-expanding global, transracial category of the home- less, jobless, and criminalized damned as the zero-most factor of Other to Western Man’s Self—has to be first and foremost a cultural shift, not an economic one. Until such a rupture in our conception of being human is brought forth, such “sociological” concerns as that of the vast global and local economic inequalities, immigration, labor policies, struggles about race, gender, class, and ethnicity, and struggles over the environment, global warming, and distribution of world resources, will remain status quo. The rise of the disciplines would come to ensure the maintenance of the Master Conception of the Western epistemological order; in the present day, this order would in turn produce the classificatory system whereby jobless Black youth would be categorized as “No Humans Involved.” The role of academics in reproducing this system is perhaps best articulated in Wynter’s brilliant article by this title—as an open letter to her colleagues (1992).
 The “rise of the West” by way of its contact with a “New World” outside of Europe, and the “specific idea of order”— an order that was to be effected and repro- duced at the deepest levels of human cognition—was the result of this new relationship. Just how a rupture in the then current order of papal order by the then “liminal Others” of that order was made possible by this new relationship with the “New World”—along with the following rupture that would occur in the 19th century—needs to be properly investigated if we are to ever have any permanent impact on our contemporary battles against slavery, colonialism, and movements for justice and freedom.
 Wynter’s 40-year archaeological project in human thought, particularly during the last 25 years, stems from her reading and development of Frantz Fanon’s concept of “sociogeny,” that he proposes in Black Skins, White Masks (1967: 11). What Fanon does is to offer an explanation for the “double consciousness” lived by Blacks in the Diaspora that was articulated by W.E.B. Dubois. Fanon does this, Wynter poses, by calling into question “our present culture’s purely biological definition of what it is to be, and therefore of what it is like to be, human” (Wynter 2001: 31).
 From Fanon’s statement, “Beside phylogeny and ontogeny stands sociogeny,” Wynter develops the concept of a “sociogenic principle” (sometimes written as “sociogenetic principle”) to refer to and contrast with the purely biological “genomic principle” used to define the “species specific” codes of purely organic life. Fanon’s conception of the human thus becomes for Wynter a truly revolutionary one—revolutionary as in causing a permanent alteration or rupture. This new conception, according to Wynter, was as disruptive of the present order of knowl- edge as that of the previous ruptures in intellectual though—those effected by Copernicus (and Columbus) in the 15th century and by Darwin in the 19th century.

#### We do get perms to test the competitiveness of the alt – we have a structural reason the plan has to precede the alt – we must disrupt economies of blackness prior

#### Perm do the plan all of the non-competitive parts of the alternative – this solves their link because we include respect and protections for the non-human world without a willingness to sacrifice those who will be decimated by warming – the 1ac is the net benefit

#### The critique just reproduces its own hierarchy – the plan is key to interrupt these hierarchies – their usage of the term human doesn’t allow us to view humans as a species but a hierarchal structure

#### Alt links to itself because you can’t divorce yourself from anthro

#### Their alternative reinforces whiteness - Only the white male subject has the luxury of renouncing human-centeredness and the aff is a disad to the alt

Lee 2009 Wendy Lynne, professor of philosophy at Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, “Restoring Human-Centerednes to Environmental Conscience: The Ecocentrist's Dilemma, the Role of Heterosexualized Anthropomorphizing, and the Significance of Language to Ecological Feminism” 14.1: Spring

What analyses like Martin's show is that, even at a level of description taken to be objectively testable, not only chauvinistic, but heterosexist constructions of the "real" come to be understood as a reflection of nature "her" self. It is unsurprising, then, that the ecocentrist mistakes chauvinism for human-centeredness per se. Failing to recognize the primarily white, male, and Western face of chauvinism, it matters less to the ecocentrist how human institutions become implicated in environmental destruction, only that they do—yet this is precisely what invites the determinism that jeopardizes the ecocentrist approach. This lacuna is made poignantly clear in Bender's discussion of ecofeminism where, although he rightly credits Karen J. Warren's insight that dualisms of mind and body, male and female, human and animal, civilization and nature solicit oppression (2003, 364–5), he nevertheless erects a false dichotomy of his own by pitting ecofeminism's concern for social justice against the ecocentrist's preoccupation with avoiding ecocide (2003, 365–70). By insisting that the only way to escape ecocide is to disavow precisely that which women have been systematically denied for virtually the whole of human history—the opportunity to experience and develop a humanly-centered self—Bender effectively reproduces in ecocentrism the male privilege he otherwise eschews. Who, after all, is in a position to disavow their self-interest but those who have enjoyed the material opportunity to realize it? Who are these if not primarily white, Western men? As Bruno Latour puts it: "it is simply a matter of asking the militant ecologists to stop being so naïve as to believe that they are defending, under cover of nature, something other than a particular viewpoint, that of Westerners. When they speak of putting an end to anthropocentrism, they manifest their own ethnocentrism" (2002, 32). That male privilege is built into Bender's view is not surprising—it follows from the conflation of human-centeredness with human chauvinism, all the while failing to register the significance of the historical fact that the "lion's share" of environmental destruction has been sponsored, financed, and wrought by men (pun intended). The central point, however, is that this criticism applies to any ecocentric perspective: First, philosophically—because the best arguments for ecocentrism turn out to be question begging. And second, practically—because the failure to recognize that human chauvinism assumes a prerogative enjoyed primarily by men risks the reproduction of future oppression, even in an ecologically sustainable "utopia." In short, where among the most foresightful versions of ecocentrism, Bender's and Acampora's, fail to lay down the welcome mat for women—particularly feminists—ecocentrism is in trouble. That ecological feminists might respond to Bender's moral axiom "form one body with all beings" with incredulity in the face of a history of oppression also makes Martin's point all the more compelling—that we anthropomorphize the actions of cells at all raises the first question with respect to who benefits from the use of the intentional stance. In other words, human chauvinism is not about human benefit per se, but about who benefits. Heterosexualist anthropomorphizing simply reinforces a construction of "who" that guarantees such benefits to those identified not as passive recipient "eggs," but as active and deliberate "sperms." Dennett, however, is also correct—there remains an important place in the explanation of behavior, including scientific explanation, for attributing human characteristics to nonhuman animals and things. In fact, it is hard to imagine the sciences without the powerful explanatory tool provided by this "as if." It is, however, at the very juncture of the "as if" that the crucial link between environmental responsibility and social justice is forged. Why? Because the moment we treat something as if she/he/it exhibited human qualities, we have already gendered and heterosexualized her/him/it via the norms naturalized by our "forms of life." This is so not because we cannot do otherwise, but because the use of gendered and heterosexualizing language is basic to the ways in which we experience a world whose most fundamental institutions—family, government, military, capitalist enterprise, and religion—remain dominated by those men who promote their ideologies and are responsible for the ongoing commodification and exploitation of women, nonhuman animals, indigenous peoples, and the environment. The "how," then, of the role of human institutions matters to the development of an environmental conscience precisely because these institutions could have evolved differently, because they are changeable—the essential ingredient in both environmental activism and the struggle for social justice. Human-centeredness is not necessarily chauvinistic—and if it is, even those who have benefited from it will ultimately come to pay the price that so many others have paid already, namely, in the ecocide that continuing environmental abuse will generate. Coming then, as Ludwig Wittgenstein might have put it, to a more perspicuous understanding of the role of anthropomorphizing language in our "forms of life" supplies us with a key tool toward developing the only conscience that stands any hope of delivering us to a future for human consciousness, that is, a future centered on the responsibility only human beings can take (1953, para.19).

### 2AC - AT: Root Cause

#### Their root cause author concedes—perm is necessary

Best ‘10 (Steve, their author, professor of philosophy, http://drstevebest.wordpress.com/2010/12/31/total-liberation-revolution-for-the-21st-century-4/)

I assert the need for more expansive visions and politics on both sides of the human/animal liberation equation, and to call for new forms of dialogue, learning, and strategic alliances that are all-too rare. The kind of alliance politics one finds throughout the world remains weak and abstract so long as veganism and animal liberation are excluded. These issues can no longer be ignored, marginalized, mocked, and trivialized by dogmatic, ignorant, and speciesist Leftists. Similarly, vegans and animal rights advocates can no longer afford to be single-issue and isolationist, they must understand the need to transcend the capitalist system, they must confront their own biases such as elitism, sexism and racism; and they must overcome their extreme isolation by forging alliances with social justice and environmental movements. Each movement has much to learn from the other, and no movement can achieve its goals apart from the other.
 A Multiperspectival Approach to Power
 A diverse and comprehensive theory of power and domination is necessary for a politics of total liberation, for alliances cannot be formed without understanding how different modes of power emerge, evolve, converge, and reinforce one another. Power is diverse, complex, and interlocking, and it cannot be adequately illuminated from the standpoint of any single group or concern.

### 2AC - AT: Serial Policy Failure

#### Their absolutist refusal to evaluate the plan causes paradigm wars, not change.

Wendt ‘98, 3rd Most Influential Scholar of IR in the World According to Survey of 1084 IR Scholars, ’98 (“On Constitution and Causation in International Relations,” British International Studies Association)

As a community, we in the academic study of international politics spend too much time worrying about the kind of issues addressed in this essay. The central point of IR scholarship is to increase our knowledge of how the world works, not to worry about how (or whether) we can know how the world works. What matters for IR is ontology, not epistemology. This doesn’t mean that there are no interesting epistemological questions in IR, and even less does it mean that there are no important political or sociological aspects to those questions. Indeed there are, as I have suggested above, and as a discipline IR should have more awareness of these aspects. At the same time, however, these are questions best addressed by philosophers and sociologists of knowledge, not political scientists. Let’s face it: most IR scholars, including this one, have little or no proper training in epistemology, and as such the attempt to solve epistemological problems anyway will inevitably lead to confusion (after all, after 2000 years, even the specialists are still having a hard time). Moreover, as long as we let our research be driven in an open-minded fashion by substantive questions and problems rather than by epistemologies and methods, there is little need to answer epistemological questions either. It is simply not the case that we have to undertake an epistemological analysis of how we can know something before we can know it, a fact amply attested to by the success of the natural sciences, whose practitioners are only rarely forced by the results of their inquiries to consider epistemological questions. In important respects we do know how international politics works, and it doesn’t much matter how we came to that knowledge. In that light, going into the epistemology business will distract us from the real business of IR, which is international politics. Our great debates should be about first-order issues of substance, like the ‘first debate’ between Realists and Idealists, not second-order issues of method.
Unfortunately, it is no longer a simple matter for IR scholars to ‘just say no’ to epistemological discourse. The problem is that this discourse has already contaminated our thinking about international politics, helping to polarize the discipline into ‘paradigm wars’. Although the resurgence of these wars in the 1980s and 90s is due in large part to the rise of post-positivism, its roots lie in the epistemological anxiety of positivists, who since the 1950s have been very concerned to establish the authority of their work as Science. This is an important goal, one that I share, but its implementation has been marred by an overly narrow conception of science as being concerned only with causal questions that can be answered using the methods of natural science. The effect has been to marginalize historical and interpretive work that does not fit this mould, and to encourage scholars interested in that kind of work to see themselves as somehow not engaged in science. One has to wonder whether the two sides should be happy with the result. Do positivists really mean to suggest that it is not part of science to ask questions about how things are constituted, questions which if those things happen to be made of ideas might only be answerable by interpretive methods? If so, then they seem to be saying that the double-helix model of DNA, and perhaps much of rational choice theory, is not science. And do post-positivists really mean to suggest that students of social life should not ask causal questions or attempt to test their claims against empirical evidence? If so, then it is not clear by what criteria their work should be judged, or how it differs from art or revelation. On both sides, in other words, the result of the Third Debate’s sparring over epistemology is often one-sided, intolerant caricatures of science.

### 2AC Warming K

#### No link – the aff doesn’t use apocalyptic rhetoric – we say warming will do undue harm to disparate populations – means their political participation is stifled – we are a K of disaster discourse

#### The neg grants language too much power: we must stop believing in the determinate power of representation to deal with disaster and suffering

Briggs 2011 (Sheila, Associate Professor of Religion and Gender Studies Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theology, 83-84)

The feminist theorists who have worked on an expanded notion of embodiment have often adopted a materialist approach (Hennessy 1993; Grosz 1994; Gatens 1996). Recently there has been a reinvigoration of the materialist feminism that is critical of the linguistic turn in feminist theory and the forms of constructionism and representationalism that have accompanied it. 'Language has been granted too much power,' writes Karen Barad (2008: 120) and Susan Hekman expresses her frustration even more forcefully at the collapse of materiality into language:
 Linguistic constructionism, however, has trouble with matter. Did concepts constitute the tsunami that devastated parts of Asia? Or hurricane Katrina's destruction of New Orleans? Or, even more disturbingly, the attack on the Twin Towers? The linguistic constructionists tell us that we understand all of these events linguistically and that it is this understanding that constitutes their reality. Yet something is missing in this explanation. Something happened in these events--and by extension all events--that escapes the strictly linguistic…It is undoubtedly true that we understand our world linguistically. But what this leaves out is that there is a world out there that we understand. Dogmatic adherence to linguistic constitution cannot account for the reality and agency of that world. (Hekman 2010).
 We are most acutely aware that we are embodied in a material world when we suffer ourselves or feel empathy towards suffering others. Stacy Alaimo elaborated her concept of transcorporeality as a way of talking about toxic bodies and environmental justice (Alaimo and Hekman 2008). It is in such circumstances that we feel viscerally the permeability of the body's boundaries that cannot be pushed aside by an appeal either to the individual's autonomy or to the linguistic construction of experience.

#### The discourse of inevitability is accurate and NECESSARY for accurate communication and action on climate change

Risbey ‘7 [1/15/7, James S. Risbey. “The new climate discourse: Alarmist or alarming?” Science Direct,http://cstpr.colorado.edu/students/envs\_4800/risbey\_2008.pdf]

Hulme (2006) says that the ‘‘language of catastrophe is not the language of science’’ and that to ‘‘state that climate change will be ‘catastrophic’ hides a cascade of value-laden assumptions which do not emerge from empirical or theoretical science’’. Yet the terms that he associates with this discourse: ‘catastrophic’, ‘rapid’, ‘urgent’, ‘irreversible’, ‘worse than we thought’, and ‘chaotic’ all seem to be fairly consistent and reasonable descriptors of the phenomenon of climate change and some of its key impacts. Empirical and theoretical science does contain these terms to describe climate change. A search of any of the standard science databases yields thousands of ‘hits’ for these terms when combined with ‘climate change’. Of course, this is a crude counting metric, but the point stands that the scientific discourse is no stranger to these terms to describe climate change. The use of terms like the above in the modern climate literature begins at least from the first papers describing possible melt of the West Antarctic ice sheet as a ‘‘threat of disaster’’ (Mercer, 1978) and continues through contemporary assessments describing the kinds of ‘‘non-linear climate responses’’ outlined here as potentially ‘‘catastrophic’’ (Mitchell et al., 2006).
 If the scientific community is not able to use terms such as ‘catastrophic’, ‘rapid’, ‘urgent’, ‘irreversible’, and ‘worse than thought’ when describing the impacts of significant phenomena, then we would not be able to communicate accurate information about the degree of threat, the rapidity and imminence of the threat, on whether and when the threat can be ameliorated, or on changes in our understanding of the threat. Scientific communication stripped of terms that describe these features of a problem might be less value-laden, but it would fall short in conveying some of the fundamental information needed to make informed judgments about the threat. There is a tendency among scientists to criticize terms describing the degree of a threat as value-laden only when the terms describe severe impacts (‘catastrophic’, ‘rapid’, ‘irreversible’), and not when the terms convey moderate impacts. One rarely sees complaints about scientists being value- loaded for describing impacts as ‘mild’ for example. This asymmetry in use of the charge of ‘value-loading’ is a form of scientific reticence (Hansen, 2007) and weakens scientific communication in the face of actual threats to the public.
 Surely the issue is not whether the climate community can use such terms as those above, but whether they are reasonable descriptors according to our understanding of the science and the nature and context of the impacts. There must be an element of judgement in deciding precisely which term to use, but that does not render the use of such terms ‘unscientific’. If it does, then for consistency, terms describing moderate impacts must also be rendered ‘unscientific’, and there is no scope for communication.

#### We need the discourse to motivate people to leave areas of disaster – you can’t evacuate without some form of communication

#### Climate denialism is 21st century invisible racism at its finest – the Politics of denial act to preserve the interests of the rich white male, ignoring the impact borne by minorities.

Mooney ’11, Chris, science and political journalist specializing in science in politics, the psychology of denialism, Knight Science Journalism Fellow, MIT; Visiting Associate, Center for Collaborative History, Princeton U; 8/2/11 (“What’s Up With Conservative White Men and Climate Change Denial?,” http://www.desmogblog.com/what-s-conservative-white-men-and-climate-change-denial)

They’re the conservative white men (CWM) of climate change denial, and we’ve all gotten to know them in one way or another. But we haven’t had population-level statistics on them until recently, courtesy of a new paper in Global Environmental Change (apparently not online yet, but live in the blogosphere as of late last week) by sociologists Aaron McCright and Riley Dunlap. It’s entitled “Cool Dudes: The denial of climate change among conservative white males in the United States.” Among other data, McCright and Dunlap show the following: — 14% of the general public doesn’t worry about climate change at all, but among CWMs the percentage jumps to 39%. — 32% of adults deny there is a scientific consensus on climate change, but 59% of CWMs deny what the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientists have said. — 3 adults in 10 don’t believe recent global temperature increases are primarily caused by human activity. Twice that many – 6 CWMs out of every ten – feel that way. What’s more, and in line with a number of post I’ve written in the past, McCright and Dunlap also find among these CWMs a phenomenon I sometimes like to call “smart idiocy.” Even as they deny mainstream climate science, conservative white males are also more likely than average U.S. adults to think they understand the science they deny—that they’re right, the scientists are wrong, and they can prove it. Indeed, they’re just dying to debate you and refute you. The authors bring up two possible explanations for the broad CWM phenomenon, both based on literature in the social sciences. The first is “identity-protective cognition” theory (or what I would call motivated reasoning). The second is “system justification” theory, which is just what it sounds like: the study of why people, often implicitly and subconsciously, are motivated to ratify and reaffirm the status quo—why their default position is against, rather than for, progressive change. Motivated reasoning suggests that men who have “hierarchical” values—resisting reforms to increase economic or social equality, believing that some people should be running things and some should be taking orders, or that it’s perfectly okay and normal that some will succeed and some will fail—will be more inclined [to] defend a social system that’s structured in this way. Such a tendency has been used in the past to explain the “white male effect”: White men tend to downplay all manner of risks, especially environmental ones, but also risks posed by things like the vast proliferation of guns in America. This, presumably, is both because they’re less harmed by such risks overall (the burden often falls more on the disadvantaged), but also because they have trouble personally conceiving of the reality of these risks (they don’t see the current state of things as being very bad or objectionable). But why do men downplay climate risks in particular? Here’s where “system justification” theory comes in: If climate change is real and human caused, it potentially threatens the whole economic order and those who have built it and benefited from it. It is the most inconvenient of truths. So the idea is that the men who benefit from the fossil-fuel based energy system will rationalize and defend that system from challenge—and the science of climate change is, in some ways, the ultimate challenge. (More on this here.) This, by the way, may help to explain why conservatives so often liken the promotion of mainstream climate science, and advocacy for greenhouse gas emission controls, to a secret agenda to advance global socialism or communism. It isn’t—we’re so far from a left wing revolution in this country that the whole idea is laughable—but you can see how this wild claim might make more sense to them than it does to you and me. There’s also a strong element of groupthink here, write McCright and Dunlap. Conservative white male elites like Rush Limbaugh disseminate the climate denial message, and then their followers come to associate with it and build identities around it: To the extent that conservative white males in the general public view their brethren within the elite sectors as an ingroup, then we expect that the former also will tend to reject the global warming claims of the scientific community, the environmental movement, and environmental policy-makers. In short, they will espouse climate change denial to defend the information disseminated within their in-group and to protect their cultural identity as conservative white males. Honestly, while we’re cranking out all these theories, I am surprised the authors didn’t bring up what may be the most biologically grounded of them: “social dominance orientation,” or SDO. This refers to a particular personality type—usually male and right wing—who wants to dominate others, who sees the world as a harsh place (metaphorically, a “jungle”) where it’s either eat or be eaten, and who tends to really believe in a Machiavellian way of things. Fundamentally, this identity is all about testosterone firing and being an alpha male. SDOs are fine with inequality and in favor of hierarchy because frankly, they think some people (e.g., them) are just better than others, and therefore destined to get ahead. What are we to make of all of these theories? Certainly they’re more than just hand-waving: They’re all based on actual survey measurements of various tendencies within the population. So there is clearly some truth to all of them. They’re also overlapping, rather than mutually exclusive. My sense is that they’re all taking a nibble at something real; some, like “social dominance” theory, may describe certain individuals but not others. But if there’s a central theme uniting them all, it’s the idea that some people, perhaps especially conservative men, will be more comfortable with, and more inclined to rationalize, hierarchy. Now, do I think conservative white men consciously wake up in the morning and say to themselves, “I’m going to go on blogs and attack climate science today so I can screw over the little guy?” Certainly not. Rather, I simply think they experience modern climate science and climate advocacy as an affront, an attack on them and what they believe. They were brought up in a certain way, they believe certain things, and they have no reason to think of themselves as bad people—and indeed, mostly they’re not bad people. They give to charity. They go to church. They provide for a family. And so on. But then they perceive all these attacks on their values coming from outsiders—hippie environmentalists and ivory tower climate scientists. If you didn’t do anything wrong, and you consider yourself as reasonable and intelligent—but people are attacking you and your values—you maybe get kind of outraged and worked up. From there, the attacks on climate science and climate scientists may begin—and the affirmation of the in-group by attacking the out-group. Needless to say, Fox News, Rush Limbaugh’s radio show, and various climate denial blogs serve to fan the flames.

#### Political participation is a prerequisite -- autonomous political groups are necessary

Herod 4 (James, Getting Free, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm)

These principles however must be embodied in concrete social arrangements. In this sketch they are embodied in the following configuration of social forms: (a) autonomous, self-governing democratic Neighborhoods (through the practice of the Home Assembly); (b) self-managed Projects; (c) cooperatively operated Households; and (d) an Association, by means of treaties, of neighborhoods one with another.
 But how can this be achieved? Now we must turn to the task of fleshing out this strategy, but this time in concrete terms rather than abstractly.

#### Framing issue – only we have evidence in the context of current disaster policy – their evidence is outdated

#### The current struggle against global warming represents the invisibility of race at its finest – the environmental movement has exemplified modern color muteness and we must connect the dots between racial discrimination in warming if we are to survive

Tim Wise April 13th 2011 Tim Wise and White Privilege http://changefromwithin.org/2011/04/13/tim-wise-and-white-privilege/ [Wise served as an adjunct faculty member at the Smith College School for Social Work, in Northampton, Massachusetts, where he co-taught a Master’s level class on Racism in the U.S. In 2001, Wise trained journalists to eliminate racial bias in reporting, as a visiting faculty-in-residence at the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Florida. From 1999-2003, Wise was an advisor to the Fisk University Race Relations Institute, in Nashville, and in the early ’90s he was Youth Coordinator and Associate Director of the Louisiana Coalition Against Racism and Nazism: the largest of the many groups organized for the purpose of defeating neo-Nazi political candidate, David Duke. He graduated from Tulane University in 1990 and received antiracism training from the People’s Institute for Survival and Beyond, in New Orleans.]

But as troubling as colorblindness can be when evinced by liberals, colormuteness may be even worse. Colormuteness comes into play in the way many on the white liberal-left fail to give voice to the connections between a given issue about which they are passionate, and the issue of racism and racial inequity. So, for instance, when environmental activists focus on the harms of pollution to the planet in the abstract, or to non-human species, but largely ignore the day-to-day environmental issues facing people of color, like disproportionate exposure to lead paint, or municipal, medical and toxic waste, they marginalize black and brown folks within the movement, and in so doing, reinforce racial division and inequity. Likewise, when climate change activists focus on the ecological costs of global warming, but fail to discuss the way in which climate change disproportionately affects people of color around the globe, they undermine the ability of the green movement to gain strength, and they reinforce white privilege. How many climate change activists, for instance, really connect the dots between global warming and racism? Even as people of color are twice as likely as whites to live in the congested communities that experience the most smog and toxic concentration thanks to fossil fuel use? Even as heat waves connected to climate change kill people of color at twice the rate of their white counterparts? Even as agricultural disruptions due to warming — caused disproportionately by the white west — cost African nations $600 billion annually? Even as the contribution to fossil fuel emissions by people of color is 20 percent below that of whites, on average? Sadly, these facts are typically subordinated within climate activism to simple “the world is ending” rhetoric, or predictions (accurate though they may be) that unless emissions are brought under control global warming will eventually kill millions. Fact is, warming is killing a lot of people now, and most of them are black and brown. To build a global movement to roll back the ecological catastrophe facing us, environmentalists and clean energy advocates must connect the dots between planetary destruction and the real lives being destroyed currently, which are disproportionately of color. To do anything less is not only to engage in a form of racist marginalizing of people of color and their concerns, but is to weaken the fight for survival.

### 2AC Wilderson

#### 1st – Doesn’t solve the affirmative and we outweigh –

1. **Natural disasters** – large scale natural disasters like Sandy and Katrina are inevitable without federal action – only the government has the resources necessarily to empirically minimize both suffering and casualties – that’s \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ from the 1AC.
2. State is necessary to end oppression – extend \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ from the 1AC which indicate that movements away from the state experience mass slaughter and genocide because the state possesses all of the weapons. Their radical stance is doomed because the government and whiteness will fight back. Only working within the system solves
3. **Timeframe** – they can’t prove when the alternative will work. In the interim, hundreds of thousands of lives will be sacrificed to a natural disaster-affirmative solvency for rebuilding oceans is quick, especially because we fiat implementation that is immediate – that’s \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ from the 1AC

#### Perm do the plan then the alt – the political is a prereq to the alt – we control the nexus issue of how economies of blackness are generated – only the 1AC diagnoses and remedies how these economies emerge – the alt leaves in tact the conditions that historically decimate low income, minority communities as proven by Sandy and Katrina.

#### Empirics on our side – 1985 Mexican earthquake demonstrated quick mobilization of opposition in face of government failure – plan resolves the political calculation of natural disasters – the USFG takes preplanned measures to prevent the rise of community resistance

#### Perm do both – Wilderson concedes the difference between paradigm and praxis is indeterminate--we have to combine the aff with their analysis to grow political opposition

Wilderson ‘11 (Frank B, http://www.yorku.ca/intent/issue5/articles/frankbwildersoniii.php)

[34] How does one calibrate the gap between objective vertigo and the need to be productive as a Black revolutionary? What is the political significance of restoring balance to the inner ear? Is tyranny of closure the only outcome of such interventions or could restoration of the Black subject’s inner ear, while failing at the level of conceptual framework, provide something necessary, though intangible, at the level of blood and sweat political activism? These unanswered questions haunt this article. Though I have erred in this article on the side of paradigm as opposed to praxis, and cautioned against assuming that we know or can know what the harvest of their sacrifice was, I believe we are better political thinkers—if not actors—as a result of what they did with their bodies, even if we still don’t know what to do with ours.

#### Impact turn the alt

#### Even radical racial movements made demands on the state – Black Panthers demanded housing, free healthcare for all, etc

#### We have justified intervention

#### We must make demands on the state to have evenly distributed protections from disasters for populations cut off from politics

#### Our discourse is key – substance determines process – putting our foot down in the debate space disrupts the generation of economies of blackness – we actually have a coherent explanation for the discursive and ethical conditions that make a given course of action possible and structure its outcome

#### They don’t control root cause – 1AC analyzes how economies of blackness come into being – the alt doesn’t remedy the regeneration of those economies – only the aff solves

#### Our is point 10 on the Black panthers ten point plan

Blackpathers.org [http://www.blackpanther.org/TenPoint.htm] The Ten Point Plan

1. WE WANT FREEDOM. WE WANT POWER TO DETERMINE THE DESTINY OF OUR BLACK AND OPPRESSED COMMUNITIES.
 We believe that Black and oppressed people will not be free until we are able to determine our destinies in our own communities ourselves, by fully controlling all the institutions which exist in our communities.
 2. WE WANT FULL EMPLOYMENT FOR OUR PEOPLE.
 We believe that the federal government is responsible and obligated to give every person employment or a guaranteed income. We believe that if the American businessmen will not give full employment, then the technology and means of production should be taken from the businessmen and placed in the community so that the people of the community can organize and employ all of its people and give a high standard of living.
 3. WE WANT AN END TO THE ROBBERY BY THE CAPITALISTS OF OUR BLACK AND OPPRESSED COMMUNITIES.
 We believe that this racist government has robbed us and now we are demanding the overdue debt of forty acres and two mules. Forty acres and two mules were promised 100 years ago as restitution for slave labor and mass murder of Black people. We will accept the payment in currency which will be distributed to our many communities. The American racist has taken part in the slaughter of our fifty million Black people. Therefore, we feel this is a modest demand that we make.
 4. WE WANT DECENT HOUSING, FIT FOR THE SHELTER OF HUMAN BEINGS.
 We believe that if the landlords will not give decent housing to our Black and oppressed communities, then housing and the land should be made into cooperatives so that the people in our communities, with government aid, can build and make decent housing for the people.
 5. WE WANT DECENT EDUCATION FOR OUR PEOPLE THAT EXPOSES THE TRUE NATURE OF THIS DECADENT AMERICAN SOCIETY. WE WANT EDUCATION THAT TEACHES US OUR TRUE HISTORY AND OUR ROLE IN THE PRESENT-DAY SOCIETY.
 We believe in an educational system that will give to our people a knowledge of the self. If you do not have knowledge of yourself and your position in the society and in the world, then you will have little chance to know anything else.
 6. WE WANT COMPLETELY FREE HEALTH CARE FOR All BLACK AND OPPRESSED PEOPLE.
 We believe that the government must provide, free of charge, for the people, health facilities which will not only treat our illnesses, most of which have come about as a result of our oppression, but which will also develop preventive medical programs to guarantee our future survival. We believe that mass health education and research programs must be developed to give all Black and oppressed people access to advanced scientific and medical information, so we may provide our selves with proper medical attention and care.
 7. WE WANT AN IMMEDIATE END TO POLICE BRUTALITY AND MURDER OF BLACK PEOPLE, OTHER PEOPLE OF COLOR, All OPPRESSED PEOPLE INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.
 We believe that the racist and fascist government of the United States uses its domestic enforcement agencies to carry out its program of oppression against black people, other people of color and poor people inside the united States. We believe it is our right, therefore, to defend ourselves against such armed forces and that all Black and oppressed people should be armed for self defense of our homes and communities against these fascist police forces.
 8. WE WANT AN IMMEDIATE END TO ALL WARS OF AGGRESSION.
 We believe that the various conflicts which exist around the world stem directly from the aggressive desire of the United States ruling circle and government to force its domination upon the oppressed people of the world. We believe that if the United States government or its lackeys do not cease these aggressive wars it is the right of the people to defend themselves by any means necessary against their aggressors.
 9. WE WANT FREEDOM FOR ALL BLACK AND OPPRESSED PEOPLE NOW HELD IN U. S. FEDERAL, STATE, COUNTY, CITY AND MILITARY PRISONS AND JAILS. WE WANT TRIALS BY A JURY OF PEERS FOR All PERSONS CHARGED WITH SO-CALLED CRIMES UNDER THE LAWS OF THIS COUNTRY.
 We believe that the many Black and poor oppressed people now held in United States prisons and jails have not received fair and impartial trials under a racist and fascist judicial system and should be free from incarceration. We believe in the ultimate elimination of all wretched, inhuman penal institutions, because the masses of men and women imprisoned inside the United States or by the United States military are the victims of oppressive conditions which are the real cause of their imprisonment. We believe that when persons are brought to trial they must be guaranteed, by the United States, juries of their peers, attorneys of their choice and freedom from imprisonment while awaiting trial.
 10. WE WANT LAND, BREAD, HOUSING, EDUCATION, CLOTHING, JUSTICE, PEACE AND PEOPLE'S COMMUNITY CONTROL OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY.
 When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.
 We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are most disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpation, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

#### No specific link – no evidence assumes oceanic climate resiliency – lack of specificity means you can’t evaluate it and you can vote affirmative because the negative isn’t defending the status quo.

#### Must work within the institution to effectuate change

Williams ‘70 [Robert F., civil rights leader, promoter of self defense, interviewed by The Black Scholar, “Interviews,” The Black Scholar Volume 1 Number 7]

Williams: It is erroneous to think that one can isolate oneself completely from institutions of a social and political system that exercises power over the environment in which he resides. Self-imposed and premature isolation, initiated by the oppressed against the organs of a tyrannical establishment, militates against revolutionary movements dedicated to radical change. It is a grave error for militant and just minded youth to reject struggle-serving opportunities to join the man's government and the services, police forces, peace corps and vital organs of the power structure. Militants should become acquainted with the methods of the oppressor. Meaningful change can be more thoroughly effectuated by militant pressure from withinas well as without.We can obtain valuable know-how from the oppressor**.** Struggle is not all violence. Effective struggle requires tactics, plans, analysis and a highly sophisticated application of mental aptness. The forces of oppression and tyranny have perfected highly articulate systems of infiltration for undermining and frustrating the efforts of the oppressed in trying to upset the unjust status quo. To a great extent, the power structure keeps itself informed as to the revolutionary activity of freedom fighters. With the looming threat of extermination looming menacingly before black Americans, it is pressingly imperative that our people enter the vital organs of the establishment. Infiltrate the man's institutions**.**

#### SEE STATE GOOD ABOVE