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## WTO Disad

#### The WTO and its settlement system’s credibility are on the brink.

**Robert Z. Lawrence** Professor of International Trade and Investment at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, March **2007**, “The United States and the WTO Dispute Settlement System” <http://www.cfr.org/publication/12871/united_states_and_the_wto_dispute_settlement_system.html> [Zavell]

The shift from bilateral to multilateral enforcement helps secure the legitimacy of the trading system and reduces the political costs associated with bilateral dispute settlement. It helps the United States itself keep protectionist impulses at bay. It is also particularly useful for dealing with disputes with America’s largest trading partners, such as the European Union, Japan, China, India, and Brazil, with which the United States has not signed free trade agreements. And yet, **despite these considerable strengths, support for the WTO and its dispute settlement system remains fragile.** This report describes how that system operates, considers the arguments of its critics, and finally provides some recommendations for improvement.

#### Targeting of domestic renewable industries with incentives will be successfully challenged at the WTO

Alina **Syunkova** National Foreign Trade Council December **2007** “WTO – Compatibility of Four Categories of U.S. Climate Change Policy” <http://www.nftc.org/default/trade/WTO/Climate%20Change%20Paper.pdf>. [Zavell]

Most types of subsidies for climate-friendly investments are likely to be found "actionable" or even "prohibited" by the SCM Agreement. For example, the Senate version of H.R. 6 contains a provision for renewable fuel facilities loan guarantees (H.R. 6, Senate version, Section 124). Facilities may receive loans of up to $250 million, covering up to 80% of the total cost of the facility. This federal "financial contribution" is "specific to certain industries or enterprises" in the sense of Article 2 of the SCM, as it is intended for the biofuels industry. However, the loan guarantees provision is aimed at "a particular subsidized primary product or commodity" - ethanol and other biofuels - and affects another primary product, conventional fuels. If it is found to be empirically-provable that international trade in biofuels and/or conventional fuels is substantially affected by this loan guarantee program (alone or in conjunction with other similar provisions in H.R. 6), they may become a WTO dispute issue. In such circumstances, a dispute panel may determine that loan guarantees, besides providing domestic "technological and economic benefits" to renewable fuels facilities (which in itself does not mean that they have international trade consequences), also serve to increase the U.S. share of the world market in ethanol and other biofuels "as compared to the average share it had during the previous period of three years, and this increase follows a consistent trend over the period that subsidies have been granted." (SCM Article 6.3 (d)). In this case, the loan guarantees would constitute an "actionable" subsidy, which could be **successfully challenged under WTO rules.**

#### Fiat guarantees the US will not comply—this tanks the WTO

Tara **Gingerich**, Senior Staff, American University Law Review; J.D. Candidate, October, **1998** The American University Law Review, Comment: “Why The Wto Should Require The Application Of The Evidentiary Threshold Requirement In Antidumping Investigations” Lexis, [Zavell]

The WTO has obligations to the international community. While it must be flexible out of political necessity, it also must set standards for international trade. It needs to establish a clear requirement of an evidentiary threshold in antidumping investigations. The standard must be one by which all countries can, and will, abide. The organization must realize its limitations and accept that if it pushes its members too far, they will not comply and the organization will lose all credibility. Conversely, it must not shrink from its responsibility to promote fair and free trade, or the WTO will risk becoming meaningless. Antidumping measures may have met this balance in the past, but they no longer do; the initiation threshold must now be set clearly, and at a sufficiently high level, in order to accomplish the same goals.

#### WTO key to solve Nuclear War

**Copley News Service, 99** (December 1)

For decades, many children in America and other countries went to bed fearing annihilation by nuclear war. The specter of nuclear winter freezing the life out of planet Earth seemed very real. Activists protesting the World Trade Organization's meeting in Seattle apparently have forgotten that threat. The truth is that nations join together in groups like the WTO not just to further their own prosperity, but also to forestall conflict with other nations. In a way, our planet has traded in the threat of a worldwide nuclear war for the benefit of cooperative global economics. Some Seattle protesters clearly fancy themselves to be in the mold of nuclear disarmament or anti-Vietnam War protesters of decades past. But they're not. They're special-interest activists, whether the cause is environmental, labor or paranoia about global government. Actually, most of the demonstrators in Seattle are very much unlike yesterday's peace activists, such as Beatle John Lennon or philosopher Bertrand Russell, the father of the nuclear disarmament movement, both of whom urged people and nations to work together rather than strive against each other. These and other war protesters would probably approve of 135 WTO nations sitting down peacefully to discuss economic issues that in the past might have been settled by bullets and bombs. As long as nations are trading peacefully, and their economies are built on exports to other countries, they have a major disincentive to wage war. That's why bringing China, a budding superpower, into the WTO is so important. As exports to the United States and the rest of the world feed Chinese prosperity, and that prosperity increases demand for the goods we produce, the threat of hostility diminishes. Many anti-trade protesters in Seattle claim that only multinational corporations benefit from global trade, and that it's the everyday wage earners who get hurt. That's just plain wrong. First of all, it's not the military-industrial complex benefiting. It's U.S. companies that make high-tech goods. And those companies provide a growing number of jobs for Americans. In San Diego, many people have good jobs at Qualcomm, Solar Turbines and other companies for whom overseas markets are essential. In Seattle, many of the 100,000 people who work at Boeing would lose their livelihoods without world trade. Foreign trade today accounts for 30 percent of our gross domestic product. That's a lot of jobs for everyday workers. Growing global prosperity has helped **counter the specter of nuclear winter**. Nations of the world are learning to live and work together, like the singers of anti-war songs once imagined. Those who care about world peace shouldn't be protesting world trade. They should be celebrating it.

## Obama Good – Iran Strikes

#### Obama’s going to win now – polls prove

Blodget 9/6/2012 [Henry Blodget, Business Insider Politics, “NATE SILVER: Obama's Odds Of Winning Have Risen Sharply--He's Now At 76%” http://www.businessinsider.com/nate-silver-obama-odds-of-winning-2012-9 SS]

President Obama's chances of winning the election have risen in the past week, according to poll-guru Nate Silver of the New York Times and the gamblers on Intrade.

Silver says Obama's odds of winning reelection have risen sharply, to 76%. He now projects that Obama will take 311 electoral votes and 51% of the popular vote (click for more from the NYT):

[tables and graphs omitted]

Meanwhile, Obama's odds have also risen on Intrade, although they're still far lower than Silver's. Intrade gives Obama a 59% chance of winning.

#### Massive public opposition to nuclear power – viewed as too risky

**Ramana, Princeton University Program on Science and Global Security Physicist, 11**

(M.V. August 3, “Nuclear power and the public,” <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/nuclear-power-and-the-public>, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

Japan is by no means alone. Around the world, nuclear energy has declined in popularity. In the United States, for example, a Washington Post-ABC poll conducted in April 2011 found that 64 percent of Americans opposed the construction of new reactors. Another poll, conducted by CBS News in March 2011, soon after the Fukushima crisis began, found that only 43 percent of those polled would approve of building new reactors, down from a 57 percent approval rating in 2008. Support for nuclear power was similar or lower in countries as varied as Chile (12 percent), Thailand (16.6 percent), Australia (34 percent), and the United Kingdom (35 percent). Even in France, which relies on nuclear power for about three-quarters of its electricity, one poll found that a majority (57 percent) were in favor of abandoning nuclear energy. These approval ratings are not strictly comparable because the polls were conducted by different agencies, asking different questions and providing different kinds of information prior to asking the questions. Nevertheless, there is little doubt among those who study public opinion on nuclear power that, by and large, it does not command much support. Nuclear power wasn't always so unpopular. For example, in the United States in 1977, when CBS News conducted its first poll on nuclear power, 69 percent of those surveyed expressed support for building more nuclear plants. Just two years later, after the Three Mile Island accident, public support had plummeted to 46 percent, and it dropped further to 34 percent after the 1986 Chernobyl accident. Since the 1980s, a majority of the US population has consistently opposed the construction of new nuclear reactors. Not coincidentally, there has been practically no nuclear construction in the United States since Three Mile Island. The public perceives nuclear power as a very risky technology. In some cases, association with nuclear facilities is even subject to stigma. The nuclear industry has tried a variety of strategies to break down public resistance to nuclear power, but they haven't worked well. With growing public concern about global warming, the industry is experimenting with a new strategy -- playing up the climate mitigation potential of nuclear power. While this has increased the benefit side of the equation for nuclear power, it hasn't decreased the risk perception associated with the technology, and nuclear power remains a reluctant choice at best. Renewable energy technologies offer the same benefits, making it unlikely that a large-scale "nuclear renaissance" will materialize.

#### GOP win causes Iran War

Jonathan Curiel 10, Prof of Journalism @ UCLA, 7-28-2010, “What just might happen if Obama loses in 2012,”http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:AIlWa6eGDQcJ:trueslant.com/jonathancuriel/2010/07/28/what-just-might-happen-if-obama-loses-in-2012/+If+Obama+losses+2012&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a

War in Iran: The Republicans’ ascension marks the return of chickenhawk diplomacy. Instead of the Obama administration’s reasoned approach to Iran, the new administration relies on all-or-nothing antagonism, leading to the third Gulf War in two decades. What ensues are thousands of new military deaths, a dangerously destabilized Middle East, and an oil crisis that shocks Western economies for years. As in Afghanistan and Iraq, the U.S. tries to shepherd in a friendlier government, but now all three countries – connected geographically, religiously and historically – become the world’s leading front for insurgency against the United States.

#### Strikes cause Middle East war and oil shocks

Petras 12/15/05 (James, former Professor of Sociology at Binghamton University, "Israel's War with Iran: The Coming Mid East Conflagration Or Israel Bombs Iran: The US Suffers the Consequences," http://www.thestruggle.org/petras.htm)

The US then would attempt to pressure Russia and China to vote in favor of sanctions or to abstain. There is reason to doubt that either or both countries would agree giving the importance of the multi-billion dollar oil, arms, nuclear and trade deals between Iran and these two countries. Having tried and failed in the Security Council, the US and Israel are likely to move toward a military attack. An air attack on suspected Iranian nuclear facilities will entail the bombing of heavily populated as well as remote regions leading to large-scale loss of life.

The principal result will be a massive escalation of war throughout the Middle East. Iran, a country of 70 million, with several times the military forces that Iraq possessed and with highly motivated and committed military and paramilitary forces can be expected to cross into Iraq. Iraqi Shiites sympathetic to or allied with Iran would most likely break their ties with Washington and go into combat. US military bases, troops and clients would be under tremendous attack. US military casualties would multiply. All troop withdrawal plans would be disrupted. The ‘Iraqization’ strategy would disintegrate, as the US ‘loyal’ Shia armed forces would turn against their American officers. Beyond Iraq, there would likely be major military-civilian uprisings in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Jordan, Palestine and Pakistan. The conflagration would spread beyond the Middle East, as the Israel-US attack on an Islamic country would ignite mass protests throughout Asia. Most likely new terrorist incidents would occur in Western Europe, North America, and Australia and against US multinationals. A bitter prolonged war would ensue; pitting 70 million unified Iranian nationals, millions of Muslims in Asia and Africa against an isolated US accompanied by its European allies facing mass popular protests at home.

Sanctions on Iran will not work, because oil is a scarce and essential commodity. China, India and other fast-growing Asian countries will balk at a boycott. Turkey and other Muslim countries will not cooperate. Numerous Western oil companies will work through intermediaries. The sanction policy is predestined to failure; its only result will be to raise the price of oil even higher. An Israeli or US military attack will cause severe political instability and increase the risk to oil producers, shippers and buyers, raising the price of oil to astronomical heights, likely over $100 a barrel, destabilizing the world economy and provoking a major world recession or worse.

#### Nuclear Wars

Primakov 9 [September, Yevgeny, President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation; Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; member of the Editorial Board of Russia in Global Affairs. This article is based on the scientific report for which the author was awarded the Lomonosov Gold Medal of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 2008, “The Middle East Problem in the Context of International Relations”]

The Middle East conflict is unparalleled in terms of its potential for spreading globally. During the Cold War, amid which the Arab-Israeli conflict evolved, the two opposingsuperpowers directly supported the conflicting parties: the Soviet Union supported Arab countries, while the United States supported Israel. On the one hand, the bipolar world order which existed at that time objectively played in favor of the escalation of the Middle East conflict into a global confrontation. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States were not interested in such developments and they managed to keep the situation under control. The behavior of both superpowers in the course of all the wars in the Middle East proves that. In 1956, during the Anglo-French-Israeli military invasion of Egypt (which followed Cairo’s decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company) the United States – contrary to the widespread belief in various countries, including Russia – not only refrained from supporting its allies but insistently pressed – along with the Soviet Union – for the cessation of the armed action. Washington feared that the tripartite aggression would undermine the positions of the West in the Arab world and would result in a direct clash with the Soviet Union. Fears that hostilities in the Middle East might acquire a global dimension could materialize also during the Six-Day War of 1967. On its eve, Moscow and Washington urged each other to cool down their “clients.” When the war began, both superpowers assured each other that they did not intend to get involved in the crisis militarily and that that they would make efforts at the United Nations to negotiate terms for a ceasefire. On July 5, the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Alexei Kosygin, who was authorized by the Politburo to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Soviet leadership, for the first time ever used a hot line for this purpose. After the USS *Liberty*was attacked by Israeli forces, which later claimed the attack was a case of mistaken identity, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson immediately notified Kosygin that the movement of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean Sea was only intended to help the crew of the attacked ship and to investigate the incident. The situation repeated itself during the hostilities of October 1973. Russian publications of those years argued that it was the Soviet Union that prevented U.S. military involvement in those events. In contrast, many U.S. authors claimed that a U.S. reaction thwarted Soviet plans to send troops to the Middle East. Neither statement is true. The atmosphere was really quite tense. Sentiments both in Washington and Moscow were in favor of interference, yet both capitals were far from taking real action. When U.S. troops were put on high alert, Henry Kissinger assured Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin that this was done largely for domestic considerations and should not be seen by Moscow as a hostile act. In a private conversation with Dobrynin, President Richard Nixon said the same, adding that he might have overreacted but that this had been done amidst a hostile campaign against him over Watergate. Meanwhile, Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at a Politburo meeting in Moscow strongly rejected a proposal by Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko to “demonstrate” Soviet military presence in Egypt in response to Israel’s refusal to comply with a UN Security Council resolution. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev took the side of Kosygin and Gromyko, saying that he was against any Soviet involvement in the conflict.  The above suggests an unequivocal conclusion that control by the superpowers in the bipolar world did not allow the Middle East conflict to escalate into a global confrontation. After the end of the Cold War, some scholars and political observers concluded that a real threat of the Arab-Israeli conflict going beyond regional frameworks ceased to exist. However, in the 21st century this conclusion no longer conforms to the reality. The U.S. military operation in Iraq has changed the balance of forces in the Middle East. The disappearance of the Iraqi counterbalance has brought Iran to the fore as a regional power claiming a direct role in various Middle East processes. I do not belong to those who believe that the Iranian leadership has already made a political decision to create nuclear weapons of its own. Yet Tehran seems to have set itself the goal of achieving a technological level that would let it make such a decision (the “Japanese model”) under unfavorable circumstances. Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In such circumstances, the absence of a Middle East settlement opens a dangerous prospect of a nuclear collision in the region, which would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world. The transition to a multipolar world has objectively strengthened the role of states and organizations that are directly involved in regional conflicts, which increases the latter’s danger and reduces the possibility of controlling them. This refers, above all, to the Middle East conflict. The coming of Barack Obama to the presidency has allayed fears that the United States could deliver a preventive strike against Iran (under George W. Bush, it was one of the most discussed topics in the United States). However, fears have increased that such a strike can be launched *Yevgeny Primakov*1 3 2 RUSSIA IN GLOBAL AFFAIRS VOL. 7 • No. 3 • JULY – SEPTEMBER• 2009 by Israel, which would have unpredictable consequences for the region and beyond. It seems that President Obama’s position does not completely rule out such a possibility.

#### Independently, Oil shocks risk extinction

Roberts 04 (Paul, Regular Contributor to Harpers and NYT Magazine, “The End of Oil: On The Edge of a Perilous New World”, p. 93-94)

The obsessive focus on oil is hardly surprising, given the stakes. In the fast-moving world of oil politics, oil is not simply a source of world power, but a medium for that power as well, a substance whose huge importance enmeshes companies, communities, and entire nations in a taut global web that is sensitive to the smallest of vibrations. A single oil "event" — a pipeline explosion in Iraq, political unrest in Venezuela, a bellicose exchange between the Russian and Saudi oil ministers — sends Shockwaves through the world energy order, pushes prices up or down, and sets off tec-Ionic shifts in global wealth and power. Each day that the Saudi-Russian spat kept oil supplies high and prices low, the big oil exporters were losing hundreds of millions of dollars and, perhaps, moving closer to financial and political disaster — while the big consuming nations enjoyed what amounted to a massive tax break. Yet in the volatile world of oil, the tide could quickly turn. A few months later, as anxieties over a second Iraq war drove prices up to forty dollars, the oil tide abruptly changed directions, transferring tens of billions of dollars from the economies of the United States, Japan, and Europe to the national banks in Riyadh, Caracas, Kuwait City, and Baghdad, and threatening to strangle whatever was left of the global economic recovery So embedded has oil become in today's political and economic spheres that the big industrial governments now watch the oil markets as closely as they once watched the spread of communism — and with good reason: six of the last seven global recessions have been preceded by spikes in the price of oil, and fear is growing among economists and policymakers that, in today's growth-dependent, energy-intensive global economy, oil price volatility itself may eventually pose more risk to prosperity and stability and simple survival than terrorism or even war.

## Pollution DA 1NC

#### US air quality is improving now but pollution is on the brink

Mitka 2012 (Mike Mitka, April 25, 2012, “US Air Quality Improves, But Polluted Air Still Threatens Millions,” JAMA, http://newsatjama.jama.com/2012/04/25/us-air-quality-improves-but-polluted-air-still-threatens-millions/)

Air quality has improved significantly since 2001, the association found. Compared with 2001 levels, in 2010, ozone levels were 13% lower, year-round particle pollution was 24% lower, and short-term particle pollution was 28% lower. Of the 25 cities with the most ozone pollution, 22 improved their air quality since last year’s report.¶ However, the data show that although more than half of the country’s most smog-polluted cities experienced their best year yet, people living in these communities are still forced to breathe air that reaches dangerously polluted levels. Unsafe levels of either ozone or particle pollution are associated with coughing, asthma attacks, heart attacks, and premature death, the association noted.¶ Nearly 4 in 10 people (116.7 million) in the United States live in areas with unhealthful levels of ozone, the report found. In addition, about 1 in 6 (nearly 50 million) live in an area with unhealthful short-term levels of particle pollution, and almost 6.4 million live in an area with unhealthful year-round levels of particle pollution. More than 5.7 million live in 1 of the 6 counties where all 3—ozone and short-term and year-round levels of particle pollution—are at unsafe levels.

#### Nuclear power produces a lot of pollution

Epstein 2008 (Eric Epstein, Chairman of Three Mile Island Alert, March 29, 2008, “The 'Brown Side' of Nuclear Power,” Three Mile Island Alert, http://www.tmia.com/node/5)

Nuclear advocates argue that the problem of greenhouse gases can be solved by nuclear power plants which do not emit carbon dioxide - at the point of production. What they don’t tell you is what happens to the nuclear wonder pill before it is magically transformed into green penicillin.¶ The nuclear-carbon shell game only works if you ignore the environmental cost on the “front end” of nuclear power production. From the moment uranium is mined - then milled, enriched, fabricated and transported - it releases large amounts of airborne pollutants. ¶ How much? Glad you asked.¶ The enrichment of uranium at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion plant releases massive amounts of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) which are more damaging as a global warmer than carbon dioxide. Nuclear fuel production in America creates at least 800,000 pounds of CFCs annually. CFCs remain the primary agent for stratospheric ozone depletion. ¶ The industry’s official strategy to reduce CFC emissions was to close its Portsmouth enrichment plant and eliminate “roughly half as many miles of leaky pipes.” The Ohio fuel plant is closed, but is undergoing a massive site cleanup to recover uranium, treat and isolate contaminated water and sewage, and decontaminate and remove miles of radioactive tubes, pipes and equipment.¶ The production of fuel for nuclear reactors is extremely energy intensive. The Paducah plant, which is currently undergoing a $191 million cleanup, requires the electrical output of two 1000-megawatt carbon dioxide producing, coal-fired plants. ¶ With all the radioactive baggage associated with nuclear power production, remember that nuclear fuel is a non-renewable energy source with an escalating cost. The price of uranium oxide, the fuel used in nuclear power plants, rose every month in 2005 to $35.25 a pound – a 66 percent increase in 2005 alone. This was the same wonder drug that sold for $7 in 2001! The price rose in 2007 to $97 a pound, then dropped again, to settle around $60 a pound in fall 2008. ¶ Production of nuclear fuel creates more terror targets, more cost, more proliferation and more toxic waste – 30 tons more annually per site. It leaves us with less safety, less security, and fewer resources for alternative energy development.¶ We need to take a close look at nuclear power’s greenhouse gas “cure” and trace its fuel cycle. It is clear that the production of nuclear electricity is not “clean”, “green” or “carbon free. ” ¶ Nuclear energy is not the answer to America’s energy addiction. Changing the color of the drug doesn't make the side effects any safer.

#### Extinction

**Driesen 2003** (David Driesen, Associate Professor at Syracuse University Law, 10 Buffalo Environmental Law Journal, Fall/Spring, Lexis)

Air pollution can make life unsustainable by harming the ecosystem upon which all life depends and harming the health of both future and present generations. The Rio Declaration articulates six key principles that are relevant to air pollution. These principles can also be understood as goals, because they describe a state of affairs that is worth achieving. Agenda 21, in turn, states a program of action for realizing those goals. Between them, they aid understanding of sustainable development's meaning for air quality. The first principle is that "human beings. . . are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature", because they are "at the center of concerns for sustainable development." While the Rio Declaration refers to human health, its reference to life "in harmony with nature" also reflects a concern about the natural environment. 4 Since air pollution damages both human health and the environment, air quality implicates both of these concerns. 5

## Russia DA – 1NC

#### High oil prices are driving Russian economic growth

MLA 12

(4/20, Meat & Livestock Australia, “High oil prices drive Russian economy,” <http://www.mla.com.au/Prices-and-markets/Market-news/High-oil-prices-drive-Russian-economy>, Accessed: 7/11/12, GJV)

The Russian economy is expected to grow by 4% in 2012, according to the latest International Monetary Fund (IMF) World Economic Outlook. This is an upward revision of 0.7% on the IMF’s January forecast, largely reflecting the outlook for a continuation of high oil prices. Russia is the world’s second largest oil producer and consequently is heavily reliant upon oil revenues for economic growth. Although growth prospects for Russia remain strong, the most prominent risk for the region, according to the IMF, is an escalation of the European debt crisis. The Euro area accounts for a large proportion of Russian exports, with a slowdown in the Euro zone likely to directly impact on export earnings. Of more concern, according to the IMF, would be a decrease in the price of oil brought about by a slowdown in the Euro zone and the wider global economy.

#### Incentives for nuclear power lowers oil prices – trade off.

US Fed News 8 (5/6/08. “SKYROCKETING GAS PRICES HIGHLIGHT NEED TO USE AMERICAN RESOURCES” <http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=08d0fc06b2da1455085f3578e4de428d&docnum=6&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAl&_md5=f4756b7493583c302d5375ed8a4b39a8>)
 Despite promises of a "commonsense plan" to lower gas prices, the Democrats have failed to act on the number one issue affecting Kentuckians' pocketbooks since taking over the Majority in Congress. Our country must invest in alternative energy sources in order to reduce our energy dependence and lower fuel costs. It is time Congress works in a bipartisan manner to create a balanced energy solution that promotes conservation efforts and increases energy production on our own soil. Speaker Nancy Pelosi has rejected commonsense solutions that increase production in America and use our own resources. The law of supply and demand is a staple of economics. It is commonsense that when we increase domestic supply, gas prices will fall. I have voted for and supported a number of proposals that would do just that. For example, the No More Excuses Energy Act (H.R. 3089) would encourage new refinery construction, allow for environmentally responsible exploration of the [Arctic National Wildlife Refuge](http://shop.ebay.com/i.html?_nkw=arctic+national+wildlife+refuge) (ANWR) and the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS), and provide tax incentives to encourage the construction of new nuclear power plants.

#### Downfall of the oil industry collapses the Russian economy

Dashevsky 11 (Steven, Managing Director of Dashevsky & Partners (Investment Firm), Adviser to Dean, Moscow School of Management May 24th, http://rt.com/business/news/russia-economy-oil-rpice/)

RT: High oil prices have helped Russia’s budget but is the country too dependent on energy exports? SD: “Well the dependence has declined greatly in recent years, but I think the sad truth remains that, to a very significant degree, Russia’s budget revenues and overall fiscal health is still very dependent on the level of oil prices.” RT: How does the energy sector shape the Russian investment climate? SD: “Well, there are many ways how the events happening in the oil and gas sector influence what is happening in the broader economy. On the one hand this is the biggest source of cash flow generation in the country, so in a sense it’s the biggest source of investment funds, both for the companies, and for the government and also because oil companies invest very significant amounts of money every year, so the ability of Russian oil companies to spend money affects really the entire Russian economy – from transport companies to oil service companies to catering companies to local airlines – so it is still, despite the significant efforts to diversify the economy, it’s a very important source of investment funds.That’s kind of one angle, and another angle is what is happening in the Russian oil and gas sector, since it is the biggest sector in the economy, affects the general investment climate, from the kind of sentiment perspective.So, when something good happens like potentially was going to happen, BP-Rosneft deal, or if there are good events happening, new fields are being developed, new pipelines are being brought on-stream, that gives investor additional confidence that the economy is progressing very well, and people are investing money in it, and the whole country is open for business.Vice versa, if things are not going well, if deals are breaking up, if instead of going to work people going to courts against each other, that clearly creates a big drag on the investors sentiment for all of the Russian economy, not just oil and gas.”

#### Nuclear war and environmental collapse

Oliker and Paley 2002, Olga Oliker and Tanya Charlick-Paley, RAND Corporation Project Air Force, “Assessing Russia’s Decline,” www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1442/

Continuing trends toward military, political, economic, and social decline in Russia threaten the interests of the United States and its allies. Moscow's capacity to govern is called into question by increasing crime and corruption (and by political and economic regionalization). Both the military nuclear arsenal and the civilian nuclear power sector present risks of materials theft or diversion, as well as of tragic accident. An increasingly aging and ailing population bodes ill for Russia's future. Reversing the country's economic decline and rebuilding an effective military have proven difficult for the financially strapped government. While improvements, especially in the economic realm, are now evident, their sustainability is far from certain. The future development of these trends is critical to U.S. interests. Nuclear material from Russia could fall into the hands of terrorists-organized crime in Russia is part of a multinational network with links to global and local terror. Russia is a major oil and gas producer and transit state, and the U.S. government has identified energy interests as key to national security. A humanitarian crisis in Russia could threaten U.S. allies with refugee flows, environmental crisis, or conflict spillover. In many scenarios, it seems likely that the United States would respond. If so, the U.S. Air Force is certain to be called upon for transportation and perhaps military missions in a very demanding environment.

## The K

#### Nuclear Energy production is a form of capitalist industrialism.

Rüdig 83

(Wolfgang, “Capitalism and nuclear power: A reassessment,” *Capital & Class 7: 117,* 1983)

To return to nuclear energy, it is thus seen as one example¶ of a recent development of industrialism leading to an increased¶ incalculability of its impacts . Nuclear energy might here be the¶ symbol, or the actual first threshold, of a transition to a new¶ phase of industrialism .¶ This concept enables us to root the issue of nuclear energy¶ firmly in the wider environmental and social impact of technological¶ development, outside the narrow framework of labour/¶ capital conflicts in the production sector . To define the term¶ `cul-de-sac technology' more comprehensively, one might introduce¶ the terms `productive' and `destructive' forces'" . A given¶ technological development could have certain destructive effects,¶ which might be part of its intrinsic structure and not of a certain¶ form of using it . A cul-de-sac technology would be one whose¶ intrinsic destructive effects of either manifest/calculable or¶ latent/non-calculable kind surpass its productive effects . Nuclear¶ energy is a technology of potentially high and uncalculable destructive¶ effects and could thus be classiffied as cul-de-sac¶ technology . $'¶ What, however, is the real importance of nuclear power¶ for `capitalism'? The fact that nuclear power is an `intrinsically'¶ capitalist technology does not necessarily imply that, in turn,¶ nuclear power is a necessary prerequisite for the survival of¶ capitalism . Indeed, it is even possible to argue that nuclear¶ power, while in one sense unthinkable outside a capitalist form of¶ development, has always remained an alien element . It would not¶ survive under strict market conditions, since it requires a steady¶ flow of subsidies, and it has created severe legitimation problems .¶ Lovins and others have argued all along that nuclear power¶ results from a failure to submit the energy sector to the free¶ market. Lovins seems to desire a return to an ideal capitalist¶ market economy with many individual capitals" . Others have¶ correspondingly argued that only state intervention has created¶ the severe environmental problems of today which would dis- appear or be reduced with a return to a market economy ."¶ Severe doubt, however, has to be voiced about whether the social¶ system Lovins and others are proposing would be free of the¶ problems of previous market economies . Indeed, Lovins' view¶ seems entirely ahistorical and neglects the basic social forces¶ which had led to state intervention and Big Industry in the first¶ place

#### Continued capitalist expansion risks extinction

Zizek 11 (Slavoj, senior researcher at the Institute of Sociology, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, visiting professor at Columbia University, Princeton, Living in the End Times, Pages 334. London: Verso, 2011. Print.)

The December 2009 Copenhagen talks between the top representatives of 20 great powers about how to fight global warming failed miserably —the result was a vague compromise without any fixed deadlines or obligations, more a statement of intentions than a treaty. The lesson is bitter and clear: the state political elites serve capital, they are unable and/or unwilling to control and regulate capital even when the very survival of the human race is ultimatelyat stake. Fredric Jameson's old quip holds today more than ever: it is easier to imagine a total catastrophe which ends all life on earth than it is to imagine a real change in capitalist relations—as if, even after a global cataclysm, capitalism will somehow continue . . . One argument more for the fact that, when our natural commons are threatened, neither market nor state will save us, but only a properly communist mobilization. All one has to do here is to compare the reaction to the financial meltdown of September 2008 with the Copenhagen conference of 2009: save the planet from global warming (alternatively: save the AIDS patients, save those dying for lack of funds for expensive treatments and operations, save the starving children, and so on) — all this can wait a little bit, but the call "Save the banks!" is an unconditional imperative which demands and receives immediate action. The panic was here absolute, a trans-national, non-partisan unity was immediately established, all grudges between world leaders momentarily forgotten in order to avert the catastrophe. We may worry as much as we want about global realities, but it is Capital which is the Real of our lives. Consequently, as suggested earlier, we should not say that capitalism is sustained by the egotistic greed of individual capitalists, since their greed is itself subordinated to the impersonal striving of the capital itself to reproduce; what we really need is more, not less, enlightened egotism. The conflict between capitalism and ecology may appear to be a typical conflict between pathological egotistic-utilitarian interests and a properly ethical care for the common good of humanity. Upon a closer look, however, it immediately becomes clear that the situation is exactly the opposite: it is our ecological concerns which are grounded in a utilitarian sense of survival, and as such lack the properly ethical dimension, simply standing for enlightened self-interest, or, at its highest, for the interest of future generations (assuming, of course, that we ignore the New Age spiritualist notion of the sacredness of life as such, of the right of the environment to preservation, etc.). The ethical dimension in this situation is rather to be found in capitalism's drive towards its own ever-expanding reproduction: a capitalist who dedicates himself unconditionally to the capitalist drive is effectively ready to put everything, including the survival of humanity, at stake, not for any "pathological" gain or goal, but simply for the sake of the reproduction of the system as an end-in-itself—fiat profitus pereat mundus might be his motto. As an ethical motto, this is of course weird, if not downright evil—however, from a strict Kantian perspective, we should recognize that what makes it seem repulsive to us is our purely "pathological" survivalist reaction: a capitalist, insofar as he acts "in accordance with his notion," is someone who faithfully pursues a universal goal, without regard for any "pathological" obstacles.. .

#### Our alternative is to do nothing

#### We must resist the urge to intervene if we are to avoid the crisis sparked by peak capitalism and succeed in radically reorganizing the economy

Richard Wolff (Professor U of Mass Amherst) 3/28/09, “Peak Oil and Peak Capitalism” The Oil Drum, <http://www.theoildrum.com/node/5245>

The concept of peak oil may apply more generally than its friends and foes realize. As we descend into US capitalism’s second major crash in 75 years (with another dozen or so “business cycle downturns” in the interval between crashes), some signs suggest we are at peak capitalism too. Private capitalism (when productive assets are owned by private individuals and groups and when markets rather than state planning dominate the distribution of resources and products) has repeatedly demonstrated a tendency to flare out into overproduction and/or asset inflation bubbles that burst with horrific social consequences. Endless reforms, restructurings, and regulations were all justified in the name not only of extricating us from a crisis but also finally preventing future crises (as Obama repeated this week). They all failed to do that. The tendency to crisis seems unstoppable, an inherent quality of capitalism. At best, flare outs were caught before they wreaked major havoc, although usually that only postponed and aggravated that havoc. One recent case in point: the stock market crash of early 2000 was limited in its damaging social consequences (recession, etc.) by an historically unprecedented reduction of interest rates and money supply expansion by Alan Greenspan’s Federal Reserve. The resulting real estate bubble temporarily offset the effects of the stock market’s bubble bursting, but when real estate crashed a few years later, what had been deferred hit catastrophically. Repeated failure to stop its inherent crisis tendency is beginning to tell on the system. The question increasingly insinuates itself even into discourses with a long history of denying its pertinence: has capitalism, qua system, outlived its usefulness? Repeated state interventions to rescue private capitalism from its self-destructive crises or from the political movements of its victims yielded longer or shorter periods of state capitalism (when productive assets are owned or significantly controlled or regulated by state officials and when state planning dominates markets as mechanisms of resource and product distribution). Yet state capitalisms have not solved the system’s crisis tendencies either. That is why they have repeatedly given way to oscillations back to private capitalism (e.g. the Reagan “revolution” in the US, the end of the USSR, etc.) Moreover, the history of FDR’s efforts to counteract the Great Depression teaches fundamental lessons about capitalism as a system that cannot forever be deferred. Since the New Deal reforms then all stopped short of transforming the structure of corporations, they left in place the corporate boards of directors and shareholders who had both the incentives and resources to evade, undermine and abolish those reforms. Evasion was their focus until the 1970s, and abolition since. Capitalism systematically organizes its key institutions of production – the corporations – such that their boards of directors, in properly performing their assigned tasks, produce crises, then undermine anti-crisis reforms, and thereby reproduce those crises Hence, attention is slowly shifting to question the one aspect of capitalism that was never effectively challenged, let alone changed, across the last century and more: the internal organization of corporations. Their decisions about what, where, and how to produce and how to utilize profits are all made not by the mass of workers (nor by the communities they impact) but rather by a board of directors. Composed typically of 15-20 individuals, corporate boards are tiny elites responsible to the only slightly larger elites comprising corporations’ major shareholders. Each corporate board is charged by its major shareholders with maximizing profit, market share, growth, or share price. The mass of workers has to live with the results of board decisions over which they exercise next to no control. This is a position they share with the communities surrounding and dependent on those same corporations. This capitalist organization of the corporation consistently generates investment, production, financial, marketing, and employment decisions that produce systemic instability – economic crises. Much as this bipolar system brought us to peak oil by its expansions, so its contractions have now brought us to peak capitalism. This system’s profoundly undemocratic organization of production demands radical transformation. Suppose, as one such transformation, that workers undertook to function as their own board of directors. All weekly job descriptions would henceforth specify four days of particular production tasks and one day participating in collective decisions about what, how and where to produce and what to do with profits. Having required political autocracy to give way to democratic mechanisms, workers would then have achieved the same in relation to the economic autocracy that structures capitalist corporations. The economy and society would then evolve very differently from the capitalist pattern. If we are to redesign our interactions with nature taking account of peak oil, why not redesign our enterprise structures to take account of the history of failed efforts to contain capitalism’s crisis-producing dysfunction. Might we consider a mutually beneficial alliance between critics of abusing our energy resources and critics of abusing our productive capabilities? How about an alliance focused on a radical, democratic, and therefore anti-capitalist reorganization of production? The point would be to make citizens and workers – those who must live with the results of what enterprises do – conjoint decision-makers focused on meeting collective needs, both productive and environmental.

## Solvency

#### SMR incentives send the nuclear power industry down a costly, dead-end road.

Daryan, 2012. (January 3rd, 2012. <http://daryanenergyblog.wordpress.com/ca/part-10-smallreactors-mass-prod/> “Part 10 – Small modular reactors and mass production options

“) RCM

So there are a host of practical factors in favour smaller reactors. But what’s the down side? Firstly, economies of scale. With a small reactor, we have all the excess baggage that comes with each power station, all the fixed costs and a much smaller pay-off. As I noted earlier, even thought many smaller reactors are a lot safer than large LWR’s (even a small LWR is somewhat safer!) you would still need to put them under a containment dome. It’s this process of concrete pouring that is often a bottle neck in nuclear reactor construction. We could get around the problem by clustering reactors together, i.e putting 2 or 4 reactors not only on the same site but under the same containment dome. The one downside here is that if one reactor has a problem, it will likely spread to its neighbours. How much of a showstopper this fact is depends on which type of reactors we are discussing.¶ A proposed modular reactor design with four 250 MWth reactors within the same containment building working a shared pair of turbines to produce 500 MWe¶ Also, in the shorter term small reactors would be slower to build, especially many of those we’ve been discussing, given that they are often made out of non-standard materials. Only a few facilities in the world could build them as the entire nuclear manufacturing industry is currently geared towards large LWR’s. Turning that juggernaut around would take decades. So by opting for small reactors while we’d get safer more flexible reactors, we be paying for it, as these reactors would be slower to build (initially anyway) and probably more expensive too.

#### Cleanup is harder and more expensive which means no adoption

Makhijani & Boyd 2010 (IEER Institute of energy and environmental research <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf>) JA

Proponents claim that with longer operation on a single fuel charge and with less ¶ ¶ production of spent fuel per reactor, waste ¶ ¶ management would be simpler. In fact, spent ¶ ¶ fuel management for SMRs would be more ¶ ¶ complex, and therefore more expensive, ¶ ¶ because the waste would be located in many ¶ ¶ more sites. The infrastructure that we have ¶ ¶ for spent fuel management is geared toward¶ light-water reactors at a limited number of ¶ ¶ sites. In some proposals, the reactor would ¶ ¶ be buried underground, making waste ¶ ¶ retrieval even more complicated and complicating retrieval of radioactive materials ¶ ¶ in the event of an accident. For instance, ¶ ¶ it is highly unlikely that a reactor containing metallic sodium could be disposed of ¶ ¶ as a single entity, given the high reactivity ¶ ¶ of sodium with both air and water. Decommissioning a sealed sodium- or potassiumcooled reactor could present far greater technical challenges and costs per kilowatt ¶ ¶ of capacity than faced by present-day aboveground reactors.¶

#### Aff doesn’t solve – doesn’t remedy fuel management

**Areva Blog 9/12** 2012 (“Used Nuclear Fuel Management: Choosing Failure or Reform”

Since 1982, ratepayers benefiting from clean, safe, and affordable nuclear electricity have paid fees into the Nuclear Waste Fund ([NWF](http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/nuclearwastedisposal/graphicsandcharts/nuclearwastefundpaymentinformationbystate/)) with the promise that the Department of Energy would take custody of used nuclear fuel by 1998. The NWF now stands at more than $26B – with roughly $750M added each year – but the DOE has yet to develop a workable management program or meet any of its contractual obligations to utilities. Ratepayers have received nothing tangible for their fees, and the failure to deliver as promised has resulted in liabilities for breach of contract estimated to total $28B by 2020 – all owed by the U.S. taxpayer.

Fortunately, there are now serious deliberations underway in the U.S. Congress to reform the existing policy framework and deliver a workable and sustainable management solution for used nuclear fuel. These deliberations are informed by the recent recommendations of the [Blue Ribbon Commission](http://cybercemetery.unt.edu/archive/brc/20120620211605/http%3A/brc.gov/) and various legislative proposals, including the Nuclear Waste Administration Act that received a hearing in the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee [today](http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/newsreleases/nuclear-industry-encourages-changes-to-nuclear-waste-reform-proposals/).

A policy consensus has emerged around the need to establish a mission-specific entity to manage used nuclear fuel, with assured access to the NWF for its intended purposes and empowered with the authority and flexibility to succeed. This entity would take over management responsibilities from the DOE, receive its funding from ratepayers (not taxpayers), and would have a stable management structure better insulated from political interference.

AREVA joins bipartisan voices in Congress and the Administration in believing that organizational change is needed to provide the credibility necessary to successfully manage a used nuclear fuel program. AREVA’s support follows the organizational principles outlined by the Nuclear Energy Institute for a [Federal Corporation](http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/nuclearwastedisposal/policybrief/fedcorp/), which would enable the transport, consolidated [storage](http://us.areva.com/EN/home-380/transnuclear-inc.html), [recycling](http://us.arevablog.com/category/nuclear-energy/used-fuel-nuclear-energy/), and geologic disposal of used nuclear fuel as part of an integrated approach to a sustainable fuel cycle framework.

#### This blocks Nuclear Power plants from being made

**Downey 8/31** 2012 [Anticipated nuclear rebirth faces tough challenges , http://www.bizjournals.com/charlotte/print-edition/2012/08/31/anticipated-nuclear-rebirth-faces.html?page=all]

When the Nuclear Regulatory Commission announced last month it would stop issuing licenses for nuclear plants until it addresses a court ruling on waste disposal, it appeared to be the latest in a series of recent reversals for the industry.¶ The high cost of new nuclear plants — pegged at $5 billion to $12 billion for a single, new-generation nuclear reactor — has raised questions about whether utilities can “bet the farm” on new plants.¶ The inexpensive alternative of natural gas for generation makes nuclear construction untenable for merchant-power producers. Electric utilities find it harder to justify nuclear plants to regulators sensitive to rising power prices.¶ The disaster at Japan’s Fukushima plant 17 months ago has raised new questions about regulatory and safety requirements. In June, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington ruled the NRC cannot simply assume the federal government eventually will resolve the issue of waste disposal by building a permanent storage site. That ruling led to last month’s NRC decision to delay new licenses and renewals, and it’s not yet known what the commission will do to address the decision.¶ “This is a game changer,” says [Geoffrey Fettus](http://www.bizjournals.com/charlotte/search/results?q=Geoffrey%20Fettus), the senior lawyer for the [Natural Resources Defense Council](http://www.bizjournals.com/profiles/company/us/ny/new_york/natural_resources_defense_council/3330606/) who argued the case on behalf of environmental groups.¶ But inside the industry, representatives insist the challenges are not insurmountable. In the United States, they say, the nuclear renaissance has been slower than anticipated. But the long-term prospects for nuclear power remain strong.

## Prolif

#### Russia and the U.S. have and will retain joint proliferation leadership

Pifer 10 (Resetting ¶ U.S.-Russian ¶ Leadership on ¶ Nuclear Arms ¶ Reductions and ¶ Non-Proliferation, Brookings Institute, Arms Control Series, Steven Pifer¶ Joseph Cirincione¶ Clifford Gaddy, 2010) JD

During their first meeting in London on April 1, 2009, Presidents Obama and Medvedev discussed ways to build a more positive relationship. They attached particular importance to nuclear arms reductions and non-proliferation: “As leaders of the two largest nuclear weapons states, we agreed to work together to fulfill our obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and demonstrate our leadership in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world. We committed our two countries to achieving a nuclear free world… We agreed to pursue new and verifiable reductions in our strategic offensive arsenals in a step-by-step process… We intend to carry out joint efforts to strengthen the international regime for non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery… Together, we seek to secure nuclear weapons and materials, while promoting the safe use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.” The focus on nuclear weapons is understandable. Detonation of a nuclear device in an American or Russian city would be a catastrophic event, to say nothing of the consequences of large-scale use of nuclear weapons in an inter-state conflict. The risk increases with the spread of nuclear weapons and the threat that they could fall into the hands of a terrorist group that might not be deterrable. It is difficult to imagine anything that would pose a greater threat to American national security.

#### Recent G8 committee appointments make U.S. the global proliferation leader

Bigongiari 12 (U.S. assumes leadership of G8′s non-proliferation bodies Published on [January 25, 2012](http://www.bioprepwatch.com/us_bioterror_policy/u-s-assumes-leadership-of-g8s-non-proliferation-bodies/322874/) by [Jeffrey Bigongiari](http://www.bioprepwatch.com/author/jeffrey_bigongiari/) <http://www.bioprepwatch.com/us_bioterror_policy/u-s-assumes-leadership-of-g8s-non-proliferation-bodies/322874/>) JD

As the head of the G8 in 2012, the United States has assumed leadership of the organization’s three non-proliferation bodies. The United States now chairs the Non-proliferation Directors Group, the Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, and the Nuclear Safety and Security Group, which will meet throughout the year to develop international nonproliferation objectives among the group’s members. The GP, which was launched at the Kananaskis Summit in 2002, was created initially as a 10 year, $20 billion initiative to support non-proliferation projects in Russia and the former Soviet Union. It has since expanded into additional regions around the world and has extended its mission beyond 2012. It now includes projects aimed at enhancing biological and radiological security, scientific engagement and U.N. nonproliferation efforts.

#### The U.S. is still the global tech leader - institutions

Acemoglu 4/19 (Christian Science Monitor, ¶ World's next technology leader will be US, not China – if America can shape up, By Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson / April 19, 2012¶ <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Global-Viewpoint/2012/0419/World-s-next-technology-leader-will-be-US-not-China-if-America-can-shape-up>) JD

But what matters for global leadership is innovation, which is not only the key driver of per capita income growth but also ultimately the main determinant of military and diplomatic leadership. It was the US that proved after [Pearl Harbor](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Pearl%2BHarbor) how a prosperous economy can rapidly increase its military power and preparedness when push comes to shove.¶ So the right question to ask is not who will be the military leader of the next century, but who will be the technological leader. The answer must be: most probably the US – but only if it can clean up its act. The odds favor the US not only because it is technologically more advanced and innovative than China at the moment, with an income per capita more than six times that of China. They do so also because innovation ultimately depends on a country’s institutions.

#### Expanding nuclear power hurts credibility – safety issues

Walsh 11 (Wednesday, Mar 16, 2011 05:17 PM MST The nuclear credibility gap As Japan and U.S. officials differ on risks, the Obama administration pushes ahead with nuclear power expansion By Joan Walsh, http://www.salon.com/2011/03/17/nuclear\_credibility\_gap/)

I’m inclined to believe Jaczko, as well as warnings from U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu and other U.S. officials. Japanese leaders have been slow to admit the extent of the Fukushima damage at every step of the way. But American leaders are putting their own credibility at risk by being so quick to reiterate the Obama administration’s commitment to expanding nuclear power in the U.S. On Wednesday Chu told Congress that officials planned to look at the “lessons” of the Japan disaster — but he also told Rep. Joe Barton (R-Energy Industry) that the president continues to support expanding nuclear power in the U.S. at a cost to taxpayers of $36 billion, mainly in loan guarantees for new reactors, and to fund new small, modular reactors. To meet the president’s clean energy goals, Chu said, “We believe we will have to have some fraction coming from nuclear.” Without knowing the “lessons” of the unforeseen Japanese disaster, I’m not sure why any administration leader is making a full steam ahead commitment to nuclear expansion.

#### Spreading nuclear energy inevitably increases proliferation

Miller 9 (Steven E. Miller & Scott D. Sagan Nuclear power without nuclear proliferation? © 2009 by the American Academy of Arts & SciencesDædalus Fall 2009, 7-18, <http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/22659/Sagan_Nuclear_power_without_nuclear_proliferation.pdf>) JD

Concerns about proliferation (whether to states or terrorists) arise at the intersection of nuclear power and nuclear weapons. Indeed, the connection between power and weapons is somewhat inevitable because key technologies in the nuclear sector–notably, uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing capabilities–are relevant to both. In the nonproliferation context, this is the dual-use dilemma: many technologies associated with the creation of a nuclear power program can be used to make weapons if a state chooses to do so. When a state seems motivated to acquire nuclear weapons, a nuclear power program in that state can appear to be simply a route leading to the bomb or a public annex to a secret bomb program. The crisis over Iran’s nuclear activities is a case in point. Depending on what capabilities spread to which states, especially regarding uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, a world of widely spread nuclear technologies could be a world in which more states, like Iran, would have the latent capability to manufacture nuclear weapons. This could easily be a world filled with much more worry about the risk of nuclear proliferation–and worse, a world where more states possess nuclear weapons. A fundamental goal for American and global security is to minimize the proliferation risks associated with the expansion of nuclear power. If this development is poorly managed or efforts to contain risks are unsuccessful, the nuclear future will be dangerous.

#### Cooperation on nuclear leadership causes prolif

Fuhrmann 9 (Matthew, Spreading Temptation: Proliferation and Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreements Matthew Fuhrmann”, Matthew Fuhrmann is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, International Security Summer 2009, Vol. 34, No. 1, <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/isec.2009.34.1.7>) JD

This article examines the relationship between peaceful nuclear cooperation and nuclear weapons proliferation. Speciacally, it explores whether countries receiving civilian nuclear aid over time are more likely to initiate weapons pro- grams and build the bomb. The conventional wisdom is that civilian nuclear cooperation does not lead to proliferation. Most scholars argue that nu- clear weapons spread when states have a demand for the bomb—not when they have the technical capacity to proliferate.4 Those who recognize the im- portance of the supply side of proliferation argue that certain types of nuclear assistance enable countries to build nuclear weapons but that others are innoc- uous or even positive from a nonproliferation standpoint. Nuclear suppliers, for instance, generally restrict the sale of uranium enrichment or plutonium re- processing facilities because these can be used directly to produce assile mate- rial for a bomb, but suppliers routinely build research or power reactors in other countries and train foreign scientists.5 A recent study ands that countries receiving enrichment and reprocessing facilities, bomb designs, or signiacant quantities of weapons-grade assile material are more likely to acquire the bomb.6 The implication of this research is that other forms of atomic assistance do not lead to the spread of nuclear weapons. This article argues that the conventional wisdom is wrong—and dangerous. All types of civilian nuclear assistance raise the risks of proliferation. Peaceful nuclear cooperation and proliferation are causally connected because of the dual-use nature of nuclear technology and know-how.7 Civilian cooperation provides technology and materials necessary for a nuclear weapons program and helps to establish expertise in matters relevant to building the bomb. I de- velop four hypotheses based on this general insight. First, receiving civilian nuclear assistance over time increases the likelihood that states will begin nu- clear weapons programs because it reduces the expected costs of such a cam- paign and inspires greater conadence among leaders that the bomb could be successfully developed. Second, militarized disputes with other countries con- dition the effect of civilian nuclear assistance on program initiation. The likeli- hood that nuclear assistance causes countries to begin weapons programs increases as their security environments worsen. Third, peaceful aid increases the probability that countries will successfully build nuclear weapons. Fourth, this is especially true when a country’s security environment deteriorates. To test these hypotheses, I produced a data set on civilian nuclear assistance based on the coding of all NCAs signed from 1945 to 2000.8 A combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis yields support for my arguments, even when controlling for the other variables thought to influence proliferation. The results from my statistical analysis indicate that other factors, such as indus- trial capacity and membership in the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), also have signiacant effects on proliferation. But peaceful cooperation is among the few variables that is consistently salient in explaining both nuclear weapons program onset and weapons acquisition.

#### New reactor types undermine nuclear conformity that’s key to tech leadership.

Lester and Rosner 9 (Richard and Robert, The growth of nuclear power: drivers & constraints, http://lion.chadwyck.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/searchFulltext.do?id=R04200587&divLevel=0&area=abell&forward=critref\_ft)

In its earliest years, the nuclear power industry also seemed destined to develop along many different trajectories. Nuclear power reactor developers in Canada, the United Kingdom, France, the Soviet Union, Japan, and the United States each introduced a different type of nuclear power reactor technology. National strategies for the nuclear fuel cycle also differed significantly. Eventually, the light water reactor technology that was first introduced in the United States came to dominate the global nuclear power industry. Light water reactors now account for more than 90 percent of installed nuclear capacity worldwide, although today the leading suppliers of this technology are French and Japanese. (The only other power reactor technology with a significant market presence internationally has historically been the Canadian CANDU design.) There is today a fairly high degree of uniformity in the nuclear plans and programs of most of the major nuclear countries, and nuclear power is one of the most highly globalized of all industries. The nuclear power plant supply industry is dominated by a small number of large global suppliers of light water reactor equipment and technology. National regulatory standards and practices are harmonized to a substantial degree. National strategies for the nuclear fuel cycle are also aligned, and major fuel cycle service providers operate globally. And a new class of global nuclear power plant investor-operators is emerging, led by the French utility EDF, whose joint ventures with nuclear power companies in China and the United States, and its recent purchase of the U.K. nuclear operator British Energy, have established it as an important player in all of the world's largest nuclear power markets. This global convergence has yielded a number of benefits, including economies of scale and accelerated learning. The case for international coordination and standardization of strategies and practices is further strengthened by the special care with which nuclear technology and materials must be handled, and the international consequences of local nuclear accidents or missteps. From time to time this strategic convergence has also served the purposes of nuclear industry leaders and government policymakers, providing them with a sort of strength-in-numbers defense against local critics. A few years ago, when President George W. Bush announced his support for closing the nuclear fuel cycle in the United States, the new policy was welcomed by the French, British, and Japanese, in no small part because it seemed to legitimize their own longstanding commitment to a closed nuclear fuel cycle, including reprocessing and mixed-oxide fuel use. Thirty years earlier, when the United States abandoned its plans to reprocess spent nuclear fuel and sought to persuade others to do likewise as a nonproliferation measure, the outraged reactions from Europe and Japan were partly stimulated by a fear that the American policy reversal would give ammunition to domestic critics of their own reprocessing plans, which they had no intention of abandoning. The attractions of nuclear conformity remain strong today, yet the prospect of divergent development pathways may now be greater than at any time since the earliest days of the nuclear power industry. What are the implications of this for nuclear energy growth? How might it affect the course of international nonproliferation efforts?

# 2nc

### 2NC AT – Case outweighs

#### Resisting this reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility – the current social order guarantees social exclusion on a global scale

**Zizek and Daly 2k4** (Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost istic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite . That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

### AT: IR nonsense

#### Capital makes the international sphere inherently violent. Conflict resolution in this environment is a fallacy – Straight turns the case

Meszaros, prof Philosophy & Political Theory, 95

(Istvan Meszaros, 1995, Professor at University of Sussex, England, “Beyond Capital: Toward a Theory of Transition”)

On the international plane, by contrast, the national state of the capital system has no interest whatsoever in restraining the boundless monopolistic drive of its dominant economic units. Quite the contrary. For in the domain of international competition the stronger and the less restrained is the politically (if needed also militarily) supported economic enterprise, the more likely it is to succeed against its actually given or potential rivals. This is why the relationship between the state and the relevant economic enterprises in this field is primarily characterized by the state quite unashamedly assuming the role of the facilitator of as monopolistic as possible capital expansion abroad. § Marked 09:12 § The ways and means of this facilitating role are, of course, altered with the change in the internal and external relation offerees due to the changing historical circumstances. But the monopolistic orienting principles of all states which occupy a dominant position in capital's global pecking order remain the same, despite the ideas of'free trade', 'fair competition', etc., which were at first genuinely believed (by people like Adam Smith) but later turned into cynical camouflage or the object of ritualistic lip service only. The state of the capital system must assert with all means at its disposal the monopolistic interests of its national capital — if need be through the imposition of 'gunboat diplomacy' — vis-a-vis all rival states involved in competition for the markets needed for capital-expansion and accumulation. This is the case with regard to the most varied political practices, from early modern colonialism (with the role assigned in it to monopolistic trading com­panies)**59** to full blown imperialism as well as to the post-colonial 'disengagement from empire' by securing new forms of neo-colonial domination, not to mention the aggressive neo-imperialist aspirations and practices of the U.S. and its subservient allies in the recently decreed 'New World Order'. However, even though the interests of particular national capitals can be distinguished from, and in the case of the dominant states to a large extent also protected against, encroachment by other national capitals, such a protection cannot remove the antagonisms of *total social capital,* i.e. the inner structural determination of capital as *a global* controlling force. This is because in the capital system all 'harmonization' can only take the form of a strictly temporary ***balancing*** — and not the proper ***resolution*** — of conflict. It is by no means accidental, therefore, that in bourgeois social and political theory we find the glorification of the concept of 'balance of powers' as the unsurpassable ideal, when in fact at any given time it can only amount to the imposition/acceptance of the prevailing relation of forces, envisaging at the same time its overturning when circumstances permit. The axiom of *helium omnium contra omnes* is the unsurpassable *modus operandi* of the capital system. For as a system of social metabolic control it is *antagonistically structured* from the smallest to the most comprehensive socioeconomic and political units. Moreover, the capital system — as indeed all conceivable forms of global social metabolic control, including the socialist — is subject to the absolute law *of uneven development* which prevails under the rule of capital in an ultimately destructive form, because of its antagonistic inner structuring principle.60 Thus, to envisage the genuine and sustainable resolution of the capital system's antagonisms at the global level it would be necessary first to believe in the fairy tale of eliminating forever the law of uneven development from human affairs. This is why the 'New World Order' is either an absurd fantasy or a cynical camouflage designed to project the hegemonic interests of the preponderant capitalist powers as the morally commendable and universally beneficial aspiration of mankind. Nothing would be resolved here by setting up a 'World Government' — and the state system corresponding to it — even if it were feasible at all.

### 2NC Framework – Impact Focus

#### The role of the ballot is to determine the desirability of capitalism.

#### Prefer this interpretation

#### Key to understand knowledge production: challenging the capitalist claims of the affirmative is key to examine the root of truth claims and understand where knowledge truly originates. This is a better internal link to education because the framework debate necessitates advocacy skills.

#### Topic Germane: determining the desirability of capitalism is key to understand the assumptions behind of market incentives. This is a better examination of the resolutional question because it questions the assumptions of a topical affirmative.

#### The 1AC never happens: determining the desirability of capitalism allows us to examine the topic and gain knowledge out of economics which are comparatively more useful in the real world.

#### Examining the desirability of capitalism is a prior question to the 1AC

**MESZAROS** (Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex) **1995**

[Istavan, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, // wyo 65]

The modern state as the comprehensive political command structure of capital — is both the necessary prerequisite for the transformation of capital’s at first fragmented units into a viable system, and the overall framework for the full articulation and maintenance of the latter as a global system. In this fundamental sense the state on account of its constitutive and permanently sustaining role must be understood as an integral part of capital’s material ground itself. Or it contributes in a substantive way not only to the formation and consolidation of all of the major reproductive structures of society but also to their continued functioning. However, the close interrelationship holds also when viewed from the other side. For the modern state itself is quite inconceivable without capital as its social metabolic foundation. This makes the material reproductive structures of the capital system the necessary condition not only for the original constitution but also for the continued survival (and appropriate historical transformations) of the modern state in all its dimensions. These reproductive structures extend their Impact over everything, from the strictly material/repressive instruments cid juridical institutions of the state all the way to the most mediated ideological and political theorizations of its raison d’être and claimed legitimacy. It is on account of this reciprocal determination that we must speak of a close match between the social metabolic ground of the capital system on the one hand, and the modern state as the totalizing political command structure of the established productive and reproductive order on the other. For socialists this is a most uncomfortable and challenging reciprocity. It puts into relief the sobering fact that any intervention in the political domain — even when it envisages the radical overthrow of the capitalist state — can have only a very limited impact in the realization of the socialist project. And the other way round, the corollary of the same sobering fact is that, precisely because socialists have to confront the power of capital’s self-sustaining reciprocity under its fundamental dimensions, it should be never forgotten or ignored - although the tragedy of seventy years (if Soviet experience is that it had been willfully ignored — that there can be no chance of overcoming the power of capital without remaining faithful to the Marxian concern with the ‘withering away’ of the state.

#### No Risk of offense: the 1ac is mooted because they failed to prove it within a discussion of the topic, not because the framework is meant to exclude them. All they have to prove is that capitalism is good and they win the round.

#### Predictable: all the aff has to do is defend their aff on every level.

#### Our criticism is policy relevant: questions of our economic system get presented in congress all the time: this takes out any real world policymaking claims.

#### Their framework arguments are just reasons why they get to weigh their 1ac against the K. At worse, they get to weigh the 1ac and we get the criticism. This is not a reason to reject the team.

#### Independent Ethics Disad to their framework: ignoring the impacts of capitalism justifies ethical violation. Even if you think this framework is dumb, you should still frame the ballot to competing impact claims. Ethics is the only pre fiat claim that occurs meaning an easy neg ballot if we prove the aff is unethical.

#### The affirmative’s knowledge is not value-neutral, its production is contingent on a specific separation of labor that privileges a small scientific and military elite, and its employment actively sustains capital

Dickens and Ormrod, 7 - \*Peter, Affiliated Lecturer in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Cambridge and Visiting Professor of Sociology, University of Essex and \*\*James, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton

(Cosmic Society: Towards a sociology of the universe, pg 31-32)

It should be noted that, contrary to Lerner’s (1991) argument, Alfred SohnRethel (1975) and Frankel (2003) have argued that this more scientific mode of relating to the universe merely intensified rather than alleviated the alienation of the masses from the universe. Sohn-Rethel’s argument is that ‘abstract’, one might say ‘objective’, knowledge first arose as part of the exchange relationship in what he calls ‘societies of appropriation’ or capitalist societies based on a high division of labour. The person producing a commodity is, as Marx described, alienated from the exchange process, in which s/he comes to see his/her product in terms of an abstract exchange value, which operates independently of the needs and uses which the seller or buyer has in mind. This purely abstract system of thought represented in the form of money (‘a crude approximation of the underlying principle’) leads to abstract, scientific, thought. Postone (1996) has argued similarly that ‘abstraction’ in general is central to capitalist societies. The development of capital in two distinct epochs has led to corresponding developments in epistemology, according to Sohn-Rethel. First, the introduction of coinage in Ancient Greece led to Greek philosophy and mathematics. Second, the development of modern capitalism led to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century scientific revolutions. He goes on to argue, and this forms a major focus of his and Lerner’s thesis, that the abstract form of scientific knowledge was instrumental in legitimizing the division of mental and manual labour in modern capitalism. The argument is that the existence of this abstract system justifies the existence of an elite of scientists capable of studying the system untainted by the practical knowledge of the worker. Davidson (1985) is also extremely critical of the development of objective scientific approaches to the universe that distance knowledge from people’s everyday experience of the universe. The latter, Davidson argues, remains Earth-centred (as in Tycho Brahe’s model). The result of de-centring Earth through science, for Davidson, is the creation of ‘a cold mechanical world’ (ibid.: 4). There are important differences between Sohn-Rethel’s account and Lerner’s. For Lerner, Galileo, like the empiricists Copernicus and Brahe before him, represents a break from the truly abstract philosophy of Plato. It is a break alleviating a lot of the problems of the division of labour by relying on artisan and serf knowledge available to all. However, Sohn-Rethel sees Galileo as representing a distinct break from his predecessors in instituting a new form of abstracted knowledge that severely heightens the mental/manual division of labour. He points to parallels between Galileo’s law of inertial motion and the abstraction of the commodity exchange. Lerner does not draw out a full criticism of the relationship between capital and cosmology that replaced it. Contrary to what Lerner implies during most of the book, colonial capitalism based initially on practical knowledge of navigation (now satellites, and possibly future capitalist exploitation of space resources) has not been an age of equality or celebration of the knowledge of the manual worker. This epoch has had its own cosmic elite of not only scientists but also engineers, and the military and the governments and corporations that control them. The scientific cosmological elite of today is still maintained by others’ labour. They are given ‘the freedom to abandon the constraints of the “ordinary” world’ (Ferguson 1990: 1).

### 2NC Perm Answer – Policy Affs

#### I’ll Do the Link Debate Here

#### Pure rejection is key: attempting to reform capitalism through political action results in mobilization against the alternative and co-option of the class struggle

Wood 98

(Ellen, PhD from UCLA in political science and Monthly Review, the independent socialist magazine co-editor, *Monthly Review* “Class compacts, the welfare state, and epochal shifts (a reply to Frances Fox Piven and Richard A Cloward”,January 1998, Proquest, accessed 7/9/09, JD)

The political moment is grim. The measures won by working class and poor people over the course of the last century, measures which humanized Western capitalism, are at risk. But they are not at risk because the structural imperatives of this new stage of capitalist development have made the social rights won in the past economically dysfunctional. Rather, they have been put at risk by the political mobilization of some human actors against other human actors. Capitalism and capitalists are on the move.... But capitalism has been on the move before, and with very similar ideas. It has also been halted before, and forced to concede the public spaces and social protections that make human life tolerable.1That is the essence of Piven and Cloward's political message, and behind it lies a historical analysis. For our purposes, the most important points in it are these: in the history of capitalism, periods of capitalist mobilization and assaults against labor have alternated with periods of strength for labor, when capitalists have been forced to make concessions. Those periods of concession can be called a kind of social compact. Such compacts are broken when capital again gathers strength and goes on the attack. Each compact and each breach represents an epochal shift, as one "power era" replaces another. The current decline of the welfare state in this account represents a moment of renewed attack by capital. "Globalization" has laid the foundation for it, undermining the power of the working class by giving added plausibility to capital's perennial threat, the threat to move elsewhere. But though globalization has made it possible, the decline is not the necessary result of some impersonal and inevitable process, some "structural imperative." It stems from yet another political and ideological mobilization of capital. There is much on which we agree. It is, I think, important to emphasize, as Piven and Cloward do, that what we're seeing today is not just some inevitable natural process but a class mobilization, that what people are calling "globalization" is not just a structural imperative but a class strategy. At the same time, though we may disagree about the constraints globalization does or doesn't impose on class struggle (I'll come back to that later), we agree-or seem to-that class strategies aren't constructed in a historical vacuum. Specific historical conditions-material, political, ideological-make some strategies possible while they rule out others.

#### No net benefit to the permutation: The alt precludes aff solvency: we need to understand the economics of social services before we can access any part of the affirmative. Alt is key for a fresh ethical examination of capitalism

**Zizek,** Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana **1999** Slavoj, The Ticklish Subject, page 153-154

It would therefore be tempting to risk a 'Badiouian-Pauline reading of the end of psychoanalysis, determining it as a New Beginning, a symbolic 'rebirth' - the radical restructuring of the analysand's subjectivity in such a way that the vicious cycle of the superego is suspended, left behind. Does not Lacan himself provide a number of hints that the end of analysis opens up the domain of Love beyond Law, using the very Pauline terms to which Badiou refers? Nevertheless, Lacan's way is not that of St Paul or Badiou: psychoanalysis is not 'psychosynthesis'; it does not already *posit* a 'new harmony', a new Truth-Event; it - as it were - merely wipes the slate clean for one. However, this 'merely' should be put in quotation marks, because it is Lacan's contention that, in this negative gesture of 'wiping the slate clean', something (a void) is confronted which is already 'sutured' with the arrival of a new Truth-Event. For Lacan negativity, a negative gesture of withdrawal precedes any positive gesture of enthusi­astic identification with a Cause: negativity functions as the condition of (im)possibility of the enthusiastic identification - that is to say, it lays the ground, opens up space for it but is simultaneously obfuscated by it and undermines it. For this reason, Lacan implicitly changes the balance between Death and Resurrection in favour of Death: what 'Death' stands for at its most radical is not merely the passing of earthly life, but the 'night of the world', the self-withdrawal, the absolute contraction of subjectivity, the severing of its links with 'reality' - *this* is the 'wiping the slate clean' that opens up the domain of the symbolic New Beginning, of the emergence of the 'New Harmony' sustained by a newly emerged Master-Signifier.

#### ETHICS DA – extend the Zizek and Daly evidence – the permutation is still unethical because it relies on the big Other of the economy to dictate our ethical and political strategies – this assures social subjugation on a global scale .

#### Permutation doesn’t solve – it supplements the system it does not disturb

 **Zizek 2008** In Defense of Lost Causes page 33

The "worldless" character of capitalism is linked to this hegemonic role of scientific discourse in modernity, a feature clearly identified already by Hegel who wrote that, for us moderns, art and religion no longer obey absolute respect: we can admire them, but we no longer kneel down in front of them, our heart is not really with them —today, only science (conceptual knowledge) deserves this respect. "Postmodernity" as the "end of grand narratives" is one of the names for this predicament in which the multitude of local fictions thrives against the background of scientific discourse as the only remaining universality deprived of sense. Which is why the politics advocated by many a leftist today, that of countering the devastating world-dissolving effect of capitalist moder­ nization by inventing new fictions, imagining "new worlds" (like the Porto Alegre slogan "Another world is possible!"), is inadequate or, at least, profoundly ambiguous: it all depends on how these fictions relate to the underlying Real of capitalism — do they just supplement it with the imaginary multitude, as the postmodern "local narratives" do, or do they disturb its functioning? In other words, the task is to produce a symbolic fiction (a truth) that intervenes into the Real, that causes a change within it.29

#### Policymakers defend cap when it benefits them, allowing them to manipulate reform movements and making them useless

Meszaros, 95

(Istvan Meszaros, 1995, Professor at University of Sussex, England, “Beyond Capital: Toward a Theory of Transition”)

AS mentioned before, capital's historical ascendancy in its broad outlines has been brought to its conclusion. Significantly, this process could unfold only in a most contradictory form, storing up enormous problems for the time ahead of us. As a result of the slanted global development accomplished in the last hundred years, under the domination of a handful of capitalistically advanced countries, the terms of Marx's original equation have fundamentally changed. The way in which this process has been brought to its conclusion pronounces a very severe judgement on it. For the consummation of the capital system's global ascendancy, despite five centuries of expansion and accumulation, carried with it the condemnation of the overwhelming majority of humankind to a hand-to-mouth existence. There are, of course, those who can see nothing wrong with the existing state of affairs. Heads of governments -like John Major in England - declare with smug self-complacency that 'capitalism works'. They refuse to entertain the questions: for whom? (certainly not for 90 percent of the world's population) and for how long? Curiously, though, when they have to defend themselves on account of their miserably failed policies and constantly broken promises, they can only repeat like a broken record that the problems which forced them ‘off the rails’ are not of their own making but shared by every 'industrial economy' (a euphemism for capitalist countries), from Japan to Germany and from the United Stares to France, not to mention Italy and all the other members of the European Economic Community. Thus they refuse to see the blatant contradiction between their self-confident declaration of faith that 'capitalism works' and the forced admission that after all it doesn't (a conclusion which they never explicitly draw, although it stares them in the face). In the course of the last century capital has certainly invaded and subdued every corner of our planet, little and large alike. However, it proved quite incapable of solving the grave problems which people must confront in their everyday life all over the world. If anything, the penetration of capital into every single corner of the 'underdeveloped' world only aggravated these problems. It promised 'modernization', but after many decades of loudly trumpeted intervention it only delivered intensified poverty, chronic indebtedness, insoluble inflation, and crippling structural dependency. So much so in fact that it is now highly embarrassing to remind the ideologists of the capital system that not so long ago they nailed their flags to the mast of 'modernization'. Things have significantly changed in the last few decades, as compared to the expansionary past. The displacement of capital's inner contradictions could work with relative ease during the phase of the system's historical ascendancy. It was possible to deal under such conditions with many problems by sweeping them under the carpet of unfulfilled promises, like modernization in the 'Third World' and ever greater prosperity and social advancement in the 'metropolitan' countries, predicated on the expectation of producing an endlessly growing cake. However, the consummation of capital's historical ascendancy radically alters the situation. It is then not only no longer possible to make plausible new sets of vacuous promises but the old promises too must be wiped out of memory, and some real gains of the working classes in the privileged capitalist countries must be 'rolled back' in the interest of the survival of the ruling socioeconomic and political order. This is where we stand today. The triumphalist celebrations of a few years ago now sound very hollow indeed. The slanted development of the last century brought no solutions on the model of'mobile property's civilized victory' (Marx), in that it simply multiplied the privileges of the few and the misery of the many. However, a radically new condition has emerged in the course of the last few decades, gravely affecting the prospects of development in the future. For what is particularly grave today from the point of view of the capital system is that even the privileges of the few cannot be sustained any longer on the backs of the many, in sharp contrast to the past. As a result, the system as a whole is being rendered quite unstable, even if it will take some time before the hill implications of this systemic instability transpire, calling for structural remedies in place of manipulative postponement.

#### Global Insecurity is grounded in the process of global commodification

Goodman 9 Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology in Sydney

James Goodman, “Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/68230825/4/Global-capitalism-and-the-production-of-insecurity, 7-7-12, JL

To ﬁrst discuss commodiﬁcation, it is important to start with the idea that insecurity is only in the last instance a military matter. Global insecurity is in large part grounded in the process of globalized commodiﬁcation — a process that reproduces the security of the propertied, and deepens the insecurity of the property-less. To understand prevailing security dynamics, attention must focus on the social, cultural, and ecological relations embedded in commodity production and consumption (Van der Pijl 1998; Sklair 2000). Ultimately commodiﬁcation renders exchange value in ﬁnitely ﬂuid. With no independent determination of value, the value of capital becomes tautologous. Its only reference point, as Negri points out, is the quantitative measure of value ﬂow, or “productivity” expressed as units of proﬁt over time (Negri 2003). The key to continued accumulation becomes the construction of seamless and universal time, literally the time of capital, enabling permanent value ﬂow without break or discontinuity. Under neoliberal globalism the capacity to ﬂow across borders — ultimately to achieve global reach — is a paramount concern. Fluidity, the capacity to render assets liquid, and thus escape material contradictions, is a central source of power. Growing capital ﬂuidity is reﬂected in the rise of ﬁnance corporates: in 1989 none of the world’s 50 largest companies were based in the ﬁnance sector; in 2003 there were 14 such companies on the list (UNCTAD 2005: 19). In 2004 the assets of the top ten ﬁnancial globalizing corporations amounted to $13 trillion, whereas the assets of the top ten nonﬁnancial globalizing corporations stood at $3.1 trillion (calculated from UNCTAD, 2006: A.1.14 and A.1.11). There has been a global ﬁnancialization of assets: total international private lending stood at about a tenth of global income in 1980; in 2006 it stood at nearly half of global income (McGuire and Tarashev 2006). In 1978, ﬁnance ﬂows were ten times the value of world trade; in 2000, they stood at about 50 times the value of world trade, with total ﬂows amounting to $1.5 trillion per day while global gross domestic product (GDP) stood at about $40 trillion (Palan 2003).The emergence of “nomadic” capitalism, where circulation speeds up in a casino of accumulated abstract value, imposes new imperatives for structures of protection. Various corporate rights regimes are constructed, treating corporate investors “as an equal subject of international law, on a par with governments” (Gal-Or 2005: 122). Investor protection commitments and rights to sue signatory governments for discriminatory regulation are now routinely written into investment agreements (Cutler 2003). There were fewer than 80 such agreements in 1990; by 2004 there were more than 400. In2006, corporate investors had initiated 255 cases against 70 countries, several leading to large pay-outs, such as in 2006 when Argentina was instructed to pay $165m (UNCTAD 2005; 2006). Financial power is also reﬂected in the emergence and growth of the “oﬀshore” economy, the logical development of capital’s “drive beyond its own barrier” (Marx quoted in Palan 2003:173). Oﬀshore entities now account for the entire foreign-exchange market, and 80 percent of international ﬁnancial transactions: a ﬁfth of the world’s private wealth is now said to be held in tax-havens (Palan 2003: 7). Stocks of monetary value are increasingly disconnected from qualitative values, of for instance coresponsibility or sociality. The role of global credit-ratings agencies exempliﬁes the process. Here, three agencies — Standard &Poor’s, Moody’s, and Fitch — now set the framework for national policy making worldwide. Governments pay the agencies six ﬁgure sums to provide a “sovereign” rating that determines access to international ﬁnance. In 1975, Standard& Poor’s conducted three country ratings; in 2004 it produced more than a hundred (Klein 2004). With intensiﬁed marketization there is a dramatic “extension of command-through-money,” and the “dehumanization of the subject” is taken to new lengths (Holloway 2002: 202). Neoliberalism thus radically disembeds social relations, bringing a “reconﬁguration of civil society, and the re-privatization of aspects of risk (both market risk and credit risk) that were largely socialized” (Gill 2003: 206). With society subordinated to capital ﬂows, exchange value dominates and we see the privatization of use value. Financialization here spells social disarticulation: “the atomization inherent in commodiﬁcation in this way is no longer compensated by socialization” (Van der Pijl 1998: 4). The cash nexus confronts lived materiality, and generates profound crises of legitimacy. “Private – personal” spheres for instance, ecologies and living environments, “nature’s” reproductive and generative capacity, the structures that reproduce political legitimacy such as welfare states, rights regimes, and representative structures, become sites of contestation between commodiﬁcation and decommodiﬁcation. In such contexts use-value becomes the central “active, collective antagonistic element” (Negri 2003: 126). In the face of these challenges maintaining security becomes central to protecting exchange value. Coercive power is called on to protect and promote the security of value. The territorial state — and the United States as the universal state — reach out to widen the realm of control against the realm of uncertainty.

#### Capitalist nature of nuclear corporations completely ignore negative impacts

Williams ‘12

(Chris Williams, author of Ecology and Socialism: Solutions to Capitalist Ecological Crisis, reports on an independent investigation into Japan’s nuclear nightmare, July 28, 2012, “NUCLEAR ENERGY: Capitalism’s Disastrous Priority,” http://www.dianuke.org/nuclear-energy-capitalisms-disastrous-priority/)

Put another way, the decisions taken were dictated by the prime directive of capitalism: make profits at all costs, grow by any means necessary. Cut whatever corners you need to, bribe and cajole whoever is necessary, denigrate and belittle those who oppose you–there is no higher power to which you will answer other than the God of Profit. This is the iron law of capital accumulation.

The consequences of those decisions, taken in the faraway, plush boardrooms of the nuclear corporations, and the lack of credible government information since the disaster, have now created [widespread fear among the people](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/mar/09/fukushima-residents-plagued-health-fears), the disbanding of families, and the destruction of their livelihoods in Fukushima prefecture. As the report lays out: They continue to face grave concerns, including the health effects of radiation exposure, displacement, the dissolution of families, disruption of their lives and lifestyles and the contamination of vast areas of the environment. There is no foreseeable end to the decontamination and restoration activities that are essential for rebuilding communities. What an utterly appalling way to make electricity. No foreseeable end to decontamination and restoration activities. Even without considering the issue of nuclear waste, the staggering cost of building and operating nuclear plants, or the umbilical cord that indelibly connects the nuclear power industry to the nuclear weapons and defense industry, can anyone honestly say that as a highly technological society, we have no better alternatives to generating electricity than operating nuclear power stations?

### Alternative Solves/Inevitability Logic Bad

#### The belief that capitalism is inevitable is rooted in capitalism and is symptom of how the system controls the masses: the belief is utopian and is maintained by the capitalist consensus to deny radical change

Johnston 04

(Adrian, International journal of Zizek studes. Vol 1.0 “The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Žižek and the Dynamics of Belief”)

A brief remark by Žižek hints that, despite his somewhat pessimistic assessment of traditional Marxism, he basically agrees with the Marxist conviction that the demise of capitalism is an inevitable, unavoidable historical necessity—“The ultimate answer to the reproach that the radical Left proposals are utopian should thus be that, today, the true utopia is the belief that the present liberal-democratic capitalist consensus could go on indefinitely, without radical changes.”151 This hurling of the charge of utopianism back at those making it is quite convincing. In fact, any system proclaiming to be the embodiment of “the end of history” invariably appears to be utopian. Given what is known about the merciless march of history, believing that an ultimate, unsurpassable socio-political arrangement finally has arrived is almost impossible. So, one should indeed accept as true the unlikelihood of capitalism continuing on indefinitely; it must eventually give way to something else, even if this “x” cannot be envisioned clearly from within the present context. Nonetheless, Žižek’s own theorizing calls for a great deal of cautious reservation about the consequences of embracing this outlook as true, of falling into the trap of (to invoke this motif once more) lying in the guise of truth. Just as the combination of a purely negative, critical Marxism with the anticipation of the event of the act-miracle threatens to turn into an intellectual fetish (in the Žižekian ideological sense of something that renders the present reality bearable), so too might acknowledging the truth of capitalism’s finitude have the same unfortunate side-effect. One can tolerate today’s capitalism, because one knows that it cannot last forever; one can passively and patiently wait it out (at one point, Žižek identifies this anticipation of indeterminate change-yet-to-come as a disempowering lure, although he doesn’t explicitly acknowledge that his own work on ideology sometimes appears to be enthralled by just such a lure152). In both cases, the danger is that the very analyses developed by Žižek in his assault upon late-capitalist ideology might serve to facilitate the sustenance of the cynical distance whose underlying complicity with the present state of affairs he describes so well.

#### The notion of capital’s inevitability is a measure taken by the elites to further repress revolutionary thoughts: Reject the notion of inevitability and take the alternative as a way to break free from the cycle of propagated domination – BELIEF is key

Ainger 04

(Activist collective, We Are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Global Anticapitalism, http://artactivism.members.gn.apc.org/allpdfs/387-%5Bessay%5DPower.pdf)

But all gods have a secret vulnerability: they cease to exist when people no longer believe in them. Trust is the fuel of power. As corporate collapses and financial scandals rock the markets, and the democratic deficit expands as people desert the charade of participation by voting, trust is in short supply. And failure of belief in a system spreads fast. A contagious whisper, it ripples through the multitude, rising to a roar. The roar was responded to by the World Economic Forum in 2003, when it chose “Rebuilding Trust” as the theme for the gathering. As preparation for the meeting it commissioned a massive public opinion survey representing the views of 1.4 billion people spanning every continent. The results, according to the WEF, revealed “that trust in many key institutions has fallen to critical proportions.” The least-trusted of the 17 institutions in the survey were national governments and corporations. Two-thirds of those surveyed worldwide disagreed that their country is “governed by the will of the people” and half distrusted the WTO and the IMF to operate in the best interest of society. The crisis of legitimacy has hit uncontainable proportions. According to a leaked email from a writer invited to Davos in 2003, the fear amongst the guests was palpable. “These people are freaked out,” she wrote, describing her dinner conversations with the elite. Despite their privilege and wealth, they know that their legitimacy is waning, that we have seen through them, that when trust has been eroded it becomes increasingly difficult to wield power. Refusing to Cooperate “The tap root of power lies below the surface. It is obedience, cooperation, collusion: the social glue that ensures that each day proceeds much like the last. Every single one of us has the power to give or withhold our willing participation. To ‘reproduce’ or reshape society.” – Alex Begg, Empowering the Earth: Strategies for Social Change, Green Books We are led to believe that the system of power is like a pyramid, similar to a food chain with the dominant species at the top maintaining its control over those at the bottom through superior strength and violence. But if an avalanche swept away all at Davos tomorrow, not much would really change because the power the Davos class accrues, through their ownership of capital, extends everywhere. There is a secret, however, that those on the mountaintop rarely reveal, which is that their power exists to some extent because we allow it to. They want us to believe that they wield power over us with their weapons and armies and police forces, and although their violence is highly effective in disrupting our movements, hurting our bodies and making us afraid, violence alone can’t guarantee their continued existence. Ultimately, it depends upon us believing in their power, in their immutability, and failing to recognize our own. This was the substance of Shelley’s furious ballad of 1819 when he wrote the famous lines to Manchester’s working poor after troops fired on them in the Peterloo massacre: “Rise, like lions after slumber / In unvanquishable number/ Shake your chains to earth like dew / Which in sleep had fall’n on you! / Ye are many, and they are few.” In reality, the system is more like a huge wedding cake than a pyramid: multiple layers of dominance held up by many pillars – pillars which are institutions and individuals, values and belief systems. Successful movement strategies, therefore, are those that identify the key pillars in society, and work to weaken their compliance until they break. As we take away one pillar, others begin to wobble and the system trembles.