#### Manufacturing is key to growth, innovation, and competitiveness — each dollar gives out $1.35 in output giving it the highest multiplier in any sector. R&D, manufacturing, and innovation go hand in hand — that’s Ezell

#### US Manufacturing low- latest report

WSJ 10/15/13- byline David George-Cosh, correspondent of the *Wall Street Journal.* (“Canadian Dollar Weaker after Disappointing US Manufacturing Report” 2013) Available online at: <http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20131015-705349.html> Accessed on: 10/15/13

TORONTO--The Canadian dollar is slightly weaker against the U.S. dollar Tuesday, as a disappointing gauge of the U.S. manufacturing sector dampened investors cautious optimism that a deal to end the partial U.S. government shutdown would come before the debt ceiling is hit.¶ The U.S. dollar was at C$1.0365 early Tuesday, from C$1.0351 late Friday, according to data provider CQG. Canadian markets were closed for the Thanksgiving Day holiday on Monday.¶ The New York Federal Reserve's Manufacturing Purchasing Managers Index fell to 1.52 in October from 6.29 in the prior month and well below expectations of 7.00 thanks to a weaker labor outlook.¶ With the absence of any major market moving data in the U.S. due to the ongoing government shutdown, the regional series moved the Canadian dollar lower in early morning trading.¶ The loonie was poised to move slightly higher after the Canadian Thanksgiving holiday weekend as it seemed a resolution to the debt ceiling debate would be made before Thursday, when the Treasury Department says the U.S. government won't have enough money for its ongoing expenses.¶ But in the absence of any major economic indicators, the Canadian dollar is likely to drift sideways Tuesday, well within its established range, said TD Securities.¶ "The Canadian dollar is getting a little less support from firmer stocks, with the correlation between the Canadian dollar and the S&P 500 easing back modestly from levels seen last week," TD Securities said.

### 2AC—DeDev—Long

#### 1. Extend Barnhizer — alternatives to growth kill *hundreds of millions of people* because of poverty and resource wars — turning off the economy is not an option

#### 2. No transition—collapse of U.S. innovation and technology only creates a weak industrial economy and *unnecessary suffering*, not dedevelopment. People would not shift to utopian local self sufficient societies.

#### 3. Extinction is inevitable without technology—it’s *try-or-die* for growth.

Bostrom 2 — Nick Bostrom, Professor in the Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School, Director of the Future of Humanity Institute, and Director of the Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology at the University of Oxford, recipient of the 2009 Eugene R. Gannon Award for the Continued Pursuit of Human Advancement, holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from the London School of Economics, 2002 (“Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards,” *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, Volume 9, Number 1, Available Online at http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html, Accessed 07-04-2011)

We should not blame civilization or technology for imposing big existential risks. Because of the way we have defined existential risks, a failure to develop technological civilization would imply that we had fallen victims of an existential disaster (namely a crunch, “technological arrest”). Without technology, our chances of avoiding existential risks would therefore be nil. With technology, we have some chance, although the greatest risks now turn out to be those generated by technology itself.

#### 4. Transitioning now is bad—we’re not ready.

Trainer 2k — Ted Trainer, Visiting Fellow in the Faculty of Arts at the University of New South Wales, 2000 (“Where are we, where do we want to be, how do we get there?,” *Democracy & Nature: The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Volume 6, Number 2, July, Available Online at http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol6/trainer\_where.htm, Accessed 10-05-2008)

If there is a boom we in the Eco-village Movement should welcome it, through gritted teeth, because it will give us the time we desperately need. The last thing we want is a collapse of the system in the immediate future. We are far from ready. Hardly any of the hundreds of millions of people who live in rich world cities have any idea of an alternative to the consumer way and their settlements have no provision for anything but maximising the throughput of resources. By all means let’s have a collapse a little later, but the prospects for The Simpler Way depend greatly on how extensively the concept can be established before the mainstream runs into serious trouble. We need at least two more decades to build the understanding, and the most effective way to do that is by developing examples.

#### 5. Sustainability—growth *overcomes* scarcity—ingenuity outweighs finitude.

Ben-Ami 11 — Daniel Ben-Ami, journalist and author, regular contributor to *spiked*, has been published in the *American*, the *Australian*, Economist.com, *Financial Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Independent*, *Novo* (Germany), *Ode* (American and Dutch editions), *Prospect*, *Shanghai Daily*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Sunday Times*, and *Voltaire* (Sweden), 2011 (“Growth is good,” *Ode*, June, Available Online at http://www.odemagazine.com/doc/print/75/growth-is-good, Accessed 08-16-2011)

There are many reasons why the notion of scarce resources is mistaken. Take energy as an example. For almost a century, authorities have warned that oil is on the verge of running out. Yet the exhaustion of oil supplies is still a long way off. New sources of oil have been discovered, including under the seabed, and extraction techniques have been improved. In the future, it may also be possible to extract huge amounts of oil from tar sands or produce plentiful gasoline from coal.

Perhaps one day, oil will be close to running out or it will be considered too dirty to use. That still leaves plenty of options. As technology improves, electric cars could become much more viable. It is also already possible to generate huge amounts of energy from nuclear fission, the process that powers the sun, while in the future, nuclear fusion could provide unlimited energy.

Perhaps other technologies will turn out to be better, but the point is that apparently insurmountable resource shortages can be overcome. Human ingenuity is unlimited. It is not a question of needing, say, three planets to sustain humanity, but of making this planet more productive.

#### 6. Empirically proven—growth solves the environment—resources are key.

Ben-Ami 11 — Daniel Ben-Ami, journalist and author, regular contributor to *spiked*, has been published in the *American*, the *Australian*, Economist.com, *Financial Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Independent*, *Novo* (Germany), *Ode* (American and Dutch editions), *Prospect*, *Shanghai Daily*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Sunday Times*, and *Voltaire* (Sweden), 2011 (“Growth is good,” *Ode*, June, Available Online at http://www.odemagazine.com/doc/print/75/growth-is-good, Accessed 08-16-2011)

But is this notion of environmental limits really true? It is certainly the case that, say, building a factory can lead to pollution. However, it is also true that economic growth can generate the resources to clean up the environment and mold it to benefit human beings. That is why, as a general rule, developed countries are less polluted and cleaner than developing ones.

Typically, countries experience an environmental transition as they develop. In the early stages, cities may be grossly unsanitary and factories might billow filthy smoke. But as they become richer, these cities clean things up. In London, my hometown, cholera was widespread in the mid-19th century as raw human waste flowed into the Thames River. Then the authorities built an extensive sewage system, a pioneering civil engineering project at the time, and the problem was solved.

If anything, today’s developing countries potentially have it easier. They do not need to reinvent sewage systems or modern medicine. Instead, they just need to generate the resources to be able to afford the type of infrastructure already available in the West.

#### 7. Technological progress is an existential risk—it’s *try-or-die*

Bostrom 2 — Nick Bostrom, Professor in the Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School, Director of the Future of Humanity Institute, and Director of the Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology at the University of Oxford, recipient of the 2009 Eugene R. Gannon Award for the Continued Pursuit of Human Advancement, holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from the London School of Economics, 2002 (“Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards,” *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, Volume 9, Number 1, Available Online at http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html, Accessed 07-04-2011)

We should not blame civilization or technology for imposing big existential risks. Because of the way we have defined existential risks, a failure to develop technological civilization would imply that we had fallen victims of an existential disaster (namely a crunch, “technological arrest”). Without technology, our chances of avoiding existential risks would therefore be nil. With technology, we have some chance, although the greatest risks now turn out to be those generated by technology itself.

#### 8. Just because we can *imagine* alternatives to growth doesn’t mean we can *implement* them—their authors are naïve.

Greer 8 — John Michael Greer, certified Master Conserver, organic gardener, and scholar of ecological history, current Grand Archdruid of the Ancient Order of Druids in America, and author of The Archdruid Report—a blog covering peak oil and environmental sustainability issues, 2008 (“Looking for Roong Thisdara,” *The Archdruid Report*, November 26th, Available Online at http://www.energybulletin.net/node/47356, Accessed 11-27-2008)

A double helping of irony surrounds all this flurry of planning. If the crisis we face could be met by making plans, we’d have little to worry about; the difficulty is that making plans is the easy part. Go digging in the archives of most American municipalities and you’ll find an energy plan drafted and adopted, after extensive citizen input, in the 1970s, calling for exactly the changes that would have made matters today much less dire: conservation standards, public transit projects, zoning changes to reduce the need for cars, and so on. You’ll have to brush a quarter inch of dust off the plan to read it, though, since nobody has looked at it since the Reagan years, and not one of its recommendations was still functioning when the housing boom began in the early 1990s. A certain skepticism toward another round of plans may thus be in order.

Yet there’s a second dimension to the irony, because the recurrent gap between plan and implementation is not the only difficulty that has to be faced. The assumption common to all these plans is that it’s possible to anticipate the process of transition to a deindustrial society in enough detail to make planning meaningful. I suggest that this assumption is badly in need of a hard second look.

There are two widely held beliefs these days about how we can deal with the end of the age of petroleum. The first claims that we simply need to find another energy source as cheap, abundant, and concentrated as petroleum, and run our society on that instead. The second claims that we simply need to replace those parts of our society that depend on cheap, abundant, concentrated energy with others that lack that dependence, and run our society with them instead. Most people in the peak oil scene, I think, have caught onto the problem with the first belief: there is no other energy source available to us that is as cheap, abundant, and concentrated as petroleum; the fact that we want one does not oblige the universe to provide us with one, and so we might as well plan to power our society by harnessing unicorns to treadmills.

The problem with the second belief is of the same order, but it’s much less widely recognized. Toss aside the parts of our society that depend on cheap, abundant, concentrated energy, and there’s nothing left. Nor are the components needed for a new low-energy society sitting on a shelf somewhere, waiting to be used; we’ve got some things that worked tolerably well in simpler agrarian societies, and some promising new developments that have been tested on a very small scale and seem to work so far, but we have nothing like a complete kit. Thus we can’t simply swap out a few parts and keep going; everything has to change, and we have no way of knowing in advance what changes will be required.

This last point is often missed. One of the people who commented on last week’s post, a software designer by trade, pointed out that he starts work on a project by envisioning what the new software is going to do, and then figures out a way to do it; he argued that it makes just as much sense to do the same thing with human society. A software designer, though, knows the capabilities of the computers, operating systems, and computer languages his programs will use; he also knows how similar tasks have been done by other designers in the past. We don’t have any of those advantages in trying to envision a sustainable future society.

Rather, we’re in the position of a hapless engineer tasked in 1947 with drafting a plan to develop word processing software. At that time, nobody knew whether digital or analog computers were the wave of the future; the handful of experimental computer prototypes that existed then used relays, mechanical linkages, vacuum tubes, and other soon-to-be-outmoded technologies, while the devices that would actually make it possible to build computers that could handle word processing had not yet been invented, or even imagined. Under those conditions, the only plan that would have yielded any results would consist of a single sentence: “Invest heavily in basic research, and see what you can do with the results.” Any other plan would have been wasted breath, and the more detailed the plan, the more useless it would have been.

The difficulty faced by our imaginary engineer is that meaningful planning can only take place when the basic outlines of the solution are already known. A different metaphor may help clarify how this works. Imagine that you suddenly wake up in a hotel room in Edinburgh. A mysterious woman tells you that you have been drugged and brought there secretly, it’s now December 30, and you have to get a message to someone you will meet beneath the statue of Nelson in Trafalgar Square in London at midnight on New Year’s Eve. If you succeed, Earth will be saved and you will get 100 million Euros. Since you know where you are, where you have to be, and how much time you have – the clock by the bed says 10 am – you can easily make plans and carry them out.

Now imagine the same scenario, except that the hotel room could be anywhere and you have no idea what day or time it is. Until you know where you are and how much time you have, planning is impossible. When the mysterious woman leaves, rather than heading for the door, the first thing you might logically do is to throw open the curtains. The results determine your next step. If you see the familiar skyline of Edinburgh, you can proceed at once to make and implement plans; if the vista before you is the clutter and bustle of an industrial town in Asia, you may need to learn more before planning becomes possible; if you see two moons setting in a pink sky above a cityscape of glittering domes, and the beings walking alongside the canal nearby have pointed ears and green skin, the one thing you know for certain is that the trip to Trafalgar Square is going to be interesting!

Now imagine the same scenario, except that the landscape outside has the pink sky, two moons, and alien promenaders, and the mysterious woman tells you that you have to get to the local equivalent of Trafalgar Square by the local equivalent of New Year’s Eve. All hope of planning has just gone out the window. Your only option is to improvise as you go, try as many options as possible, collect tidbits of information, and attempt to piece together what you learn into a workable mental model. Nor will you have any way of knowing whether your model is right or wrong until you fling yourself out of an ornate airboat, sprint up to the giant bas-relief of Gresh the Omnivorous at Roong Thisdara right at the purple of the high red of twelfth Isbil past Eshrey of the rising calendar, and find the person you need to meet waiting there for you.

Conventional ideas of planning tend to assume situations like the first scenario I’ve just outlined, where the problem and the potential solutions are both clearly visible and the only issue is how to connect them. More innovative ideas of planning – and it’s to the credit of the peak oil scene that these latter have been very well represented there – tend to assume situations like the second scenario, where investigation must precede planning, and then follow along the planning process to keep it on track, rather like a herdsman’s dog trotting alongside a flock of sheep. As I see it, though, the situation we face at the end of the petroleum age most resembles the third scenario, where all we have to go on is a relatively vague idea of what a solution might be like, success or failure can be known only in retrospect, and improvisation is the order of the day.

The core fact of the matter, after all, is that what we are trying to invent here – a society that can support some approximation of modern technology on a sustainable basis – has never existed on Earth. We have no working models to go by; all we have, again, is a mix of agrarian practices that seem to have been sustainable, on the one hand, and some experiments that seem to be working so far on a very small scale, on the other. Our job is to piece something together using these, and other things that don’t exist yet, to cope with future challenges we can only foresee in the most general terms. That leaves us, in terms of the metaphor, looking for Roong Thisdara when the only thing we know about it is that it’s roughly equivalent to Trafalgar Square.

Now of course it’s quite possible to imagine post-industrial communities and societies in a fair amount of detail, and several imagined futures of this sort have found enthusiastic followings. The fact that something can be imagined, though, does nothing to prove that it will work. It’s not too hard to envisage a perpetual motion machine, say, or an investment that keeps on gaining value forever, and as we’ve seen, it’s quite possible to build a substantial social movement around belief in the latter, only to find out the hard way that attractive visions and passionate beliefs can rest on foundations of empty air. I recognize that many people find belief in such visions a powerful source of hope in a difficult time, and I sympathize with their feelings, but if we allow the desire for emotional comfort to trump the need to face unwelcome realities, we are in very deep trouble indeed.

#### 9. Growth massively improves quality of life for *billions of people*—it is a matter of life and death.

Friedman 5 — Benjamin M. Friedman, William Joseph Maier Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University, former Chair of the Department of Economics at Harvard University, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University, 2005 (“Economics and Politics in the Developing World,” *The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth*, Published by Knopf Publishing Group, ISBN 0679448918, p. 297-298)

The attraction of economic growth in the developing world, where incomes are mostly very low compared to Western industrial standards, is in many ways straightforward. In more than three-fourths of the world’s countries, encompassing roughly 5 billion of the world’s 6 billion inhabitants, if per [end page 297] capita incomes are higher, people can expect to live longer. Fewer of their children die in infancy. Both children and adults suffer less from malnutrition and disease. They are more likely to have clean water and basic sanitation, and they have better access to medical care. They are more likely to be able to read and write, and they enjoy greater access to education in general. When incomes and living standards are low to begin with, what economic growth means before anything else is enhancement of the most basic dimensions of human life.

#### 10. Alternatives to growth are morally repugnant—condemn *billions* to poverty.

Ben-Ami 11 — Daniel Ben-Ami, journalist and author, regular contributor to *spiked*, has been published in the *American*, the *Australian*, Economist.com, *Financial Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Independent*, *Novo* (Germany), *Ode* (American and Dutch editions), *Prospect*, *Shanghai Daily*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Sunday Times*, and *Voltaire* (Sweden), 2011 (“Growth is good,” *Ode*, June, Available Online at http://www.odemagazine.com/doc/print/75/growth-is-good, Accessed 08-16-2011)

This still leaves the ultimate argument used against economic growth: climate change. The orthodox view is that we need to modify our behavior and make sacrifices to save the planet. We should avoid leaving electronic devices on standby, not take hot baths or perhaps any baths at all, and avoid using plastic bags when possible.

Not only is such an approach undesirable, it is also the worst possible response to climate change. It is undesirable because it means accepting what is essentially a form of rationing in the West. Even worse, it means ruling out the possibility of full-scale development of the developing world. It literally means telling billions of people they cannot have access to air travel, cars, computers, modern medicine and much else that we in the West take for granted. Depriving billions of people of products so common for us in the West is morally repugnant.

#### 11. Economic decline increases racism and discrimination.

Friedman 5 — Benjamin M. Friedman, William Joseph Maier Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University, former Chair of the Department of Economics at Harvard University, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University, 2005 (“What Growth Is, What Growth Does,” *The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth*, Published by Knopf Publishing Group, ISBN 0679448918, p. 7-8)

The consequence of the stagnation that lasted from the mid-1970s until the mid-1990s was, in numerous dimensions, a fraying of America’s social fabric. It was no coincidence that during this period popular antipathy to immigrants resurfaced to an extent not known in the United States since before World War II, and in some respects not since the 1880s when intense nativism spread in response to huge immigration at a time of protracted economic distress. It was not an accident that after three decades of progress toward bringing the country’s African-American minority into the mainstream, public opposition forced a rolling retreat from affirmative action programs. It was not mere happenstance that, for a while, white supremacist [end page 7] groups were more active and visible than at any time since the 1930s, antigovernment private “militias” flourished as never before, and all the while many of our elected political leaders were reluctant to criticize such groups publicly even as church burnings, domestic terrorist attacks, and armed standoffs with law enforcement authorities regularly made headlines. Nor was it coincidental that the effort to “end welfare as we know it”—a widely shared goal, albeit for different reasons among different constituencies— often displayed a vindictive spirit that was highly uncharacteristic of America in the postwar era.

With the return of economic advance for the majority of Americans in the mid-1990s, many of these deplorable tendencies began to abate. In the 2000 and 2004 presidential campaigns, for example, neither anti-immigrant rhetoric nor resistance to affirmative action played anything like the role seen in the elections in 1996 and especially 1992. While hate groups and anti-government militias have not disappeared, they have again retreated toward the periphery of the nation’s consciousness. Even so, much of the legacy of those two decades of stagnation remains. While it has become commonplace to talk of the importance of “civil society,” many thoughtful observers increasingly question the vitality in today’s America of the attitudes and institutions that compose it. 7 Even our public political discourse has lately lost much of its admittedly sparse civility, foundering on personal charges, investigations, and reverberating recrimination.

#### 12. No warming and not anthropogenic—CO2 emissions aren’t key.

Happer 12 — William Happer, Professor of Physics at Princeton University, 2012 (“Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again,” *Wall Street Journal*, March 27th, Available Online at <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html>, Accessed 08-07-2012)

What is happening to global temperatures in reality? The answer is: almost nothing for more than 10 years. Monthly values of the global temperature anomaly of the lower atmosphere, compiled at the University of Alabama from NASA satellite data, can be found at the website http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/. The latest (February 2012) monthly global temperature anomaly for the lower atmosphere was minus 0.12 degrees Celsius, slightly less than the average since the satellite record of temperatures began in 1979.

The lack of any statistically significant warming for over a decade has made it more difficult for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and its supporters to demonize the atmospheric gas CO2 which is released when fossil fuels are burned. The burning of fossil fuels has been one reason for an increase of CO2 levels in the atmosphere to around 395 ppm (or parts per million), up from preindustrial levels of about 280 ppm.

CO2 is not a pollutant. Life on earth flourished for hundreds of millions of years at much higher CO2 levels than we see today. Increasing CO2 levels will be a net benefit because cultivated plants grow better and are more resistant to drought at higher CO2 levels, and because warming and other supposedly harmful effects of CO2 have been greatly exaggerated. Nations with affordable energy from fossil fuels are more prosperous and healthy than those without.

The direct warming due to doubling CO2 levels in the atmosphere can be calculated to cause a warming of about one degree Celsius. The IPCC computer models predict a much larger warming, three degrees Celsius or even more, because they assume changes in water vapor or clouds that supposedly amplify the direct warming from CO2. Many lines of observational evidence suggest that this "positive feedback" also has been greatly exaggerated.

There has indeed been some warming, perhaps about 0.8 degrees Celsius, since the end of the so-called Little Ice Age in the early 1800s. Some of that warming has probably come from increased amounts of CO2, but the timing of the warming—much of it before CO2 levels had increased appreciably—suggests that a substantial fraction of the warming is from natural causes that have nothing to do with mankind.

### 2AC — Consult Indigenous People CP

#### 1. No cultural genocide DA — the aff improves efficiency and reduces congestion at ports of entry. No logical link between plan and indigenous destruction.

#### 2. Consultation counterplans are a voting issue. Reject the argument and the team to set a precedent and deter introduction.

#### A. Unpredictable — neg can consult 180 countries plus any other actor. Unpredictability undermines unlimited aff prep.

#### B. Artificially Inflates the Net-Benefit — takes all 1AC offense and adds any miniscule net benefit that doesn’t have a significant impact.

#### C. Kills Education — moots 1AC and aff research. Consult CP can link to any aff any year.

#### D. Unfair — steals entire 1AC and not reciprocal — aff stuck with USFG.

#### E. Our interpretation is that the counterplan is legitimate if and only if there’s a piece of comparative evidence about the act of the consultation. Kinnison isn’t about the aff.

#### 3. Permute: do both. Genuine non-binding consultation with indigenous peoples is sufficient to solve. Kinnison advocates the non-binding perm.

*(“U.S. law and policy should move toward viewing indigenous consultation as involving a spectrum of requirements—with good-faith, meaningful consultation as a minimum and with consent required in certain contexts, including large-scale extractive industries.”)*

#### 4. The counterplan devastates U.S. hegemony — the case is a disad.

Carroll 9 — James F. F. Carroll, Notes & Comments Editor of the *Emory International Law Review*, holds a J.D. from Emory University School of Law and a B.A. in Political Science from Wake Forest University, Runner-Up at the 2006 National Debate Tournament, 2009 (“Back to the Future: Redefining The Foreign Investment and National Security Act’s Conception of National Security,” *Emory International Law Review* (23 Emory Int'l L. Rev. 167), Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

Footnote n221. See Thomas Friedman, Op-Ed., 9/11 is Over, N.Y. Times, Sept. 30, 2007, § 4, at 12. This does not mean, however, that foreign countries should hold a veto over U.S. foreign or domestic policies, particularly policies that are not directly related to their national survival. Allowing foreign countries or international institutions to veto or modify unrelated U.S. policies would make a mockery of our foreign policy and destroy the credibility of American leadership. International cooperation does not require making our policy subservient to the whims of other nations. See generally The Allies and Arms Control (F.O. Hampson et al. eds., 1992). See also Khalilzad, supra note 177.

#### 5. Permute: do counterplan. Doesn’t sever — not *textually* competitive — consultation is plan-plus. Plan *should* be done — not aff’s burden to defend immediacy or certainty.

#### 6. No net-benefit — Kinnison says consultation should be done for “large-scale extractive activities” that “directly impact indigenous peoples’ right to use, enjoy, control, and develop their traditional lands.” The plan isn’t extraction and doesn’t affect traditional lands.

### 2AC — Security Critique

#### Conditionality is a voting issue—

Allows contradictory strategies—DA links to the CP/critique and vice versa—teaches bad advocacy skills—justifies multiple condo.

One condo solves their offence.

Judge is a norm-setter—vote aff for deterrence.

#### 1. Framework: The role of the ballot is to choose between the plan and a competitive policy option. Critiques must prove the plan is a bad idea—necessary for predictable clash—plan focus provides a stasis point for debate—creates stable aff offense.

#### 2. Because the resolution is a question of public policy, they must translate their philosophy arguments into policy consequences

Dan W. Brock, Professor of Philosophy and Biomedical Ethics at Brown University, 1987 (“Truth or Consequences: The Role of Philosophers in Policy-Making," *Ethics*, Volume 97, July, Available Online via JSTOR, p. 787)

When philosophers become more or less direct participants in the policy-making process and so are no longer academics just hoping that an occasional policymaker might read their scholarly journal articles, this scholarly virtue of the unconstrained search for the truth—all assumptions open to question and follow the arguments wherever they lead—comes under a variety of related pressures. What arises is an intellectual variant of the political problem of "dirty hands" that those who hold political power often face. I emphasize that I do not conceive of the problem as one of pure, untainted philosophers being corrupted by the dirty business of politics. My point is rather that the different goals of academic scholarship and public policy call in turn for different virtues and behavior in their practitioners. Philosophers who steadfastly maintain their academic ways in the public policy setting are not to be admired as islands of integrity in a sea of messy political compromise and corruption. Instead, I believe that if philosophers maintain the academic virtues there they will not only find themselves often ineffective but will as well often fail in their responsibilities and act wrongly. Why is this so?

The central point of conflict is that the first concern of those responsible for public policy is, and ought to be, the consequences of their actions for public policy and the persons that those policies affect. This is not to say that they should not be concerned with the moral evaluation of those consequences—they should; nor that they must be moral consequentialists in the evaluation of the policy, and in turn human, consequences of their actions—whether some form of consequentialism is an adequate moral theory is another matter. But it is to say that persons who directly participate in the formation of public policy would be irresponsible if they did not focus their concern on how their actions will affect policy and how that policy will in turn affect people.

The virtues of academic research and scholarship that consist in an unconstrained search for truth, whatever the consequences, reflect not only the different goals of scholarly work but also the fact that the effects of the scholarly endeavor on the public are less direct, and are mediated more by other institutions and events, than are those of the public policy process. It is in part the very impotence in terms of major, direct effects on people's lives of most academic scholarship that makes it morally acceptable not to worry much about the social consequences of that scholarship. When philosophers move into the policy domain, they must shift their primary commitment from knowledge and truth to the policy consequences of what they do. And if they are not prepared to do this, why did they enter the public domain? What are they doing there?

#### 3. Permutation: Do Both. Double-bind—either the alternative can overcome the plan or it can’t overcome the status quo.

#### 4. Perm best — shields link and avoids anti-politics.

Nunes 12 — João Nunes, Leverhulme Trust Early Career Fellow in Politics and International Studies at the University of Warwick, former Visiting Research Fellow at the Gothenburg Centre for Globalization and Development at Gothenburg University, holds a Ph.D. in International Politics from Aberystwyth University, 2012 (“Reclaiming the political: Emancipation and critique in security studies,” *Security Dialogue*, Volume 43, Number 4, August, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via SAGE Journals Online)

This discussion points towards a second idea in the security-as-emancipation framework: the fact that it assumes a thoroughly politicized notion of security and thus sees itself as a form of praxis committed to political change – specifically, the transformation of arrangements that are implicated in the (re)production of insecurities. Thus, on the one hand, security is underpinned by political and ethical assumptions. It is a ‘derivative concept’, insofar as ‘security outcomes (policies, situations, etc.) derive from different underlying understandings of the character and purpose of politics’ (Booth, 2007: 109, emphasis in original). On the other hand, understandings of security have important implications for politics. Reality is supported – or can alternatively be challenged – by existing versions of it. The condition of insecurity can be transformed not only by social struggles, but also by ideas that shape these struggles. Theories draw the boundaries of political imagination and possibility; they are appropriated by actors and help to constitute their self-perception and behaviour. By being constitutive of reality, security theory is ultimately a form of politics.

It thus becomes clear that, for emancipatory approaches, critique is not the questioning of security in the general sense. Predominant ideas and practices of security do deserve close scrutiny and, very often, fierce opposition. However, by emphasizing the insecurities affecting people, this approach moves beyond the idea that ‘security’ is merely a representation of reality or a modality for dealing with issues. Rather, critique sets out to impact upon political actors’ perceptions and actions, so as to pave the way for a reconstruction of security along more open, inclusive and democratic lines. Critique strives to redress immediate insecurities and to work towards the long-term objective of a life less determined by unwanted and unnecessary constraints.

#### 5. Epistemology DA to the critique—Our advantages are justified expert empirical evaluations—their critique is just speculation—empirically disproves the argument that framing overcomes policy.

#### 8. No alt solvency—Can’t resolve security perceptions of foreign governments or US gov’t—discourse in round does not shape national politics.

#### 9. Must identify threats—the alternative is war

Doran 99 — Charles F. Doran, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University, 1999 (“Is major war obsolete? An exchange,” *Survival*, Volume 41, Issue 2, Summer, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Proquest)

The conclusion, then, is that the probability of major war declines for some states, but increases for others. And it is very difficult to argue that it has disappeared in any significant or reliable or hopeful sense. Moreover, a problem with arguing a position that might be described as utopian is that such arguments have policy implications. It is worrying that as a thesis about the obsolescence of major war becomes more compelling to more people, including presumably governments, the tendency will be to forget about the underlying problem, which is not war per se, but security. And by neglecting the underlying problem of security, the probability of war perversely increases: as governments fail to provide the kind of defence and security necessary to maintain deterrence, one opens up the possibility of new challenges. In this regard it is worth recalling one of Clauswitz's most important insights: A conqueror is always a lover of peace. He would like to make his entry into our state unopposed. That is the underlying dilemma when one argues that a major war is not likely to occur and, as a consequence, one need not necessarily be so concerned about providing the defences that underlie security itself. History shows that surprise threats emerge and rapid destabilising efforts are made to try to provide that missing defence, and all of this contributes to the spiral of uncertainty that leads in the end to war.

#### 10. Epistemology critique of the alternative—focus on post-modernism ignores cause and effect

Rotter 2k (History Professor at Colgate, October “Orientalism and US Diplomatic History” Vol 105, No 4)

For diplomatic historians, the link between cause and effect is crucial, and this constitutes another area of disagreement with Said. In a perceptive 1995 Diplomatic History essay, Melvyn P. Leffler complained that "the post-modernist emphasis on culture, language, and rhetoric often diverts attention from questions of causation and agency." The problem with discourse theory specifically "is that although we might learn that seemingly unconnected phenomena are related in some diffuse ways, we do not necessarily get much insight into how relatively important these relationships are to one another." And Leffler quotes Patrick O'Brien: "'Foucault's study of culture is a history with beginnings but no causes.'" Leffler does not mention Said, but insofar as Said employs Foucauldian analysis in his work, the criticism could apply to him as well.13 If most historians continue to believe that establishing the cause of things is a meaningful part of their enterprise, even more insistently do diplomatic historians hold to this principle. That is because so much is at stake: most scholars of U.S. foreign policy are interested in expansionism, imperialism, and ultimately war. Given the field of analysis, the dismissal of cause seems irresponsible, for people should try to understand what causes imperialism and war, and where power has such solemn consequences it seems trivial to equate it with knowledge. Power, say diplomatic historians, is economic and military superiority, not narrative authority. Imperialism is not just an attitude. War is not preeminently a discourse.

### 2AC — Iran Politics

#### 1. No unique link — current engagement through HLED.

Hill 9/19 — The Hill, 2013 (“Biden heading to Mexico to talk trade, economic ties,” Byline Vicki Needham, September 19th, Available Online at <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/323329-biden-heading-to-mexico-to-talk-trade-economic-ties#ixzz2fSa9oqCE>, Accessed 09-20-2013)

Vice President Biden is heading to Mexico later Thursday to kick off the first-ever high level economic dialogue between the two nations.

On his third trip to Mexico, Biden will sit down with President Enrique Peña Nieto as part of the launch of the U.S.-Mexico High Level Economic Dialogue in Mexico City to improve the economic relationship between the two neighbors.

U.S. and Mexican officials are aiming to continue this period of ramped-up U.S. engagement in Latin America within the new framework by tackling a broad range of issues from the scope of their economic relationship to security and more specific topics such as trade, education, transportation and telecommunications, according to senior administration officials.

"The vice president will be talking about where the economies fit in the global picture," a senior administration official said on Thursday.

#### 2. Not intrinsic — a decision-maker with the authority to enact the plan can also enact. Disregard decision-making models not grounded in opportunity cost — it’s the most logical way to analyze policies.

#### 3. Link not unique- Congress is partisan now- no bipartisanship- multiple issues cause tensions between the parties- Obamacare, Immigration, Farm bill

#### 5. No internal link — sanctions vote is ideological

#### 6. If Congress was bipartisan now, then there would be no issue with the plan’s passage

#### 7. Future engagement with Mexico thumps the DA — the link is inevitable.

State Department 9/20 — U.S. State Department Press Release, 2013 (“Press Releases: U.S.-Mexico High Level Economic Dialogue,” September 20th, Available Online at http://www.officialwire.com/pr/press-releases-u-s-mexico-high-level-economic-dialogue/, Accessed 09-26-2013)

Among other takeaways and as initial steps toward accomplishing the goals laid out in the HLED work plan, the United States and Mexico plan to: continue the work of the Mexico-U.S. Entrepreneurship and Innovation Council (MUSEIC) and expand entrepreneurship delegation exchanges; collaborate on organizing an information and communications technology road show, regulatory workshop series, and broadband innovation information exchanges; announce negotiations to modernize and expand our bilateral air transport relationship; develop an agenda of ongoing cooperation on intelligent transportation and freight systems; make efficient use of the North American Development Bank by supporting new and ongoing cross-border initiatives and directing its Board to begin an assessment of the Bank’s long-term capital needs as well as how it can more effectively leverage private sector capital to support border infrastructure; and pursue joint investment initiatives.

#### 8. Deal delayed and Biden is trying to stop it.

AP 11/15 — Associated Press, 2013 (“Health Care Dispute Could Delay Iran Sanctions,” November 15th, Available Online at http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/health-care-dispute-delay-iran-sanctions-20901920, Accessed 11-16-2013)

Under pressure from President Barack Obama, the Democratic-controlled Senate could delay a likely vote on a new round of tough sanctions on Iran.

With talks between Western powers and Tehran scheduled in Geneva next week, the president has spoken to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., and other senators pressing for a delay in any additional penalties while dispatching Vice President Joe Biden and Secretary of State John Kerry to Capitol Hill to make a similar argument.

#### 9. The plan diverts Biden’s attention, paving the way for passage.

Wood and Wilson 9/20 — Duncan Wood, Director of the Mexico Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, former Professor and Director of the International Relations Program at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, former Senior Associate with the Simon Chair and the Americas Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, holds a Ph.D. in Political Studies from Queen’s University (Canada), and Christopher E. Wilson, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, previously served as a Mexico Analyst for the U.S. Military and as a researcher at American University’s Center for North American Studies, holds an M.A. in International Affairs from American University, 2013 (“For Biden, Mexico’s endless allure,” *The Great Debate*—a *Reuters* blog, September 20th, Available Online at http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2013/09/20/for-biden-mexicos-endless-allure/, Accessed 09-23-2013)

Initiatives and forums do exist to address border and other issues, but U.S.-Mexico relations are notoriously difficult because of the mix of domestic and foreign policy issues in play. In addition, a wide array of federal agencies, and even state and local governments, are involved.

The High Level Economic Dialogue will be focused on three main pillars: competitiveness and connectivity; productivity and innovation, and cooperation on regional and global issues. Initiatives are being developed in each category and are likely to be discussed on the trip. But just as important as the specific projects is the role of the vice president.

The vice president’s office is not often credited with major policy initiatives. But in this case, a great deal could depend on Biden. Solutions to many issues will require coordinating responses from various federal agencies and probably Congress — a big task. A job of this magnitude requires a champion — preferably from the White House — and U.S.-Mexico relations may have just found one.

#### 10. It also diverts Kerry’s attention.

Lee and Wilson 12 — Erik Lee, Associate Director at the North American Center for Transborder Studies at Arizona State University, former assistant director at the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies at the University of California-San Diego, holds an M.A. in Latin American Studies from the University of California-San Diego, and Christopher E. Wilson, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, previously served as a Mexico Analyst for the U.S. Military and as a researcher at American University’s Center for North American Studies, holds an M.A. in International Affairs from American University, 2012 (“The State of Trade, Competitiveness and Economic Wellbeing in the U.S.-Mexico Border Region,” Working Paper of the Border Research Partnership—comprised of Arizona State University’s North American Center for Transborder Studies, the Colegio de la Frontera Norte, and the Woodrow Wilson Center’s Mexico Institute, June, Available Online at http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/State\_of\_Border\_Trade\_Economy\_0.pdf, Accessed 08-10-2013, p. 18-19)

Coordination and Cooperation: Border Master Plans and the Interagency Process

Managing the U.S.-Mexico border is made particularly difficult by the large number of federal, state, and local government entities that manage and protect the border and surrounding transportation infrastructure.

While the State Department and Mexico’s Foreign Ministry clearly guide and coordinate most bilateral issues, in the case of the border they must work alongside a number of federal stakeholders, such as Commerce/Economía, DHS/Gobernación, DOT/SCT, and EPA/SEMARNAT, to name but a few. In light of border region complaints over the slowdown in crossborder commerce due to increased concerns regarding terrorism and drug-trafficking related violence, the Obama Administration reconfigured the interagency process by which the U.S. federal government coordinated its various border operations as a part of the 21st Century Border initiative. The National Security Staff Interagency Policy Committee sits at the nexus of a new Executive Steering Committee and three major components, Infrastructure Planning, Port Operations, and Corridor Security. Figure 7, on the next page, gives an idea of this still-complex process by which the U.S. federal government organizes itself in terms of border operations. [end page 18]

[Graph/Chart omitted]

A key component of how the U.S.-Mexico border functions to facilitate trade has to do with transportation planning because in its absence infrastructure investments on one side of the border or in one region can simply feed traffic into a bottleneck in another area. This process is largely managed by the Joint Working Committee, a binational entity comprised of representatives from the two countries’ transportation agencies, the State Department, Mexico’s Foreign Ministry, other federal agencies and state departments of transportation, but as border communities felt themselves increasingly affected by decisions made in Washington and Mexico City, their insistence in being included in these discussions led to the regional border master plan process, in which state DOTs lead stakeholder discussions on border infrastructure priorities. While this process makes sense from a U.S. perspective (in the absence of a national transportation plan, state DOTs essentially manage and spend federal transportation dollars), this process is somewhat of a mismatch for Mexico’s more centralized political system. The system seems to work better in certain cross-border communities, as is seen with California and Baja California’s award-winning master plan.

#### 11. Sanctions won’t pass: White House doesn’t want them

WorldBulletin 13 ([www.worldbulletin.net](http://www.worldbulletin.net), “White House calls for a halt of new Iran sanctions,” created October 26, 2013, accessed November 20, 2013, available online at <http://www.worldbulletin.net/?aType=haber&ArticleID=121526>)

Amid the ongoing US-Iranian détente, the Obama administration has urged Congress to halt any new sanctions on the Iranian government. “So while we understand that Congress may consider new sanctions, we think this is a time for a pause, as we asked for in the past, to see if negotiations can gain traction,” said State Department Spokesperson Jen Psaki Friday. She said that the administration’s position was conveyed to US congressmen Thursday during a meeting at the White House. The request comes as the P5+1 group of world powers, which includes the US, are engaged with Iran in delicate negotiations over its nuclear program. The next round of talks is scheduled for November 7. Psaki added, “We think that the flexibility right now would be helpful in putting a pause on sanctions to see if this process will work out, moving forward.” Even as the administration calls for a hiatus on new sanctions, it remains open to the possibility of increasing the sanctions regime should there be a lack of progress in negotiations.

“There's always time for sanctions in the future as needed, but this is an ask we're making to Congress now,” remarked Psaki.

#### **12. Sanctions fail at stopping proliferation**

Davidovich 13 (Joshua Davidovich, reporter for [www.timesofisreal.com](http://www.timesofisreal.com), “Sanctions having no effect on Iran nuclear program, Watchdog says,” Created June 17, 2013, accessed November 21, 2013, available online at <http://www.timesofisrael.com/sanctions-havng-no-effect-on-iran-nuclear-program-un-watchdog-says/>)

The United Nations’ atomic watchdog says work on Iran’s nuclear program is steadily ramping up, despite a heavy sanctions regime on the country’s economy. International Atomic Energy Agency head Yukiya Amano said Monday that Tehran’s nuclear program was making “steady progress,” Reuters reported. He added that sanctions were not having any impact on slowing down Iran’s nuclear program. “There is a steady increase of capacity and production” in Iran’s nuclear program, Amano told the news agency. The West and others have imposed several rounds of increasing sanctions on the Islamic Republic in hopes of forcing it to pull back from its nuclear program, which is widely believed to be for military purposes. Several rounds of talks between the West and Tehran have also failed to slow down Iran’s nuclear work. The sanctions have wreaked havoc on Iran’s economy, and may have played a role in the election of relative moderate Hasan Rowhani to be the country’s president on Friday. Earlier in the day, Rowhani said Tehran would strive to be more transparent about its nuclear program, but said the work would not slow down.