# Case

#### Terrorists have religious motivations that make discourse and compromise meaningless. The only way to win the war we are in is to kill them before they kill us.¶

Peters 4

- (Ralph, Retired Army Officer, “In Praise of Attrition,” Parameters, Summer)¶

Trust me. We don’t need discourses. We need plain talk, honest answers, and the will to close with the enemy and kill him. And to keep on killing him until it is unmistakably clear to the entire world who won. When military officers start speaking in academic gobbledygook, it means they have nothing to contribute to the effectiveness of our forces. They badly need an assignment to Fallujah. Consider our enemies in the War on Terror. Men who believe, literally, that they are on a mission from God to destroy your civilization and who regard death as a promotion are not impressed by elegant maneuvers. You must find them, no matter how long it takes, then kill them. If they surrender, you must accord them their rights under the laws of war and international conventions. But, as we have learned so painfully from all the mindless, left-wing nonsense spouted about the prisoners at Guantanamo, you are much better off killing them before they have a chance to surrender. We have heard no end of blather about network-centric warfare, to the great profit of defense contractors. If you want to see a superb—and cheap—example of “net-war,” look at al Qaeda. The mere possession of technology does not ensure that it will be used effectively. And effectiveness is what matters. It isn’t a question of whether or not we want to fight a war of attrition against religion-fueled terrorists. We’re in a war of attrition with them. We have no realistic choice. Indeed, our enemies are, in some respects, better suited to both global and local wars of maneuver than we are. They have a world in which to hide, and the world is full of targets for them. They do not heed laws or boundaries. They make and observe no treaties. They do not expect the approval of the United Nations Security Council. They do not face election cycles. And their weapons are largely provided by our own societies. We have the technical capabilities to deploy globally, but, for now, we are forced to watch as Pakistani forces fumble efforts to surround and destroy concentrations of terrorists; we cannot enter any country (except, temporarily, Iraq) without the permission of its government. We have many tools—military, diplomatic, economic, cultural, law enforcement, and so on—but we have less freedom of maneuver than our enemies. But we do have superior killing power, once our enemies have been located. Ultimately, the key advantage of a superpower is superpower. Faced with implacable enemies who would kill every man, woman, and child in our country and call the killing good (the ultimate war of attrition), we must be willing to use that power wisely, but remorselessly. We are, militarily and nationally, in a transition phase. Even after 9/11, we do not fully appreciate the cruelty and determination of our enemies. We will learn our lesson, painfully, because the terrorists will not quit. The only solution is to kill them and keep on killing them: a war of attrition. But a war of attrition fought on our terms, not theirs. Of course, we shall hear no end of fatuous arguments to the effect that we can’t kill our way out of the problem. Well, until a better methodology is discovered, killing every terrorist we can find is a good interim solution. The truth is that even if you can’t kill yourself out of the problem, you can make the problem a great deal smaller by effective targeting. And we shall hear that killing terrorists only creates more terrorists. This is sophomoric nonsense. The surest way to swell the ranks of terror is to follow the approach we did in the decade before 9/11 and do nothing of substance. Success breeds success. Everybody loves a winner. The clichés exist because they’re true. Al Qaeda and related terrorist groups metastasized because they were viewed in the Muslim world as standing up to the West successfully and handing the Great Satan America embarrassing defeats with impunity. Some fanatics will flock to the standard of terror, no matter what we do. But it’s far easier for Islamic societies to purge themselves of terrorists if the terrorists are on the losing end of the global struggle than if they’re allowed to become triumphant heroes to every jobless, unstable teenager in the Middle East and beyond. Far worse than fighting such a war of attrition aggressively is to pretend you’re not in one while your enemy keeps on killing you. Even the occupation of Iraq is a war of attrition. We’re doing remarkably well, given the restrictions under which our forces operate. But no grand maneuvers, no gestures of humanity, no offers of conciliation, and no compromises will persuade the terrorists to halt their efforts to disrupt the development of a democratic, rule-of-law Iraq. On the contrary, anything less than relentless pursuit, with both preemptive and retaliatory action, only encourages the terrorists and remaining Baathist gangsters.

### At: War Impacts - No Root Cause

#### The alternative locks in the war system – infinite number of non-falsifiable ‘root causes’ means only incentive theory solves

Moore ’04 – Dir. Center for Security Law @ University of Virginia, 7-time Presidential appointee, & Honorary Editor of the American Journal of International Law, Solving the War Puzzle: Beyond the Democratic Peace, John Norton Moore, pages 41-2.

If major interstate war is predominantly a product of a synergy between a potential nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence, what is the role of the many traditional "causes" of war? Past, and many contemporary, theories of war have focused on the role of specific disputes between nations, ethnic and religious differences, arms races, poverty or social injustice, competition for resources, incidents and accidents, greed, fear, and perceptions of "honor," or many other such factors. Such factors may well play a role in motivating aggression or in serving as a means for generating fear and manipulating public opinion. The reality, however, is that while some of these may have more potential to contribute to war than others, there may well be an infinite set of motivating factors, or human wants, motivating aggression. It is not the independent existence of such motivating factors for war but rather the circumstances permitting or encouraging high risk decisions leading to war that is the key to more effectively controlling war. And the same may also be true of democide. The early focus in the Rwanda slaughter on "ethnic conflict," as though Hutus and Tutsis had begun to slaughter each other through spontaneous combustion, distracted our attention from the reality that a nondemocratic Hutu regime had carefully planned and orchestrated a genocide against Rwandan Tutsis as well as its Hutu opponents.I1 Certainly if we were able to press a button and end poverty, racism, religious intolerance, injustice, and endless disputes, we would want to do so. Indeed, democratic governments must remain committed to policies that will produce a better world by all measures of human progress. The broader achievement of democracy and the rule of law will itself assist in this progress. No one, however, has yet been able to demonstrate the kind of robust correlation with any of these "traditional" causes of war as is reflected in the "democratic peace." Further, given the difficulties in overcoming many of these social problems, an approach to war exclusively dependent on their solution may be to doom us to war for generations to come. A useful framework in thinking about the war puzzle is provided in the Kenneth Waltz classic Man, the State, and War,12 first published in 1954 for the Institute of War and Peace Studies, in which he notes that previous thinkers about the causes of war have tended to assign responsibility at one of the three levels of individual psychology, the nature of the state, or the nature of the international system. This tripartite level of analysis has subsequently been widely copied in the study of international relations. We might summarize my analysis in this classical construct by suggesting that the most critical variables are the second and third levels, or "images," of analysis. Government structures, at the second level, seem to play a central role in levels of aggressiveness in high risk behavior leading to major war. In this, the "democratic peace" is an essential insight. The third level of analysis, the international system, or totality of external incentives influencing the decision for war, is also critical when government structures do not restrain such high risk behavior on their own. Indeed, nondemocratic systems may not only fail to constrain inappropriate aggressive behavior, they may even massively enable it by placing the resources of the state at the disposal of a ruthless regime elite. It is not that the first level of analysis, the individual, is unimportant. I have already argued that it is important in elite perceptions about the permissibility and feasibility of force and resultant necessary levels of deterrence. It is, instead, that the second level of analysis, government structures, may be a powerful proxy for settings bringing to power those who may be disposed to aggressive military adventures and in creating incentive structures predisposing to high risk behavior. We should keep before us, however, the possibility, indeed probability, that a war/peace model focused on democracy and deterrence might be further usefully refined by adding psychological profiles of particular leaders, and systematically applying other findings of cognitive psychology, as we assess the likelihood of aggression and levels of necessary deterrence in context. A post-Gulf War edition of Gordon Craig and Alexander George's classic, Force and Statecraft,13 presents an important discussion of the inability of the pre-war coercive diplomacy effort to get Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait without war.14 This discussion, by two of the recognized masters of deterrence theory, reminds us of the many important psychological and other factors operating at the individual level of analysis that may well have been crucial in that failure to get Hussein to withdraw without war. We should also remember that nondemocracies can have differences between leaders as to the necessity or usefulness of force and, as Marcus Aurelius should remind us, not all absolute leaders are Caligulas or Neros. Further, the history of ancient Egypt reminds us that not all Pharaohs were disposed to make war on their neighbors. Despite the importance of individual leaders, however, we should also keep before us that major international war is predominantly and critically an interaction, or synergy, of certain characteristics at levels two and three, specifically an absence of democracy and an absence of effective deterrence. Yet another way to conceptualize the importance of democracy and deterrence in war avoidance is to note that each in its own way internalizes the costs to decision elites of engaging in high risk aggressive behavior. Democracy internalizes these costs in a variety of ways including displeasure of the electorate at having war imposed upon it by its own government. And deterrence either prevents achievement of the objective altogether or imposes punishing costs making the gamble not worth the risk. Testing the Hypothesis Theory without truth is but costly entertainment. HYPOTHESES, OR PARADIGMS, are useful if they reflect the real world better than previously held paradigms.

In the complex world of foreign affairs and the war puzzle, perfection is unlikely. No general construct will fit all cases even in the restricted category of "major interstate war"; there are simply too many variables. We should insist, however, on testing against the real world and on results that suggest enhanced usefulness over other constructs. In testing the hypothesis, we can test it for consistency with major wars; that is, in looking, for example, at the principal interstate wars in the twentieth century, did they present both a nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence?' And although it is by itself not going to prove causation, we might also want to test the hypothesis against settings of potential wars that did not occur. That is, in nonwar settings, was there an absence of at least one element of the synergy? We might also ask questions about the effect of changes on the international system in either element of the synergy; that is, what, in general, happens when a totalitarian state makes a transition to stable democracy or vice versa? And what, in general, happens when levels of deterrence are dramatically increased or decreased?
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#### 3. Counter interpretation- financial incentives are disbursement of public funds or contingent commitments

Webb 93

(lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.¶ By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where *public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed*, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive *effects* which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, thedefinition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to *encourage* behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### 2. Energy production is every stage of nuclear power

Lorton 12

(Utility Analyst in the Natural Gas Division of the Indiana Office of Utility

Consumer Counselor; BA & MS Economic, ISU, thirty years experience in government and private industry, ) Bradley Deposition Testimony

https://myweb.in.gov/IURC/eds/Modules/Ecms/Cases/Docketed\_Cases/ViewDocument.aspx?DocID=0900b6318018efb3

The Clean Energy Statute defined "nuclear energy production or generating facility" as an energy production or generation facility that:¶ (1) uses a nuclear reactor as its heat source to provide steam to a turbine generator to produce or generate electricity;¶ (2) supplies electricity to Indiana retail customers on July 1, 2011;¶ (3) is dedicated primarily to serving Indiana customers; and¶ (4) is undergoing a comprehensive life cycle management project to enhance the safe and reliable operation of the facility during the period the facility is licensed to operate by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. (lC 8-1-8.8-8.5(a))¶ The Clean Energy Statute includes financial incentives for eligible businesses for clean energy projects, including nuclear energy production. Incentives for eligible businesses with nuclear energy production or generating facilities shall be provided by the Commission:¶ ... in the form of timely recovery of costs incurred in connection with the study, analysis, development, development, siting, design, licensing, permitting, construction, repowering, expansion, life cycle management, operation, or maintenance of the facilities.

#### Predictable and key to ground- only way to use the government as an energy producer, key to involve the military which is key beat the states counterplan, and is heavily grounded in the literature, and our definition is from the clean energy statute

#### 2. they only allow fussion affs destroys most of the topic

#### Reasonability prevents a race to the bottom

# Elections

#### Romney supports

**National Polls AND Ryan bounce next week**

**Weekly Standard 10-6**

<http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/rasmussen-romney-takes-lead_653860.html>

In its **first national polling taken** mostly **after Wednesday** night**’s** presidential **debate, Rasmussen** Reports **shows** Mitt **Romney up 2** points on President Obama (49 to 47 percent). Before the debate, Obama was up 2 points on Romney (49 to 47 percent). Among independent voters, Romney now leads by 16 points (54 to 38 percent).¶ Rasmussen’s write-up says, “The generation gap remains wide. Obama leads by double digits among those under 40. Romney leads by double digits among those over 40.” With a spirited performance **during his debate next week against** Vice President **Biden**, however, Paul **Ryan may** be able to **make a dent in Obama’s advantage among younger voters** — many of whom are poised to respond to a powerfully delivered anti-Obamacare, anti-debt, pro-growth message.

**Rasmussen is ONLY post-debate national poll available-and Romney likely leads electorally**

**Weekly Standard 10-6**

<http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/rasmussen-romney-takes-lead_653860.html>

About two-thirds of Rasmussen’s latest polling was taken after the presidential debate. The poll that Rasmussen will release tomorrow morning will be the first taken entirely after the debate and will show whether Romney’s debate bounce was even greater than the 4 points that it looks to be right now. **Rasmussen is the first polling outfit to have released a poll taken mostly after the debate**. In terms of the **electoral map**, **Rasmussen shows the race to be** essentially **dead-even**. **But** **most of Rasmussen’s** latest **state-by-state** **polling** in the key swing states **was taken prior to the debate. So Romney may** not only **have the momentum** **but also the lead** — not just **nationally, but also electorally**.

#### New Military Base Spending is popular

**Bloomberg 9/4**

(Danielle Ivory, “Virginia Leads Swing States at Risk Over Cliff: BGOV Barometer” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-09-04/virginia-leads-swing-states-at-risk-over-cliff-bgov-barometer.html>, SHE)

For some swing-state voters, the presidential election may come down to who they want holding the net if their economies go over the fiscal cliff.¶ The BGOV Barometer shows that the battlegrounds of Virginia, Colorado and Pennsylvania are among 19 states and the District of Columbia that depended on U.S. government contracts for more than 3 percent of their 2011 gross domestic product. The states are vulnerable to $1.2 trillion in automatic 10-year budget reductions, called sequestration, that will begin in January if Congress and the White House fail to agree on a deficit-reduction plan. ¶ President Barack Obama and his Republican challenger, Mitt Romney , need the 42 electoral votes represented by Virginia, Colorado and Pennsylvania as they compete for the 270 it takes to win. Their lines of attack on the automatic cuts, which along with tax increases make up the fiscal cliff, may help determine the outcome in those swing states.¶ “It’s going to increasingly become an issue in this election,” said Todd Harrison , a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments in Washington. “Both sides want to run against sequestration.¶ “Maybe that’s what this boils down to,” Harrison said in an interview. “Whose approach do you prefer for avoiding sequestration?”¶ The government spent more than $500 billion on federal contracts in 2011. Agencies awarded $58.9 billion in orders that year for work performed in Virginia.¶ ‘Tentacles Everywhere’¶ Federal awards represented 14 percent of the economy in the state, home to the Pentagon and headquarters of top federal contractors such as McLean-based SAIC Inc. (SAI) The company was the top recipient of awards in Virginia, receiving $3 billion for work in the state. SAIC performs computer and engineering services for agencies including the Department of Defense .¶ Federal awards support economies outside the state, so a contract in Virginia might have implications for a lawyer or consultant in Ohio or Texas, Ric Brown, the state’s finance secretary, said in an interview. “It has tentacles everywhere,” he said.¶ Contractors performing work in Colorado won $10.2 billion in U.S. awards last year, which represented 3.8 percent of the state’s economy. Lockheed Martin Corp. (LMT), based in Bethesda, Maryland , won the most in contracts, $2.41 billion, for work in the state. The company is the No. 1 U.S. defense contractor.¶ ‘Held Hostage’¶ Agencies last year awarded $17.7 billion in contracts for work in Pennsylvania. The state relied on the awards for 3.1 percent of its economy. Bechtel Group, based in San Francisco , was the top recipient of contracts in the state with $1.99 billion in awards.¶ The three swing states also have direct federal employees and military bases that require additional government funding. Nevada, Florida, Wisconsin, Ohio and Iowa -- swing states with 69 electoral votes -- may be less vulnerable because they derived less than 3 percent of their economy from federal contracts.

#### DOD energy programs don’t link---conservative won’t oppose

Davenport 12

Coral Davenport, energy and environment correspondent for National Journal. Prior to joining National Journal in 2010, Davenport covered energy and environment for Politico, and before that, for Congressional Quarterly. In 2010, she was a fellow with the Metcalf Institute for Marine and Environmental Reporting. From 2001 to 2004, Davenport worked in Athens, Greece, as a correspondent for numerous publications, including the Christian Science Monitor and USA Today, covering politics, economics, international relations and terrorism in southeastern Europe. She also covered the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens, and was a contributing writer to the Fodor’s, Time Out, Eyewitness and Funseekers’ guidebook series. Davenport started her journalism career at the Daily Hampshire Gazette in Northampton, Massachusetts, after graduating from Smith College with a degree in English literature. National Journal, 2/10/12, White House Budget to Expand Clean-Energy Programs Through Pentagon, ProQuest

The White House believes it has figured out how to get more money for clean-energy programs touted by President Obama without having it become political roadkill in the wake of the Solyndra controversy: **Put it in the Pentagon**. While details are thin on the ground, lawmakers who work on both energy- and defense-spending policy believe the fiscal 2013 budget request to be delivered to Congress on Monday probably won't include big increases for wind and solar power through the Energy Department, a major target for Republicans since solar-panel maker Solyndra defaulted last year on a $535 million loan guarantee. But they do expect to see increases in spending on alternative energy in the Defense Department, such as programs to replace traditional jet fuel with biofuels, supply troops on the front lines with solar-powered electronic equipment, build hybrid-engine tanks and aircraft carriers, and increase renewable-energy use on military bases. While Republicans will instantly shoot down requests for fresh spending on Energy Department programs that could be likened to the one that funded Solyndra, many support alternative-energy programs for the military. "I do expect to see the spending," said Rep. Jack Kingston, R-Ga., a member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, when asked about increased investment in alternative-energy programs at the Pentagon. "I think in the past three to five years this has been going on, but that it has grown as a culture and a practice - and it's a good thing." "If Israel attacks Iran, and we have to go to war - and the Straits of Hormuz are closed for a week or a month and the price of fuel is going to be high," Kingston said, "the question is, in the military, what do you replace it with? It's not something you just do for the ozone. It's strategic." Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who sits on both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said, "I don't see what they're doing in DOD as being Solyndra." "We're not talking about putting $500 million into a goofy idea," Graham told National Journal . "We're talking about taking applications of technologies that work and expanding them. I wouldn't be for DOD having a bunch of money to play around with renewable technologies that have no hope. But from what I understand, there are renewables out there that already work." A senior House Democrat noted that this wouldn't be the first time that the **Pentagon has been utilized to advance policies that wouldn't otherwise be supported**. "They did it in the '90s with medical research," said Rep. Henry Waxman, D-Calif., ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In 1993, when funding was frozen for breast-cancer research programs in the National Institutes of Health, Congress boosted the Pentagon's budget for breast-cancer research - to more than double that of the health agency's funding in that area. **Politically, the strategy makes sense**. Republicans are ready to fire at the first sign of any pet Obama program, and renewable programs at the Energy Department are an exceptionally ripe target. That's because of Solyndra, but also because, in the last two years, the Energy Department received a massive $40 billion infusion in funding for clean-energy programs from the stimulus law, a signature Obama policy. When that money runs out this year, a request for more on top of it would be met with flat-out derision from most congressional Republicans. Increasing renewable-energy initiatives at the Pentagon can also help Obama advance his broader, national goals for transitioning the U.S. economy from fossil fuels to alternative sources. As the largest industrial consumer of energy in the world, the U.S. military can have a significant impact on energy markets - if it demands significant amounts of energy from alternative sources, it could help scale up production and ramp down prices for clean energy on the commercial market. Obama acknowledged those impacts in a speech last month at the Buckley Air Force Base in Colorado. "The Navy is going to purchase enough clean-energy capacity to power a quarter of a million homes a year. And it won't cost taxpayers a dime," Obama said. "What does it mean? It means that the world's largest consumer of energy - the Department of Defense - is making one of the largest commitments to clean energy in history," the president added. "That will grow this market, it will strengthen our energy security." Experts also hope that Pentagon engagement in clean-energy technology could help yield breakthroughs with commercial applications. Kingston acknowledged that the upfront costs for alternative fuels are higher than for conventional oil and gasoline. For example, the Air Force has pursued contracts to purchase biofuels made from algae and camelina, a grass-like plant, but those fuels can cost up to $150 a barrel, compared to oil, which is lately going for around $100 a barrel. Fuel-efficient hybrid tanks can cost $1 million more than conventional tanks - although in the long run they can help lessen the military's oil dependence, Kingston said Republicans recognize that the up-front cost can yield a payoff later. "It wouldn't be dead on arrival. But we'd need to see a two- to three-year payoff on the investment," Kingston said. Military officials - particularly Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who has made alternative energy a cornerstone of his tenure - have been telling Congress for years that the military's dependence on fossil fuels puts the troops - and the nation's security - at risk. Mabus has focused on meeting an ambitious mandate from a 2007 law to supply 25 percent of the military's electricity from renewable power sources by 2025. (Obama has tried and failed to pass a similar national mandate.) Last June, the DOD rolled out its first department-wide energy policy to coalesce alternative and energy-efficient initiatives across the military services. In January, the department announced that a study of military installations in the western United States found four California desert bases suitable to produce enough solar energy - 7,000 megawatts - to match seven nuclear power plants. And so far, those **moves have met with approval from congressional Republicans**. Even so, any request for new Pentagon spending will be met with greater scrutiny this year. The Pentagon's budget is already under a microscope, due to $500 billion in automatic cuts to defense spending slated to take effect in 2013. But even with those challenges, clean-energy spending probably won't stand out as much in the military budget as it would in the Energy Department budget. Despite its name, the Energy Department has traditionally had little to do with energy policy - its chief portfolio is maintaining the nation's nuclear weapons arsenal. Without the stimulus money, last year only $1.9 billion of Energy's $32 billion budget went to clean-energy programs. A spending increase of just $1 billion would make a big difference in the agency's bottom line. But it would probably be easier to tuck another $1 billion or $2 billion on clean-energy spending into the Pentagon's $518 billion budget. Last year, the Pentagon spent about $1 billion on renewable energy and energy-efficiency programs across its departments.

**Romney’s stance on Iran is same as the status quo – no aggression**

**CNN ’12**

(Tom Cohen, 7/30/2012, “Romney talks tough but differs little from Obama on Iran”, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/30/politics/romney-iran/index.html>)

Mitt **Romney** seeks to assure Israel and Iran, as well as Jewish voters in the United States, that he will be tougher against Iran's nuclear ambitions than President Barack Obama.¶ So far, though, the **main differences on the issue** between the presumptive Republican nominee and the president he hopes to defeat in the November **election involve tone and nuance more than substance**.¶ In two high-profile speeches in the past week, **Romney has tried to position himself as a better friend to Israel than Obama** **by pledging full support** for any steps necessary to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear state.¶ Calling the issue America's "highest national security priority," the former Massachusetts governor said Sunday in Jerusalem that "we recognize Israel's right to defend itself, and that it is right for America to stand with you."¶ [Romney walks a wary line](http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/30/opinion/jerusalem-postcard/index.html)**¶ Meanwhile, a top Romney adviser on foreign policy** told reporters Sunday that Romney would respect a decision by Israel to "take action on its own in order to stop Iran" from developing nuclear capability -- code for a possible Israeli military strike against Iranian nuclear facilities.¶ The adviser, Dan Senor**, said Romney was not advocating war with Iran, only making clear what the options were should diplomacy fail**. He later sought to clarify his comment by noting Romney hoped diplomatic efforts would succeed.¶ **Romney's stance is "almost identical" to Obama's position**, which seeks increased international pressure on Iran while keeping a military option "on the table," noted Martin Indyk, a former U.S. ambassador to Israel during the Clinton administration who now is foreign policy director at the Brookings Institution.¶ **"It's hard to see what the difference is, since Gov. Romney and his spokesman make it clear that sanctions and negotiations would be tried and force should be kept on the table as a last resort,**" Indyk told CNN on Monday.¶ **Even Romney seemed to recognize the similarity,** telling CNN in an interview broadcast Monday that "**our president has said and I have said that it is unacceptable for Iran to become nuclear."¶ "And that would mean that if all other options were to fail -- and they have not all been exercise**d**, they've not all been executed at their most extreme level -- but if all other options -- diplomatic, political, economic** -- fail, then a military option is one which would be available to the president of the United States," Romney told CNN's Wolf Blitzer.¶ Romney's three-nation trip to key U.S. allies Great Britain, Israel and Poland has shifted the election campaign spotlight to foreign policy, with particular focus on thorny issues such as the Middle East conflict and Iran.¶ While he directly criticized Obama in last week's speech to American war veterans, Romney has avoided similar attacks against the president while on foreign soil. At the same time, he sought to distinguish himself from Obama on some specific issues.¶ For example, **Romney** made a point of calling Jerusalem the capital of Israel, though he **conceded in the interview with CNN that the issue must be resolved through negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians -- the position of Obama and previous presidents**.¶ Romney also made a point in both speeches of calling for a halt of all nuclear enrichment by Iran, aligning himself with Israel's insistence that Iran must have no nuclear capability.¶ To Indyk, that kind of pronouncement was something a candidate can say on the campaign trail that doesn't easily adapt to the realities of complex international negotiations.¶ He noted the United States and its negotiating partners in the so-called P5-plus-1 talks with Iran seek implementation of U.N. Security Council resolutions that call for Iran to cease its enrichment program.¶ While some form of limited enrichment could emerge from negotiations, **the stated policy of the Obama administration for now is the same as what Romney declared, Indyk said.¶ "The view is different from the Oval Office than on the campaign trail," said Indyk,** one of three authors of the recent book "Bending History: Barack Obama's Foreign Policy."¶ "If you're actually trying to negotiate an agreement which secures the bottom line -- that is to say that you put meaningful curbs on Iran's nuclear program such as they cannot procure nuclear weapons -- then you're going to have find some way to get to that," he added.¶ [Panetta begins Middle East tour](http://www.cnn.com/2012/07/29/politics/panetta-middle-east-tour/index.html)¶ Another issue of contention between the campaigns has been whether the diplomatic efforts that include U.N. and other sanctions have made any progress.¶ Romney's team insists the negotiations and sanctions have proven fruitless and allowed Iran to continue to develop its enrichment capability in recent years.¶ Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu bolstered that argument by saying Sunday that "all the sanctions and diplomacy so far have not set back the Iranian program by one iota."¶ "That's why I believe that we need a strong and credible military threat coupled with the sanctions to have a chance to change that situation," he added.¶ Netanyahu is a longtime friend and former work colleague of Romney, but his relationship with Obama has been rocky. The Obama administration, while maintaining strong support for Israel's military and security, has adopted a more mediating role in the Middle East peace process that has chafed at times.¶ Defense Minister Ehud Barak noted the dynamic in an interview with CNN that was broadcast Monday.¶ "This administration under President Obama is doing in regard to our security more than anything that I can remember in the past," Barak said, later adding "it doesn't mean that we agree on everything."¶ Administration officials argue the president has built the foundation for an international coalition that is increasing pressure on Iran through sanctions.¶ Russia and China have supported Security Council measures against Iran, which was "not an insignificant development," noted Josh Earnest, the principal White House deputy press secretary.¶ Now, Earnest told reporters Monday, the Iranian regime is acknowledging the toll of sanctions and "starting to exhibit some signs of dissent within the ranks."¶ Indyk said Romney can make the point that Iran has made progress on nuclear enrichment despite Obama's diplomatic efforts, "but Obama has made progress against Iran, which I don't think is convenient for the Romney campaign to admit to."¶ He cited European oil sanctions on Iran, something Indyk said would have been "inconceivable" under the past two presidents.¶ Michele Flournoy, a former U.S. Defense Department official who co-chairs the Obama campaign's national security advisory committee, said last week that Pentagon planning for a possible military option in Iran is "incredibly robust."¶ "You look at our force posture in the region -- you know, it is very strong and well positioned," Flournoy told a Brookings Institution event on the candidates' foreign policy positions. "So, the military option is real. The president's judgment is that now is not yet the time, because there is still a chance, with further sanctions biting, for Iran to change its calculus."¶ **Asked how much longer before a military strike might be necessary to prevent Iran from being able to enrich weapons-grade material, Flournoy said the intelligence community believes it will be "a year or more at a minimum**."¶ At the same event, however, Romney's senior adviser for foreign and defense policy said the Obama administration offered "no credible threat of force."¶ "No one in Tehran or in the region feels that the Obama administration will use force," said Rich Williamson, a former ambassador and top official in several Republican administrations.¶ In the Jerusalem speech, **Romney defended a hard-line stance on Iran as a deterrent to war, rather than a desire to start one.¶ "It is sometimes said that those who are the most committed to stopping the Iranian regime from securing nuclear weapons are reckless and provocative and inviting war," he said. "The opposite is true. We are the true peacemakers. History teaches with force and clarity that when the world's most despotic regimes secure the world's most destructive weapons, peace often gives way to oppression, to violence, or to devastating war."**

# Counterplan

#### Permutation do the counterplan

#### Perm- The Department of Defense should only procure small modular reactors that are cost competitive.

#### Squo solves research

Szondy 2/16

(David, writer for Gizmag, “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” <http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/>, SEH)

In terms of power, RTGs are the equivalent of batteries while small nuclear reactors are only "small" when compared to conventional reactors. They are hardly the sort that you would keep in the garage. In reality, SMR power plants would cover the area of a small shopping mall. Still, such an installation is not very large as power plants go and a reactor that only produces 300 megawatts may not seem worth the investment, but the US Department of Energy is offering US$452 million in matching grants to develop SMRs and private investors like the Bill Gates Foundation and the company of Babcock and Wilcox are putting up money for their own modular reactor projects.

#### 9 to 10 years to solve

King et al 11

(Marcus King, Associate Director of Research at The George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S.

Military Installations” <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>, SEH)

The time required to obtain design certification, license, and build¶ the next generation of nuclear plants is about 9 to 10 years. After the¶ first plants are built it may be possible to reduce the time required for¶ licensing and construction to approximately 6 years [45].

#### SMRs will never be cost competitive- natural gas

St. Louis Post-Dispatch ‘12

[Jeffrey Tomich, <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/business/2012/05/10/small-problem.html> ETB]

While some utilities are still pursuing full-scale plants, there is a parallel push for smaller reactors that could be easier for utilities to finance and minimize sticker shock for regulators and consumers. But despite a lower total cost, there’s no evidence that tiny fission factories would be able to produce electricity at a competitive cost in an era of abundant, cheap natural gas.¶ “There just isn’t any proof that small reactors are going to be any more economic than larger ones,” said Peter Bradford, an adjunct law professor at Vermont Law School and a former Nuclear Regulatory Commission member. “At this point, it’s all about hype and hope.”

#### Multi-actor counterplans that include the agent bad

#### They are unpredictable- no stable literature base, there are an infinite number of combinations of actions, and no logical policy maker can move two agencies

#### Destroys fairness- allows them to skirt outside of actor constraints, creates artificially competitive advantages, and forces us to debate ourselves

#### Not secret they are public, squo disproves impact to Grious

# Asia Pivot

### 2AC Cuts Now

#### Modernization budget will be cut now - Mandated cuts

Weisgerber 2/12

(Marcus Weisgerber of Defense News which is a global newsweekly on politics, business and technology of defense. Defense News serves an audience of senior military, government and industry decision-makers throughout the world “2013 DoD Modernization Budget Falls 7% Below Prior Projections” Feb. 12, 2012 - 11:36AM http://www.defensenews.com/article/20120212/DEFREG02/302120003/2013-DoD-Modernization-Budget-Falls-7-Below-Prior-Projections, TSW)

The Pentagon has proposed slashing its 2013 modernization budget more than 7 percent from its spending projections a year ago, according to a U.S. Defense Department document obtained by Defense News.¶ Funds used to buy and develop new weapons, projected to total $193.3 billion in February 2012, will fall to $178.8 billion, down $14.5 billion, in DoD’s 2013 spending request, which will be sent to Congress on Feb. 13.¶ The so-called modernization budget is the sum of the procurement and research-and-development accounts in both the base budget and overseas contingency operations budget.¶ A year ago, the Pentagon projected spending $117.6 billion and procurement and another $75.7 on research and development (R&D). The new plan calls for spending $109.1 billion on procurement and $69.7 billion on R&D efforts.¶ The decline is attributed to the Pentagon’s plan to cut $487 billion from planned spending projections over the next decade. The first five years of those savings, totaling about $259 billion, will be outlined in DoD’s 2013 budget proposal.¶ The Budget Control Act of 2011, designed to lower the U.S. government deficit, mandated these defense cuts.¶ In early January, the Pentagon unveiled new strategic guidance, which officials said would help shape the cuts to defense spending. That guidance, the product of a months-long review, call for DoD to focus more on the Pacific region, while maintaining a focus on the Middle East.¶ Since the Pacific is such a vast, maritime region, spending on the Navy and Air Force programs is expected to be higher than Army and Marine Corps efforts.¶ Still, the funds requested for major mission sectors, such as aircraft and shipbuilding, in 2013 is down from what DoD asked for in 2012.¶ The Pentagon is requesting $47.6 billion for aircraft programs, down from a $54 billion 2012 request. The shipbuilding request is more than $1 billion less than last year’s $24 billion request.¶ The 2013 request includes $10.9 billion for ground systems. In 2012, DoD asked Congress to approve $16 billion for this type of equipment.¶ DoD’s 2013 budget request includes $11.9 billion for science-and-technology-related R&D nearly the same amount the Pentagon asked for in 2012.

### 2AC Way Ahead

#### China military 20 years behind US – PLA general concedes

Xinhua 2/21

(Xinhua is the official press agency of the People's Republic of China and the biggest center for collecting information and press conferences in China. “Scholar disputes Jane's report on Chinese military” 2012-02-21 00:03:50 <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2012-02/21/c_131421249.htm>, TSW)

A Chinese military scholar on Monday disputed a global research group's report on China's defense budget growth, saying the motivation of the report was to play up China's military threat.¶ The IHS Jane's report said China's military budget will double by 2015, making it more than the rest of the Asia Pacific region's combined.¶ China's military spending will reach 238.2 billion U.S. dollars in 2015 compared with 119.8 billion in 2011, according to the report.¶ Li Zhaoxing, spokesman for the annual session of China's national legislature, announced in March last year that the country's defense budget in 2011 was 601 billion yuan (91.5 billion U.S. dollars), an increase of 12.7 percent from that of 2010.¶ China's defense budget in 2010 increased by 7.5 percent from that of 2009, according to official statistics.¶ Professor Ma Gang with the People's Liberation Army (PLA) National Defense University said the IHS Jane's report was sensational and lacked a rational and factual basis.¶ "The report's prediction that China's military budget will gain an annual increase of 18.75 percent in the upcoming five years was purely speculative," Ma said.¶ "The facts have proved that China's military budget increase has gone up and down over the past years and will not always keep growing fast," Ma said.¶ The Chinese government has repeated that its military budget increase over the past decade made up for restrained military construction in the 1980s.¶ According to China's official record, the country's military budget increase ratios in the past six years were 14.7 percent, 17.8 percent, 17.5 percent, 18.5 percent, 7.5 percent and 12.7 percent.¶ However, from 1979 to 1989, China's military spending had experienced an average annual decrease of 5.83 percent.¶ Chen Bingde, the PLA's Chief of the General Staff, has said that China's military hardware lagged 20 years behind that of the U.S. and other military powers.¶ China's military budget for 2011 accounted only 1.5 percent of the country's gross domestic product, in comparison with U.S.'s 4.8 percent and the U.K.'s 2.7 percent.¶ More over, the proportion of China's military budget in the country's total fiscal budget had dropped from 8.66 percent in 1998 to 6.94 percent in 2009.

#### Asia pivot sets off conflict in Asia- Bush proves

Ullman 9/26

(Harlan, retired United States Naval Commander. He is an advisor to government and the private sector and is active in transformation both of business and the Department of Defense, “Strategic pivot to nowhere” <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2012/09/26/Outside-View-Strategic-pivot-to-nowhere/UPI-48191348655400/>, SEH)

A common thread in this flawed strategic thinking links the miscalculations of the Bush 43 administration in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq with the Obama pivot.¶ While Bush had little alternative after the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, except to strike Osama bin Laden and his Afghan sanctuary, the "What next?" question was never asked or addressed. This initial failure was dwarfed by the abdication of strategic thinking in planning for the aftermath of Operation Iraqi Freedom once the Iraqi military was destroyed.¶ Irrespective of believing (or wishing) that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, the "what next question" remained totally ignored and Iraq descended into chaos that still persists.¶ This latest strategic pivot follows this fundamental lapse in America's strategic ability to think beyond first order issues and ask "what next" (including Obama's original "AfPak" 2009 study).¶ Worse, as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq forced the Pentagon to become the default setting and surrogate for the missing diplomatic, economic, political and social tools necessary for achieving at least a partially successful outcome, the same, predictable phenomenon could occur in the Pacific.¶ One agonizing dilemma of this strategic lacunae is how not to provoke China to respond in ways that will inflame and exacerbate the many tensions already present in Asia.¶ Thus far, no explanation to this quandary has been offered.

#### Asian pivot wrecks European relations

Ullman 9/26

(Harlan, retired United States Naval Commander. He is an advisor to government and the private sector and is active in transformation both of business and the Department of Defense, “Strategic pivot to nowhere” <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2012/09/26/Outside-View-Strategic-pivot-to-nowhere/UPI-48191348655400/>, SEH)

This January, in announcing a new defense strategy, the White House made another blunder. This strategy was proclaimed as "a strategic pivot to Asia."¶ Almost immediately, the administration reversed gears. No one easily accepts responsibility for a major gaffe and "rebalancing" became the palliative excuse.¶ Yet, the damage was done. And the real reason for the pivot, namely an "emerging" China -- another offensive reference -- was unmentioned by the White House as if it were a bizarre relative hidden in the attic so as not to frighten the kiddies.¶ Allies and friends in Europe read this pivot as a major erosion in long-standing U.S. European priorities. But given large European defense reductions, allies were too polite to complain even as the United States cut two brigade combat teams permanently based on the continent. Other seemingly insignificant changes such as terminating the National Defense University's Center for Trans-Atlantic Security Studies reinforced this perception of downgrading Europe.

# Capitalism

### Framework

#### Framework: the affirmative must defend a topical plan, the negative must defend the status quo or a competing policy option.

#### a) Best for real world education – our fw most closely resembles how policymakers decide on advocacy.

#### b) Fairness – our interp provides a clear way to compare two advocacies by weighing impacts which is essential to fairness. Their fw makes opportunity cost impossible and invites judge intervention.

#### c) Predictability – our fw ensures predictable aff ground because we predict args based upon our aff literature.

#### d) Infinitely regressive – there are an infinite number of philosophical perspectives from which they can argue

### Neolib inev

#### 1. Neoliberalism is inevitable through global pressure

Weede, Professor of Sociology at the University of Bonn, 04 (Erich, “The Diffusion of Prosperity and Peace by Globalization,” The Independent Review, Vol. 9, No. 2, Fall, http://www.independent.org /pdf/tir/tir\_09\_2\_1\_weede.pdf) First, prosperous countries influence the legal foundations for capitalism or economic policies elsewhere. How much this influence matters was demonstrated during the Cold War by the divided nations, where one part was influenced by the Soviet Union and the other part by the United States. Economies benefiting from U.S. influence, such as West Germany, South Korea, and Taiwan, did much better than East Germany, North Korea, or mainland China, which were inspired by the Soviet model. After China began to abandon socialist practices and converted to creeping capitalism in the late 1970s, it quadrupled its income per capita in two decades and almost closed a sixteen-to-one gap in income per capita with Russia (Weede 2002). The idea of advice should not be conceived too narrowly. By providing a model for emulation, successful countries implicitly provide advice to others. In general terms, the best institutional and policy advice may be summarized as “promote economic freedom” (Berggren 2003; Kasper 2004). Cross-national studies (Dollar 1992; Edwards 1998; Haan and Sierman 1998; Haan and Sturm 2002; Weede and Kämpf 2002) demonstrate that economic freedom or improvements in economic freedom increase growth rates.4 Economic openness or export orientation is part of the package of economic freedom.

#### 3. Turn—There’s no tradeoff between competitiveness and environmental justice—it is the only way to make structural changes.

Porter and Van Der Linde 95 (“Toward a New Conception of the Environment-Competitiveness Relationship.” The Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Autumn, 1995), pp. 97-118 Michael E. Porter is the C. Roland Christensen Professor of Business Administration, Harvard Business School.

Class van der linde is faculty at the International Management Research Insitute of St. Gallen University)

The relationship between environmental goals and industrial competitiveness has normally been thought of as involving a tradeoff between social benefits and private costs. The issue was how to balance society's desire for environmental protection with the economic burden on industry. Framed this way, environmental improvement becomes a kind of arm-wrestling match. One side pushes for tougher standards; the other side tries to beat the standards back. Our central message is that the environment-competitiveness debate has been framed incorrectly. The notion of an inevitable struggle between ecology and the economy grows out of a static view of environmental regulation, in which technology, products, processes and customer needs are all fixed. In this static world, where firms have already made their cost-minimizing choices, environmental regulation inevitably raises costs and will tend to reduce the market share of domestic companies on global markets. However, the paradigm defining competitiveness has been shifting, particularly in the last 20 to 30 years, away from this static model. The new paradigm of international competitiveness is a dynamic one, based on innovation. A body of research first published in The Competitive Advantage of Nations has begun to address these changes (Porter, 1990). Competitiveness at the industry level arises from superior productivity, either in terms of lower costs than rivals or the ability to offer products with superior value that justify a premium price.' Detailed case studies of hundreds of industries, based in dozens of countries, reveal that internationally competitive companies are not those with the cheapest inputs or the largest scale, but those with the capacity to improve and innovate continually. (We use the term innovation broadly, to include a product's or service's design, the segments it serves, how it is produced, how it is marketed and how it is supported.) Competitive advantage, then, rests not on static efficiency nor on optimizing within fixed constraints, but on the capacity for innovation and improvement that shift the constraints. This paradigm of dynamic competitiveness raises an intriguing possibility: in this paper, we will argue that properly designed environmental standards can trigger innovation that may partially or more than fully offset the costs of complying with them. Such "innovation offsets," as we call them, can not only lower the net cost of meeting environmental regulations, but can even lead to absolute advantages over firms in foreign countries not subject to similar regulations. Innovation offsets will be common because reducing pollution is often coincident with improving the productivity with which resources are used. In short, firms can actually benefit from properly crafted environmental regulations that are more stringent (or are imposed earlier) than those faced by their competitors in other countries. By stimulating innovation, strict environmental regulations can actually enhance competitiveness. There is a legitimate and continuing controversy over the social benefits of specific environmental standards, and there is a huge benefit-cost literature. Some believe that the risks of pollution have been overstated; others fear the reverse. Our focus here is not on the social benefits of environmental regulation, but on the private costs. Our argument is that whatever the level of social benefits, these costs are far higher than they need to be. The policy focus should, then, be on relaxing the tradeoff between competitiveness and the environment rather than accepting it as a given.

### Extinction O/W

#### Life should be valued as apriori – it precedes the ability to value anything else

Amien Kacou. 2008. WHY EVEN MIND? On The A Priori Value Of “Life”, Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, Vol 4, No 1-2 (2008) cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184

Furthermore, that manner of finding things good that is in pleasure can certainly not exist in any world without consciousness (i.e., without “life,” as we now understand the word)—slight analogies put aside. In fact, we can begin to develop a more sophisticated definition of the concept of “pleasure,” in the broadest possible sense of the word, as follows: it is the common psychological element in all psychological experience of goodness (be it in joy, admiration, or whatever else). In this sense, pleasure can always be pictured to “mediate” all awareness or perception or judgment of goodness: there is pleasure in all consciousness of things good; pleasure is the common element of all conscious satisfaction. In short, it is simply the very experience of liking things, or the liking of experience, in general. In this sense, pleasure is, not only uniquely characteristic of life but also, the core expression of goodness in life—the most general sign or phenomenon for favorable conscious valuation, in other words. This does not mean that “good” is absolutely synonymous with “pleasant”—what we value may well go beyond pleasure. (The fact that we value things needs not be reduced to the experience of liking things.) However, what we value beyond pleasure remains a matter of speculation or theory. Moreover, we note that a variety of things that may seem otherwise unrelated are correlated with pleasure—some more strongly than others. In other words, there are many things the experience of which we like. For example: the admiration of others; sex; or rock-paper-scissors. But, again, what they are is irrelevant in an inquiry on a priori value—what gives us pleasure is a matter for empirical investigation. Thus, we can see now that, in general, something primitively valuable is attainable in living—that is, pleasure itself. And it seems equally clear that we have a priori logical reason to pay attention to the world in any world where pleasure exists. Moreover, we can now also articulate a foundation for a security interest in our life: since the good of pleasure can be found in living (to the extent pleasure remains attainable),[17] and only in living, therefore, a priori, life ought to be continuously (and indefinitely) pursued at least for the sake of preserving the possibility of finding that good. However, this platitude about the value that can be found in life turns out to be, at this point, insufficient for our purposes. It seems to amount to very little more than recognizing that our subjective desire for life in and of itself shows that life has some objective value. For what difference is there between saying, “living is unique in benefiting something I value (namely, my pleasure); therefore, I should desire to go on living,” and saying, “I have a unique desire to go on living; therefore I should have a desire to go on living,” whereas the latter proposition immediately seems senseless? In other words, “life gives me pleasure,” says little more than, “I like life.” Thus, we seem to have arrived at the conclusion that the fact that we already have some (subjective) desire for life shows life to have some (objective) value. But, if that is the most we can say, then it seems our enterprise of justification was quite superficial, and the subjective/objective distinction was useless—for all we have really done is highlight the correspondence between value and desire. Perhaps, our inquiry should be a bit more complex.

### Calculations Good

#### Worst-case scenarios calculate for the sake of responsibility – mobilization is key to effective to political movements that prevent the worst forms of their impact

Michael Williams, Professor of International Politics – U. Wales, Aberystwyth**, ‘5**

(*The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* p. 165-7)

Moreover, the links between sceptical realism and prevalent post-modern themes go more deeply than this, particularly as they apply to attempts by post-structural thinking to reopen questions of responsibility and ethics.80 In part, the goals of post-structural approaches can be usefully charactised, to borrow Stephen White’s illuminating contrast, as expressions of ‘responsibility to otherness’ which question and challenge modernist equations of responsibility with a ‘responsibility to act’. A responsibility to otherness seeks to reveal and open the constitutive processes and claims of subjects and subjectivities that a foundational modernism has effaced in its narrow identification of responsibility with a ‘responsibility to act’.81 Deconstruction can from this perspective be seen as a principled stance unwilling to succeumb to modernist essentialism which in the name of responsibility assumes and reifies subjects and structures, obscures forms of power and violence which are constitutive of them, and at the same time forecloses a consideration of alternative possibilities and practices. Yet it is my claim that the willful Realist tradition does not lack understanding of the contingency of practice or a vision of responsibility to otherness. On the contrary, its strategy of objectification is precisely an attempt to bring together a responsibility to otherness and a responsibility to act within a wilfully liberal vision. The construction of a realm of objectivity and calculation is not just a consequence of a need to act – the framing of an epistemic context for successful calculation. It is a form of responsibility to otherness, an attempt to allow for diversity and irreconcilability precisely by – at least initially – reducing the self and the other to a structure of material calculation in order to allow a structure of mutual intelligibility, mediation, and stability. It is, in short, a strategy of *limitation*: a wilful attempt to construct a subject and a social world limited – both epistemically and politically – in the name of a politics of toleration: a liberal strategy that John Gray has recently characterized as one of *modus vivendi*.82 If this is the case, then the deconstructive move that gains some of its weight by contrasting itself to a non- or apolitical objectivism must engage with the more complex contrast to a sceptical Realist tradition that is itself a constructed, ethical practice. This issue becomes even more acute if one considers Iver Neumann’s incisive questions concerning postmodern constructions of identity, action, and responsibility.83 As Neumann points out, the insight that identities are inescapably contingent and relationally constructed, and even the claim that identities are inescapably *indebted* to otherness, do not in themselves provide a foundation for practice, particularly in situations where identities are ‘sedimented’ and conflictually defined. In these cases, deconstruction alone will not suffice unless it can demonstrate a capacity to counter in practice and not just in philosophic practice the essentialist dynamics it confronts.84 Here, a responsibility to act must go **beyond** **deconstruction** to consider viable alternatives and counter-practices. To take this critique seriously is not necessarily to be subject yet again to the straightforward ‘blackmail of the Englightenment and a narrow ‘modernist’ vision of responsibility.85 While an unwillingness to move beyond a deconstructive ethic of responsibility to otherness for fear that an essentialist stance is the only (or most likely) alternative expresses a legitimate concern, it should not license a retreat from such questions or their practical demands. Rather, such situations demand also an evaluation of the structures (of identity and institutions) that might viably be mobilized in order to offset the worst implications of violently exclusionary identities. It requires, as Neumann nicely puts it, the generation of compelling ‘as if’ stories around which counter-subjectivities and political practices can coalesce. Wilful Realism, I submit, arises out of an appreciation of these issues, and comprises an attempt to craft precisely such ‘stories’ within a broader intellectual and sociological analysis of their conditions of production, possibilities of success, and likely consequences. The question is, to what extent are these limits capable of success, and to what extent might they be limits upon their own aspirations toward responsibility? These are crucial questions, but they will not be addressed by retreating yet again into further reversals of the same old dicohotomies.

### Ethical

#### Capitalism is the most ethical system

C. Bradley Thompson. 1993. BB&T Research Professor at Clemson University and the Executive Director of the Clemson Institute for the Study of Capitalism “Socialism vs. Capitalism: which is the moral system”On Principle, v1n3 October 1993

The intellectuals’ mantra runs something like this: In theory socialism is the morally superior social system despite its dismal record of failure in the real world. Capitalism, by contrast, is a morally bankrupt system despite the extraordinary prosperity it has created. In other words, capitalism at best, can only be defended on pragmatic grounds. We tolerate it because it works. Under socialism a ruling class of intellectuals, bureaucrats and social planners decide what people want or what is good for society and then use the coercive power of the State to regulate, tax, and redistribute the wealth of those who work for a living. In other words, socialism is a form of legalized theft. The morality of socialism can be summed-up in two words: envy and self-sacrifice. Envy is the desire to not only possess another’s wealth but also the desire to see another’s wealth lowered to the level of one’s own. Socialism’s teaching on self-sacrifice was nicely summarized by two of its greatest defenders, Hermann Goering and Bennito Mussolini. The highest principle of Nazism (National Socialism), said Goering, is: "Common good comes before private good." Fascism, said Mussolini, is " a life in which the individual, through the sacrifice of his own private interests…realizes that completely spiritual existence in which his value as a man lies." Socialism is the social system which institutionalizes envy and self-sacrifice: It is the social system which uses compulsion and the organized violence of the State to expropriate wealth from the producer class for its redistribution to the parasitical class. Despite the intellectuals’ psychotic hatred of capitalism, it is the only moral and just social system. Capitalism is the only moral system because it requires human beings to deal with one another as traders--that is, as free moral agents trading and selling goods and services on the basis of mutual consent. Capitalism is the only just system because the sole criterion that determines the value of thing exchanged is the free, voluntary, universal judgement of the consumer. Coercion and fraud are anathema to the free-market system. It is both moral and just because the degree to which man rises or falls in society is determined by the degree to which he uses his mind. Capitalism is the only social system that rewards merit, ability and achievement, regardless of one’s birth or station in life. Yes, there are winners and losers in capitalism. The winners are those who are honest, industrious, thoughtful, prudent, frugal, responsible, disciplined, and efficient. The losers are those who are shiftless, lazy, imprudent, extravagant, negligent, impractical, and inefficient. Capitalism is the only social system that rewards virtue and punishes vice. This applies to both the business executive and the carpenter, the lawyer and the factory worker. But how does the entrepreneurial mind work? Have you ever wondered about the mental processes of the men and women who invented penicillin, the internal combustion engine, the airplane, the radio, the electric light, canned food, air conditioning, washing machines, dishwashers, computers, etc.? What are the characteristics of the entrepreneur? The entrepreneur is that man or woman with unlimited drive, initiative, insight, energy, daring creativity, optimism and ingenuity. The entrepreneur is the man who sees in every field a potential garden, in every seed an apple. Wealth starts with ideas in people’s heads. The entrepreneur is therefore above all else a man of the mind. The entrepreneur is the man who is constantly thinking of new ways to improve the material or spiritual lives of the greatest number of people. And what are the social and political conditions which encourage or inhibit the entrepreneurial mind? The free-enterprise system is not possible without the sanctity of private property, the freedom of contract, free trade and the rule of law. But the one thing that the entrepreneur values over all others is freedom--the freedom to experiment, invent and produce. The one thing that the entrepreneur dreads is government intervention. Government taxation and regulation are the means by which social planners punish and restrict the man or woman of ideas. Welfare, regulations, taxes, tariffs, minimum-wage laws are all immoral because they use the coercive power of the state to organize human choice and action; they’re immoral because they inhibit or deny the freedom to choose how we live our lives; they’re immoral because they deny our right to live as autonomous moral agents; and they’re immoral because they deny our essential humanity. If you think this is hyperbole, stop paying your taxes for a year or two and see what happens. The requirements for success in a free society demand that ordinary citizens order their lives in accordance with certain virtues--namely, rationality, independence, industriousness, prudence, frugality, etc. In a free capitalist society individuals must choose for themselves how they will order their lives and the values they will pursue. Under socialism, most of life’s decisions are made for you. Both socialism and capitalism have incentive programs. Under socialism there are built-in incentives to shirk responsibility. There is no reason to work harder than anyone else because the rewards are shared and therefore minimal to the hard-working individual; indeed, the incentive is to work less than others because the immediate loss is shared and therefore minimal to the slacker. Under capitalism, the incentive is to work harder because each producer will receive the total value of his production--the rewards are not shared. Simply put: socialism rewards sloth and penalizes hard work while capitalism rewards hard work and penalizes sloth..

### Inevitable

#### Capitalism isn’t dead and its inevitable – empirically economic panics show resilience/innovation of the system

Walter Russell Mead, 2008. James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College , The Australian, “Boom and bust the way of the West”, Dec 5, 2008,

And those 300 years have been marked by one financial crisis after another. Even before the English began to dominate global markets, the Dutch suffered though the tulip bubble of the 17thcentury. There was the South Sea bubble of the early 18th century. There were the panics of the Napoleonic wars, followed by successive and intensifying panics and crashes during the 19th century. Financial crises have continued throughout the 20th century and now into the 21st. And none of those panics and crashes interrupted or fundamentally altered the liberal capitalist path of development. It is possible, of course, that this time is different, but history gives us sound reason to believe that this kind of economic crisis does not mean the system is failing or has failed. Indeed, economic crisis is intrinsic to the capitalist economic system. It's not pleasant, but it is a regular and inevitable part of our lives. This is because the essence of capitalism is change. Capitalism constantly forces us to innovate, to do things differently, and as the economy changes we no longer understand it as well as we once did. In the past 25 years we have seen a series of revolutionary changes taking place in financial markets. We have seen extraordinary progress in the way information technology has been harnessed for the purposes of market trading. There have been new kinds of securities developed. The crisis occurred because market participants and regulators no longer fully understand how the toe bone is connected to the foot bone in an international financial crisis. But none of this means capitalism has failed; it means capitalism is succeeding. The history of the world economy shows us that crisis and panic have been our teachers. It is only through the study of past crashes that we have been able to understand risks and trade-offs in markets. We will come to grips with our past failures and figure out ways to protect against the problems that have landed us here, at least until markets develop a new level of complexity that defeats us and leads to yet another meltdown.

### Transition Wars

#### The alt causes backlash and transition wars

Anderson 1984. professor of sociology – UCLA, ’84 (Perry, In the tracks of historical materialism, p. 102-103)

That background also indicates, however, what is essentially missing from his work. How are we to get from where we are today to where he point us to tomorrow? There is no answer to this question in Nove. His halting discussion of “transition” tails away into apprehensive admonitions to moderation to the British Labor Party, and pleas for proper compensation to capitalist owners of major industries, if these are to be nationalized. Nowhere is there any sense of what a titanic political change would have to occur, with what fierceness of social struggle, for the economic model of socialism he advocates ever to materialize. Between the radicalism of the future end-state he envisages, and the conservatism of the present measures he is prepared to countenance, there is an unbridgeable abyss. How could private ownership of the means of production ever be abolished by policies less disrespectful of capital than those of Allende or a Benn, which he reproves? What has disappeared from the pages of The Economics of Feasible Socialism is virtually all attention to the historical dynamics of any serious conflict over the control of the means of production, as the record of the 20th century demonstrates them. If capital could visit such destruction on even so poor and small an outlying province of its empire in Vietnam, to prevent its loss, is it likely that it would suffer its extinction meekly in its own homeland? The lessons of the past sixty-five years or so are in this respect without ambiguity or exception, there is no case, from Russia to China, from Vietnam to Cuba, from Chile to Nicaragua, where the existence of capitalism has been challenged, and the furies of intervention, blockade and civil strife have not descended in response. Any viable transition to socialism in the West must seek to curtail that pattern: but to shrink from or to ignore it is to depart from the world of the possible altogether. In the same way, to construct an economic model of socialism in one advanced country is a legitimate exercise: but to extract it from any computable relationship with a surrounding, and necessarily opposing, capitalist environment—as this work does—is to locate it in thin air.

#### That causes extinction

Kothari 1982

Kothari, profrssor of political science – University of Delhi, ‘82

(Rajni, Towards a Just Social Order, Alternatives, p. 571)

Attempts at global economic reform could also lead to a world racked by increasing turbulence, a greater sense of insecurity among the major centres of power -- and hence to a further tightening of the structures of domination and domestic repression – producing in their wake an intensification ofthe old arms race and militarization of regimes, encouraging regional conflagrations and setting the stage for eventual global holocaust.

#### Transition fails—causes war—consumption would reemerge even worse—try or die assessments are wrong

George Monbiot. 2009. The Guardian, Is there any point in fighting to stave off industrial apocalypse?, [www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change)

I detect in your writings, and in the conversations we have had, an attraction towards – almost a yearning for – this apocalypse, a sense that you see it as a cleansing fire that will rid the world of a diseased society. If this is your view, I do not share it. I'm sure we can agree that the immediate consequences of collapse would be hideous: the breakdown of the systems that keep most of us alive; mass starvation; war. These alone surely give us sufficient reason to fight on, however faint our chances appear. But even if we were somehow able to put this out of our minds, I believe that what is likely to come out on the other side will be worse than our current settlement.¶ Here are three observations: 1 Our species (unlike most of its members) is tough and resilient; 2 When civilisations collapse, psychopaths take over; 3 We seldom learn from others' mistakes.¶ From the first observation, this follows: even if you are hardened to the fate of humans, you can surely see that our species will not become extinct without causing the extinction of almost all others. However hard we fall, we will recover sufficiently to land another hammer blow on the biosphere. We will continue to do so until there is so little left that even Homo sapiens can no longer survive. This is the ecological destiny of a species possessed of outstanding intelligence, opposable thumbs and an ability to interpret and exploit almost every possible resource – in the absence of political restraint.¶ From the second and third observations, this follows: instead of gathering as free collectives of happy householders, survivors of this collapse will be subject to the will of people seeking to monopolise remaining resources. This will is likely to be imposed through violence. Political accountability will be a distant memory. The chances of conserving any resource in these circumstances are approximately zero. The human and ecological consequences of the first global collapse are likely to persist for many generations, perhaps for our species' remaining time on earth. To imagine that good could come of the involuntary failure of industrial civilisation is also to succumb to denial. The answer to your question – what will we learn from this collapse? – is nothing.

### Sustainable Transition

#### Alt destroys transition to sustainable capitalism
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– Jeremy Rifkin, President of the Foundation on Economic Trends, January 11, 2010, “'The Empathic Civilization': Rethinking Human Nature in the Biosphere Era,” online: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jeremy-rifkin/the-empathic-civilization\_b\_416589.html

The pivotal turning points in human consciousness occur when new energy regimes converge with new communications revolutions, creating new economic eras. The new communications revolutions become the command and control mechanisms for structuring, organizing and managing more complex civilizations that the new energy regimes make possible. For example, in the early modern age, print communication became the means to organize and manage the technologies, organizations, and infrastructure of the coal, steam, and rail revolution. It would have been impossible to administer the first industrial revolution using script and codex. Communication revolutions not only manage new, more complex energy regimes, but also change human consciousness in the process. Forager/hunter societies relied on oral communications and their consciousness was mythologically constructed. The great hydraulic agricultural civilizations were, for the most part, organized around script communication and steeped in theological consciousness. The first industrial revolution of the 19th century was managed by print communication and ushered in ideological consciousness. Electronic communication became the command and control mechanism for arranging the second industrial revolution in the 20th century and spawned psychological consciousness. Each more sophisticated communication revolution brings together more diverse people in increasingly more expansive and varied social networks. Oral communication has only limited temporal and spatial reach while script, print and electronic communications each extend the range and depth of human social interaction. By extending the central nervous system of each individual and the society as a whole, communication revolutions provide an evermore inclusive playing field for empathy to mature and consciousness to expand. For example, during the period of the great hydraulic agricultural civilizations characterized by script and theological consciousness, empathic sensitivity broadened from tribal blood ties to associational ties based on common religious affiliation. Jews came to empathize with Jews, Christians with Christians, Muslims with Muslims, etc. In the first industrial revolution characterized by print and ideological consciousness, empathic sensibility extended to national borders, with Americans empathizing with Americans, Germans with Germans, Japanese with Japanese and so on. In the second industrial revolution, characterized by electronic communication and psychological consciousness, individuals began to identify with like-minded others. Today, **we are on the cusp of another historic convergence of energy and communication**--a third industrial revolution--**that could extend empathic sensibility to the biosphere itself and all of life on Earth**. The distributed Internet revolution is coming together with distributed renewable energies, making possible a sustainable, post-carbon economy that is both globally connected and locally managed. In the 21st century, hundreds of millions--and eventually billions--of human beings will transform their buildings into power plants to harvest renewable energies on site, store those energies in the form of hydrogen and share electricity, peer-to-peer, across local, regional, national and continental inter-grids that act much like the Internet. The open source sharing of energy, like open source sharing of information, will give rise to collaborative energy spaces--not unlike the collaborative social spaces that currently exist on the Internet. When every family and business comes to take responsibility for its own small swath of the biosphere by harnessing renewable energy and sharing it with millions of others on smart power grids that stretch across continents, we become intimately interconnected at the most basic level of earthly existence by jointly stewarding the energy that bathes the planet and sustains all of life. The new distributed communication revolution not only organizes distributed renewable energies, but also **changes human consciousness**. The information communication technologies (ICT) revolution is quickly extending the central nervous system of billions of human beings and connecting the human race across time and space, allowing empathy to flourish on a global scale, for the first time in history. Whether in fact we will begin to empathize as a species will depend on how we use the new distributed communication medium. While distributed communications technologies-and, soon, distributed renewable energies - are connecting the human race, what is so shocking is that no one has offered much of a reason as to why we ought to be connected. We talk breathlessly about access and inclusion in a global communications network but speak little of exactly why we want to communicate with one another on such a planetary scale. What's sorely missing is an overarching reason that billions of human beings should be increasingly connected. Toward what end? The only feeble explanations thus far offered are to share information, be entertained, advance commercial exchange and speed the globalization of the economy. All the above, while relevant, nonetheless seem insufficient to justify why nearly seven billion human beings should be connected and mutually embedded in a globalized society. The idea of even billion individual connections, absent any overall unifying purpose, seems a colossal waste of human energy. More important, making global connections without any real transcendent purpose risks a narrowing rather than an expanding of human consciousness. But what if our distributed global communication networks were put to the task of helping us re-participate in deep communion with the common biosphere that sustains all of our lives? The biosphere is the narrow band that extends some forty miles from the ocean floor to outer space where living creatures and the Earth's geochemical processes interact to sustain each other. We are learning that the biosphere functions like an indivisible organism. It is the continuous symbiotic relationships between every living creature and between living creatures and the geochemical processes that ensure the survival of the planetary organism and the individual species that live within its biospheric envelope. If every human life, the species as a whole, and all other life-forms are entwined with one another and with the geochemistry of the planet in a rich and complex choreography that sustains life itself, then we are all dependent on and responsible for the health of the whole organism. Carrying out that responsibility means living out our individual lives in our neighborhoods and communities in ways that promote the general well-being of the larger biosphere within which we dwell. **The Third Industrial Revolution offers just such an opportunity**. If we can harness our empathic sensibility to establish a new global ethic that recognizes and acts to harmonize the many relationships that make up the life-sustaining forces of the planet, we will have moved beyond the detached, self-interested and utilitarian philosophical assumptions that accompanied national markets and nation state governance and into a new era of biosphere consciousness. We leave the old world of geopolitics behind and enter into a new world of biosphere politics, with new forms of governance emerging to accompany our new biosphere awareness. The Third Industrial Revolution and the new era of distributed capitalism allow us to sculpt a new approach to globalization, this time emphasizing continentalization from the bottom up. Because renewable energies are more or less equally distributed around the world, every region is potentially amply endowed with the power it needs to be relatively self-sufficient and sustainable in its lifestyle, while at the same time interconnected via smart grids to other regions across countries and continents.

#### Prevents extinction
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[Alan AtKisson is President and CEO of The AtKisson Group, an international sustainability consultancy to business and government, “Sustainability is Dead— Long Live Sustainability, ” http://www.rrcap.unep.org/uneptg06/course/Robert/SustainabilityManifesto2001.pdf]

At the dawn of the third milennium human civilization finds itself in a seeming paradox of gargantuan proportions. On the one hand, industrial and technological growth is destroying much of nature, endangering ourselves, and threatening our descendants. On the other hand, we must accelerate our industrial and technological development, **or the forces we have already unleashed** will wreak even greater havoc on the world for generations to come. We cannot go on, and we cannot stop. We must transform. Facing a Great Paradox At precisely the moment when humanity’s science, technology, and economy has grown to the point that we can monitor and evaluate all the major systems that support life, all over the Earth, we have discovered that most of these systems are being systematically degraded and destroyed . . . by our science, technology, and economy. The evidence that we are beyond the limits to growth is by now overwhelming: the alarms include climatic change, disappearing biodiversity, falling human sperm counts, troubling slow-downs in food production after decades of rapid expansion, the beginning of serious international tensions over basic needs like water. Wild storms and floods and eerie changes in weather patterns are but a first visible harbinger of more serious trouble to come, trouble for which we are not adequately prepared. Indeed, change of all kinds—in the Biosphere (nature as a whole), the Technosphere (the entirety of human manipulation of nature), and the Noösphere (the collective field of human consciousness)—is happening so rapidly that it exceeds our capacity to understand it, control it, or respond to it adequately in corrective ways. Humanity is simultaneously entranced by its own power, overwhelmed by the problems created by progress, and continuing to steer itself over a cliff. Our economies and technologies are changing certain basic structures of planetary life, such as the balance of carbon in the atmosphere, genetic codes, the amount of forest cover, species variety and distribution, and the foundations of cultural identity. Unless we make technological advances of the highest order, **many of the destructive changes we are causing to nature are irreversible**. Extinct species cannot (yet) be brought back to life. No credible strategy for controlling or reducing carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere has been put forward. We do not know how to fix what we’re breaking. At the same time, some of the very products of our technology— creations. In the case of certain creations, like nuclear materials and some artificially constructed or genetically modified organisms, our secure custodianship must be maintained for thousands of years. We are, in effect, committed to a high-technology future. **Any slip in our mastery over the forces now under our command could doom our descendants**—including not just human descendants, but also those wild species still remaining in the oceans and wilderness areas—to unspeakable suffering. We must continue down an intensely scientific and technological path, and we can never stop. Sustaining such high levels of complex civilization and continuous development has never before happened in the history of humanity, so far as we know. From the evidence in hand, ancient civilizations have generally done no better than a few hundred years of highly variable progress and regress, at comparatively low levels of technology, with relatively minor risks to the greater whole associated with their inevitable collapse. The only institutions that have demonstrated continuity over millennia are religions and spiritual traditions and institutions. So, while we must be intensely scientific, our future is also in need of a renewed sense of spirituality and the sacred. Given our diversity and historic circumstances, no one religion is likely to be able, now or in the future, to sustain us or unite us.We need a new sense of spirituality that is inclusive of believers, nonbelievers, and those for whom belief itself is not the core of spiritual experience.We need a sense of the sacred that is inclusive of the scientific quest and the technological imperative. We need a common sense of high purpose that connects, bridges, and uplifts all of our religious traditions to their highest levels of wisdom and compassion, while sustaining and honoring their unique historical gifts. We need, especially, all the inspiration and solace they can offer, because the task ahead of us is enormous beyond compare. Our generation is charged with an unprecedented responsibility: to lay secure foundations for a global civilization that can last for thousands of years. To accomplish this task, we must, in the coming decades, maintain and greatly enhance our technical capacities and cultural stability, while simultaneously changing almost every technological system on which we now depend so that it causes no harm to people or the natural world, now or in the future. Our situation is not only without precedent; it is virtually impossible to comprehend. Those who, in the waning decades of the Second Millennium, have been able to comprehend this Great Paradox to some degree often feel themselves emotionally overwhelmed and powerless to effect change—the situation I have elsewhere called “Cassandra’s Dilemma,” after the mythical Trojan prophet whose accurate foresight went unheeded. Those in power, on the other hand, face stiff barriers to comprehension and action, including financial, political, and psychological disincentives. Denial and avoidance have been civilization’s predominant responses to the warnings coming from science and the signals coming from nature during the 1970s, 80s, and 90s. But the feedback from nature, as well as the growing global distress signals from those left behind in either relative or absolute poverty, are both becoming so strong that they can no longer be denied, even by those with the greatest vested interest in denial. These early decades of the Third Millennium—and especially this first decade, which philosopher Michael Zimmerman has said should be declared “the Oughts” to signify the urgency for addressing what ought to be done—are the decades of reckoning, the time for decisively changing course. Modest Changes are Not Enough Change is clearly possible. Modest changes in the direction of greater sustainability are now underway, and modest, incremental changes in both technology and habitual practice can ameliorate—indeed, have ameliorated—some dangerous trends in the short run. But overall, incremental change of this sort has proven exceedingly slow and difficult to effect, and most incremental change efforts fall far short of what is needed. Carbon emissions, which are now causing visible climate change, provide a good example: current global agreements for modest reductions are hard to reach, impossible to enforce, and virtually without effect; and even if they were successful, they would have a negligible impact on the critical trend. Far more dramatic changes are required. Dramatic, rapid change, in the form of extremely accelerated innovation in the Noösphere (conscious awareness and understanding) and the Technosphere (physical practice) is necessary both to prevent continuing and ever more catastrophic damage to the Biosphere, and to adapt to those irreversible changes to which the planet is already committed, such as some amount of climatic instability. The rapid evolution of many social, economic, and political institutions, which mediate between the Noösphere and the Technosphere, is obviously necessary as well. Without extraordinary and dramatic change, the most probable outcome of industrial civilization's current trajectory is convulsion and collapse. “Collapse” refers not to a sudden or apocalyptic ending, but to a process of accelerating social, economic, and ecological decay over the course of a generation or two, punctuated by ever-worsening episodes of crisis. The results would likely be devastating, in both human and ecological terms. The onset of collapse is probably not ahead of us in time, but behind us: in some places, such as storm-ravaged Orissa, Honduras, Bangladesh, Venezuela, even England and France, collapse-related entropy may already be apparent. Trend, of course, is probability, not destiny. It is still theoretically possible, albeit very unlikely, that civilization could continue straight ahead, without any conscious effort to direct technological development and the actions of markets in more environmentally benign and culturally constructive ways, and escape collapse through an unexpected (though currently unimaginable) technological breakthrough or improbable set of events. Some have called this the “Miracle Scenario.” But hoping for a miracle is by far the riskiest choice. The future may be fundamentally unknowable, but certain physical processes are predictable, given adequate knowledge about current trends, causal linkages, and systemic effects. Prediction based on extrapolation is not just the province of physics: much of our economy is focused on efforts to accurately predict the future based on past trends. The Internet economy, for example, relies upon Moore’s Law (that the speed and capacity of semiconductor chips doubles roughly every 18 months). Insurance companies base their entire portfolio of investments and fees on statistical assessments of past disasters and projected trends into the future. When it comes to the prospects for sustaining our civilization, we have to trust our species’ best judgment, which comes from the interpretations and extrapolations of our best experts. These experts—such as the respected Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—are reporting a disturbingly high degree of consensus about the level of threat to our future well-being. We are in trouble. We must transform our civilization. Transformation is Possible Dramatic civilizational change—transformation, in a word—is not so difficult to imagine. History is full of examples. Global history since the Renaissance, with all our remarkable transformations in technology, economics, and culture, is largely a product of humanity learning to take seriously the evidence of its senses, to reflect on that evidence carefully, and to make provisional conclusions that can be tested. This is the cornerstone of science. If we are to take seriously the evidence of our senses and our science, we must provisionally conclude that we are now largely responsible for living conditions on this planet. We have the power to fundamentally shape climate, manage ecosystems, design life-forms, and much more. The fact that we are currently doing these things very badly obscures the fact that we are doing them, and can therefore learn to do them better. Designing and managing the world is now our responsibility. That is the hypothesis that must now be tested by humanity as a whole, if we are to prevent collapse and succeed in restoration. To succeed, we must take our responsibility as world-shapers far more seriously than we currently do. History demonstrates that we, as a species, have the power to create the future we envision. If, therefore, we give in to despair, collapse will follow. If we cultivate a vision of ourselves as powerful and wise stewards of our planetary home, transformation becomes possible. Examples of cultural transformation occurring in a generation or less abound. The Meiji Restoration transformed Japan from a closed, agricultural society to an industrial one in just a few decades. The wholesale redirection of the North American and European economies during World War II took just a few years. The Apollo Program’s success in putting humans on the moon transpired, on schedule, within a decade. The fall of the Berlin Wall . . . the end of Apartheid . . . the change in China from a state-planned to a market economy . . . much of recent history suggests that transformation is not only possible, but a frequent occurrence in civilizational evolution. None of these events, however, remotely approaches the scale of global transformation we must now effect in technology, energy, transportation, agriculture, infrastructure, and economics, based on a new cultural understanding of our role as nature’s managers, the world's architects, the planet’s artists and engineers. But this testimony from history illustrates something profoundly important about transformation, in addition to its raw and indisputable possibility: no transformative change truly happens suddenly. Nor does transformation involve the magical or instantaneous creation of a new culture. “Transformation” is the name we give to the extremely accelerated adoption of existing innovations, together with the acceleration of innovation itself. Understanding transformation in these terms gives, to those who seek to create one, a reason for hope. An enormous amount of design work, preliminary to a transformation of the kind envisioned here, has already been done. Inventions, policies, models, scenarios, alternatives . . . innovations of all kinds have been developed by thoughtful and committed people over a generation, and the speed of innovation is increasing. Intense and focused commitment by a critical mass of talented, dedicated, and influential people—in business, government, religion, the arts, the civil sector, every walk of life—could accelerate the process by which innovation enters the mainstream of technical and social practice, and thereby turns humanity on a more hopeful course. By framing ambitious and visionary goals, and by highlighting the dangers and risks of inaction, this corps of skilled and forward-looking individuals in groups, organizations, corporations and governments could inspire others. The numbers involved could grow exponentially, and as institutions became thoroughly oriented toward achieving transformation, enormous resources could be mobilized, accelerating the transformation process still further. One generation of intensely focused investment, research, and redevelopment— redesigning our energy systems, overhauling our chemical industries, rebuilding our cities, finding substitutes for wood and replanting lost forests, and so much more—could transform the world as we know it into something far more beautiful, satisfying, and sustainable. This I believe: Sustainability is possible. Sustainability is desirable. Sustainability is a goal worthy of one’s life’s work. Sustainability is the great task of the next century. Sustainability is the next challenge on the road to our destiny. (1-8)

### War

#### Capitalism prevents war
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[Andrew, Ph.D., Philosophy, Graduate School of the City University of New York, lecturer. The Capitalist Manifesto The Historic, Economic and Philosophic case for laissez-faire. 2005. p. 231-236]

The cause of **the Persian Gulf War** of the early 1990s was similar: the armies of the brutal dictator, Saddam Hussein of Iraq (armed, unfortunately, to some degree by the United States, but principally by the Soviet Union) invaded and conquered freer Kuwait. **The freer countries of the West, led by the United States, did not initiate that conflict; they went to war** — rightly or wrongly — **to prevent Kuwait** (and, eventually, Saudi Arabia and the entire Middle East) **from being conquered** by Saddam Hussein .**3 The current “war on terror” was initiated by the brutal Islamist tyrannies of the Middle East,** pre—eminently Iran, who sponsored terrorist organizations whose specific purpose was to attack the freer West, especially America. It is a proxy war in which murderous dictatorships, too weak to assault America and the other free nations directly, fund, train and support terrorists to do their dirty work. **America did not initiate the conflict; it fought only after decades of repeated terrorist attacks culminated in the atrocities of September 11**, 2001; and even then, unfortunately, used only a miniscule fraction of its military might to defend itself and only against a part, not the totality; of the despotic alliance assaulting it.4 Observe that **every** prominent **dictatorship of the 20th century** — the Fascists, the Communists, the Islamists — **hated their antipode, the world’s freest nation, America**, **and initiated war against her in some form**. Hitler’s ally attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor. **The Soviets** enslaved Eastern Europe and then **threatened** America’s allies — the free nations of Western Europe — with conquest, and **America** herself **with nuclear annihilation**. It was with Stalin’s approval that North Korea launched its murderous invasion of America’s ally, freer South Korea. Today, and in recent decades, the world’s blood-drenched Islamic dictatorships — Iran, Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan — sponsor(ed) terrorist attacks against Americans and America.5 **That statism, not freedom, is responsible for war should be clear**. The question is: why? So far, only the external relations of a dictatorship have been examined — but the answer lies in its internal nature. Again, it is good to examine the facts. The Nazis enslaved their own citizens, forcing all to serve the state. They murdered a whole segment of their own population — the Jews — and terrorized the rest by means of their secret police, the Gestapo. The Communists have done the same. In Soviet Russia, **Stalin murdered untold millions of Soviet peasants in the attempt to force the rest onto the collective farms**. In China, among other atrocities**, Mao turned loose the Red Guards to intimidate and murder all “enemies of the revolution,” the overwhelming majority of whom were native Chinese**. In Cambodia, Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge slaughtered virtually twenty-five per cent of the country’s population in less than four years.6 Nor does a dictator have to be a Nazi or Communist to murder his own citizens. Saddam Hussein murdered any number of Kurds within Iraq, and silenced (often fatally) any Iraqi citizen who questioned his regime. In Uganda, Idi Amin murdered an estimated 300,000 people in his eight year reign of terror — one in every forty of the country’s population. “Bodies floated down the Nile and turned up by the hundreds in Mabira and Namanve forests. The prisons filled up and prisoners were forced to stand in line and beat each other to death with ten-pound sledgehammers; the last man was shot.” **In Afghanistan**, **the recent Islamic dictators, the Taliban, brutally oppressed the country’s entire female population**.7 The principle is: statist regimes are at chronic war with their own cit izens. Statism — in fact and in principle — is nothing more than gang rule. A dictatorship is a gang devoted to looting the productive citizens of its own country. ‘**When a statist ruler exhausts his own country’s economy, he attacks his neighbors**. **It is his only means of postponing internal collapse and prolonging his rule.** A county that violates the rights of its own citizens, will not respect the rights of its neighbors. **Those who do not recognize individual rights, will not recognize the rights of nations: a nation is only a number of individuals**. Statism needs war; a free country does not. **Statism survives by looting; a free country survives by production**.8 The cause of war is that men still accept the primitive notion that they can properly achieve their goals by initiating the use of force against their fellow men. To abolish war it is first necessary to outlaw the initiation of force. **Any so-called “peace” movement which endorses socialism is bound to fail.** To the extent that it succeeds in promoting socialism, to that same extent it will cause war. This is so, because a socialist regime, by its very nature, stands for the initiation of force against its own citizens, and therefore, **no moral principle constrains it from following an aggressive policy toward the citizens of neighboring countries**. The central point must be reiterated until mankind finally learns the lesson: No government which violates the rights of its own citizens can be expected to respect the rights of foreigners. Statism is the system of war.9 **The principle that a government exists to protect the rights of its citizens is the direct application to politics of the broader Enlightenment** creed of the Rights of Man, the conviction that every individual — domestic or foreign — has inalienable rights that include those to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of personal happiness. It follows that a government based on the principle of individual rights must both protect the rights of its own citizens and refuse to violate those of foreigners. There is a fundamental similarity in regard to its treatment of both domestic and foreign residents: it must refrain from the initiation of force or fraud against any and all of them. **Capitalism, as the only system based on the preservation of individual rights and the consequent banning of the initiation of force, must be understood as the system of peace.** “Laissez-faire capitalism is the only social system based on the recognition of individual rights and, therefore, the only system that bans force from social relationships. By the nature of its basic principles and interests, **it is the only system fundamentally opposed to war**.”10 **World peace, therefore, requires the establishment of global capitalism**. If there is ever to exist an enduring peace among men, then statism — the root cause of war — must be finally and fully extirpated from their political systems. The essence of capitalist foreign relations is international free trade. Free trade simply means that individuals and companies in one country can trade with individuals and companies in other countries without bar riers and taxes imposed by their respective governments. The moral right of peaceful, non-criminal individuals to trade and interact across national boundaries is protected. International free trade is simply the principle of individual rights applied to economic and cultural relationships across national borders. Practically, such a policy of abolishing tariffs and trade barriers opens nations to various forms of peaceful intercourse, including mutually-beneficial commerce, emigration and immigration, and cultural exchange. Free trade removes the economic incentive to war, by making it possible for citizens of one country to gain by trade the goods produced by citizens of other countries. **Capitalism renders unnecessary the murderous practice of plunder, and replaces it with the cordial and mutually-beneficial relation of trade.** The institution of such a policy is a major step toward the diminishment of suspicion and hostility between nations that have often developed over centuries. It is no accident “that capitalism gave mankind the longest period of peace in history — a period during which there were no wars involving the entire civilized world — from the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 to the outbreak of World War I in 1914.” It is also no accident that, with the 20th century emergence of the most virulent form of statism in history — the socialist regimes of Germany and Russia — the world was plunged into its most destructive war ever.11 **Even Marx and Engels introduced a semi-admiring note into their pervasive hostility toward capitalism when they described the universal benefits of free trade.** In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climates. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there emerges a world literature.’2 Insofar as national policy makers are concerned with the rational self- interest of their countries, they would do well to realize that individual rights and free trade — not war, conquest, plunder and imperialism — will promote wealth and power; the only rational, life-giving power: that to produce.