### A2 Dickinson

#### Consensus goes aff

Dickinson 10 (David Dickinson. Director of SciDev.net; Science in diplomacy: “On tap but not on top”; June 28, 2010; http://scidevnet.wordpress.com/category/science-diplomacy-conference-2010/)//KDUB

“Science for diplomacy” therefore ended up with a highly mixed review. The consensus seemed to be that science can prepare the ground for diplomatic initiatives – and benefit from diplomatic agreements – but cannot provide the solutions to either. “On tap but not on top” seems as relevant in international settings as it does in purely national ones. With all the caution that even this formulation still requires.

### 2AC EE Resnik

#### Plan is economic means – promotes trade and investment

State Department (“Science and Technology Cooperation”, http://www.state.gov/e/oes/stc/)

Thirty U.S. S&T Agreements worldwide establish bilateral frameworks to facilitate the exchange of scientific results, provide for protection and allocation of intellectual property rights and benefit sharing, facilitate access for researchers, address taxation issues, and respond to the complex set of issues associated with economic development, domestic security and regional stability. S&T cooperation supports the establishment of science-based industries, encourages investment in national science infrastructure, education and the application of scientific standards, promotes international trade and dialogue on issues of direct import to global security, such as protection of the environment and management of natural resources. S&T collaboration assists USG agencies to establish partnerships with counterpart institutions abroad. These relationships enable them to fulfill their individual responsibilities by providing all parties with access to new resources, materials, information, and research. High priority areas include such areas as agricultural and industrial biotechnology research (including research on microorganisms, plant and animal genetic materials, both aquatic and terrestrial), health sciences, marine research, natural products chemistry, environment and energy research.

#### Counter Interp Engagement requires offering positive incentives

**Haass and O’Sullivan, 2k** - \*Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution AND \*\*a Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution (Richard and Meghan, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies” Survival,, vol. 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf>

The term ‘engagement’ was popularised in the early 1980s amid controversy about the Reagan administration’s policy of ‘constructive engagement’ towards South Africa. However, the term itself remains a source of confusion. Except in the few instances where the US has sought to isolate a regime or country, America arguably ‘engages’ states and actors all the time simply by interacting with them. To be a meaningful subject of analysis, the term ‘engagement’ must refer to something more specific than a policy of ‘non-isolation’. As used in this article, ‘engagement’ refers to a foreign-policy strategy which depends to a significant degree on positive incentives to achieve its objectives. Certainly, it does not preclude the simultaneous use of other foreign-policy instruments such as sanctions or military force: in practice, there is often considerable overlap of strategies, particularly when the termination or lifting of sanctions is used as a positive inducement. Yet the distinguishing feature of American engagement strategies is their reliance on the extension or provision of incentives to shape the behaviour of countries with which the US has important disagreements.

#### That means we’re T

Haass and O’Sullivan 2k– American diplomat, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, Director of Policy Planning for the Department of State, advisor to Colin Powell, US Coordinator for the Future of Afghanistan / former deputy national security advisor on Iraq and Afghanistan, Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of Practice of International Affairs and senior fellow at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, and adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (Richard N. and Meghan L., “f Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Brooking Institute, 2000; < http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf>)//Beddow

Many different types of engagement strategies exist, depending on who is engaged, the kind of incentives employed and the sorts of objectives pursued. Engagement may be conditional when it entails a negotiated series of exchanges, such as where the US extends positive inducements for changes undertaken by the target country. Or engagement may be unconditional if it offers modifications in US policy towards a country without the explicit expectation that a reciprocal act will follow. Generally, conditional engagement is geared towards a government; unconditional engagement works with a country’s civil society or private sector in the hopes of promoting forces that will eventually facilitate cooperation. Architects of engagement strategies can choose from a wide variety of incentives. Economic engagement might offer tangible incentives such as export credits, investment insurance or promotion, access to technology, loans and economic aid. 3 Other equally useful economic incentives involve the removal of penalties such as trade embargoes, investment bans or high tariffs, which have impeded economic relations between the United States and the target country. Facilitated entry into the economic global arena and the institutions that govern it rank among the most potent incentives in today’s global market. Similarly, political engagement can involve the lure of diplomatic recognition, access to regional or international institutions, the scheduling of summits between leaders – or the termination of these benefits. Military engagement could involve the extension of international military educational training in order both to strengthen respect for civilian authority and human rights among a country’s armed forces and, more feasibly, to establish relationships between Americans and young foreign military officers. While these areas of engagement are likely to involve working with state institutions, cultural or civil-society engagement entails building people-to-people contacts. Funding non- governmental organisations, facilitating the flow of remittances and promoting the exchange of students, tourists and other non-governmental people between countries are just some of the possible incentives used in the form of engagement.

Limits – their definition overlimits and impacts education where one advantage is static

Ground – Our interp solves predictable ground by allowing the neg a stable locus of links

Default to exclusive definitions they provide the best brightline

Their def arbitrarily excludes the aff

Lit checks - we have lit contextually defining econ engagement including our aff

Potential abuse is not a voter

Reasonability avoids infinite regress

### 2ac cir – notre dame

plan is bipartisan – americans perceive it as good foreign policy – uniquely key at midterms politicians want to get re-elected

specificity is the lens for the link

#### The plan’s popular

**DeWeerd, 1** – writer in seatte, cites Nick Smith, a republican rep from MI, (Sarah, “Embargoing Science: US Policy toward Cuba and Scientific Collaboration” 2001)ahayes

These relatively streamlined procedures have been in place since 1999, when the Clinton administration announced a new policy to expand people-to-people contacts-such as scientific exchanges-between the United States and Cuba. Scientific collaboration between the two countries continues to enjoy broad bipartisan support in Washington. Rep. Nick Smith (R-MI), who visited Cuba in April as part of a delegation organized by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, says that scientific collaboration is "one area that's reasonable" for contact with Cuba. "There are some things we can learn from them, and certainly many things they can learn from the scientific effort in this country."

#### Won’t pass

Bolton 10/29 (Alex Bolton - 10/29/13; “Ted Cruz looms large over comprehensive immigration reform”; The Hill; <http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/188422-ted-cruz-looms-large-over-comprehensive-immigration-reform>; KDUB)

Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) has shaped the view of Republican leaders on immigration reform, and his sway with grassroots conservatives will make passing comprehensive legislation significantly more difficult.¶ Cruz scored a victory in the battle for the hearts and minds of his party over the weekend when Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) backed away from the Senate’s overhaul of immigration laws.¶ GOP leaders, after President Obama’s reelection last year, sounded more open to moving broad legislation on immigration, but their interest in doing so has waned as Cruz’s power has grown.¶ “There are going to be a lot of Republicans who don’t want to be on the other side of Ted Cruz,” said Rosemary Jenks, director of government relations at NumbersUSA, a group that advocates for reduced immigration flows.¶ Cruz told Rubio and other Senate Republican colleagues earlier this year that a bill including a pathway to citizenship for an estimated 11 million illegal immigrants could not pass Congress and suggested removing the controversial provision.¶ Cruz has yet to decide what strategy he will pursue in the weeks ahead as Obama and Democrats try to ramp up pressure on the House to pass immigration reform.¶ “He’ll definitely be engaged,” a Senate GOP aide said.¶ Cruz’s influential stands against funding the Affordable Care Act and passing comprehensive immigration reform have made him a hero among conservative activists in Iowa, which hosts the first contest in the GOP presidential primary election.¶ “If the caucuses were held today, he would lap the field,” Steve Deace, a nationally syndicated radio host based in Iowa, told The Hill last week.¶ Deace said “Rubio is a nonstarter here” because of his partnership with Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.) to pass the Senate immigration bill.¶ Cruz spent the weekend in Iowa with Rep. Steve King (R-Iowa), the most outspoken critic of comprehensive immigration reform in the lower chamber. It’s a potentially fruitful relationship for both lawmakers.¶ Cruz, who has become an influential voice among House Tea Party conservatives, can help cement opposition to merging the broad Senate package with one of the narrower House bills that could pass there this fall. ¶ King does not want any immigration reform proposal to pass, fearing that one of the House piecemeal bills could later be used as vehicle to move the 1,200-page Senate bill.¶ King’s support could be crucial in the 2016 Iowa caucuses if Cruz decides to launch a bid for the White House.¶ Cruz pointedly clashed with Schumer, the chief Democratic sponsor of the Senate bill, and McCain on the need to pass a comprehensive bill in April.¶ “Any attempt to say in the House that you will not have a path to citizenship, will be a nonstarter,” Schumer warned reporters at a breakfast sponsored by The Christian Science Monitor. “I say that unequivocally. It will not pass the Senate.” ¶ “There’s no way of getting this job done without giving people a path to citizenship,” McCain told reporters.¶ At a Judiciary Committee hearing a few days earlier, Cruz warned a comprehensive bill could not pass¶ “I think if instead the bill includes elements that are deeply divisive — and I would note that I don’t think there is any issue in this entire debate that is more divisive than a path to citizenship for those who are here illegally — in my view, any bill that insists upon that jeopardizes the likelihood of passing any immigration reform bill,” Cruz said.¶ Conservative strategists say Cruz’s aggressive push to defund ObamaCare, which resulted in a 16-day government shutdown, has slammed the door on the Senate bill.¶ “The defund fight has affirmatively closed door on passing amnesty because it soured the relationship between the White House and Republicans,” a conservative strategist said.¶ Cruz’s popularity among Tea Party voters soared during the shutdown. A recent Pew poll showed he had a 74 percent favorable rating among Tea Party Republicans.¶ Conservatives warn that if GOP leaders attempt to negotiate a comprehensive reform bill with Senate Democrats, they would risk another intraparty blowup.¶ “They have no credibility to push through something so unpopular with the base,” the conservative strategist said.¶ Rubio, a likely 2016 presidential candidate, tempered his support for the Senate bill over the weekend.¶ “An ‘all or nothing’ strategy on immigration reform would result in nothing,” Alex Conant, Rubio’s spokesman, said Monday.¶ “What is keeping us from progress on a series of immigration issues on which there is strong consensus is the fear that a conference committee on a limited bill will be used to negotiate a comprehensive one. We should take that option off the table so that we can begin to move on the things we agree on,” he added.

#### Forcing controversial fights key to Obama’s agenda- try or die for the link turn

Dickerson 13 (John, Slate, Go for the Throat!, 1/18 www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html)

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. Gridlock over the fiscal cliff preceded it and gridlock over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that the president's clashes with House Republicans will end soon. Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day. But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country. The challenge for President Obama’s speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s partisan rancor, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP. If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat. President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack Obama of the first administration might have approached the task by finding some Republicans to deal with and then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would win some of their votes. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. That's the old way. He has abandoned that. He doesn't think it will work and he doesn't have the time. As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the Republicans are dead set on opposing him. They cannot be unchained by schmoozing. Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation. Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges in 2014 are not going to be willing partners. He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

#### Piecemeal passage is more likely

Foley 10/29 (Elise Foley, reporter; Huffington Post; 10/29/2013; “Conservatives Pushing Immigration Reform Say Piecemeal Approach Gains Steam”; <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/29/immigration-reform-conservatives_n_4175758.html>; KDUB)

House Republican leaders have rejected a comprehensive approach, saying they will instead vote on individual pieces of legislation. Though some immigration-related bills have been approved by House committees, they haven't gone to the floor for a vote.¶ Other bills are being drafted, but haven't been released, such as one led by Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) and Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) to give legal status to undocumented young people. Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) reportedly plans to introduce a bill that would allow undocumented immigrants to stay in the U.S. temporarily while they seek long-term solutions. It's unclear if such a measure could win support, given Republican opposition to so-called "amnesty" and Democratic reluctance to support something without a path to citizenship.¶ House Democrats have introduced a bill of their own and won support from nearly all of their own caucus and two Republicans: Reps. Jeff Denham (R-Calif.) and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.). The Democratic bill is a combination of the Senate-passed comprehensive reform legislation -- which includes a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants -- and a separate border security measure approved by the House Homeland Security Committee. The House Democrat-led bill won't get a vote, according to GOP leadership.¶ Based on what he heard from House members, Bailey said he doesn't think a path to citizenship "is going to happen." But Democrats, he said, may be realizing they're better off taking what they can get now and pushing for expanded reforms later.

#### Capital isn’t key to immigration reform

Hirsh ’13 (Michael Hirsh is chief correspondent for National Journal. He also contributes to 2012 Decoded. Hirsh previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau. He was also Newsweek’s Washington web editor and authored a weekly column for Newsweek.com. (“There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, National Journal, 2/7/2013, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>)

Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.

#### XO solves

The Hill 2-16 (“Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform”

http://thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform#ixzz2LEvg4R5R)

President Obama can – and will – take steps on immigration reform in the event Congress doesn't reach a comprehensive deal this year, according to several House Democratic leaders. While the Democrats are hoping Congress will preclude any executive action by enacting reforms legislatively, they say the administration has the tools to move unilaterally if the bipartisan talks on Capitol Hill break down. Furthermore, they say, Obama stands poised to use them. "I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "He's ready to move forward if we're not." Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.), vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, echoed that message, saying Obama is "not just beating the drum," for immigration reform, "he's actually the drum major." "There are limitations as to what he can do with executive order," Crowley said Wednesday, "but he did say that if Congress continued to fail to act that he would take steps and measures to enact common-sense executive orders to move this country forward." Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who heads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said there are "plenty" of executive steps Obama could take if Congress fails to pass a reform package. "The huge one," Grijalva said, is "the waiving of deportation" in order to keep families together. "Four million of the undocumented [immigrants] are people who overstayed their visas to stay with family," he said Friday. "So that would be, I think, an area in which … there's a great deal of executive authority that he could deal with." The administration could also waive visa caps, Grijalva said, to ensure that industries like agriculture have ample access to low-skilled labor. "Everybody's for getting the smart and the talented in, but there's also a labor flow issue," he said. To be sure, Obama and congressional Democrats would prefer the reforms to come through Congress – both because that route would solidify the changes into law and because it would require bipartisan buy-in. Still, House Republicans have been loath to accept one of the central elements of Obama's strategy: A pathway to citizenship for the estimated 11-12 million undocumented people currently living in the country – a move which many conservatives deem "amnesty." Indeed, when the House Judiciary Committee met earlier this month on immigration reform, much of the discussion focused on whether there is some middle ground between citizenship and mass deportation. “If we can find a solution that is … short of a pathway to citizenship, but better than just kicking 12 million people out, why is that not a good solution?” Rep. Raul Labrador (R-Idaho) asked during the hearing. Obama on Tuesday spent a good portion of his State of the Union address urging Congress to send him a comprehensive immigration reform bill this year. Central to that package, he said, should be provisions for "strong border security," for "establishing a responsible pathway to earned citizenship" and for "fixing the legal immigration system to cut waiting periods and attract the highly-skilled entrepreneurs and engineers that will help create jobs and grow our economy." "We know what needs to be done," Obama said. "So let’s get this done." Becerra said he and other immigration reformers have had two meetings with the White House on immigration this month, one with the executive team working on the issue and, more recently, with Obama himself. Becerra said administration officials "essentially" know what reforms they want – "and they have communicated that to both House and Senate members, bipartisanly" – but they also want Congress to take the lead. "They're giving Congress a chance to work its will to move this," Becerra said. "But … I don't think he's going to wait too long. "If you were to ask him would he be prepared to submit a bill if Congress isn't ready … he would tell you, I have no doubt, 'I can do it in a heartbeat,'" Becerra added. "The president will move forward where he can if Congress doesn't act."

### 2AC MUST READ

#### Baudrillard is the worst example of ivory tower academia—instead of dealing with real problems on the ground, he retreats into his safe western university and makes statements which echo colonialism and authorize genocide by cloaking war in philosophical terms. Technology makes war MORE real, not less—the correct course is ACTION to abate the CONSEQUENCES OF WAR. Star this card, because it lights their kritik on fire.

**BALSAS, 2006** [BALSAS is an interdisciplinary journal on media culture. Interview with Art Group BBM, “on first cyborgs, aliens and other sides of new technologies,” translated from lithiuanian <http://www.balsas.cc/modules.php?name=News&file=print&sid=151>]

Valentinas: We all know that Jean Baudrillard did not believe that the Gulf War did take place, as it was over-mediated and over-simulated. In fact, the Gulf War II is still not over, and Iraq became much more than just a Frankenstein laboratory for the new media, technology and “democracy” games. What can we learn from wars that do not take place, even though they cannot be finished? Are they becoming a symptom of our times as a confrontation between multiple time-lines, ideologies and technologies in a single place?

Lars: Actually, it has always been the same: new wars have been better test-beds for the state of art technologies and the latest computer-controlled firearms. The World War I already was a fully mechanized war where pre-robots were fighting each other and gassing the troops. And afterwards, the winners shape the new world order.

Olaf: **Who on hell is Baudrillard**? The one who earns money by publishing his prognoses after the things happen? **What a fuck,** **French philosophy deals too much with luxury problems and elegantly ignores the problem itself**. It’s no wonder, **this is the colonizer’s mentality**, you can hear it roaring in their words: **they use phrases made to camouflage genocide.**

I went to see that Virilio’s exhibition "Ce qui arrive" at Foundation Cartier in 2003. I was smashed by that banal presentation of  the evil of all kinds: again, natural catastrophes and evil done by man were exposed on the same wall, glued together with a piece of "theory". There you find it all, filed up in one row: the pure luxury of the Cartier-funded Jean Nouvel building, an artwork without any blood in its veins, and that late Christian philosophy about the techno-cataclysm being the revenge of God. **Pure shit, turned into gold in the holy cellars of the modern alchemists’ museums.**

The artist-made video "documents" of the Manhattan towers opposed to Iraqian war pictures: that’s not Armageddon, that’s man-invented war technology to be used to subdue others. And **there is always somebody who pushes the buttons,** even when the button is a computer mouse some ten thousand kilometers away from the place where **people die**, or even if it is a civil airplanes redirected by Islamists. Everybody knows that. **War technology has always been made to make killing easier**. And to produce martyrs as well.

Janneke: Compare Baudrillard with **Henry Dunant,** the founder of the International Committee of the Red Cross. Dunant was no philosopher, he was just an intelligent rich man in the late 19th century. But his ideas went far more in the direction where **you should hope to find** **philosophers** as well. He experienced war as a "randonneur": he passed by, he saw the suffering and the inhumanity of war. **And he felt obliged to act**. Apart from the maybe 10 days he spent on the battlefield, on the beautiful meadows in the Europeans Alps, helping wounded people to survive, as a complete medical layman he decided to do something more sustainable against these odds. He knew that his efforts couldn’t prevent war in general, but he felt that he could alter the cruelty of reality. **And he succeeded in doing it**. No wonder that in our days we find the most engaged people to support the TROIA projects intention in Geneva, where they are still based. And they are not only doing their necessary surgeon’s work in the field: they are as well **fighting with the same energy on the diplomatic battlefield.**

### AT: Role of the Ballot

#### The role of the ballot is to simulate the enactment of the plan --- debate is a game and that game requires the neg to prove that the entire plan is a bad idea – their framework creates a self-serving vision of the topic where they create goal posts, assert we don’t meet them and then suddenly they have assembled a coherent neg argument – that disincentives substantive debate and research

#### And, policy simulation doesn’t preclude bottom up politics, but engaging in bureaucratic reform results in effective outcomes ---- it doesn’t deny agency or result in a technocratic stranglehold on politics

Hager, 92 [Carol, J, professor of political science – Bryn Mawr College, “Democratizing Technology: Citizen & State in West German Energy Politics, 1974-1990” *Polity*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p. 45-7]

During this phase, the citizen initiative attempted to overcome its defensive posture and implement an alternative politics. The strategy of legal and technical challenge might delay or even prevent plant construction, but it would not by itself accomplish the broader goal on the legitimation dimension, i.e., democratization. Indeed, it worked against broad participation. The activists had to find a viable means of achieving change. Citizens had proved they could contribute to a substantive policy discussion. Now, some activists turned to the parliamentary arena as a possible forum for an energy dialogue. Until now, parliament had been conspicuously absent as a relevant policy maker, but if parliament could be reshaped and activated, citizens would have a forum in which to address the broad questions of policy-making goals and forms. They would also have an institutional lever with which to pry apart the bureaucracy and utility. None of the established political parties could offer an alternative program. Thus, local activists met to discuss forming their own voting list. These discussions provoked internal dissent. Many citizen initiative members objected to the idea of forming a political party. If the problem lay in the role of parliament itself, another political party would not solve it. On the contrary, parliamentary participation was likely to destroy what political innovations the extraparliamentary movement had made. Others argued that a political party would give the movement an institutional platform from which to introduce some of the grassroots democratic political forms the groups had developed. Founding a party as the parliamentary arm of the citizen movement would allow these groups to play an active, critical role in institutionalized politics, participating in the policy debates while retaining their outside perspective. Despite the disagreements, the Alternative List for Democracy and Environmental Protection Berlin (AL) was formed in 1978 and first won seats in the Land parliament with 7.2 percent of the vote in 1981.43 The founders of the AL were encouraged by the success of newly formed local green parties in Lower Saxony and Hamburg,44 whose evolution had been very similar to that of the West Berlin citizen move-ment. Throughout the FRG, unpopular administrative decisions affect-ing local environments, generally in the form of state-sponsored indus-trial projects, prompted the development of the citizen initiative and ecology movements. The groups in turn focused constant attention on state planning "errors," calling into question not only the decisions themselves, but also the conventional forms of political decision making that produced them.45 Disgruntled citizens increasingly aimed their critique at the established political parties, in particular the federal SPD/ FDP coalition, which seemed unable to cope with the economic, social, and political problems of the 1970s. Fanned by publications such as the Club of Rome's report, "The Limits to Growth," the view spread among activists that the crisis phenomena were not merely a passing phase, but indicated instead "a long-term structural crisis, whose cause lies in the industrial-technocratic growth society itself."46 As they broadened their critique to include the political system as a whole, many grassroots groups found the extraparliamentary arena too restrictive. Like many in the West Berlin group, they reasoned that the necessary change would require a degree of political restructuring that could only be accomplished through their direct participation in parliamentary politics.

Green/alternative parties and voting lists sprang up nationwide and began to win seats in local assemblies. The West Berlin Alternative List saw itself not as a party, but as the parliamentary arm of the citizen initiative movement. One member explains: "the starting point for alternative electoral participation was simply the notion of achieving a greater audience for [our] own ideas and thus to work in support of the extraparliamentary movements and initia-tives,"47 including non-environmentally oriented groups. The AL wanted to avoid developing structures and functions autonomous from the citizen initiative movement. Members adhered to a list of principles, such as rotation and the imperative mandate, designed to keep parliamentarians attached to the grassroots. Although their insistence on grassroots democracy often resulted in interminable heated discussions, the participants recognized the importance of experimenting with new forms of decision making, of not succumbing to the same hierarchical forms they were challenging. Some argued that the proper role of citizen initiative groups was not to represent the public in government, but to mobilize other citizens to participate directly in politics themselves; self-determination was the aim of their activity.48 Once in parliament, the AL proposed establishmento f a temporary parliamentaryco mmissiont o studye nergyp olicy,w hichf or the first time would draw all concernedp articipantst ogetheri n a discussiono f both short-termc hoicesa nd long-termg oals of energyp olicy. With help from the SPD faction, which had been forced into the opposition by its defeat in the 1981 elections, two such commissions were created, one in 1982-83 and the other in 1984-85.49T hese commissionsg ave the citizen activists the forum they sought to push for modernizationa nd technicali nnovation in energy policy. Although it had scaled down the proposed new plant, the utility had produced no plan to upgrade its older, more polluting facilities or to install desulfurizationd evices. With proddingf rom the energyc ommission, Land and utility experts began to formulate such a plan, as did the citizen initiative. By exposing administrative failings in a public setting, and by producing a modernization plan itself, the combined citizen initiative and AL forced bureaucratic authorities to push the utility for improvements. They also forced the authorities to consider different technological solutions to West Berlin's energy and environmental problems. In this way, the activists served as technological innovators. In 1983, the first energy commission submitted a list of recommendations to the Land parliament which reflected the influence of the citizen protest movement. It emphasized goals of demand reduction and efficiency, noted the value of expanded citizen participation and urged authorities to "investigate more closely the positive role citizen participation can play in achieving policy goals."50 The second energy commission was created in 1984 to discuss the possibilities for modernization and shutdown of old plants and use of new, environmentally friendlier and cheaper technologies for electricity and heat generation. Its recommendations strengthened those of the first commission.51 Despite the non-binding nature of the commissions' recommendations, the public discussion of energy policy motivated policy makers to take stronger positions in favor of environmental protection. III. Conclusion The West Berlin energy project eventually cleared all planning hurdles, and construction began in the early 1980s. The new plant now conforms to the increasingly stringent environmental protection requirements of the law. The project was delayed, scaled down from 1200 to 600 MW, moved to a neutral location and, unlike other BEWAG plants, equipped with modern desulfurization devices. That the new plant, which opened in winter 1988-89, is the technologically most advanced and environmen-tally sound of BEWAG's plants is due entirely to the long legal battle with the citizen initiative group, during which nearly every aspect of the original plans was changed. In addition, through the efforts of the Alter-native List (AL) in parliament, the Land government and BEWAG formulated a long sought modernization and environmental protection plan for all of the city's plants. The AL prompted the other parliamentary parties to take pollution control seriously. Throughout the FRG, energy politics evolved in a similar fashion. As Habermas claimed, underlying the objections against particular projects was a reaction against the administrative-economic system in general. One author, for example, describes the emergence of two-dimensional protest against nuclear energy: The resistance against a concrete project became understood simul-taneously as resistance against the entire atomic program. Questions of energy planning, of economic growth, of understanding of democracy entered the picture. . . . Besides concern for human health, for security of conditions for human existence and protec-tion of nature arose critique of what was perceived as undemocratic planning, the "shock" of the delayed public announcement of pro-ject plans and the fear of political decision errors that would aggra-vate the problem.52 This passage supports a West Berliner's statement that the citizen initiative began with a project critique and arrived at *Systemkritik*.53 I have labeled these two aspects of the problem the public policy and legitima-tion dimensions. In the course of these conflicts, the legitimation dimen-sion emergd as the more important and in many ways the more prob-lematic. Parliamentary Politics In the 1970s, energy politics began to develop in the direction Offe de-scribed, with bureaucrats and protesters avoiding the parliamentary channels through which they should interact. The citizen groups them-selves, however, have to a degree reversed the slide into irrelevance of parliamentary politics. Grassroots groups overcame their defensive posture enough to begin to formulate an alternative politics, based upon concepts such as decision making through mutual understanding rather than technical criteria or bargaining. This new politics required new modes of interaction which the old corporatist or pluralist forms could not provide. Through the formation of green/alternative parties and voting lists and through new parliamentary commissions such as the two described in the case study, some members of grassroots groups attempted to both operate within the political system and fundamentally change it, to restore the link between bureaucracy and citizenry. Parliamentary politics was partially revived in the eyes of West German grassroots groups as a legitimate realm of citizen participation, an outcome the theory would not predict. It is not clear, however, that strengthening the parliamentary system would be a desirable outcome for everyone. Many remain skeptical that institutions that operate as part of the "system" can offer the kind of substantive participation that grass-roots groups want. The constant tension between institutionalized politics and grassroots action emerged clearly in the recent internal debate between "fundamentalist" and "realist" wings of the Greens. Fundis wanted to keep a firm footing outside the realm of institutionalized politics. They refused to bargain with the more established parties or to join coalition governments. Realos favored participating in institutionalized politics while pressing their grassroots agenda. Only this way, they claimed, would they have a chance to implement at least some parts of their program. This internal debate, which has never been resolved, can be interpreted in different ways. On one hand, the tension limits the appeal of green and alternative parties to the broader public, as the Greens' poor showing in the December 1990 all-German elections attests. The failure to come to agreement on basic issues can be viewed as a hazard of grass-roots democracy. The Greens, like the West Berlin citizen initiative, are opposed in principle to forcing one faction to give way to another. Disunity thus persists within the group. On the other hand, the tension can be understood not as a failure, but as a kind of success: grassroots politics has not been absorbed into the bureaucratized system; it retains its critical dimension, both in relation to the political system and within the groups themselves. The lively debate stimulated by grassroots groups and parties keeps questions of democracy on the public agenda. Technical Debate In West Berlin, the two-dimensionality of the energy issue forced citizen activists to become both participants in and critics of the policy process. In order to defeat the plant, activists engaged in technical debate. They won several decisions in favor of environmental protection, often proving to be more informed than bureaucratic experts themselves. The case study demonstrates that grassroots groups, far from impeding techno-logical advancement, can actually serve as technological innovators. The activists' role as technical experts, while it helped them achieve some success on the policy dimension, had mixed results on the legitimation dimension. On one hand, it helped them to challenge the legitimacy of technocratic policy making. They turned back the Land government's attempts to displace political problems by formulating them in technical terms.54 By demonstrating the fallibility of the technical arguments, activists forced authorities to acknowledge that energy demand was a political variable, whose value at any one point was as much influenced by the choices of policy makers as by independent technical criteria. Submission to the form and language of technical debate, however, weakened activists' attempts to introduce an alternative, goal-oriented form of decision making into the political system. Those wishing to par-ticipate in energy politics on a long-term basis have had to accede to the language of bureaucratic discussion, if not the legitimacy of bureaucratic authorities. They have helped break down bureaucratic authority but have not yet offered a viable long-term alternative to bureaucracy. In the tension between form and language, goals and procedure, the legitima-tion issue persists. At the very least, however, grassroots action challenges critical theory's notion that technical discussion is inimical to democratic politics.55 Citizen groups have raised the possibility of a dialogue that is both technically sophisticated and democratic. In sum, although the legitimation problems which gave rise to grass-roots protest have not been resolved, citizen action has worked to counter the marginalization of parliamentary politics and the technocratic character of policy debate that Offe and Habermas identify. The West Berlin case suggests that the solutions to current legitimation problems may not require total repudiation of those things previously associated with technocracy.56 In Berlin, the citizen initiative and AL continue to search for new, more legitimate forms of organization consistent with their principles. No permanent Land parliamentary body exists to coordinate and con-solidate energy policy making.57 In the 1989 Land elections, the CDU/ FDP coalition was defeated, and the AL formed a governing coalition with the SPD. In late 1990, however, the AL withdrew from the coali-tion. It remains to be seen whether the AL will remain an effective vehi-cle for grassroots concerns, and whether the citizenry itself, now includ-ing the former East Berliners, will remain active enough to give the AL direction as united Berlin faces the formidable challenges of the 1990s. On the policy dimension, grassroots groups achieved some success. On the legitimation dimension, it is difficult to judge the results of grass-roots activism by normal standards of efficacy or success. Activists have certainly not radically restructured politics. They agree that democracy is desirable, but troublesome questions persist about the degree to which those processes that are now bureaucratically organized can and should be restructured, where grassroots democracy is possible and where bureaucracy is necessary in order to get things done. In other words, grassroots groups have tried to remedy the Weberian problem of the marginalization of politics, but it is not yet clear what the boundaries of the political realm should be. It is, however, the act of calling existing boundaries into question that keeps democracy vital. In raising alternative possibilities and encouraging citizens to take an active, critical role in their own governance, the contribution of grassroots environmental groups has been significant. As Melucci states for new social movements in general, these groups mount a "symbolic" challenge by proposing "a different way of perceiving and naming the world."58 Rochon concurs for the case of the West German peace movement, noting that its effect on the public discussion of secur-ity issues has been tremendous.59 The effects of the legitimation issue in the FRG are evident in increased citizen interest in areas formerly left to technical experts. Citizens have formed nationwide associations of environmental and other grassroots groups as well as alternative and green parties at all levels of government. The level of information within the groups is generally quite high, and their participation, especially in local politics, has raised the awareness and engagement of the general populace noticeably.60 Policy concessions and new legal provisions for citizen participation have not quelled grassroots action. The attempts of the established political parties to coopt "green" issues have also met with limited success. Even green parties themselves have not tapped the full potential of public support for these issues. The persistence of legitima-tion concerns, along with the growth of a culture of informed political activism, will ensure that the search continues for a space for a delibera-tive politics in modern technological society.61

### Gifts

#### Gifts and protection do not undermine dignity and reflect democratic ethics

Cuoto and Eken 2, Richard A. Couto, Professor of Leadership Studies at Antioch College and Stephanie C. Eken, Adolescent Psychiatry & Pediatric Psychiatry, 2002

(*To Give their Gifts: Health, Community, and Democracy*, p. 217-218).

Through the gift relationship, which meets the needs of strangers and expresses our mutual responsibility for each other, communities and individuals can work to narrow the gap between democratic values and actual practices. We conclude with reflections on innovative democratic leadership, the democratic prospect of community, and the democratic premise of the worth and dignity of every person.

#### **Perm do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alt - gift relationships in the context of civic society are still meaningful.**

O’Neill 01, John O’Neill, professor of sociology at York University, 2001, *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 6.2, “The Time(s) of the Gift,” pg. 13

In a secular society what is sacred is our gift to ourselves by means of taxation, the decommodified gifts of welfare (health, education) and the civic inclusion of all persons regarded as bearers of inalienable citizenship rights and duties. Even though mercantile and industrial capitalism makes the exchange of gifts secondary to contractual exchange,

it can hardly be said that social cohesion has ceased to work though gift relationships. Sociability, charity and welfare have remained ever present if not enlarged practices of modern society. Indeed, what concerned Mauss is that the privileged might neglect the return gift of the poor, so to speak, as much through lip-service to market rationality as from greed. Gifts are neither covertly egoistic nor simply demeaning; one cannot give without treating the receiver as one entitled in turn to give. For this reason, even poverty allowances include the receiver’s obligations to give and to engage hospitably and seasonally with others.

#### **Social life is a gift that cannot be reduced to contracts – the K is just an excuse not to help others.**

O’Neill 01, John O’Neill, professor of sociology at York University, 2001, *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 6.2, “The Time(s) of the Gift,” pg. 1

Today, we seek to give less to the poor -- to refuse them work, to reduce their wages, to withdraw welfare and to turn away the beggar. To rationalize the withdrawal of the welfare gift, market theorists have enunciated an ideology of the free gift -- the gift that must obligate neither the donor nor the recipient. It is quite remarkable, therefore, that Derrida's Given Time (1994) should risk offering the ideologists of the autonomous gift a philosophical/ literary pedigree. To do so, Derrida has tried to overwhelm the counter-sociological tradition of the gift that is voluntary yet obligatory (Mauss, 1950; 1990; Titmuss, 1970). I shall argue instead that what Mauss teaches us is that social life involves a meta-gift, i.e., an inalienable surplus of labour and service that cannot be reduced to the calculation of contracts. This gift cannot be returned by creating an egalitarian society anymore than it can be liquidated in the exercise of possessive talents. This is because the surplus-value in the gift derives from an economy of collective ability rather than one of individual need. Collective talent therefore complements the inequality of need with a gift of civic assurances, that are the proper context for the secular practices of charity (O'Neill, 1994).

### Perm

#### Only the perm can solve—their totalizing link arguments make it impossible to conceive of an escape from hegemonic orders—only combining their criticism with our embededness in reality and empirical research can create genuine opposition

**King, 1998** *[*Anthony, Professor at Essex University, Telos Journal, “Baudrillard’s Nihilism and the End of Theory*”,* <http://eric.exeter.ac.uk/exeter/bitstream/10036/71394/1/King%2520Baudrillard%2520Telos.pdf>]

In the end, Baudrillard’s discussion of hyperreality degenerates into technological determinism. As Raymond Williams has argued, technical development always presupposes a social and political context in which innovative technology is regarded as useful by particular groups, given their self-understandings. Consequently, **the development and use of any technology must always be analyzed in terms of the political realities which gave rise to it** and in which it remains embedded. From this opposition to technological determinism, Williams develops a critique of cultural pessimism because, for him, the belief in technological autonomy must lead critics into political quietism and pessimism. If technology determines social development and emerges independently, **then political resistance is** **futile**. In line with his claim that any technical development is always embedded in and employed in a social context, Williams rejects this cultural and political pessimism by arguing that**, since technology is always social, it cannot only be resisted but, more importantly, it is always potentially open to creative usage by opposition groups**.32

Williams’ insistence on the cultural embeddedness of television and opposition to technological determinism has important implications for Critical Theory in the postmodern era, and allows a re-application of Baudrillard’s early critique of capitalism to this later post-Fordist period. Just as Baudrillard argued that the notion of the objectivity of labor was a central political principle for the development of capitalism, because it seemed to render the market system indisputable, so is the apparently unstoppable development of brilliant new forms of technology in postFordist society employed to legitimate the contemporary political economic order and obviate political discontent and debate. The fantastic development of new technologies seems to divide post-Fordist society from all other social forms, demonstrating the indisputable superiority of this society. In such an apparent technological utopia, political opposition seems to become absurd and obsolete. Yet, despite its construction as an objective, inevitable and utopian force, technology is as deeply political and cultural as any previous capitalist cultural category and, therefore, **anything but inevitable and objective**. Given his early writings**, Baudrillard should have seen through this ideology of technology and not have been tricked into pessimism by its utopian and monolithic representation**. He should have seen through the rhetoric of the objectivity of technological development, just as he saw through claims about the objectivity of the market system to see why certain groups would want to represent new forms of technology in this way.

Had he immersed himself in the actual production and consumption of new technological forms, such as television, whose practices undermine the rhetoric of technological utopian determinism, it is doubtless that he would have done so. Then, just as Baudrillard claimed that capitalism was not a new political economy but only a symbolic system of exchange which dare not speak its name, so he would have seen that televisual culture, despite its technological novelty, is an unoriginal interpretative and symbolic social practice. Since these everyday practices and constructions of social reality belie official hegemonic accounts of reality, **the close analysis of them offers a route to** a **genuinely oppositional critical position**. As Piccone has argued: “With the dogma of a monolithic modernity engendering one particular self-referential cultural model no longer encumbering critical thought, it may be possible to vindicate particularity, specificity and otherness in really existing communities of people constituting their social reality through personal interaction and direct participation in most of the **decisions affecting their life.**”33 This engagement with **diverse popular practices** is **necessary** **if Critical Theory is to have a voice** in the post-Fordist order, but, true to the spirit of early Baudrillard (and Adorno), this engagement with popular practices must never make the error sometimes detectable in cultural studies of lapsing into a facile and uncritical populism, which automatically legitimates anything these groups choose to do.34 The popular practices with which Critical Theory should engage must themselves be subjected to critique where popular constructions of reality are themselves not assumed to be correct. In light of the necessarily interpretive nature of supposedly hyperreal culture, Baudrillard’s rejection of Critical Theory becomes unnecessary and incorrect. Instead of hypostatizing his own initial interpretation of the emergence of television as a new cultural phenomenon, Baudrillard should have taken his initial interpretation as a starting point, which would have driven him to **more detailed empirical research** by which his own understanding would be developed dialectically. Such concrete research would have demonstrated to him the actual way in which individuals conceive and construct their social reality, rather than his taking at face value commonsensical and hegemonic notions of social reality.35

### 2AC Science

#### Critiques of science will be exploited by groups interested in destroying the environment

Ted **BENTON** Sociology @ Essex **5** in *After Postmodernism* eds. Jose Lopez and Garry Potter p. 137-138

Second, the post‑Kuhnian relativist aproaches to the sociology of science, in challenging the proclaimed finality and cultural authority of big science, saw themselves as on the side of 'the underdog', pressing for democratic account­ability on the part of the scientific establishment ‑ even for a thoroughgoing democratisation of knowledge itself. Sociologists of science have tended to see 'technoscience' as indissolubly tied to political and industrial power and domin­ation. To call into question its epistemological authority has been to undermine a key source of legitimation for established power. However, the politics of the critique of science become more complex and ambivalent in the face of the new ecological issues. While many Greens see the interests associated with technoscience as largely to blame for many ecological hazards, they also rely on scientific detection, measurement and theoretical explanations in making out the Green case. The construction of incinerators for waste disposal adjacent to working‑class estates, the noise and fumes emitted by heavy road‑traffic, the loss of treasured landscapes and so on, are forms of ecological degradation which are readily perceptible, and may enter directly into the discourses of popular movements. However, many other, often more sinister and catastrophic, forms of ecological transformation may only be detected by scientific instrumentation. Nuclear and other forms of radiation, low concentrations of toxins in food and drinking water, antibiotic‑resistant pathogens, shifts in the chemical composi­tion of the upper atmosphere and so on fall into this category. In other cases, the scale of transformation is what is ecologically significant and, here again, scientific modelling and measurement displace the evidence provided by the senses of necessarily localised human agents. Global climate change, biodiversity loss, ozone depletion are among the transformations which fall into this category. Finally, rational discourse about policy options depends on (but is certainly not restricted to) best‑available scientific thinking about the causal mechanisms involved(the 'greenhouse' effect, CO2 exchanges at the surface of the oceans, pholovvnthesis, mechanisms of cloud‑formation and many others in the case of dinsate 'hanged. To expose the normatively and culturally 'constructed' character of those scientific research programmes which have so far indcnt‑ifled, measured and explained the hazardous dynamics of ecological change is to run a serious political risk. The big industrial complexes, such as the biotech, pharmaceutical, agribusiness, petrochemical, construction and road transport sectors, together with their state sponsors, have a lifeline thrown to them. That the knowledge ‑base which exposes the ecological 'externalities' of their activities is culturally biased and epistemologically questionable is music to their ears. Why put the brakes on wealth creation and progress on the basis of such flimsy and questionable evidence (see R. Rowell, 1996, esp. chap. 5)? These misuses of the work of constructionist sociology of environmental science are often seen as problematic from the standpoint of its practitioners (see, for example, r} a special issue of Social *Studies of Science, 1996).* Of course, it would be quite posble to accept these implications of he approach, in the face of unwanied political consequences: perhaps the weakening or even abandoning of environmental regulation and technteal safety standards could be accepted as an appropriate response to the sociologied dchunking of en ironmental science. lot esnnglv, however, few constructionists would be happy with such an out­conic. the question is, can they coherently or consistently unhappy about it? Winne i9% and Burninghaio md. Coopei (1999) oiler sophisticated defences of their own variants of construe onism from this sort of 'realist' criticism. They claim, variously, that the 'taking of sides' in environmental conflicts is not necessarily the most productive role for social scientists to take, and that, not­withstanding rite realist [critique. it](http://critique.it) often possible to combine constructionism with cotmitiimmred cn'‑ironmen iahsns. These contributions deserve much fuller responses than I have space for here hot, as I shall argue below. dicnt are other reasons for scepticism about the more radical versions of constructionism.

#### Empiricism is the best way of explaining the world --- otherwise exhibit biases

Benson, 8-

Ophelia editor of the website Butterflies and Wheels and deputy editor of The Philosophers' Magazine “Ways of knowing” http://www.butterfliesandwheels.org/2008/ways-of-knowing/

That comes much too close to saying explicitly that religion has a way of knowing, but that’s the very thing religion doesn’t have. It has lots of ways of claiming to know, of pretending to know, of performing an imitation of knowing; but it has no way of actually legitimately knowing. (Tom says exactly that in the paragraph following the quoted passages. I just felt like saying it too.) By implying non-empiricism might have some epistemic merit as a route to objectivity in certain realms, the NAS and other science-promoting organizations miss the biggest selling point for science, or more broadly, intersubjective empiricism: it has no rival when it comes to modeling reality in *any* domain that’s claimed to exist. The reason is simple but needs to be made explicit: religious and other non-empirical ways of knowing don’t sufficiently respect the distinction between appearance and reality, between subjectivity and objectivity. They are not sufficiently on guard against the possibility that one’s model of the world is biased by perceptual limitations, wishful thinking, uncorroborated intuition, conventional wisdom, cultural tradition, and other influences that may not be responsive to the way the world actually is. Just so – along with the rest of what Tom says about it; it’s hard to excerpt because it’s all so admirably clear and compelling. At any rate – all this is obvious enough and yet it’s kept tactfully veiled in much public discourse simply in order to appease people who are not sufficiently on guard against the possibility that one’s model of the world is biased by wishful thinking among other things. It’s all very unfortunate. **The very people who most need to learn to guard against cognitive bias are the ones who are being appeased lest they get ‘offended’** at discovering that. It’s an endless circle of epistemic disability. Faith-based religions and other non-empirically based worldviews routinely make factual assertions about the existence of god, paranormal abilities, astrological influences, the power of prayer, etc. So they are inevitably in the business of representing reality, of describing what they purport to be objective truths, some of which concern the supernatural. But having signed on to the cognitive project of supplying an accurate model of the world, they routinely violate basic epistemic standards of reliable cognition. There’s consequently no reason to grant them any domain of cognitive competence. Although this might sound arrogant, it’s a judgment reached from the standpoint of epistemic *humility*. The real arrogance is the routine violation of epistemic standards of reliable cognition. There’s something so vain, so self-centered, about doing that – as if it’s appropriate to think that our hopes and wishes get to decide what reality is. It’s just decent humility to realize that reality is what it is and that we are not so important or powerful that we can create it or change it with the power of thought.

#### That should be the threshold for a truth claim --- other modes of evaluating the world cause extinction

**Coyne, 06** – Author and Writer for the Times (Jerry A., “A plea for empiricism”, FOLLIES OF THE WISE, Dissenting essays, 405pp. Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker and Hoard, 1 59376 101 5)

Supernatural forces and events, essential aspects of most religions, play no role in science, not because we exclude them deliberately, but because they have never been a useful way to understand nature. Scientific “truths” are empirically supported observations agreed on by different observers. Religious “truths,” on the other hand, are personal, unverifiable and contested by those of different faiths. Science is nonsectarian: those who disagree on scientific issues do not blow each other up. Science encourages doubt; most religions quash it. But religion is not completely separable from science. Virtually all religions make improbable claims that are in principle empirically testable, and thus within the domain of science: Mary, in Catholic teaching, was bodily taken to heaven, while Muhammad rode up on a white horse; and Jesus (born of a virgin) came back from the dead. None of these claims has been corroborated, and while science would never accept them as true without evidence, religion does. A mind that accepts both science and religion is thus a mind in conflict. Yet scientists, especially beleaguered American evolutionists, need the support of the many faithful who respect science. It is not politically or tactically useful to point out the fundamental and unbreachable gaps between science and theology. Indeed, scientists and philosophers have written many books (equivalents of Leibnizian theodicy) desperately trying to show how these areas can happily cohabit. In his essay, “Darwin goes to Sunday School”, Crews reviews several of these works, pointing out with brio the intellectual contortions and dishonesties involved in harmonizing religion and science. Assessing work by the evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould, the philosopher Michael Ruse, the theologian John Haught and others, Crews concludes, “When coldly examined . . . these productions invariably prove to have adulterated scientific doctrine or to have emptied religious dogma of its commonly accepted meaning”. Rather than suggesting any solution (indeed, there is none save adopting a form of “religion” that makes no untenable empirical claims), Crews points out the dangers to the survival of our planet arising from a rejection of Darwinism. Such rejection promotes apathy towards overpopulation, pollution, deforestation and other environmental crimes: “So long as we regard ourselves as creatures apart who need only repent of our personal sins to retain heaven’s blessing, we won’t take the full measure of our species-wise responsibility for these calamities”. Crews includes three final essays on deconstruction and other misguided movements in literary theory. These also show “follies of the wise” in that they involve interpretations of texts that are unanchored by evidence. Fortunately, the harm inflicted by Lacan and his epigones is limited to the good judgement of professors of literature. Follies of the Wise is one of the most refreshing and edifying collections of essays in recent years. Much like Christopher Hitchens in the UK, Crews serves a vital function as National Sceptic. He ends on a ringing note: “The human race has produced only one successfully validated epistemology, characterizing all scrupulous inquiry into the real world, from quarks to poems. It is, simply, empiricism, or the submitting of propositions to the arbitration of evidence that is acknowledged to be such by all of the contending parties. Ideas that claim immunity from such review, whether because of mystical faith or privileged “clinical insight” or the say-so of eminent authorities, are not to be countenanced until they can pass the same skeptical ordeal to which all other contenders are subjected.” As science in America becomes ever more harried and debased by politics and religion, we desperately need to heed Crews’s plea for empiricism.

### 2AC I! Framing

Case outweighs and turns the k

Probability – They have no internal link from the plan to their terminal impact, our 1AC outlines a specific chain of events, which makes it more likely

Timeframe – Their root cause and extinction scenarios haven’t happened in thousands of years no reason they’ll do now, our 1ac impacts happen in the short term

That forecloses our ability to solve the k – you can’t do shit once you’re dead

Magnitude – staying alive is a prerequisite to their impact

We turn the k – our evidence indicates that the US will inevitably cling to its leadership position, the alt can’t solve that however science diplomacy makes US engagement benevolent; chances are we solve their impact that’s Federoff

Prefer proximate causes – root cause claims can’t be falsified falsifiability is key to effective decision making because it excludes random theories that have no real world basis

### Ressentiment d

#### Ressentiment is silly—avoiding it by rejecting active compassion is life-negating

Frazer 6

The Review of Politics (2006), 68: 49-78 Cambridge University Press

Michael Frazer's research focuses on Enlightenment political philosophy and its relevance for contemporary political theory. His current book project, “The Enlightenment of Sympathy: Justice and the Moral Sentiments in the Eighteenth Century and Today,” defends a psychologically holistic approach to political reflection through an examination of such authors as David Hume, Adam Smith and J. G. Herder. Dr. Frazer has also published articles on Maimonides, Nietzsche, John Rawls and Leo Strauss in such journals as "Political Theory" and "The Review of Politics." After receiving his B.A. from Yale University and his Ph.D. from Princeton University, Dr. Frazer spent the 2006-7 academic year as a postdoctoral research associate in the Political Theory Project at Brown University.

Assistant professor – HARVARD

There is a second way in which the painful experience of compassion can threaten human excellence. Not only do we risk developing contempt for all but the suffering masses, but we also risk developing contempt for the compassion that forces us to suffer with them. The terrible experience of shared suffering might lead some of the would-be great on a futile quest to abolish human misery. Others, however, are likely to conclude that their sympathetic pain could be most efficiently relieved by extirpating the faculties responsible for it. When we do not hate the suffering of others, but only our own sharing of this suffering, we seek only to banish compassion from our own breasts. Doing so, however, requires us to shield ourselves from the troubling awareness of our fellows' plight, to sever the imaginative and emotional bonds which connect us to others. It requires that we turn against our own strength of intelligence and imagination, that we sacrifice knowledge for ignorance by denying our insights into the human condition. Some of us might succeed in turning ourselves into such isolated, unthinking beings, but such individuals are not destined for creative achievement.

By contrast, the natural philosopher, poet, or psychologist—the born and inevitable unriddler of human souls—could no more destroy his own sense of compassion than he could abolish the human suffering which compassion compels him to share. A futile quest to extirpate his sympathetic sentiments would only turn such an individual against the world, against life, and against himself; in the end, it might even destroy him. Zarathustra does not pass the greatest test of his strength by purging compassion from his psyche. To the contrary, he affirms his painful experience of the emotion as creativity-enhancing and life-promoting. In doing so, Nietzsche's protagonist warns against those who unduly oppose compassion as well as those who unduly celebrate it. Both sides treat pain as something to be soothed away rather than harnessed for creative purposes; they differ only in whether the pain to be alleviated is our own or that of others. From the ethically authoritative perspective of life, both can be seen as opponents of human flourishing.

**Global extinction risks require rereading resentiment – we have to accept pity for utilitarian reasons**

**Winchester 94** (James J. Winchester teaches Philosophy at Spelman College, “Nietzsche's Aesthetic Turn”)

As uninformed as it is to assume that there is an easy connection between his thought and National Socialism, it is neither difficult nor misguided to consider his lack of social concern. Nietzsche saw one danger in our century, but failed to see a second. His critique of herd mentality reads like a prophetic warning against the dictatorships that have plagued and continue to haunt the twentieth century. **But the context of our world has changed in ways that Nietzsche never imagined. We now have, as never before, the ability to destroy the planet.** The threat of the destruction of a society is not new. From the beginnings of Western literature in the Iliad and the Odyssey, the Western mind has contemplated the destruction that, for example, warfare has wrought. Although the Trojan war destroyed almost everyone involved, both the victors and the vanquished, it did not destroy the entire world. **In the twentieth century, what has changed is the scale of destruction**. If a few countries destroy the ozone layer, the whole world perishes, or if two countries fight a nuclear or biological war, the whole planet is threatened. This is something new in the history of the world. The interconnectedness of the entire world has grown dramatically. We live, as never before, in a global community where our actions affect ever-larger numbers of the world's population. The earth's limits have become more apparent. Our survival depends on working together to solve problems like global pollution. Granted mass movements have instituted reigns of tenor, but **our survival as a planet is becoming ever-more predicated on community efforts of the sort that Nietzsche's thought seems to** denigrate if not **preclude**. I do not criticize Nietzsche for failing to predict the rise of problems requiring communal efforts such as the disintegration of the ozone layer, acid rain, and the destruction of South American rain forests. Noting his lack of foresight and his occasional extremism, I propose, in a Nietzschean spirit, to reconsider his particular tastes, without abandoning his aesthetic turn. Statements like "common good is a self-contradiction" are extreme, even for Nietzsche. He was not always so radical. Yet there is little room in Nietzsche's egoism for the kind of cooperation and sense of community that is today so important for our survival. I am suggesting that the time for Nietzsche's radical individualism is past. There are compelling pragmatic and aesthetic reasons why we should now be more open to the positive possibilities of living in a community. There is nothing new about society's need to work together. What has changed is the level of interconnectedness that the technological age has pressed upon us.

### Science Good

#### Empirics are an effective process for prediction, even if they fail at explanation

Walt 5 (Stephen M. Walt, Professor in the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, “The Relationship Between Theory and Policy in International Relations,” Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. 2005. 8:23–48, p.25-26, http://www.iheid.ch/webdav/site/political\_science/shared/political\_science/3452/walt.pdf)

Policy decisions can be influenced by several types of knowledge. First, policy makers invariably rely on purely factual knowledge (e.g., how large are the opponent’s forces? What is the current balance of payments?). Second, decision makers sometimes employ “rules of thumb”: simple decision rules acquired through experience rather than via systematic study (Mearsheimer 1989).3 A third type of knowledge consists of typologies, which classify phenomena based on sets of specific traits. Policy makers can also rely on empirical laws. An empirical law is an observed correspondence between two or more phenomena that systematic inquiry has shown to be reliable. Such laws (e.g., “democracies do not fight each other” or “human beings are more risk averse with respect to losses than to gains”) can be useful guides even if we do not know why they occur, or if our explanations for them are incorrect. Finally, policy makers can also use theories. A theory is a causal explanation— it identifies recurring relations between two or more phenomena and explains why that relationship obtains. By providing us with a picture of the central forces that determine real-world behavior, theories invariably simplify reality in order to render it comprehensible. At the most general level, theoretical IR work consists of “efforts by social scientists. . .to account for interstate and trans-state processes, issues, and outcomes in general causal terms” (Lepgold & Nincic 2001, p. 5; Viotti & Kauppi 1993

#### The scientific method is a form of predictions that solves and is fully defensible—it’s objective and requires a degree of academic consensus not present in any other field

**Sullivan 98** (Phillip A., professor of aerospace engineering at the University of Toronto’s Institute for Aerospace Studies, “An Engineer Dissects Two Cases Studies”, A House Built on Sand: Exposing Postmodernist Myths about Science, edited by Noretta Koertge)

The Process of Scientific Discovery This story illustrates all the characteristics of scientific discovery, and two points are relevant here. First, unless there is political interference, flawed or weak arguments of even the most respected scientists are rapidly exposed. Furthermore, eager for recognition and priority, individual scientists are quick to promote novel explanations. Thus, when scientists finally do agree on the solution to a problem, this agreement is not solely the result of negotiation; it is forged by the evidence. The second point is that interpretation of this evidence is often complex, being in many ways akin to the assembly of an elaborate jigsaw puzzle. The result of any individual theoretical or experimental investigation is at best ambiguous, and its ultimate meaning is dependent on other investigations. In the initial assembly stages, the available puzzle pieces may suggest many interpretations and may provoke much controversy, so rhetoric and reputation can play major roles in persuasion. As additional investigations are undertaken, however, any consensus on interpretation that develops often has such compelling consistency or can allow such spectacular predictions that it becomes increasingly difficult to deny that it reflects objectivity. [11](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/62417656) Finally, as the sound-speed story shows, for questions at the frontier of science, assembly of the puzzle may take decades and longer. It follows that to make a convincing case, advocates of relativism in science cannot simply point to the disputes and controversies surrounding a puzzle that is still being assembled. Rather, they must demonstrate that social factors have entered the content of Chalmers's "good science." For the purposes of this discussion, I understand "good science" to be those propositions that are part of an accepted scientific consensus and that have an established record of successful prediction. Both of the two case studies I examine here concern aspects of mature disciplines that, when used appropriately, are capable of making accurate predictions. [12](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/62417656)

#### Science is the only objective field—their indicts of science don’t assume its ability to be de-politicized and detached

**Sullivan 98** (Phillip A., professor of aerospace engineering at the University of Toronto’s Institute for Aerospace Studies, “An Engineer Dissects Two Cases Studies”, A House Built on Sand: Exposing Postmodernist Myths about Science, edited by Noretta Koertge)

On the Nature of Science Scientists usually work in a framework of unstated assumptions. According to English astronomer John Barrow, these include the following ( 1988, 24-26): There is an external world separable from our perception. The world is rational: "A" and "not A" cannot be simultaneously true. The world can be analyzed locally; that is, we can examine a process without having to take into account all the events occurring elsewhere. We can separate events from our perception of them. There are predictable regularities in nature. The world can be described by mathematics. These presuppositions hold everywhere and at all times. In discussing these assumptions, English biologist Lewis Wolpert observes that they "may not be philosophically acceptable, but they are experimentally testable and they are consistent with the ability of science to describe and explain a very large number of phenomena" ( Wolpert 1993, 107). In other words, notwithstanding the ongoing debates among philosophers and theoretical scientists about the implications of certain features of quantum mechanics, the day-to-day practice of scientists is best characterized by the doctrine that philosophers call *scientific realism* ( Sparkes 1991, 187). In contrast, a characteristic feature of twentieth-century Western thought is the growing influence of the doctrine of *relativism*, which asserts that there are no absolutes in morals, values, or knowledge. Experimental confirmation just after World War I of Einstein's theory of relativity in physics played a major role in spreading acceptance of the doctrine among intellectuals ( Johnson 1984, esp. 1-11), but it has no philosophical relationship to Einstein's theory. Australian philosopher A. W. Sparkes suggested that those who believe so allow their thinking to be dominated by a "mere pun" ( Sparkes 1991, 206). The application of this doctrine to scholarship has been, at best, problematical and is increasingly controversial. More of a moral position than a coherent theory of knowledge, the main consequence has been its advocates' denial of the possibility of objectivity, even as an ideal. Classicist Mary Lefkowitz described its effect on history, noting that taken to its logical conclusion, relativism reduces history to fiction. Motive becomes more important than evidence, and the credibility of views of an individual on controversial matters is judged by that individual's class, race, or gender ( 1996, 49-52). That is, a form of ad hominem argument takes precedence over the evaluation of the intrinsic merits of evidence ( Sparkes 1991, 105-6). Relativism seems to be taken as axiomatic by current cultural critics of science. For example, as described by Australian philosopher Alan Chalmers, sociologists distinguish between "weak" and "strong" programs. In weak programs, social factors affect both the choice of topic to be investigated and the pace of investigation, but in strong programs, "social influences can affect the content of good science" ( Chalmers 1990, 96). Although nobody having any sense of the history of science denies the weak version, most sociological accounts accept the strong or relativistic version. Philosopher Susan Haack listed the claims made by relativists: Social values are inseparable from scientific inquiry. The purpose of science is the achievement of social goals. Knowledge is nothing but the product of negotiation among the members of the scientific community. Knowledge, facts and reality are nothing more than social constructions. Science should be more democratic. The physical sciences are subordinate to (i.e., are a subdiscipline of social science. [4](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/62417656)  The critiques I present here illustrate two points. First, advocates of relativism have not provided a single convincing instance of cultural factors entering the theoretical propositions of what Chalmers calls "good science." Second, as claimed by biologist Paul Gross and mathematician Norman Levitt, because most cultural studies of sci- ence do not understand the content of the subject they critique, they are severely flawed. [5](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/62417656) Thus they divert attention from serious issues in the practice of science worthy of detached analysis.