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#### Immigration reform will pass but Obama’s capital is still key

PBS 1/7/14 (Associated Press reporter Jim Kuhnhenn wrote this report. AP Director of Polling Jennifer Agiesta and AP News Survey Specialist Dennis Junius also contributed to this report, “Obama begins a renewed political push for immigration reform in 2014”, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2014/01/president-obama-congress-push-for-immigration-reform-one-final-time.html, MK)

WASHINGTON (AP) – His agenda tattered by last year's confrontations and missteps, President Barack Obama begins 2014 clinging to the hope of winning a lasting legislative achievement: an overhaul of immigration laws.¶ It will require a deft and careful use of his powers, combining a public campaign in the face of protests over his administration's record number of deportations with quiet, behind-the-scenes outreach to Congress, something seen by lawmakers and immigration advocates as a major White House weakness.¶ In recent weeks, both Obama and House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, have sent signals that raised expectations among overhaul supporters that 2014 could still yield the first comprehensive change in immigration laws in nearly three decades. If successful, it would fulfill an Obama promise many Latinos say is overdue.¶ The Senate last year passed a bipartisan bill that was comprehensive in scope that addressed border security, provided enforcement measures and offered a path to citizenship for 11 million immigrants in the United States illegally. House leaders, pressed by tea party conservatives, demanded a more limited and piecemeal approach.¶ Indicating a possible opening, Obama has stopped insisting the House pass the Senate version. And two days after calling Boehner to wish him happy birthday in November, Obama made it clear he could accept the House's bill-by-bill approach, with one caveat: In the end, "we're going to have to do it all."¶ Boehner, for his part, in December hired Rebecca Tallent, a former top aide to Sen. John McCain and most recently the director of a bipartisan think tank's immigration task force. Even opponents of a broad immigration overhaul saw Tallent's selection as a sign legislation had suddenly become more likely. Boehner also fed speculation he would ignore tea party pressure, bluntly brushing back their criticism of December's modest budget agreement.

#### Engaging Mexico is unpopular- water disputes

Martinez, writer for the Brownsville Herald, 13 (Laura B. Martinez, 5.15.13, “Bill seeks to address Mexico water debt”, Date accessed: 9/16/13, <http://www.themonitor.com/news/local/article_9bf8fb54-bced-11e2-bcb3-001a4bcf6878.html>, LE)

Federal legislation has been filed that would prevent the U.S. government from extending benefits to Mexico in an attempt to get the U.S. State Department more involved in the ongoing water-sharing dispute between the two countries.

U.S. Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, filed an amendment to the Water Resources Development Act that would prohibit the U.S. secretary of state from extending benefits to Mexico if the State Department fails to submit quarterly paperwork to Congress that describes Mexico’s efforts to comply with a water-sharing treaty that governs the countries’ use of common water sources, such as the Rio Grande and its tributaries.

As of May 4, 2013, Mexico’s deliveries during the current 5-year cycle totaled 411,779 acre-feet, the International Boundary and Water Commission reported.

Cornyn filed the amendment Tuesday to try to get the U.S. State Department to address Texas’ water shortage and Mexico’s non-compliance with a 1944 water-sharing treaty between Mexico and the United States.

“The water debt and uncertainty about supply harms Texas farmers, ranchers and small businesses who rely on regular, reliable sources of water,” Cornyn said in a news release. “Unfortunately, over the past two decades, Texas farmers alone have lost hundreds of millions of dollars during the shortfalls, and the Obama Administration must step up pressure on Mexico before it’s too late.”

If the secretary of state does not comply with the quarterly report requirement, the amendment would prohibit the department from extending benefits to Mexico, the legislation reads.

U.S. Rep. Filemon Vela, D-Brownsville, earlier this month drafted a similar House bill that also would require the secretary of state to send Congress a report on water sharing with Mexico.

Vela said Mexico is not complying with the agreement between the two countries under the 1944 treaty, which he described as ironic because the United States is complying with a similar treaty that pertains to the California-Arizona-Mexico border.

“We comply with that and do more all the time,” Vela said at the time. “On the Texas-Mexico border, they are supposed to deliver 350,000 acre-feet (of water) per year, and they are not complying with that, and they have historically failed to comply with their part of the treaty.”

Although Mexico recently released water held in its reservoirs, Valley officials said it is not enough to help alleviate the extreme and exceptional drought conditions in the area.

#### Key to cybersecurity

McLarty 9 (Thomas F. III, President – McLarty Associates and Former White House Chief of Staff and Task Force Co-Chair, “U.S. Immigration Policy: Report of a CFR-Sponsored Independent Task Force”, 7-8, http://www.cfr.org/ publication/19759/us\_immigration\_policy.html)

We have seen, when you look at the table of the top 20 firms that are H1-B visa requestors, at least 15 of those are IT firms. And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States. We're seeing a lot more activity around cyber-security, certainly noteworthy attacks here very recently. It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to generate a more effective group of IT experts here in the United States, many of which are coming to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions from overseas and often returning back? This potentially puts us at a competitive disadvantage going forward. MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more talented students studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really have a tremendous ability to develop these kind of technology and scientific advances, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of the green card being handed to them or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, that's going to strengthen, I think, our system, our security needs.

#### Nuke war

Fritz 9 (Jason, BS – St. Cloud, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control”, Study Commissioned on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, July, www.icnnd.org/Documents/Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking\_NC2.doc)

*Direct control of launch*
The US uses the two-man rule to achieve a higher level of security in nuclear affairs. Under this rule two authorized personnel must be present and in agreement during critical stages of nuclear command and control. The President must jointly issue a launch order with the Secretary of Defense; Minuteman missile operators must agree that the launch order is valid; and on a submarine, both the commanding officer and executive officer must agree that the order to launch is valid. In the US, in order to execute a nuclear launch, an Emergency Action Message (EAM) is needed. This is a preformatted message that directs nuclear forces to execute a specific attack. The contents of an EAM change daily and consist of a complex code read by a human voice. Regular monitoring by shortwave listeners and videos posted to YouTube provide insight into how these work. These are issued from the NMCC, or in the event of destruction, from the designated hierarchy of command and control centres. Once a command centre has confirmed the EAM, using the two-man rule, the Permissive Action Link (PAL) codes are entered to arm the weapons and the message is sent out. These messages are sent in digital format via the secure Automatic Digital Network and then relayed to aircraft via single-sideband radio transmitters of the High Frequency Global Communications System, and, at least in the past, sent to nuclear capable submarines via Very Low Frequency (Greenemeier 2008, Hardisty 1985). The technical details of VLF submarine communication methods can be found online, including PC-based VLF reception. Some reports have noted a Pentagon review, which showed a potential “electronic back door into the US Navy’s system for broadcasting nuclear launch orders to Trident submarines” (Peterson 2004). The investigation showed that cyber terrorists could potentially infiltrate this network and insert false orders for launch. The investigation led to “elaborate new instructions for validating launch orders” (Blair 2003). Adding further to the concern of cyber terrorists seizing control over submarine launched nuclear missiles; The Royal Navy announced in 2008 that it would be installing a Microsoft Windows operating system on its nuclear submarines (Page 2008). The choice of operating system, apparently based on Windows XP, is not as alarming as the advertising of such a system is. This may attract hackers and narrow the necessary reconnaissance to learning its details and potential exploits. It is unlikely that the operating system would play a direct role in the signal to launch, although this is far from certain. Knowledge of the operating system may lead to the insertion of malicious code, which could be used to gain accelerating privileges, tracking, valuable information, and deception that could subsequently be used to initiate a launch. Remember from Chapter 2 that the UK’s nuclear submarines have the authority to launch if they believe the central command has been destroyed. Attempts by cyber terrorists to create the illusion of a decapitating strike could also be used to engage fail-deadly systems. Open source knowledge is scarce as to whether Russia continues to operate such a system. However evidence suggests that they have in the past. Perimetr, also known as Dead Hand, was an automated system set to launch a mass scale nuclear attack in the event of a decapitation strike against Soviet leadership and military. In a crisis, military officials would send a coded message to the bunkers, switching on the dead hand. If nearby ground-level sensors detected a nuclear attack on Moscow, and if a break was detected in communications links with top military commanders, the system would send low-frequency signals over underground antennas to special rockets. Flying high over missile fields and other military sites, these rockets in turn would broadcast attack orders to missiles, bombers and, via radio relays, submarines at sea. Contrary to some Western beliefs, Dr. Blair says, many of Russia's nuclear-armed missiles in underground silos and on mobile launchers can be fired automatically. (Broad 1993) Assuming such a system is still active, cyber terrorists would need to create a crisis situation in order to activate Perimetr, and then fool it into believing a decapitating strike had taken place. While this is not an easy task, the information age makes it easier. Cyber reconnaissance could help locate the machine and learn its inner workings. This could be done by targeting the computers high of level official’s—anyone who has reportedly worked on such a project, or individuals involved in military operations at underground facilities, such as those reported to be located at Yamantau and Kosvinksy mountains in the central southern Urals (Rosenbaum 2007, Blair 2008) Indirect Control of Launch Cyber terrorists could cause incorrect information to be transmitted, received, or displayed at nuclear command and control centres, or shut down these centres’ computer networks completely. In 1995, a Norwegian scientific sounding rocket was mistaken by Russian early warning systems as a nuclear missile launched from a US submarine. A radar operator used Krokus to notify a general on duty who decided to alert the highest levels. Kavkaz was implemented, all three chegets activated, and the countdown for a nuclear decision began. It took eight minutes before the missile was properly identified—a considerable amount of time considering the speed with which a nuclear response must be decided upon (Aftergood 2000). Creating a false signal in these early warning systems would be relatively easy using computer network operations. The real difficulty would be gaining access to these systems as they are most likely on a closed network. However, if they are transmitting wirelessly, that may provide an entry point, and information gained through the internet may reveal the details, such as passwords and software, for gaining entrance to the closed network. If access was obtained, a false alarm could be followed by something like a DDoS attack, so the operators believe an attack may be imminent, yet they can no longer verify it. This could add pressure to the decision making process, and if coordinated precisely, could appear as a first round EMP burst. Terrorist groups could also attempt to launch a non-nuclear missile, such as the one used by Norway, in an attempt to fool the system. The number of states who possess such technology is far greater than the number of states who possess nuclear weapons. Obtaining them would be considerably easier, especially when enhancing operations through computer network operations. Combining traditional terrorist methods with cyber techniques opens opportunities neither could accomplish on their own. For example, radar stations might be more vulnerable to a computer attack, while satellites are more vulnerable to jamming from a laser beam, thus together they deny dual phenomenology. Mapping communications networks through cyber reconnaissance may expose weaknesses, and automated scanning devices created by more experienced hackers can be readily found on the internet. Intercepting or spoofing communications is a highly complex science. These systems are designed to protect against the world’s most powerful and well funded militaries. Yet, there are recurring gaffes, and the very nature of asymmetric warfare is to bypass complexities by finding simple loopholes. For example, commercially available software for voice-morphing could be used to capture voice commands within the command and control structure, cut these sound bytes into phonemes, and splice it back together in order to issue false voice commands (Andersen 2001, Chapter 16). Spoofing could also be used to escalate a volatile situation in the hopes of starting a nuclear war. “ \*\*[they cut off the paragraph]\*\* “In June 1998, a group of international hackers calling themselves Milw0rm hacked the web site of India’s Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC) and put up a spoofed web page showing a mushroom cloud and the text “If a nuclear war does start, you will be the first to scream” (Denning 1999). Hacker web-page defacements like these are often derided by critics of cyber terrorism as simply being a nuisance which causes no significant harm. However, web-page defacements are becoming more common, and they point towards alarming possibilities in subversion. During the 2007 cyber attacks against Estonia, a counterfeit letter of apology from Prime Minister Andrus Ansip was planted on his political party website (Grant 2007). This took place amid the confusion of mass DDoS attacks, real world protests, and accusations between governments.
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#### Text: The President of the United States should issue an executive order to invest in cross border transmission, electricity regulation, standardization, and grid integration to the United Mexican States.

#### XO has supreme law of the land.

Nelson 2009

[Anne E. J.D. Candidate, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law, 2010, “Muddled to Medellin: A Legal History of Sole Executive Agreements”, <http://www.arizonalawreview.org/pdf/51-4/51arizlrev1035.pdf>, 1036-1027, accessed 9/21, CC]

Can the President of the United States unilaterally make federal law? For most students of American Government, the knee-jerk reaction to this question is an emphatic "no," as they are taught that it is the legislature's role to create laws and the President's role to see that the laws are faithfully executed. n1 Indeed, the United States' political identity depends on a delicate separation of powers that prevents the President from accumulating too much power. n2 Over time, however, the delicate separation of powers balance has shifted, and this emphatic "no" has [\*1036] transformed into a more muddled "maybe," with the President's use of sole executive agreements.¶ Sole executive agreements present a unique challenge to traditional separation of powers principles. These agreements are legal tools the President can use to unilaterally resolve foreign disputes with other countries. The Supreme Court has upheld the President's authority to enter into sole executive agreements and has broadly held that these agreements, being analogous to treaties, are fit to preempt conflicting state law. Thus, sole executive agreements are a means by which the President can sideline the legislature and unilaterally create federal law.¶ Sole executive agreements have been used since the early days of the Republic. n3 Since the turn of the twentieth century and the rise of the United States as a global power, Presidents have aggressively used sole executive agreements to resolve significant matters of foreign policy. The expansive use of sole executive agreements has attracted debate amongst scholars as to their constitutional validity, why they have been held to preempt federal law, and, most importantly, how the preemptive effect of these agreements could be limited to better harmonize with the Supremacy Clause and traditional separation of powers principles. n4¶ Until recently, the Supreme Court has not provided much guidance to this debate. In a series of decisions, n5 the Supreme Court has sanctioned the use of sole executive agreements and concluded that such agreements can be considered "the supreme Law of the Land." n6 In doing so, the Court has granted sweeping power to the President to effectively create federal law through sole executive agreements without any meaningful limitations.
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#### The affirmative is premised on a value system where only beings which are tied to the human can have value – they reduce nature to how it is perceived and necessitated by the human

Sivil, studied at University of Durban, 2000

(Richard Sivil , “WHY WE NEED A NEW ETHIC FOR THE ENVIRONMENT”, 2000, <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series02/II-7/chapter_vii.htm>, RECUT, ST)

 Three most significant and pressing factors contributing to the environmental crisis are the ever increasing human population, the energy crisis, and the abuse and pollution of the earth’s natural systems. These and other factors contributing to the environmental crisis can be directly linked to anthropocentric views of the world. The perception that value is located in, and emanates from, humanity has resulted in understanding human life as an ultimate value, superior to all other beings. This has driven innovators in medicine and technology to ever improve our medical and material conditions, in an attempt to preserve human life, resulting in more people being born and living longer. In achieving this aim, they have indirectly contributed to increasing the human population. Perceptions of superiority, coupled with developing technologies have resulted in a social outlook that generally does not rest content with the basic necessities of life. Demands for more medical and social aid, more entertainment and more comfort translate into demands for improved standards of living. Increasing population numbers, together with the material demands of modern society, place ever increasing demands on energy supplies. While wanting a better life is not a bad thing, given the population explosion the current energy crisis is inevitable, which brings a whole host of environmental implications in tow. This is not to say that every improvement in the standard of living is necessarily wasteful of energy or polluting to the planet, but rather it is the cumulative effect of these improvements that is damaging to the environment. The abuses facing the natural environment as a result of the energy crisis and the food demand are clearly manifestations of anthropocentric views that treat the environment as a resource and instrument for human ends. The pollution and destruction of the non-human natural world is deemed acceptable, provided that it does not interfere with other human beings. It could be argued that there is nothing essentially wrong with anthropocentric assumptions, since it is natural, even instinctual, to favour one’s self and species over and above all other forms of life. However, it is problematic in that such perceptions influence our actions and dealings with the world to the extent that the well-being of life on this planet is threatened, making the continuance of a huge proportion of existing life forms "tenuous if not improbable" (Elliot 1995: 1). Denying the non-human world ethical consideration, it is evident that anthropocentric assumptions provide a rationale for the exploitation of the natural world and, therefore, have been largely responsible for the present environmental crisis (Des Jardins 1997: 93). Fox identifies three broad approaches to the environment informed by anthropocentric assumptions, which in reality are not distinct and separate, but occur in a variety of combinations. The "expansionist" approach is characterised by the recognition that nature has a purely instrumental value to humans. This value is accessed through the physical transformation of the non-human natural world, by farming, mining, damming etc. Such practices create an economic value, which tends to "equate the physical transformation of ‘resources’ with economic growth" (Fox 1990: 152). Legitimising continuous expansion and exploitation, this approach relies on the idea that there is an unending supply of resources. The "conservationist" approach, like the first, recognises the economic value of natural resources through their physical transformation, while at the same time accepting the fact that there are limits to these resources. It therefore emphasises the importance of conserving natural resources, while prioritising the importance of developing the non-human natural world in the quest for financial gain. The "preservationist" approach differs from the first two in that it recognises the enjoyment and aesthetic enrichment human beings receive from an undisturbed natural world. Focusing on the psychical nourishment value of the non-human natural world for humans, this approach stresses the importance of preserving resources in their natural states. All three approaches are informed by anthropocentric assumptions. This results in a one-sided understanding of the human-nature relationship. Nature is understood to have a singular role of serving humanity, while humanity is understood to have no obligations toward nature. Such a perception represents "not only a deluded but also a very dangerous orientation to the world" (Fox 1990: 13), as only the lives of human beings are recognised to have direct moral worth, while the moral consideration of non-human entities is entirely contingent upon the interests of human beings (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 9). Humanity is favoured as inherently valuable, while the non-human natural world counts only in terms of its use value to human beings. The "expansionist" and "conservationist" approaches recognise an economic value, while the "preservationist" approach recognises a hedonistic, aesthetic or spiritual value. They accept, without challenge, the assumption that the value of the non-human natural world is entirely dependent on human needs and interests. None attempt to move beyond the assumption that nature has any worth other than the value humans can derive from it, let alone search for a deeper value in nature. This ensures that human duties retain a purely human focus, thereby avoiding the possibility that humans may have duties that extend to non-humans. This can lead to viewing the non-human world, devoid of direct moral consideration, as a mere resource with a purely instrumental value of servitude. This gives rise to a principle of ‘total use’, whereby every natural area is seen for its potential cultivation value, to be used for human ends (Zimmerman 1998: 19). This provides limited means to criticise the behaviour of those who use nature purely as a warehouse of resources (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 184). It is clear that humanity has the capacity to transform and degrade the environment. Given the consequences inherent in having such capacities, "the need for a coherent, comprehensive, rationally persuasive environmental ethic is imperative" (Pierce & Van De Veer 1995: 2). The purpose of an environmental ethic would be to account for the moral relations that exist between humans and the environment, and to provide a rational basis from which to decide how we ought and ought not to treat the environment. The environment was defined as the world in which we are enveloped and immersed, constituted by both animate and inanimate objects. This includes both individual living creatures, such as plants and animals, as well as non-living, non-individual entities, such as rivers and oceans, forests and velds, essentially, the whole planet Earth. This constitutes a vast and all-inclusive sphere, and, for purposes of clarity, shall be referred to as the "greater environment". In order to account for the moral relations that exist between humans and the greater environment, an environmental ethic should have a significantly wide range of focus. I argue that anthropocentric value systems are not suitable to the task of developing a comprehensive environmental ethic. Firstly, anthropocentric assumptions have been shown to be largely responsible for the current environmental crisis. While this in itself does not provide strong support for the claim, it does cast a dim light on any theory that is informed by such assumptions. Secondly, an environmental ethic requires a significantly wide range of focus. As such, it should consider the interests of a wide range of beings. It has been shown that anthropocentric approaches do not entertain the notion that non-human entities can have interests independent of human interests. "Expansionist", "conservationist" and "preservationist" approaches only acknowledge a value in nature that is determined by the needs and interests of humans. Thirdly, because anthropocentric approaches provide a moral account for the interests of humans alone, while excluding non-humans from direct moral consideration, they are not sufficiently encompassing. An environmental ethic needs to be suitably encompassing to ensure that a moral account is provided for all entities that constitute the environment. It could be argued that the indirect moral concern for the environment arising out of an anthropocentric approach is sufficient to ensure the protection of the greater environment. In response, only those entities that are in the interest of humans will be morally considered, albeit indirectly, while those entities which fall outside of this realm will be seen to be morally irrelevant. Assuming that there are more entities on this planet that are not in the interest of humans than entities that are, it is safe to say that anthropocentric approaches are not adequately encompassing. Fourthly, the goals of an environmental ethic should protect and maintain the greater environment. It is clear that the expansionist approach, which is primarily concerned with the transformation of nature for economic return, does not meet these goals. Similarly, neither does the conservationist approach, which is arguably the same as the expansionist approach. The preservationist approach does, in principle satisfy this requirement. However, this is problematic for such preservation is based upon the needs and interests of humans, and "as human interests and needs change, so too would human uses for the environment" (Des Jardins 1997: 129). Non-human entities, held captive by the needs and interests of humans, are open to whatever fancies the interests of humans. In light of the above, it is my contention that anthropocentric value systems fail to provide a stable ground for the development of an environmental ethic.

#### This repression of the animal other results in the worse types of violence – this creates an authoritarian system which justifies genocides of the other, causes loss of value to life, and makes extinction inevitable

Sanbonmatsu, associate professor of philosophy at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 11

(John Sanbonmatsu, “Critical Theory and Animal Liberation”, January 2011, accessed 10/20/13, ST)

Weisberg, Bell, Davis, and indeed all the contributors to our volume show that the compulsory forgetting, or repression, of our own animal essence— that is, of the knowledge that we human beings are always already caught up with the drama of being animal (desiring, feeling, experiencing, suffering, laboring, loving, and so on)—prepares the way for the unending catastrophes of modernity. This is to say that speciesism is both symptomatic of and constitutive of a total mode of domination. Negation of the animal other is not a side concern to the “real issues” facing human social life but the pivot which our civilization has formed, the phenomelogical ground upon which the figure of the human being continues to sand. As Horkheimer and Adorno observed: Throughout European history, the idea of the human being has been expressed in contradistinction to the animal. The latter's lack of reason is the proof of human dignity. So insistently and unanimously has this antithesis been recited by all the earliest precursors of bourgeois thought, the ancient Jews, the Stoics, and the Early Fathers, and then through the Middle Ages to modern times, that few other ideas are so fundamental to Western anthropology. The animal other is thus not only the material stuff of civilization – the flesh and bone, labor and intelligence we exploit for our purposes—but the psycho-semiotic medium upon, which we inscribe the entirety of our culture, our philosophy, our cosmology. Hence Adorno's continual return to the problem of the animal: as Eduardo Mendieta points out in his chapter in these pages, "Animal Is to Kantianism as Jew Is to Fascism: Adorno's Bestiary." Adorno's whole philosophy was centrally a "critique of metaphysics and [of | its implicit positive anthropology that delimits the human and reason by invidiously excluding the animal" In arriving at these conclusions, it is worth noting, both Adorno and Horkheimer seem to have been influenced by the work of the psychologist .mil social theorist Wilhelm Reich. Though not a member of the Frankfurt School, "William" Reich (as Adorno refers to him in his letters) was nevertheless a fellow traveler in the circles of critical philosophy of the 1930s, a maverick German intellectual who, like the sociologists and philosophers of the Frankfurt School, felt that the rise of fascism had thrown the most fundamental assumptions concerning European civilization into doubt. That Nazism could develop in such a culturally "advanced" society, one at the very height of its creative and technological powers, required a rethinking of the bases of Western civilization. It was in this spirit of a grand epoché or bracketing of Europe's own common-sense notions of modernity that Reich thought he had traced fascism and the authoritarian personality to a foundational hatred of the animal, a hatred which, he argued, had come to structure virtually the entirety of human consciousness and culture. Whether in man's "science, his religion, his art, or his other expressions of life," Reich wrote in The Mass Psychology of Fascism, first published in 1933, the "highest task of human existence" is held to be the 'slaying of his animal side' and the cultivation of values. Man is fundamentally an animal…. (Yet) man developed the peculiar idea that he was not an animal; he was a "man." and he had long since divested himself of the "vicious" and "brutal." Man takes great pains to disassociate himself from the vicious animal and to prove that he "is better" by pointing to his culture and his civilization, which distinguish him from the animal. His entire altitude, his "theories of value," moral philosophies, his "monkey trials," all bear witness to the fact that he does not want to be reminded that he is fundamentally an animal. that he has Incomparably more in common with "the animal" than he has with that which he thinks and dreams himself to be.... His viciousness, his inability to live peacefully with his own kind, his wars, bear witness to the fact the fact that man is distinguished from the other animals only by a boundless sadism and the mechanical trinity of an authoritarian way of life, mechanistic silence, and the machine. If one looks back over long stretches of the results of human civilizaation, one finds that man's claims are not only false, but are peculiarly contrived to make him forget that he is an animal. This episteme, to borrow Foucault's term, has subtended and conditioned the whole of civilization from its beginning, providing the very basis of positive human culture. For centuries, our sciences and systems of knowledge have conspired to divide sentient life, conscious being-in-the-world, into two neat, mutually exclusive, and utterly fraudulent halves—"the, human" versus "the rest.' Paradoxically, though, in distancing ourselves from the animal other, we end up disavowing our own humanity (itself, after all, a form of animality) embracing a "machine civilization" based in death-fetishism. "How is it possible," Reich wondered, "that [man] does not see the damages (psychic illnesses, biopathies, sadism, and wars) to his health, culture, and mind that are caused by this biologic renunciation?' It is striking that Reich, Adorno, and Horkheimer. all of whom were personally forced to flee Germany by Hitler, had no qualms about comparing the human treatment of animals to the treatment of Jews and other enemies of the Third Reich under fascism.2' After the war. Adorno famously wrote that "Auschwitz begins wherever someone looks at a slaughterhouse and thinks: they're only animals," a once-obscure quote that recently has been given new life by animal rights activists and sympathetic scholars. In fact, pointed comparisons of our treatment of other animals to the Nazis' treatment of the Jews and others in the Holocaust are peppered throughout Adorno's work, some – times showing up in the most unexpected places (including a study of Beethoven's music). As Mandieta observes here, Adorno drew an explicit link between Kant's denial of any meaningful subjectivity or moral worth to animals and the catastrophes of the twentieth century, including the rise of National Socialism. "Nothing is more abhorrent to the Kantian." he wrote, "than a reminder of man's resemblance to animals. This taboo is always at work when the idealist berates the materialist. Animals play for the idealist system virtually the same role as the Jews for fascism. Indeed, is speciesism itself not a form of fascism, perhaps even its paradigmatic or primordial form? The very word "massacre," Semelin observes, originally meant "putting an animal to death": human massacres of other humans have always been realized through the semiotic transposition of the one abject onto the other. "Killing" supposedly human 'animals' then becomes entirely possible."20 Adorno made a similar point in Minima Moraha, sixty years earlier: "The constantly encountered assertion that savages, blacks, Japanese are like animals, monkeys for example, is the key to the pogrom. The possibility of pogroms is decided in the moment when the gaze of a fatally wounded animal falls on a human being."17 What is crucial to bear in mind, however, as Victoria Johnson points out in her chapter here ("Everyday Rituals of the Master Race: Fascism, Stratification, and the Fluidity of 'Animal' Domination") the very “power of such animal metaphors depends on a prior cultural understanding of other animals themselves, as beings who are by nature, abject, degraded, and hence worthy of extermination" The animal, thus, rests at the intersection of race and caste systems. And nowhere is the link between the human and nonhuman caste systems clearer than "in fascist ideology." for "no other discourse so completely authorizes absolute violence against the weak." In our own contemporary society too, Johnson emphasizes, we find daily life and meaning based on elaborate rituals intruded to keep us from acknowledging the violence we do to subordinate classes of beings, above all the animals. So numerous in fact are the parallels—semiotic, ideological, psychological, (historical, cultural, technical, and so forth—between Nazis’ extermination of the Jews and Roma and the routinized mass murder of nonhuman beings, that (Diaries Patterson's recent book on the subject. Eternal Treblinka: Our 'treatment of Animals and the Holocaust, despite its strengths, only manages to scratch the surface of a topic whose true dimensions have yet to be fathomed." In the ideological mechanisms used to legitimate killing, in the bad faith of the human beings who collude with the killing through indifference in Ignorance of the facts," above all in the technologies of organized murder – practices of confinement and control, modes of legitimation and deception, methods of elimination (gassing, shooting, clubbing, burning, vivisecting, and so on)—the mass killing of animals today cannot but recall the Nazi liquidation of European Jewry and Roma. The late Jacques Derrida observed that "there are also animal genocides"" With uncharacteristic moral sobriety he wrote: The annihilation of certain species is indeed in progress, but it is occurring through the organization and exploitation of an artificial, infernal, and virtually interminable in conditions that previous generations would have fudged monstrous, outside of every supposed norm of a life proper to animals that are thus exterminated by means of their continued existence or even overpopulation. As if for example, instead of throwing people into ovens or gas chambers (let's say Nazis) doctors and geneticists had decided to organize the overproduction and overgeneration of Jews, gypsies, and homosexuals by means of artificial insemination, so that, being more numerous and better fed, they could be destined in always increasing numbers for the same hell, that of the imposition of genetic experimentation or extermination by gas or fire. What would it mean for us to come to terms with the knowledge that civilization, our whole mode of development and culture, has been premised and built upon extermination – on a history experienced as “terror without end” ( to borrow a phrase from Adorno)? To dwell with such a thought would he to throw into almost unbearable relief the distance between our narratives of inherent human dignity and grace and moral superiority, on one side, and the most elemental facts of our actual social existence, on the other. We congratulate ourselves for our social progress—for democratic governance and state-protected civil and human rights (however notional or incompletely defended)—yet continue to enslave and kill millions of sensitive creatures who in many biological, hence emotional and cognitive, particulars resemble us. To truly meditate on such a contradiction is to comprehend our self-understanding to be not merely flawed, but to be almost comically delusional. Immanuel Kant dreamed of a moral order in which we would all participate as equals in a "kingdom of ends." But it is time to ask whether morality as such is even possible under conditions of universal bad faith and hidden slaughter, in the same way that we might ask whether acts of private morality; under National Socialism were not compromised or diminished by the larger context in which they occurred." When atrocity becomes the very basis of society, does society not forfeit its right to call itself moral? In the nineteenth century, the animal welfare advocate Edward Maitland warned that our destruction of the other animals lead only to our own "debasement and degradation of character" as a species. "For the principles of Humanity cannot be renounced with impunity; but their renunciation, if persisted in, involves inevitably the forfeiture of Humanity itself. And to cease through such forfeiture to be man is to become demon. What else indeed can we call a being but demon who enslaves and routinely kills thousands of millions of other gentle beings, imprisons them in laboratories, electrocutes or poisons or radiates or drowns them? A being who tests the capacity of empathy in other beings by forcing them to choose between life-sustaining food and subjecting a stranger of their own species in an adjacent tank or cage to painful electrical shocks? And what does it tell us about the vaunted moral superiority of humankind that while the rat, the octopus, the monkey will forgo food to avoid harming another, the human researcher will persist in tormenting his captive, until he or she collapses in convulsions and dies? Do such tests, designed to detect the presence of empathy in other species, only demonstrate the paucity of empathy in our own? Above all, it is the existential question that haunts: Who, or rather what, are we?

#### The alternative is to embrace a non-anthropocentric ethic and think from the perspective of the nonhuman – it is the self-realization that humans are not isolated egos but rather part of a larger community of beings – humans are the rocks, quarks, and mountains which have existed millions of years in the past

Seed, founder of the Rainforest Information Centre, 1995

(John Seed, “Beyond Anthropocentrism”, 1995, accessed 1/4/13, RECUT, <http://www.rainforestinfo.org.au/deep-eco/Anthropo.htm>, ST)

"Anthropocentrism" or "homocentrism" means human chauvinism. Similar to sexism, but substitute "human race" for “man" and “all other species" for "woman". Human chauvinism, the idea that humans are the crown of creation, the source of all value, the measure of all things, is deeply embedded in our culture and consciousness. "And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all that moveth on the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hands they are delivered".(2) When humans investigate and see through their layers of anthropocentric self-cherishing, a most profound change in consciousness begins to take place. Alienation subsides. The human is no longer an outsider, apart. Your humanness is then recognized as being merely the most recent stage of your existence, and as you stop identifying exclusively with this chapter, you start to get in touch with yourself as mammal, as vertebrate, as a species only recently emerged from the rainforest. As the fog of amnesia disperses, there is a transformation in your relationship to other species, and in your commitment to them. What is described here should not be seen as merely intellectual. The intellect is one entry point to the process outlined, and the easiest one to communicate. For some people however, this change of perspective follows from actions on behalf of Mother Earth. "I am protecting the rainforest" develops to "I am part of the rainforest protecting myself. I am that part of the rainforest recently emerged into thinking." What a relief then! The thousands of years of imagined separation are over and we begin to recall our true nature. That is, the change is a spiritual one, thinking like a mountain (3), sometimes referred to as "deep ecology". As your memory improves, as the implications of evolution and ecology are internalized and replace the outmoded anthropocentric structures in your mind, there is an identification with all life, then follows the realization that the distinction between "life" and "lifeless" is a human construct. Every atom in this body existed before organic life emerged 4000 million years ago. Remember our childhood as minerals, as lava, as rocks? Rocks contain the potentiality to weave themselves into such stuff as this. We are the rocks dancing. Why do we look down on them with such a condescending air. It is they that are immortal part of us. (4) If we embark upon such an inner voyage, we may find, upon returning to present day consensus reality, that our actions on behalf of the environment are purified and strengthened by the experience. We have found here a level of our being that moth, rust, nuclear holocaust or destruction of the rainforest gene pool do not corrupt. The commitment to save the world is not decreased by the new perspective, although the fear and anxiety which were part of our motivation start to dissipate and are replaced by a certain disinterestedness. We act because life is the only game in town, but actions from a disinterested, less attached consciousness may be more effective. Activists often don't have much time for meditation. The disinterested space we find here may be similar to meditation. Some teachers of meditation are embracing deep ecology (5) and vice versa (6). Of all the species that have existed, it is estimated that less than one in a hundred exist today. The rest are extinct. As environment changes, any species that is unable to adapt, to change, to evolve, is extinguished. All evolution takes place in this fashion in this way an oxygen starved fish, ancestor of yours and mine, commenced to colonize the land. Threat of extinction is the potter's hand that molds all the forms of life. The human species is one of millions threatened by imminent extinction through nuclear war and other environmental changes. And while it is true that the "human nature" revealed by 12,000 years of written history does not offer much hope that we can change our warlike, greedy, ignorant ways, the vastly longer fossil history assures us that we CAN change. We ARE the fish, and the myriad other death-defying feats of flexibility which a study of evolution reveals to us. A certain confidence (in spite of our recent "humanity") is warranted. From this point of view, the threat of extinction appears as the invitation to change, to evolve. After a brief respite from the potter's hand, here we are back on the wheel again. The change that is required of us is not some new resistance to radiation, but a change in consciousness. Deep ecology is the search for a viable consciousness. Surely consciousness emerged and evolved according to the same laws as everything else. Molded by environmental pressures, the mind of our ancestors must time and again have been forced to transcend itself. To survive our current environmental pressures, we must consciously remember our evolutionary and ecological inheritance. We must learn to think like a mountain. If we are to be open to evolving a new consciousness, we must fully face up to our impending extinction (the ultimate environmental pressure). This means acknowledging that part of us which shies away from the truth, hides in intoxication or busyness from the despair of the human, whose 4000 million year race is run, whose organic life is a mere hair's breadth from finished.(7) A biocentric perspective, the realization that rocks WILL dance, and that roots go deeper that 4000 million years, may give us the courage to face despair and break through to a more viable consciousness, one that is sustainable and in harmony with life again.

# Manufacturing

#### No impact – manufacturing is at an all time high

Campos, Reuters, 11/1

[Rodrigo, Reuters, “U.S. factory growth hits fastest pace in 2-1/2 years”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/01/us-usa-economy-idUSBRE99L04G20131101>, accessed 11/5/13]

(Reuters) - The U.S. manufacturing sector expanded at its fastest pace in more than two years in October, according to an industry report, signaling a strong start to fourth-quarter factory activity despite a government shutdown during the first half of the month.

The Institute for Supply Management said on Friday its index of national factory activity rose to 56.4 in October, its best showing since April 2011, handily beating expectations of a slight slowdown in the growth rate.

Last month was the fifth in a row of quicker growth in the goods-producing sector, according to ISM's data.

"It certainly was a surprise, and a good one. We don't get that many of those on the data stream of late," said Art Hogan, managing director at Lazard Capital Markets in New York.

"This was supposed to be a government shutdown-affected number, and it certainly didn't show that."

Analysts expected weak economic data readings after a political stalemate in Washington forced a partial federal government shutdown through the first 16 days of October.

A separate reading from financial data firm Markit cast some doubt on the strength of factory activity growth. Markit said its final U.S. Manufacturing Purchasing Managers Index stood at 51.8 last month, beating the preliminary October reading but notching the worst final showing since October 2012.

The two surveys use several different methodologies, including one related to seasonal adjustment. Both figures indicated expansion in the manufacturing sector.

#### ISM unexpectedly improved

RBC Financial Group, 11/5/13

(Daily Forex, “US ISM Non-Manufacturing Index Unexpectedly Improved in October”, <http://www.actionforex.com/analysis/daily-forex-fundamentals/us-ism-non-manufacturing-index-unexpectedly-improved-in-october-20131105201376/>, accessed 11/5/13, JZ)

The Institute for Supply Management (ISM) non-manufacturing index improved to 55.4 in October 2013 to retrace some of the 4.2 point decline to 54.4 in September. Market expectations had been for a slight moderation to 54.0 in the month.

The "Business activity" and "employment" sub-components both posted strong gains in October, while "new orders" and "supplier deliveries" fell slightly from the previous month.

The increase in the ISM non-manufacturing index in October retraced some of the unexpected decline in September, which saw the headline reading fall 4.2 points from a near eight-year high in August. This month's strong reading was particularly encouraging given the 16-day government shutdown that fell during the survey period. As with the ISM manufacturing release last Friday, today's report defied market expectations for a slowdown, thus providing some initial indications that the negative effect on business sentiment due to the shutdown appears to have been less pronounced than anticipated.

The ISM non-manufacturing index improved by 1.0 points to 55.4 in October 2013, partially retracing the 4.2 point decline in September that brought the index down to 54.4 from its almost eight-year high of 58.6 in August. Market expectations had been for a slight moderation to 54.0 in October.

#### Mexican Energy Reform solves manufacturing

Iliff and Luhnow Mexico/Latin America correspondent at the Wall Street Journal and at Dow Jones Newswires and Latin American Bureau Chief for the Wall Street Journal 13 (Laurence Iliff and David Luhnow, December 13, 2013, “PEMEX CEO: Mexican Energy Overhaul Opens Opportunity”, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303932504579256693926525588>, Accessed: 23 December 2013, TM)

MEXICO CITY—Emilio Lozoya, the chief executive of state-run oil giant Petróleos Mexicanos, on Friday welcomed the decision by the country's congress to end the company's 75-year monopoly on Mexican oil and gas, calling it a historic move that should have happened decades ago.¶ "It's a paradigm shift, a jump to modernity that should have happened decades ago," he said in the first interview after Mexico's congress voted earlier in the week to open the country's closed energy sector to private firms for the first time since 1938.¶ "Normally, monopolies don't want competition. We believe competition is the best thing that can happen to Pemex," said the 39-year-old former investment banker.¶ The landmark bill, which is expectedly to be approved by state legislatures and signed into law early next year, aims to stop sliding Mexican oil production by allowing private firms to explore and produce oil. Supporters say it will attract billions in foreign investment and boost Mexico's economy.¶ For Pemex, the world's fifth-biggest producer of crude oil with sales of about $130 billion in 2012, it means being allowed to partner with private firms in projects ranging from deep water oil to building pipelines to even making fertilizer. But it also means competing for the first time since the company was created more than seven decades ago.¶ Mr. Lozoya, the youngest-ever Pemex CEO at just 38 years when he took over last year, outlined a vision of a state company that rises to the challenge of competition by growing rather than shrinking—boosting its investment spending, hiring more skilled workers and paying them better, and becoming less corrupt and more transparent.¶ "It's very exciting. But the challenge now is execution. We delivered on the legislative side, now we need to execute," said Mr. Lozoya, who holds a master's degree in economic development from Harvard and managed investment funds in New York before his appointment. He is also the son of a former energy minister.¶ Pemex has already identified oil fields where it wants to go it alone, and others where it wants partners. Under the rules of Mexico's reform, the company can keep any field it already has as well as have first pick of future fields.¶ While deep-water oil was the key long-term priority, in the shorter term, Pemex could use partners to drill heavy oil in shallow waters and in older fields where production has fallen or where the company had long since left.¶ "As of the first or second quarter of next year, we'll be ready to listen to investment proposals," he said, adding the first barrel of oil that came from a partnership with a private firm could be out of the ground as soon as late 2014 and early 2015.¶ Until now, Mexico has had among the world's most closed energy laws, even barring any gasoline stations other than Pemex. The new laws allow private companies to do everything from search for the gas to sell it at filling stations.¶ The extent of the changes in the energy laws came as a surprise to many, given Pemex's role as the source of a third of all government income here and as a longtime symbol of national sovereignty. Pemex also has 160,000 employees, making it Mexico's largest single employer.¶ Already, the leftist Party of the Democratic Revolution, which voted against the changes amid cries of "treason," has proposed holding a referendum in 2015, to coincide with midterm elections. The Supreme Court will decide if the referendum can go ahead. If it does, the outcome would be binding, meaning voters could turn back the new energy laws.¶ But Mr. Lozoya was confident the referendum wouldn't be allowed by the courts because the constitution states that no referendum will be allowed on matters that could negatively affect fiscal matters or the budget.¶ "We are completely certain the constitutional change and implementing laws give full legal certainty to Pemex and the industry," he said. "We don't believe investors will need to hold back."¶ Under the new rules, Pemex will have two years to change to a company run along commercial lines from a firm whose highest priority was maximizing tax revenue for the government.¶ A new tax code recently passed by congress should help by trying to raise nonoil tax revenue, easing the federal budget's dependence on Pemex. The energy reform will give Pemex autonomy over its budget and significantly lower its tax burden international levels.¶ Mr. Lozoya said the changes might allow Pemex to raise its investment budget to between $30 billion and $35 billion a year from about $25 billion at the moment, allowing Pemex to pursue a raft of initiatives that would make sense for the company and Mexico.¶ The best example might be natural gas. Mexico imports natural gas from the U.S. despite having sizable reserves of its own. But Pemex has neglected to develop natural gas or even build the pipelines to import more of it because of its limited budget. That has led to a scarcity of natural gas in much of the country and raised costs for manufacturers.¶ Consider the effect on fertilizers and petrochemicals. Mexico imports the majority of both products right now mostly because there isn't enough natural gas. Having more natural gas would allow Mexican industry to undercut imports, he said. Pemex is close to setting up its own fertilizer unit, he added.¶ "This kind of thing is a no brainer," he said, adding that 60% of Mexico's farmland is not fertilized. "This will have a big impact on parts of the country with high rates of poverty."¶ Another example is building pipelines to transport energy and fuel across Mexico rather than moving fuel by truck, which is the norm in much of the country but raises transport costs by 15 times compared to pipeline, he said. "Why didn't we do these kinds of project before? Our investment capacity was so limited that we focused only on the highest return, which was exploration and production," he said.¶ There are so many projects Pemex has left on the shelf in the past decades that the main challenge, he said, was "execution."¶ Outside observers said Mr. Lozoya will have his hands full.¶ "For Pemex, this reform is a monumental shock. Private-sector competition will lead Pemex to change its corporate governance, and its daily practices to become more efficient if the firm wants to survive. It means to step out under father's State's underskirts," said Carlos Elizondo, a political analyst and influential columnist at daily Excelsior who has extensively written of Mexico's oil history.

#### Alt causes to manufacturing

Jasinowski 4-22-2013(Jerry Jasinowshi, Former President of the National Association of Manufacturers, “A Real Manufacturing Resurgence.” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jerry-jasinowski/manufacturing-comeback_b_3131062.html> )//NR

There are contradictory analyses in the media about a resurgence of manufacturing - some praising it as the second coming and others insisting it is imaginary. For instance, on April 2, The Washington Post featured a front page report of European manufacturers setting up shop in the U.S. to take advantage of low natural gas prices, while the *New York Times* had a [story on the front page](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/02/business/economy/rumors-of-a-cheap-energy-jobs-boom-remain-just-that.html?pagewanted=all" \t "_hplink) of its business section entitled "Manufacturing's Mirage, A Jobs Boom Built on Cheap Energy Has Yet To Appear." In reality, there is no contradiction. Even the optimistic souls like me who perceive a resurgence in manufacturing do not contend manufacturing will ever be the fountain of jobs that it once was. It is a fact of life that low skill manufacturing jobs have fled the U.S. and they are increasingly fleeing developing nations as more and more rote tasks are automated. Even so, manufacturing remains a key driving force of economy growth and a critical seedbed for innovation. Akio Morita, the founder of Sony, said years ago that the world power that loses its manufacturing base will cease to be a world power. That is why the Chinese are so determined to build their manufacturing sector. Manufacturing is key to economic growth. The reality on the ground is that U.S. manufacturing is today giving a good account of itself, but with sensible incentives, it could do much more. Thomas J. Duesterberg of the Aspen Institute suggests there is a realistic path for growing manufacturing's contribution to GDP by 4 percentage points, from 11.6 percent to 15.8 percent by 2025. To do it, he advocates: • Expanding exports and reducing imports. We need a much more aggressive effort to open foreign markets to our exports, a greater effort to promote exports, and a tougher stand on violations of trade agreements, such as currency manipulation. • We need a clear strategy for taking advantage of plentiful and cheaper natural gas that is attracting foreign investment. In many key manufacturing sectors, this gives us a once in a lifetime opportunity to grow and expand. • We must intensify our investments in productivity gains, knowing our competitors are nipping at our heels, and we should also streamline the U.S. regulatory process and apply manufacturing technology to the service industries. • We need a coherent national commitment to endow workers with the skills they need in modern manufacturing. For though manufacturing will never again be the fountain of jobs it once was, it is creating millions of fresh opportunities for qualified people. The Aspen Study on the Manufacturing Resurgence provides a practical framework for increasing manufacturing's contribution to economic growth, and the corporate and public policies we need to make it happen. We should read it and heed it.

## Aerospace

#### The US aerospace industry is strong now and new policies will make it stronger.

Tom Donohue, Chamber Post, “Aerospace Makes Jobs And Exports Soar,” 9/15/2010, http://www.chamberpost.com/2010/09/aerospace-makes-jobs-and-exports-soar.html

For the naysayers who argue that American manufacturing is dead (it’s not!), let me suggest that they take a look at what’s happening in the aerospace industry. Despite the recent economic downturn, aerospace achieved $215 billion in sales last year, all while providing more than 644,000 good-paying jobs.

This critical industry—which is essential to national defense, transportation, and technological innovation—is also a leader when it comes to exports. In 2009, American aerospace companies enjoyed a trade surplus of $56 billion. In the spirit of National Aerospace Week, let me share what the U.S. Chamber is doing to help the aerospace industry—and the broader economy—expand and create the jobs that will get Americans back to work.

First, we support the modernization of aviation infrastructure, which received a “D” on a report card issued by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). Over the next five years, ASCE projects that aviation infrastructure will suffer from a $40 billion funding shortfall. This is unacceptable. We need to improve airports and air traffic control systems today. The Chamber’s Let’s Rebuild America initiative is leading the charge for adequate infrastructure funding and will continue to address this issue in the next Congress.

Second, the Chamber believes that Congress should reauthorize the programs under the Federal Aviation Administration. Any such legislation should expedite air traffic control modernization (known as NextGen), provide research and technology funding targeted to projects that increase national aviation system capacity and safety, and ensure continued air service to communities nationwide.

Third, we are advocating for an expansion of international trade, which would benefit the aerospace industry and the broader economy by opening up new markets to American goods and services. This must include the modernization and reform of U.S. export controls—which the Obama administration has begun to pursue. We welcome efforts to create an export controls regime appropriate to America’s national security needs, one that facilitates rather than hinders R&D and trade activities critical to the continued health and international superiority of our aerospace and defense industry.

Finally, the Chamber will continue to lead the fight against any Buy American mandates in federal legislation that would invite retaliation from our trading partners, hurting the aerospace industry and the workers it employs.

#### Air force not key to curbing conflicts

Farley, assistant professor at Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, 13

(Robert, 8/12/13, “America deoes not need the air force”, https://medium.com/war-is-boring/ff4662469f95, 10/28/13, AL)

The real problem isn’t that the Army is marginally more or less useful that it was 10 years ago, but rather that the institutions that were designed in 1947, when the Army and Air Force split, are insufficiently flexible to negotiate the modern security landscape.

The fault for this lies not primarily with the Army, but with the United States Air Force, an institution built on the optimistic vision that ordnance delivered from the air could, cheaply and cleanly, bring about a peaceful, American-dominated world.

Look, creating institutions is all about drawing useful lines between areas of responsibility. Historically, it made sense to divide the responsibility between managing security on land and on sea between specific organizations tasked with training, managing and equipping professionals in their respective arenas.

In other words, an army and a navy. They had their disputes from time to time, but by and large their missions were sufficiently distinct — as distinct as earth and water, really — that differences in outlook, opinion, and interest didn’t interfere all that much with fighting actual wars.

But even from the dawn of flight, it never made much sense to separate the professional upbringing of aerial warfighters from their sea and land counterparts. Since before World War I, aviators have supported soldiers and sailors through reconnaissance, interdiction of enemy transit, air transport and direct attacks against fielded enemy forces.

Separating aerial military assets from the ground and naval assets they organically support makes no more sense than the creation of separate arms for tanks and submarines. The creation of the Air Force broke apart the organic unity of the Army.

## Heg

#### 1. US decline inevitable and peaceful

Wohlforth and Ziabari 13 (Prof. William C. Wohlforth and Kourosh Ziabari. January 1st 2013. Wohlforth is a political scientist and Daniel Webster Professor of Government at the Department of Government of the Dartmouth College. “Iran Review 2013 with World Political Scientists: US Decline?” <http://www.iranreview.org/content/Documents/US-Decline-No-2-William-Wohlforth-The-United-States-Lost-Some-Ground-over-the-Past-Decade.htm> MB Accessed: 12/27/13)

There’s no doubt that the signs of the decline of the U.S. Empire and the weakening of the bases of imperialism have begun to emerge. The United States, although it lawlessly continues to wage wars on the other countries and threaten independent nations with its aggressive war rhetoric, economic sanctions and media propaganda, is not as powerful and influential as it had been during the Vietnam War. The United States is now plunged into an unprecedented economic crisis and the people at the White House and Pentagon know well that it’s not too easy to convince the American public that more wars are needed to export the values of imperialism to the other world nations, especially now that the United States is grappling with unemployment, poverty and other socioeconomic crises. Iran Review has begun to conduct a set of interviews with world’s great political scientists about the decline of the U.S. hegemony and global dominance and the downfall of the American Empire. Our first interview with Prof. Francis Shor was published on December 10. What follows is our interview with Prof. William C. Wohlforth, political scientist and Daniel Webster Professor of Government at the Department of Government of the Dartmouth College. Prof. Wohlforth was chair of the Department of Government for three years and is the author of “Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions during the Cold War.” He is the co-author of the book “World Out of Balance: International Relations Theory and the Challenge of American Primacy” with Prof. Stephen Brooks. Prof. Wohlforth has taken part in an exclusive interview with Iran Review and presented his viewpoints regarding the social, economic and political challenges the United States is facing and the future of America’s global hegemony as a supposedly-unrivaled superpower. Q: As you know, the uni-polar, hegemonic system of global governance led by the United State constitutes the basis and structure of current international order. In this regard, some people believe that the signs of the decline of the United States and a consequent transformation in the international order have begun to emerge. What’s your viewpoint on that? A: There is little doubt that after increasing its economic, technological and military dominance in the 1990s, the United States has lost some ground over the past ten years. While this trend may well continue, whether it really leads to a transformation depends on two things primarily: the speed and scale of U.S. decline, and the interests of other major players. A lot of ink has been spilled on the first of these, the so called “rise of the rest.” So much, in fact, that we’re now seeing something of backlash, as analysts are starting to notice weaknesses and vulnerabilities in the rising powers’ economies, societies and politics. But the second issue is at least as important, if not more so. Note that the attitude of the countries with most of the world’s largest and most advanced economies and militaries are generally favorable to the U.S.-led order: the EU, Japan, Canada, Mexico and many other American countries, Australia, New Zealand, South Korea, etc. Given this huge preponderance of power lining up basically in favor of the status quo, even if the U.S. itself declines, there will still be very powerful support for the current arrangements. That said, in international politics there is always the possibility for large-scale change, and some of the hypotheses you suggest might indeed be validated in the years ahead. Q: A change based on the founding of a power balance against the United States has begun to emerge in the global equations of political power. What’s your analysis of this change and the challenges it poses to U.S. hegemony? A: This is not in the cards. There is no evidence that countries have banded together in anti-American alliances or expanded their own militaries to match U.S capabilities—or that they will do so in the future. The United States is just not like past hegemons, against which the balancing coalitions of the past formed. It is geographically isolated, which means that it presents far less of a direct threat to the other major states. If you look at all the balancing coalitions of the past, they occurred among contiguous great-power rivals that could step up to the task of balancing. “Offshore” hegemons like the U.S. and Britain before it do not spark balancing coalitions. The main alliance formation in the world is with not against the United States. America has some 69 allies—which include most of the world’s richest, technologically advanced, and militarily capable countries. China has one ally—starving North Korea. When Uzbekistan withdrew from the CSTO earlier this year, Russia’s number of allies sank to five mostly poor and uniformly militarily weak former Soviet republics. This makes it even harder for any competitor to match the U.S. military. The United States is far ahead militarily in both quantitative and qualitative terms, and its security alliances give it the leverage to prevent allies from giving military technology to potential U.S. rivals. Because the United States dominates the high-end defense industry, it can trade access to its defense market for allies’ agreement not to transfer key military technologies to its competitors. The embargo that the United States has convinced the EU to maintain on military sales to China since 1989 is a case in point. Q: It seems that the United States is voluntarily retreating from its position as a global hegemon, as a result of a remarkable increase in the costs of the unipolar and hegemonic order and the considerable decrease in its utilities. What’s your viewpoint in this regard?

#### 2. Turn- heg causes Taiwan war

Whyte 13 (Alexander Whyte, February 13,2013. Masters of International Relations at Bristol University. “Interpreting the Rise of China” <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/02/13/interpreting-the-rise-of-china/> MB Accessed 12/23/12)

The Taiwan Strait is regarded as a political hot topic. China’s relationship with the United States remains internationally important; within this relationship, the Taiwan issue has always been a crucial factor. The fragile “status quo” relationship between China and Taiwan has been existence since 1949, when the nationalist Kuomintang (KMT) leaders of the republic of China regarded the Communist government as illegitimate and fled to the small island off the coast of the mainland establishing the Republic of China (ROC). The People’s Republic of China (PRC) denied the ROC de jure political status. Although interpretations between the two parties vary, according to the ‘One China’ principle, mainland China still considers Taiwan to be an inalienable part of it. While Taiwan’s former president Chen Shui-bian rejected this principle, through the 1992 consensus, the KMT accepts it as a starting point for negotiations (Roberge & Lee, 2009). What makes Taiwan such a precarious and a delicate issue is the ties it maintains with the US. With regards to China’s ‘One China’ principle, the PRC sees the United States as a major attainment of this goal; the United States is bound by its Taiwan Relations Act to protect the island against any aggression. For this reason, it is not surprising that the PRC feels that the United States still views the country as a potential enemy in its regional defence calculus (Yusof, 1999, p.63). The cooperation between the United States and Taiwan creates tension between the PRC and the US. China seeks supremacy over not merely Taiwan, but the entire region, in pursuit of regional hegemony (Mearsheimer & Brzezinski, 2005, p.4). An Economist article argued that Taiwan is the main spur for China’s military expansion. China’s new gunboat diplomacy promises to be a formidable array of assets; designed not to match American military power in the Western Pacific but rather to exploit its vulnerabilities. China’s strategy is built around the possibility of cross-strait armed conflict in which China would have to not only overcome Taiwan, but deter, delay or defeat American forces This military build-up does not go without response. The Pentagon is stepping up investments in a range of weapons, jet fighters and technology. Despite talks of budget cuts, the development of China’s first radar-evading jet, as well as anti-ballistic missile that could hit American aircraft carriers, pushed the Pentagon to make improvements in American weaponry a priority (Bumiller, 2011). Moreover, America has raised the possibility that it might sell Taiwan the F-16 C/D fighter jets, in an attempt to close Taiwan’s so-called ‘fighter-gap’ (Economist, May 1 2012). Taiwan continues to modernize both its missile forces and its amphibious assault capabilities. Between 2000 and 2007, Taiwan received $8.4 billion in arms deliveries from worldwide sources; the United States has consistently been a significant source of Taiwan’s arms purchases. The influx of arms from the United States further guarantees their commitment to protecting Taiwan from any aggressor (Roberge & Lee, 2009).

#### That causes extinction

Straits Times 2k (The Straits Times, “No One Gains in War over Taiwan,” Lexis Nexis, MB Accessed 12/23/12)

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

#### 3. Turn- heg causes prolif

Rosett 13(Claudia Rosett, 4-10-13, an American writer and journalist. She is journalist-in-residence at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, a policy institute based in Washington, D.C, went to Yale then Columbia, “The Pyongyang-Tehran Proliferation Playbook” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/claudiarosett/2013/04/10/the-pyongyang-tehran-proliferation-playbook/> MB Accessed 12/23/12)

Clearly the dangers posed by North Korea reside not only in its arsenal, but in the precedents Pyongyang keeps setting for just how much a rogue regime can get away with in this era of receding American power. As North Korea hones its missile reach and nuclear abilities — while threatening to incinerate Seoul, [Washington](http://www.forbes.com/places/dc/washington/) and U.S. bases in the Pacific — it appears the limits of such behavior have yet to be discovered. That spectacularly dangerous message is surely being read with interest by other anti-American regimes, especially by North Korea’s chief partner in proliferation, [Iran](http://www.forbes.com/places/iran/). Iran’s interest in the North Korean playbook goes back some three decades, to the early days of the Islamic Republic. It extends beyond a shared interest in military hardware, to a mutually reinforcing policy of threatening the U.S. A signal event in this relationship took place in 1989, shortly after the end of the 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq War, in which North Korea supplied weapons, including knock-offs of Soviet Scud missiles, to Iran. In May of 1989, Iran’s then-president Ali Khamenei paid a visit to Pyongyang, then ruled by Kim Il Sung, grandfather of North Korea’s current tyrant, Kim Jong Un. The gist of Khamenei’s message during that visit is important, because less than a month later Iran’s revolutionary tyrant Ayatollah Khomeini died, and Khamenei took over as Iran’s Supreme Leader — which he remains to this day. During his 1989 trip to North Korea, Khamenei was full of praise for North Korea’s heavily armed hostility toward the U.S. In a statement to Kim Il Sung, broadcast by Tehran Radio, and reported at the time by the Associated Press, Khamenei said, “Anti-Americanism can be the most important factor in our cooperation with the People’s Democratic Republic of North Korea.” He added, admiringly, “You have proved in Korea that you have the power to confront America.” Plenty has changed in the world, but the anti-American alliance between Iran and North Korea has endured. In 2009, according to a laudatory account by Pyongyang’s Korean Central News Agency, Iran held a ceremony at its embassy in Pyongyang to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the meeting between Iran’s Supreme Leader Khamenei and North Korea’s late Great Leader Kim. In 2012, when a high-level North Korean delegation to Tehran signed a Scientific Cooperation Agreement with Iran, fraught with nuclear overtones, Khamenei gave his public blessing to the deal — citing a shared need to defy “common enemies.” Underpinning this cozy anti-American axis are decades of weapons development and trade. Iran has the oil money that cash hungry North Korea craves for its weapons programs, and North Korea has the willingness to pioneer ever more dangerous means of threatening America and its allies. Following unconfirmed press reports of Iranians being present at North Korea’s third nuclear test this February, the news has been full of stories about the North Korea-Iran axis of proliferation. But some particularly horrifying information can be found in a 2011 paper published by the Seoul-based Institute of National [Security](http://www.forbes.com/security/) Strategy, authored by Larry Niksch, an Asia specialist formerly with the U.S. Congressional Research Service. In this paper, Niksch estimated that North Korea’s regime was earning “between $1.5 billion and $2.0 billion annually from its multi-faceted collaboration with Iran (including support for the terrorist groups Hezbollah and Hamas).”

#### B. Proliferation causes extinction

Horowitz 9­­( Michael Horowitz, April 2009, Professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania, “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons and International Conflict: Does Experience Matter?” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Volume 53 Number 2, pg. 234-257 MB Accessed 12/23/12)

Learning as states gain experience with nuclear weapons is complicated. While to some extent nuclear acquisition might provide information about resolve or capabilities, it also generates uncertainty about the way an actual conflict would go – given the new risk of nuclear escalation – and uncertainty about relative capabilities. Rapid proliferation may especially heighten uncertainty given the potential for reasonable states to disagree at times about the quality of the capabilities each possesses. 3 What follows is an attempt to describe the implications of inexperience and incomplete information on the behavior of nuclear states and their potential opponents over time. Since it is impossible to detail all possible lines of argumentation and possible responses, the following discussion is necessarily incomplete. This is a first step. The acquisition of nuclear weapons increases the confidence of adopters in their ability to impose costs in the case of a conflict and the expectations of likely costs if war occurs by potential opponents. The key questions are whether nuclear states learn over time about how to leverage nuclear weapons and the implications of that learning, along with whether or not actions by nuclear states, over time, convey information that leads to changes in the expectations of their behavior – shifts in uncertainty – on the part of potential adversaries. Learning to Leverage? When a new state acquires nuclear weapons, how does it influence the way the state behaves and how might that change over time? Though nuclear acquisition might be orthogonal to a particular dispute, it might be related to a particular security challenge, might signal revisionist aims with regard to an enduring dispute, or might signal the desire to reinforce the status quo. This section focuses on how acquiring nuclear weapons influences both the new nuclear state and potential adversaries. In theory, system-wide perceptions of nuclear danger could allow new nuclear states to partially skip the early Cold War learning process concerning the risks of nuclear war and enter a proliferated world more cognizant of nuclear brinksmanship and bargaining than their predecessors. However, each new nuclear state has to resolve its own particular civil-military issues surrounding operational control and plan its national strategy in light of its new capabilities. Empirical research by Sagan, Feaver, and Blair suggests that viewing the behavior of other states does not create the necessary tacit knowledge; there is no substitute for experience when it comes to handling a nuclear arsenal, even if experience itself cannot totally prevent accidents (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992; Sagan 1993). Sagan contends that civil-military instability in many likely new proliferators and pressures generated by the requirements to handle the responsibility of dealing with nuclear weapons will skew decision-making towards more offensive strategies (Sagan 1995). The questions surrounding Pakistan’s nuclear command and control suggest there is no magic bullet when it comes to new nuclear powers making control and delegation decisions (Bowen and Wolvén 1999). Sagan and others focus on inexperience on the part of new nuclear states as a key behavioral driver. Inexperienced operators, and the bureaucratic desire to “justify” the costs spent developing nuclear weapons, combined with organizational biases that may favor escalation to avoid decapitation, the “use it or lose it” mindset, may cause new nuclear states to adopt riskier launch postures, like launch on warning, or at least be perceived that way by other states (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992; Sagan 1995). 4 Acquiring nuclear weapons could alter state preferences and make them more likely to escalate disputes once they start, given their new capabilities.5 But their general lack of experience at leveraging their nuclear arsenal and effectively communicating nuclear threats could mean new nuclear states will be more likely to select adversaries poorly and find themselves in disputes with resolved adversaries that will reciprocate militarized challenges. The “nuclear experience” logic also suggests that more experienced nuclear states should gain knowledge over time from nuclearized interactions that helps leaders effectively identify the situations in which their nuclear arsenal is likely to make a difference. Experienced nuclear states learn to select into cases where their comparative advantage, nuclear weapons, is more likely to be effective, increasing the probability that an adversary will not reciprocate. Coming from a slightly different perspective, uncertainty about the consequences of proliferation on the balance of power and the behavior of new nuclear states on the part of their potential adversaries could also shape behavior in similar ways (Schelling 1966; Blainey 1988). While a stable and credible nuclear arsenal communicates clear information about the likely costs of conflict, in the short-term nuclear proliferation is likely to increase uncertainty about the trajectory of a war, the balance of power, and the preferences of the adopter.

#### 4. Turn- Hege causes a Russian-Sino Alliance culminating in nuclear war

Paul Craig Roberts 07 (August 9, assistant secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration. He was associate editor of the Wall Street Journal editorial page and contributing editor ofNational Review, William E. Simon chair in political economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, and senior research fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, "US Hegemony Spawns Russian-Chinese Military Alliance", [http://www.antiwar.com/roberts/?articleid=11422](http://www.antiwar.com/roberts/?articleid=11422" \t "_blank))

This week the Russian and Chinese militaries are conducting a joint military exercise involving large numbers of troops and combat vehicles. The former Soviet Republics of Tajikistan, Kyrgkyzstan, and Kazakstan are participating. Other countries appear ready to join the military alliance. This new potent military alliance is a real world response to neoconservative delusions about US hegemony. Neocons believe that the US is supreme in the world and can dictate its course. The neoconservative idiots have actually written papers, read by Russians and Chinese, about why the US must use its military superiority to assert hegemony over Russia and China. Cynics believe that the neocons are just shills, like Bush and Cheney, for the military-security complex and are paid to restart the cold war for the sake of the profits of the armaments industry. But the fact is that the neocons actually believe their delusions about American hegemony. Russia and China have now witnessed enough of the Bush administration's unprovoked aggression in the world to take neocon intentions seriously. As the US has proven that it cannot occupy the Iraqi city of Baghdad despite 5 years of efforts, it most certainly cannot occupy Russia or China. That means the conflict toward which the neocons are driving will be a nuclear conflict. In an attempt to gain the advantage in a nuclear conflict, the neocons are positioning US anti-ballistic missiles on Soviet borders in Poland and the Czech Republic. This is an idiotic provocation as the Russians can eliminate anti-ballistic missiles with cruise missiles. Neocons are people who desire war, but know nothing about it. Thus, the US failures in Iraq and Afghanistan. Reagan and Gorbachev ended the cold war. However, US administrations after Reagan's have broken the agreements and understandings. The US gratuitously brought NATO and anti-ballistic missiles to Russia's borders. The Bush regime has initiated a propaganda war against the Russian government of Vladimir Putin. These are gratuitous acts of aggression. Both the Russian and Chinese governments are trying to devote resources to their economic development, not to their militaries. Yet, both are being forced by America's aggressive posture to revamp their militaries. Americans need to understand what the neocon Bush regime cannot: a nuclear exchange between the US, Russia, and China would establish the hegemony of the cockroach.

#### 5. Turn- Heg causes terrorism

Jervis, 2009 ( Robert Jervis is the Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Affairs at Columbia University, and has been a member of the faculty since 1980, “Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective“ <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/wp/summary/v061/61.1.jervis.html>, MB Accessed 12/23/12 )

Some classical balance thinking still applies, however. States have a variety of security concerns that require influencing or acting independently from the superpower, and they have interests that extend beyond security that may call for a form of counterbalancing. Even if others do not fear attack from the unipole, they may believe that the latter’s behavior endangers them, a worry that parallels that of traditional alliance entrapment.46 Thus today some states believe that the way the U.S. is pursuing its “war on terror” increases the chance they will be the victim of terrorist attacks and decreases stability in the Middle East, an area they depend on for oil. So there is reason for them to act in concert to restrain the U.S.47 The point is not to block the U.S. from conquering them, as in traditional balancing, but to increase their influence over it. Although such efforts will not be automatic and their occurrence will depend on complex calculations of costs, benefits, and the possibilities of success, these concerns provide an impetus for trying to make it harder for the unipole to act alone. Others may also fear that the unipole will refuse to act when their security, but not its own security, is at stake. As Waltz notes, “absence of threat permits [the superpower’s] policy to become capricious.”48 It is not surprising that American policy has changed more from one administration to the next after the cold war than it did during it, and the fear of abandonment may be the main motive behind the Europeans’ pursuit of a rapid reaction force. With it they would have the capability to act in the Balkans or East Europe if the U.S. chose not to, to intervene in small humanitarian crises independently of the U.S., and perhaps to trigger American action by starting something that only the U.S. could finish. This is not balancing against American power, but, rather, is a hedge against the possibility that the U.S. would withhold it, perhaps in response to European actions of which the U.S. disapproved. 49

#### B. Terrorism goes nuclear

Alexander ’03 (Yonah, Prof, Dir – Inter-University for Terrorism Studies, Washington Times, 8-28, Lexis)

Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns.