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### Capitalism K

#### Energy production is inseparable from capitalist growth—quick tech fixes to scarcity are temporary at best and exclude radical historical critique

Clark and York ‘8 Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University, and Richard York, coeditor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, “Rifts and Shifts: Getting to the Root of Environmental Crises,” Monthly Review, Vol. 60, Issue 06, November 2008

The development of energy production technologies provides one of the best examples of rifts and shifts, as technological fixes to energy problems create new ecological crises in the attempt to alleviate old ones. Biomass, particularly wood, has, of course, been one of the primary energy sources humans have depended on throughout their history. The development of more energy intensive processes, such as the smelting of metals, was, therefore, connected with greater pressure on forests, as trees were fed to the fires. By the time the Industrial Revolution began to emerge in Europe, vast regions of the continent had already been deforested, particularly in areas close to major sites of production, and much of this deforestation was driven by the demand for fuel. As industrialization advanced, new sources of power were desired to fuel the machines that allowed for production to take place on a growing scale. Whole forests could be devoured at an unprecedented rate, making wood ever more scarce. The tension between the desire of the capitalist owners of the new industrial technologies for expanding the accumulation of capital and the biophysical limits of Earth were apparent from the start of the Industrial Revolution. However, capitalists did not concern themselves with the internal contradictions of capitalism, except insofar as they were barriers to be transcended. Thus, efforts to achieve what we would today call sustainability were not even considered by the elite. Rather, coal (and subsequently other fossil fuels) quickly became the standard fuel of industry, temporarily sidestepping the fuelwood crisis (although forests continued to fall due to the many demands placed on them) but laying the foundations for our current global climate change crisis by dramatically increasing the emission of carbon dioxide.16 The pattern has remained similar to how it was in the early years of the Industrial Revolution. Oil was quickly added to coal as a fuel source and a variety of other energy sources were increasingly exploited. Among these was hydropower, the generation of which requires damming rivers, and thus destroying aquatic ecosystems. For example, the expansion of hydropower over the twentieth century in the U.S. Pacific Northwest was the primary force leading to the widespread depletion and extinction of salmon runs. Nuclear power was, of course, the most controversial addition to the power mix. Despite initial claims that it would provide clean, unlimited power that would be too cheap to meter, it proved to be an expensive, risky power source that produced long-lived highly radioactive waste for which safe long-term storage sites have been nearly impossible to develop. Now, in the twenty-first century, with global climate change finally being recognized by the elite as a serious problem, the proposed solutions are, as we would expect, to shift the problem from one form of energy to a new form of energy. Nuclear power, despite its drop in popularity toward the end of the last century, due to high costs and widespread public opposition, is now very much back on the agenda, with new promises of how the new nuclear plants are safer—never mind the issue of radioactive waste. We are also regaled with promises of agrofuels, ironically bringing us back to the pre-coal energy crisis. Recent scientific reports note that growing crops for agrofuel to feed cars may actually increase the carbon emitted into the atmosphere.17 But even this ignores the fact that the production of agrofuel would be based on unsustainable agricultural practices that demand massive inputs of fertilizers and would only further the depletion of soil nutrients, bringing us back to the metabolic rift that Marx originally addressed. Two recent examples of technical approaches to mitigating climate change are particularly illustrative of how technological optimism distracts us from the political-economic sources of our environmental problems. Nobel laureate Paul Crutzen, who admirably played a central role in identifying and analyzing human-generated ozone depletion in the stratosphere, recently argued that climate change can be avoided by injecting sulfur particles into the stratosphere to increase the albedo of the Earth, and thus reflect more of the sun’s energy back into space, which would counter the warming stemming from rising concentrations of greenhouse gases. Although no doubt offered sincerely and out of desperation stemming from the failure of those in power adequately to address the mounting climate crisis, the technical framing of the climate change issue makes it easy for political and business leaders to avoid addressing greenhouse gas emissions, since they can claim that technical fixes make it unnecessary to take action to preserve forests and curtail the burning of fossil fuels. Engineering the atmosphere on this scale is likely to have many far-reaching consequences (acid rain being only the most obvious), many of which have not been anticipated. In a similar vein, well-known physicist Freeman Dyson recently suggested that we can avoid global climate change by replacing one-quarter of the world’s forests with genetically engineered carbon-eating trees. The ecological consequences of such an action would likely be extraordinary. Both of these so-called solutions avoid addressing the dynamics of an economic system that is largely structured around burning fossil fuels, that must constantly renew itself on a larger scale, and that runs roughshod over nature. Often techno-solutions are proposed in a manner that suggests they are completely removed from the world as it operates. The irony is that such narrowly conceived “solutions” would only serve as a means to prop up the very forces driving ecological degradation, allowing those forces to continue to operate, as they create additional ecological rifts.18

#### Capitalism generates internal contradictions erupting in imperialism, nuclear war, and ecocide

Foster ‘5 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, "Naked Imperialism," Monthly Review, Vol. 57 No. 4, 2005

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue.

#### Vote negative in favor of classist politics

#### Revolutionary theory is a prior question—the aff is irrelevant in the grand scheme of capitalism—we should instead affirm the historical necessity of communism

Tumino ’12 Stephen Tumino, more marxist than Marx himself, “Is Occupy Wall Street Communist,” Red Critique 14, Winter/Spring 2012, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/isoccupywallstreetcommunist.htm

Leaving aside that the purpose of Wolff's speech was to popularize a messianic vision of a more just society based on workplace democracy, he is right about one thing: Marx's original contribution to the idea of communism is that it is an historical and material movement produced by the failure of capitalism not a moral crusade to reform it. Today we are confronted with the fact that capitalism has failed in exactly the way that Marx explained was inevitable.[4] It has "simplified the class antagonism" (The Communist Manifesto); by concentrating wealth and centralizing power in the hands of a few it has succeeded in dispossessing the masses of people of everything except their labor power. As a result it has revealed that the ruling class "is unfit to rule," as The Communist Manifesto concludes, "because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him." And the slaves are thus compelled to fight back. Capitalism makes communism necessary because it has brought into being an international working class whose common conditions of life give them not only the need but also the economic power to establish a society in which the rule is "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Programme). Until and unless we confront the fact that capitalism has once again brought the world to the point of taking sides for or against the system as a whole, communism will continue to be just a bogey-man or a nursery-tale to frighten and soothe the conscience of the owners rather than what it is—the materialist theory that is an absolute requirement for our emancipation from exploitation and a new society freed from necessity! As Lenin said, "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" (What Is To Be Done?). We are confronted with an historic crisis of global proportions that demands of us that we take Marxism seriously as something that needs to be studied to find solutions to the problems of today. Perhaps then we can even begin to understand communism in the way that The Communist Manifesto presents it as "the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority" to end inequality forever.

### Bataille K

#### Text: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should declare its sole authority to regulate nuclear power wasting in the United States.

#### Energy production under the sign of utility denies constitutive excess through the fiction of infinite accumulation. This necessitates conflict outbreak and nuclear escalation to discharge its built-up excess

Stoekl ‘7 Allan Stoekl, Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Penn State University, Bataille’s Peak: Energy, Religion, and Postsustainability, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2007, p. 56-58

Just as there are two energetic sources of economic value, then—muscle power and inanimate fuel power—so too there are two kinds of expenditure. The stored and available energy derived from fossil or inanimate fuel expenditure, for production or destruction, is different in quality, not merely in quantity, from muscular energy. The latter is profoundly more and other than the mere “power to do work.” No intimacy (in the Bataillean sense) can be envisaged through the mechanized expenditure of fossil fuels. The very use of fossil and nonorganic fuels—coal, oil, nuclear— implies the effort to maximize production through quantification, the augmentation of the sheer quantity of things. Raw material becomes, as Heidegger put it, a standing reserve, a measurable mass whose sole function is to be processed, used, and ultimately discarded.28 It is useful, nothing more (or less), at least for the moment before it is discarded; it is related to the self only as a way of aggrandizing the latter’s stability and position. There is no internal limit, no angoisse or pain before which we shudder; we deplete the earth’s energy reserves as blandly and indifferently as the French revolutionaries (according to Hegel) chopped off heads: as if one were cutting off a head of cabbage. “Good” duality has completely given way to “bad.” As energy sources become more efficiently usable—oil produces a lot more energy than does coal, in relation to the amount of energy needed to extract it, transport it, and dispose of waste (ash and slag)—more material can be treated, more people and things produced, handled, and dumped. Consequently more food can be produced, more humans will be born to eat it, and so on (the carrying capacity of the earth temporarily rises). And yet, under this inanimate fuels regime, the very nature of production and above all destruction changes. Even when things today are expended, they are wasted under the sign of efficiency, utility. This very abstract quantification is inseparable from the demand of an efficiency that bolsters the position of a closed and demanding subjectivity. We “need” cars and SUVs, we “need” to use up gas, waste landscapes, forests, and so on: it is all done in the name of the personal lifestyle we cannot live without, which is clearly the best ever developed in human history, the one everyone necessarily wants, the one we will fight for and use our products (weapons) to protect. We no longer destroy objects, render them intimate, in a very personal, confrontational potlatch; we simply leave items out for the trash haulers to pick up or have them hauled to the junkyard. Consumption (la consommation) in the era of the standing reserve, the frame - work (Ge - Stell), entails, in and through the stockpiling of energy, the stockpiling of the human: the self itself becomes an element of the standing reserve, a thing among other things. There can hardly be any intimacy in the contemporary cycle of production -consumption -destruction, the modern and degraded version of expenditure. As Bataille put it, concerning intimacy: Intimacy is expressed only under one condition by the thing [la chose]: that this thing fundamentally be the opposite of a thing, the opposite of a product, of merchandise: a burn -off [consumation] and a sacrifice. Since intimate feeling is a burn -off, it is burning -off that expresses it, not the thing, which is its negation. (OC, 7: 126; AS 132: italics Bataille’s) War, too, reflects this nonintimacy of the thing: fossil fuel and nuclear - powered explosives and delivery systems make possible the impersonal destruction of lives in great numbers and at a great distance. Human beings are now simply quantities of material to be processed and destroyed in wars (whose purpose is to assure the continued availability of fossil fuel resources). Killing in modern warfare is different in kind from that carried out by the Aztecs. All the sacrificial elements, the elements by which the person has been transformed in and through death, have disappeared. Bataille, then, should have distinguished more clearly between intimate and impersonal varieties of useless squandries when it came to his discussion of the Marshall Plan.29 (In the same way, he should have distinguished between energy that is stockpiled and put to use and energy that is fundamentally “cursed” not only in and through bodily excess but in its ability to do “work.”)30 It is not merely a question of our attitude toward expenditure, our “self -consciousness”: also fundamental is how it is carried out. Waste based on the consumption of fossil or inanimate (nuclear) fuels cannot entail intimacy because it is dependent on the thing as thing, it is dependent on the energy reserve, on the stockpiled, planned, and protected self: “[This is] what we know from the outside, which is given to us as physical reality (at the limit of the commodity, available without reserve). We cannot penetrate the thing and its only meaning is its material qualities, appropriated or not for some use [utilité], understood in the productive sense of the term. (OC, 7: 126; AS, 132; italics Bataille’s) The origin of this destruction is therefore to be found in the maximizing of the efficiency of production; modern, industrialized waste is fundamentally only the most efficient way to eliminate what has been over - produced. Hence the Marshall Plan, proposing a gift -giving on a vast, mechanized scale, is different in kind from, say, a Tlingit potlatch ceremony. “Growth” is the ever -increasing rhythm and quantity of the treatment of matter for some unknown and unknowable human purpose and that matter’s subsequent disposal/ destruction. One could never “self -consciously” reconnect with intimacy through the affirmation of some form of indus-trial production-destruction. To see consumer culture as in some way the fulfillment of Bataille’s dream of a modern -day potlatch is for this reason a fundamental misreading of The Accursed Share.31 Bataille’s critique is always an ethics; it entails the affirmation of a “general economy” in which the particular claims of the closed subjectivity are left behind. The stockpiled self is countered, in Bataille, by the generous and death -bound movement of an Amélie, of a Sadean heroine whose sacrifice puts at risk not only an object, a commodity, but the stability of the “me.” To affirm a consumption that, in spite of its seeming delirium of waste, is simply a treatment of matter and wastage of fossil energy in immense quantities, lacking any sense of internal limits (angoisse), and always with a particular and efficacious end in view (“growth,” “comfort,” “personal satisfaction,” “consumer freedom”) is to misrepresent the main thrust of Bataille’s work. The point, after all, is to enable us to attain a greater “self -consciousness,” based on the ability to choose between modes of expenditure. Which entails the greatest intimacy? Certainly not nuclear devastation (1949) or the simple universal depletion of the earth’s resources and the wholesale destruction of ecosystems (today).

#### The counterplan affirms the limit of human development by transgressing it in profligous wastage—this shatters humanist individualism and founds a communal ethic of generosity

Stoekl ‘7 Allan Stoekl, Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Penn State University, Bataille’s Peak: Energy, Religion, and Postsustainability, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2007, p. 46-48

Carrying capacity poses a limit to growth: a society can destroy the excess through sacrifice, infanticide, ritual, festival; or excess can be put to work through the waging of war, in which case carrying capacity may be expanded through the appropriation of another society’s land. War too, however, shows some elements of religious, ruinous expenditure in that it entails, as does sacrifice, glory. Especially in modern times, war also brings with it the possibility of defeat: in that case there is no glory, and certainly no possibility of the expansion of carrying capacity. Indeed, as in the case of nuclear holocaust, societies run the risk of completely obliterating— wasting—the carrying capacity of their land. In accord with Bataille’s implicit ethical model, one can argue that the limits imposed by carrying capacity evoke two possible responses from societies. First, a society can recognize limits. Here, paradoxically, one violates limits, consciously transgresses them, so to speak, by recognizing them. Through various forms of ritual expenditure one ultimately respects limits by symbolically defying the very principle of conservation and measured growth—of, in other words, limits. “Spending without reserve” is the spending of that which cannot be reinvested because of the limit, and yet the very act of destruction is the transgression of the logic of the limit, which would require, in its recognition, a sage and conservative attentiveness to the dangers of excessive spending. If there is a limit to the production of goods and resources, however, we best respect and recognize that limit through its transgression—through, in other words, the destruction of precious but unusable energy resources. To attempt to reinvest, or put to use, the totality of those resources, to guarantee maximum productivity and growth, would only ignore the limit (rather than transgressing it), thereby eventually lowering the limit if not eliminating it entirely (elimination of carrying capacity, ecological destruction, desertification).25 For this reason, a theory of expenditure is inseparable from, is even indistinguishable from, a theory of depletion. Such an affirmation—of limits and expenditure—entails a general view of economy and, we might add, ecology. In positing such a respect for limits through their transgression, we forgo an individual concern, which would customarily be seen as the human one (but which is not, in Bataille’s view): a concern with personal survival, enrichment, and advancement. From a larger perspective, we forego the needs of Man as a species or moral category (or the needs of God as Man’s moral proxy). The supremacy of self-interest is tied for Bataille to the simple ignorance of limits: not their transgression, but their heedless violation. In the case of transgression of limits, we risk what might be personally comfortable or advantageous in order to attain a larger “glory” that is tied to unproductive expenditure and entails a possible dissolution of the self. From a general perspective, this expenditure is (as Bataille would say) on the scale of the universe; it must also be, in principle, on the scale of the carrying capacity of a given landscape or ecology (else the expenditure would very quickly cancel itself out). This version of limits and their transgression can be associated with Bataille’s conception of eroticism. What separates humans from the animals, according to Bataille, is the interdiction of “immediate, unreserved, animal pleasure [jouissance] ” (OC, 8: 47). Decency, the rules against sexual expression, incest, and intense pleasure that characterize human society are fundamental to an organized society. But the human is not exclusively to be found in the interdiction: its ultimate “self -consciousness” is derived through the ecstatic transgression of that interdiction. Interdiction is an aftereffect of transgression, just as conservation is an aftereffect of expenditure (we produce and conserve in order to expend). What ultimately counts for us as humans (for us to be human) is an awareness of the necessity of expenditure (including that of our own death)—an awareness that animals lack.

### Elections DA

#### Obama winning now: post-convention swing-state surge

Nate Silver, NYT, “Sept 13: After convention bounce, holding Obama’s polls to a higher standard” 9/14 <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/>

On Thursday at 6:30 p.m. Eastern time, there was a deluge of comments in my Twitter feed when NBC News and Marist University released poll results showing President Obama with clear leads in three swing states. Mr. Obama led by five points in their polls of Virginia and Florida, and by seven in their poll of Ohio.¶ These are undoubtedly good surveys for Mr. Obama, and they came in crucial states. And yet, our forecast model did not move toward Mr. Obama on Thursday. Instead, Mr. Obama’s forecast declined slightly; the model now gives him a 78.6 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, versus 80.7 percent on Wednesday.¶ Part of this is because the other polling data released on Thursday was not as strong for Mr. Obama as the set of NBC-Marist polls, but let me make a broader point first.¶ We have seen a shift toward Mr. Obama in the polls since the Democratic convention. It appears that if an election were held today, he’d win it by somewhere in the neighborhood of four or perhaps five percentage points.¶ If Mr. Obama is ahead by four to five points nationally, we’d certainly also expect him to post his share of leads by about that margin in swing states. Because of statistical variance and differences in methodology, some of the numbers are going to be a little bit better for him than others. But the consensus of the data ought to quite strong for him.

#### Nuclear power’s controversial—spending and safety—scares off undecided voters

Knowledge@Wharton 11 (Knowledge@Wharton, the online research and analysis journal of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, Mar 30, [knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=2743], jam)

Yet while the Administration continues to voice its support, Fukushima may have stalled the expansion of nuclear power in the U.S. for the near future, say Wharton professors and nuclear experts. Despite calls for a "nuclear renaissance," the industry was already struggling to move forward in the midst of an economic downturn and competition from cheap natural gas. Now events in Japan have reignited fears about nuclear's safety, which could cause further delays. The lingering question for U.S. energy policy: If not nuclear, then what? Nuclear as part of U.S. energy policy "depends on what leadership we have," says Erwann Michel-Kerjan, managing director of the Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center. "Where do we want our country to be? We have been talking about energy independence for a long time. The question is, what do we do about that?" Before the earthquake in Japan, a growing number of people were saying nuclear. Not only would it allow the United States to become more energy independent, but it would also lower greenhouse gas emissions, the industry argued. When measured by carbon footprint, nuclear is on par with solar, hydro, wind, biomass and geothermal, and in terms of the land use required, nuclear comes out ahead of other green energy sources, they say. For a 1,000 megawatt power plant, nuclear requires about one square mile of space, compared with 50 square miles for solar, 250 for wind and 2,600 for biomass. But nuclear power plants are enormously expensive, costing as much as $2 billion to $6 billion to build, according to "Nuclear Energy Policy," a report from the Congressional Research Service. Financing new reactors is heavily dependent on loan guarantees from the federal government, which are highly controversial. To expand, the industry says it needs more than the $18.5 billion in loan guarantees the government currently allocates, which is enough for three or four reactors. Opponents argue that loan guarantees unfairly subsidize a mature industry and would be better spent elsewhere. The debate in some other countries is less heated. Unlike the United States, which has significant natural resources, many other countries have fewer energy options and have made a strong commitment to nuclear power. They are unlikely to abandon it now, says Michel-Kerjan. France, for example, which turned to nuclear energy decades ago after suffering through an oil crisis, relies on nuclear for 80% of its power. Emerging economies such as China and India are also investing heavily in nuclear to cope with increasing energy demand.

Link/il

#### Romney win causes Iran strikes—causes escalating conflict

Hussain 9-12 Murtaza Hussain, Toronto-based writer and analyst focused on issues related to Middle Eastern politics, “Why war with Iran would spell disaster,” Al-Jazeera, 9/12/2012, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/09/201291194236970294.html

Leading members of the House and Congress from both parties as well as the closest advisers to Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney have called for attacking Iran, with some high-ranking GOP advisers even suggesting that the time is now for a Congressional resolution formally declaring war on the country. Romney and many other leading Republican figures have called for pre-emptive war against Iran, and have continually upped the ante in terms of threats of military action throughout the election campaign. This alarming and potentially highly consequential rhetoric is occurring in a context where the American people are still recovering from the disastrous war in Iraq and winding down the US occupation of Afghanistan, while at the same time coping with the worst economic drought since the Great Depression. Public statements claiming that the extent of the conflict would be limited to targeted airstrikes on Iranian nuclear facilities are utterly disingenuous, ignoring the escalating cycle of retribution that such "limited" conflicts necessarily breed. As did the war in Libya start off with calls only for a benign "no-fly zone" to protect civilians and seamlessly turned into an all-out aerial campaign to topple Muammar Gaddafi, any crossing of the military threshold with Iran would also likely result in a far bigger conflagration than the public has been prepared for by their leaders. War with Iran would be no quick and clean affair, as many senior political and military figures have pointed out it would make the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, which cost trillions of dollars and the lives of thousands of soldiers and civilians, seem like "a cakewalk". The fact that it is becoming increasingly likely, inevitable in the eyes of many, and that it is high on the agenda of so many leading political figures warrants exploration of what such a conflict would really entail. Conflict on an unprecedented scale Not a war of weeks or months, but a "generations-long war" is how no less a figure than former Mossad chief Efraim Halevy describes the consequences of open conflict with Iran. In comparison with Iraq and Afghanistan, both countries with relatively small populations which were already in a state of relative powerlessness before they were invaded, Iran commands the eighth largest active duty military in the world, as well as highly trained special forces and guerilla organisations which operate in countries throughout the region and beyond. Retired US General John Abizaid has previously described the Iranian military as "the most powerful in the Middle East" (exempting Israel), and its highly sophisticated and battle-hardened proxies in Lebanon and Iraq have twice succeeded in defeating far stronger and better funded Western military forces. Any attack on Iran would assuredly lead to the activation of these proxies in neighbouring countries to attack American interests and would create a situation of borderless war unprecedented in any past US conflicts in the Middle East. None of this is to suggest that the United States would not "win" a war with Iran, but given the incredibly painful costs of Iraq and Afghanistan; wars fought again weak, poorly organised enemies lacking broad influence, politicians campaigning for war with Iran are leading the American people into a battle which will be guaranteed to make the past decade of fighting look tame in comparison. A recent study has shown that an initial US aerial assault on Iran would require hundreds of planes, ships and missiles in order to be completed; a military undertaking itself unprecedented since the first Gulf War and representative of only the first phase of what would likely be a long drawn-out war of attrition. For a country already nursing the wounds from the casualties of far less intense conflicts and still reeling from their economic costs, the sheer battle fatigue inherent in a large-scale war with Iran would stand to greatly exacerbate these issues. Oil shocks and the American economy The fragile American economic recovery would be completely upended were Iran to target global energy supplies in the event of war, an act which would be both catastrophic and highly likely if US Iran hawks get their way. Not only does the country itself sit atop some of the largest oil and natural gas reserves on the planet, its close proximity to the shipping routes and oil resources of its neighbours means that in the event of war, its first response would likely be to choke off the global supply of crude; a tactic for which its military defences have in fact been specifically designed. The Strait of Hormuz, located in the Persian Gulf is the shipping point for more than 20 per cent of the world's petroleum. Iran is known to have advanced Silkworm missile batteries buried at strategic points around the strait to make it impassable in the event of war, and has developed "swarming" naval tactics to neutralise larger, less mobile ships such as those used by the US Navy. While Iran could never win in straightforward combat, it has developed tactics of asymmetrical warfare that can effectively inflict losses on a far stronger enemy and render the strait effectively closed to naval traffic. The price of oil would immediately skyrocket, by some estimates upwards several hundred dollars a barrel, shattering the already tenuous steps the US and other Western economies are taking towards recovery. Former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has said a war with Iran could drag out years and would have economic consequences "devastating for the average American"; but these facts are conspicuously absent in public discussion of the war. Every conflict has blowback, but if US politicians are attempting to maneouver the country into a conflict of such potentially devastating magnitude, potentially sacrificing ordinary Americans' economic well-being for years to come, it would behoove them to speak frankly about these costs and not attempt to obfuscate or downplay them in order to make their case. Conflict across borders Finally, a war with Iran would be not be like conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya where the fighting was constrained to the borders of the country in question. Despite widespread resentment towards the country due to the perception of it as a regionally imperialist power as well sectarian animosity towards it as Shia Muslim theocracy, Iran maintains deep links throughout the Middle East and South Asia and can count on both popular support as well as assistance from its network of armed proxies in various countries. In a report for Haaretz, Ahmed Rashid noted that an attack on Iran would likely inflame anti-American sentiment throughout the region, across both Shia and Sunni Muslim communities. Despite Iran's poor human rights record and bellicose leadership, polls have consistently shown that Iranian and Iranian-backed leaders such as Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hassan Nasrallah remain among the most popular figures throughout the Arab and Muslim world. This popularity comes not necessarily out of respect for Iranian ideology, but from a perception that Iran is the only assertive power in the region and is the target of aggression from the United States and its allies. In Rashid's analysis, both the Middle East and South Asia would become unsafe for American citizens and their interests for years to come; popular anger would reach a level which would render these area effectively off-limits and would cause grave and immediate danger to both American businesses and troops based in the region. Again, this would be a situation quite different from the other wars of the past decade, fought against isolated regimes without the ability to call upon large and often well-funded numbers of regional sympathisers; a fact also rarely mentioned by war advocates. Not a political game Going to war with Iran would be an elective decision for the United States, but it is for too grave and consequential a choice to be left up to the whims of politicians seeking to win the approval of lobby groups and one-up each other to appeal to influential campaign donors who would like to see a war with Iran. Make no mistake, the possibility of war is very real and has become eminently more so in recent months. Many of the same politicians and political advisers responsible for engineering the Iraq War have returned to public life and are at the forefront of pushing a new American conflict with Iran. Mitt Romney's closest foreign policy advisers include leading hawks from the war with Iraq, including John Bolton, Eliot Cohen and Dan Senor. Many of them have enthusiastically and publicly expressed their desire to engineer a US military confrontation with Iran and have already begun to tout the inevitability of this action in a Romney presidency.

#### Causes global nuclear war

Primakov ’10 Yevgeny Primakov, President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation, member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and member of the editorial board of Russia in Global Affairs, “The Fundamental Conflict,” New Eastern Outlook, 1/2/2010, http://www.journal-neo.com/?q=node/102

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 opposing superpowers 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.

### States CP

#### The fifty states, relevant territories, and the District of Columbia should substantially increase financial incentives for energy production of nuclear power.

#### States can undergo energy projects—Massachusetts efforts prove feasibility.

Engineering Wire 12 (Lexis, <http://www.power-eng.com/news/2012/08/06/united-states-new-massachusetts-law-boosts-wind-and-solar-energy.html> 8/6/12) CJQ

On August 3, 2012, Massachusetts Governor Patrick signed new energy legislation that, among other things, expands the incentives and opportunities for developing wind, solar, hydro and other forms of renewable power generation to serve the state's electricity consumers. This law, Senate Bill 2395, An Act relative to competitively priced electricity in the Commonwealth (the "Act"), also includes provisions that aim to manage some of the drivers of energy cost increases. In regard to renewable energy, the Act: more than doubles the amount of power supply that electric distribution companies must purchase from renewable generators under long term contracts,increases the opportunities for owners of distributed renewable energy facilities to sell their excess power at favorable rates, and increases the size of hydroelectric projects eligible for financial incentives under the state's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS). ML Strategies and Mintz Levin have been actively engaged with the Legislature and the Patrick Administration in the development of the Act. We welcome the opportunity to advise interested companies on the details and implications of the Act as well as on the development of regulations to implement it. In this alert, we summarize the provisions in the Act that will significantly expand the opportunities and incentives for renewable energy development. More Long-Term Contracts for Renewable Power The Act increases the overall percentage of electricity supply that electric distribution companies may purchase from renewable generating facilities under long-term contracts to 7%. The Green Communities Act (GCA) of 2008 previously required distribution companies to obtain up to 3% of their total annual supply from long-term contracts for renewable energy with terms of 10 to 15 years. The Act adds a new long-term contracting provision, Section 83A, to the GCA, that requires distribution companies to solicit proposals from renewable energy developers for long-term contracts with terms of 10 to 20 years for up to 4% of their annual load.1 By December 2016, electric distribution companies must conduct two rounds of joint solicitations for the new 10 to 20 year contracts. Achieving the overall 7% will require renewable energy developers to construct hundreds of megawatts of new renewable generation facilities. Wind farms are likely to be the form of generation that delivers the power to meet this additional demand for renewable generation, which RPS rules allow be built in any of the New England states, New York or nearby Canadian provinces. In another important modification of the GCA, the new Section 83A added by the Act requires distribution companies to develop the new round of contracts only though a competitive bidding process. By contrast, the existing Section 83 of the GCA allows distribution companies to develop contracts through individual negotiations with renewable energy developers. This provision, for example, allowed for the individual negotiations that led to the development of the power purchase agreements for the Cape Wind project. The new legislation also contains a provision that requires each distribution company to enter into long-term power purchase contracts with "newly developed, small, emerging or diverse renewable energy distributed generation facilities" located in its service territory. Of the additional 4% of electricity supply that must be procured from renewable generating facilities under Section 83A, 10% of that amount (0.4% of total supply) must be purchased from these small generators. To qualify, such generators must have a maximum capacity no greater than 6 megawatts and not be net metering facilities.

### Prolif DA

#### Civilian nuclear energy leads to proliferation:

#### All nuclear technology is dual use. Even if they win defense on the materials and facilities used, increased knowledge makes bomb making easier

#### It changes states strategic calculus to make nuclearization more palatable

#### Empirics support

Fuhrmann 09 -- Matthew Fuhrmann [Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina] “Spreading Temptation” International Security Summer 2009, Vol. 34, No. 1, Pages 7-41, Posted Online July 7, 2009. <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2009.34.1.7>

Civilian Nuclear Cooperation and the Bomb Decades ago scholars offered a “technological momentum” hypothesis, suggesting that countries are more likely to pursue nuclear weapons once they obtain civilian nuclear technology and expertise. 21 The logic driving this hypothesis is that the accumulation of nuclear technology and knowledge leads to incremental advances in the field of nuclear engineering that ultimately makes progress toward developing a nuclear weapons capability before a formal decision to build the bomb is made. 22 John Holdren illustrates this argument well when he states that the proliferation of nuclear power represents the spread of an “attractive nuisance.” 23 This logic highlights the relationship between the peaceful and military uses of the atom, but it underplays the political dimensions of proliferation. 24 Peaceful nuclear cooperation and nuclear weapons are related in two key respects. First, all technology and materials linked to a nuclear weapons program have legitimate civilian applications. For example, uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing facilities have dual uses because they can produce fuel for power reactors or fissile material for nuclear weapons. Second, civilian nuclear cooperation increases knowledge in nuclear-related matters. This knowledge can then be applied to weapons-related endeavors. Civilian nu clear programs necessitate familiarity with the handling of radioactive materials, processes for fuel fabrication and materials having chemical or nuclear properties, and the operation and function of reactors and electronic control systems. They also provide experience in other crucial fields, such as metallurgy and neutronics. 25 These experiences offer “a technology base upon which a nuclear weapon program could draw.” 26 These linkages suggest that peaceful nuclear assistance reduces the expected costs of a weapons program, making it more likely that a decision to begin such a program will be made. Considerable political and economic costs—such as international sanctions, diplomatic isolation, and strained relationships with allies—can accompany nuclear weapons programs. 27 Leaders may be reluctant to take on these burdens unless they believe that a weapons campaign could succeed relatively quickly. 28 As Stephen Meyer argues, “When the financial and resource demands of [beginning a weapons program] become less burdensome, states might opt to proceed . . . under a balance of incentives and disincentives that traditionally might have been perceived as insufficient for a proliferation decision.” 29 Sometimes, nuclear assistance can cause leaders to initiate nuclear weapons programs in the absence of a compelling security threat. This usually happens when scientists and other members of atomic energy commissions convince the political leadership that producing a nuclear weapon is technologically possible and can be done with relatively limited costs. 30 Scientists do not always push leaders down the nuclear path, but in many cases they do. 31 Leaders are persuaded by this lobbying because they are keenly aware that the quicker the bomb can be developed, the less likely other national priorities will suffer. Although nuclear assistance occasionally produces bomb programs in the absence of a security threat, the relationship between such assistance and proliferation is usually more nuanced. Countries that have received considerable assistance are especially likely to initiate bomb programs when threats arise because they have greater demand for the strategic advantages that nuclear weapons offer. 32 In other words, peaceful nuclear assistance typically conditions the effect that a security environment has on a state’s political decision to begin a weapons program. A state that suffers a defeat in war or feels threatened for another reason is unlikely to initiate a program if it lacks a developed civilian nuclear program. Without the technical base in place, it is too costly to venture down the weapons path. This explains, in part, why Saudi Arabia has yet to begin a nuclear weapons program even though it faces considerable security threats. 33 Likewise, countries are unlikely to nuclearize—even if they have accumulated significant amounts of assistance—if they do not face security threats. On the other hand, initiation of a weapons program is more likely in states that operate in dangerous security environments and possess peaceful nuclear facilities and a cadre of trained scientists and technicians. There are also strong theoretical reasons to suggest the existence of a relationship between civilian nuclear cooperation and the acquisition of nuclear weapons. Given the links described above, civilian nuclear energy cooperation can aid nuclear weapons production by providing the technology and items necessary to produce fissile material. 34 This is noteworthy because fissile material production is the most difficult step in building the bomb. 35 Cooperation also establishes a technical knowledge base that permits advances in nuclear explosives and related fields, ultimately facilitating bomb production. Occasionally, technical capacity alone causes states to produce the bomb. But just as all states receiving nuclear aid do not begin weapons programs, every country that acquires assistance does not assemble bombs. Security threats, which pro- vide the political motivation to build the bomb, coupled with atomic aid are a recipe for the acquisition of nuclear weapons. Four hypotheses ºow from this logic: Hypothesis 1: Countries receiving peaceful nuclear assistance are more likely to begin nuclear weapons programs. Hypothesis 2: Countries receiving peaceful nuclear assistance are more likely to begin nuclear weapons programs when a security threat arises. Hypothesis 3: Countries receiving peaceful nuclear assistance are more likely to acquire nuclear weapons. Hypothesis 4: Countries facing security threats and receiving peaceful nuclear assistance are more likely to acquire weapons. Below I apply these hypotheses to several cases to show how peaceful nuclear cooperation can lead to proliferation.

#### Prolif causes extinction from arms races and miscalculations

Utgoff '2 (Deputy Director of the Strategy Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses, Victor, “Proliferation, Missile Defence, and American Ambitions,” Survival, Volume 44, Number 2, Summer)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the, late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

### Econ Adv

#### Federal incentives hurt growth—trade off with more efficient industries and discourage innovation

Zycher ’12 Benjamin Zycher, president of Benjamin Zycher Economics Associates Inc., a senior fellow at the Pacific Research Institute, and an adjunct professor of Economics and Business at the Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics, California State University, Channel Islands, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, served as a senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers from July 1981 to July 1983, “Renewable Energy Subsidies Should Be Abandoned,” Statement before the Senate Finance Committee Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure, 3/27/2012, http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Zycher%20Senate%20Finance%20renewables%20incentives%20testimony%203-27-12.pdf

The depletion or sustainability criticism of conventional technologies is incorrect simply as a matter of basic economics, and is inconsistent with the historical evidence in any event. Finally, the premise that expansion of renewable power will yield an increase in “green employment” confuses benefits for a particular group with costs imposed upon the economy as a whole, and fails to distinguish between employment growth in the aggregate and employment shifts among economic sectors. Moreover, the actual employment effect of expanded renewables subsidies is likely to be negative because of the inverse aggregate relationship between electricity costs and employment, because of the adverse employment effects of the taxes needed to finance the subsidies, and because of the adverse employment effects of an economy smaller than otherwise would be the case. In short: The purported economic and social benefits of policy support for renewables are illusory. The market difficulties faced by renewables are likely to be exacerbated by ongoing supply and price developments in the market for natural gas, which will weaken further the competitive position of renewable power generation. At the same time, subsidies and mandates for renewables impose nontrivial costs upon the taxpayers and upon consumers in electricity markets. The upshot is the imposition of substantial net burdens upon the U.S. economy as a whole even as the policies bestow important benefits upon particular groups and industries, thus yielding enhanced incentives for innumerable interests to seek favors from government. As is the case in most contexts, the resource uses emerging from market competition, even as constrained and distorted by tax and regulatory policies, are the best guides for the achievement of resource allocation that is most productive. As federal policymakers address the ongoing issues and problems afflicting renewable electricity generation, the realities of this recent history provide a useful guide for policy reform. One such reform should be the abandonment of tax subsidies and other policy support for renewable energy.

#### Economic benefits are compartmentalized—green incentives hurt the economy overall

Zycher ’12 Benjamin Zycher, president of Benjamin Zycher Economics Associates Inc., a senior fellow at the Pacific Research Institute, and an adjunct professor of Economics and Business at the Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics, California State University, Channel Islands, associate in the Intelligence Community Associates Program of the Office of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, U.S. Department of State, served as a senior staff economist for the President's Council of Economic Advisers from July 1981 to July 1983, “Renewable Energy Subsidies Should Be Abandoned,” Statement before the Senate Finance Committee Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure, 3/27/2012, http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Zycher%20Senate%20Finance%20renewables%20incentives%20testimony%203-27-12.pdf

A common argument in support of expanded renewable power posits that policies in support of that goal will yield important benefits in the form of complementary employment growth in renewables sectors, and stronger demand in the labor market in the aggregate. Both of those premises are almost certainly incorrect. The employment in renewables sectors created by renewables policies actually would be an economic cost rather than a benefit for the economy as a whole. Suppose that policy support for renewables (or for any other sector) had the effect of increasing the demand for high-quality steel. That clearly would be a benefit for steel producers, or more broadly, for owners of inputs in steel production, including steel workers. But for the economy as a whole, the need for additional high-quality steel in an expanding renewable power sector would be an economic cost, as that steel (or the resources used to produce it) would not be available for use in other sectors. Similarly, the creation of “green jobs” as a side effect of renewables policies is a benefit for the workers hired (or for those whose wages rise with increased market competition for their services). But for the economy as whole, that use of scarce labor is a cost because those workers no longer would be available for productive activity elsewhere.27

#### 200,000 jobs added last month and stocks are at multi-year highs from fed stimulus – econ’s fine

#### No risk or impact to economic decline

Drezner ‘11 Daniel W. Drezner, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, “Please come down off the ledge, dear readers,” Foreign Policy, 8/12/11, http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/08/12/please\_come\_down\_off\_the\_ledge\_dear\_readers

So, when we last left off this debate, things were looking grim. My concern in the last post was that the persistence of hard times would cause governments to take actions that would lead to a collapse of the open global economy, a spike in general riots and disturbances, and eerie echoes of the Great Depression. Let's assume that the global economy persists in sputtering for a while, because that's what happens after major financial shocks. Why won't these other bad things happen? Why isn't it 1931? Let's start with the obvious -- it's not gonna be 1931 because there's some passing familiarity with how 1931 played out. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has devoted much of his academic career to studying the Great Depression. I'm gonna go out on a limb therefore and assert that if the world plunges into a another severe downturn, it's not gonna be because central bank heads replay the same set of mistakes. The legacy of the Great Depression has also affected public attitudes and institutions that provide much stronger cement for the current system. In terms of [public] attitudes, compare the results of this mid-2007 poll with this mid-2010 poll about which economic system is best. I'll just reproduce the key charts below: The headline of the 2010 results is that there's eroding U.S. support for the global economy, but a few other things stand out. U.S. support has declined, but it's declined from a very high level. In contrast, support for free markets has increased in other major powers, such as Germany and China. On the whole, despite the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression, public attitudes have not changed all that much. While there might be populist demands to "do something," that something is not a return to autarky or anything so [drastic]. Another big difference is that multilateral economic institutions are much more robust now than they were in 1931. On trade matters, even if the Doha round is dead, the rest of the World Trade Organization's corpus of trade-liberalizing measures are still working quite well. Even beyond the WTO, the complaint about trade is not the deficit of free-trade agreements but the surfeit of them. The IMF's resources have been strengthened as a result of the 2008 financial crisis. The Basle Committee on Banking Supervision has already promulgated a plan to strengthen capital requirements for banks. True, it's a slow, weak-assed plan, but it would be an improvement over the status quo. As for the G-20, I've been pretty skeptical about that group's abilities to collectively address serious macroeconomic problems. That is setting the bar rather high, however. One could argue that the G-20's most useful function is reassurance. Even if there are disagreements, communication can prevent them from growing into anything worse. Finally, a note about the possibility of riots and other general social unrest. The working paper cited in my previous post noted the links between austerity measures and increases in disturbances. However, that paper contains the following important paragraph on page 19: [I]n countries with better institutions, the responsiveness of unrest to budget cuts is generally lower. Where constraints on the executive are minimal, the coefficient on expenditure changes is strongly negative -- more spending buys a lot of social peace. In countries with Polity-2 scores above zero, the coefficient is about half in size, and less significant. As we limit the sample to ever more democratic countries, the size of the coefficient declines. For full democracies with a complete range of civil rights, the coefficient is still negative, but no longer significant. This is good news!! The world has a hell of a lot more democratic governments now than it did in 1931. What happened in London, in other words, might prove to be the exception more than the rule. So yes, the recent economic news might seem grim. Unless political institutions and public attitudes buckle, however, we're unlikely to repeat the mistakes of the 1930's. And, based on the data we've got, that's not going to happen.

### Warming Adv

#### Nuclear power is worse for climate change. It emits as much CO2 as nat-gas, plus ionizing radiation. Increased nuclear power trades off with carbon free renewables

Mez September 2012—Lutz Mez [Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universitat Berlin] “Nuclear energy–Any solution for sustainability and climate protection” Energy Policy 48 (2012) 56–63

The sector of electrical power production accounts for about 27 percent of global anthropogenic CO2 emissions and constitutes by far the biggest and fastest growing source of greenhouse gas emissions. That is why supposedly CO2-free nuclear power plants have frequently been praised as a panacea against climate change. As an argument in favor of civil use of nuclear energy, advocates such as RWE manager Fritz Vahrenholt are fond of pointing out that the operation of nuclear power plant does not cause any CO2 emissions (Vahrenholt in ‘‘Welt online’’, 23 September 2010). And, underscoring the advantages of German nuclear power plants, he added: ‘‘if their output was replaced by power plants using fossil fuels, this would cause additional emissions of 120,000,000 t of CO2 per year.’’ Here Vahrenholt assumed that total nuclear power would be replaced by lignite coal plants. But a turnaround in energy policy would make greater use of renewable energy and decentralized gas- ﬁred combined heat and power plants which do not cause any more CO2 emissions than nuclear power plants (Fritsche et al., 2007). On top of this, viewed from a systemic perspective, nuclear power plants are by no means free of CO2 emissions. Already today, they produce up to 1/3 as much greenhouse gases as large modern gas power plants. CO2 emissions of nuclear energy in connection with its production—depending on where the raw material uranium is mined and enriched—amounts to between 7 and 126 g CO2equ 1 per kilowatt hour (GEMIS 4.7). O ¨ ko-Institut has estimated a speciﬁc emission of 28 g CO2equ per kilowatt hour for a typical nuclear power plant in Germany—including emis- sions caused by the construction of the plant—with enriched uranium from different supplier countries. An initial estimate of global CO2 emissions through the production of nuclear power for 2010 has produced an amount of more than 117,000,000 t CO2equ (see Table 4)—this is roughly as much as the entire CO2 emissions produced by Greece this year. And this data does not even include the emissions caused by storage of nuclear waste. Storm van Leeuwen & Smith calculated the ratio of CO2 emissions from nuclear energy and from a gas ﬁred plant of the same net (electrical) capacity. Electricity generated from atomic energy emits 90–140 g CO2 per kWh. The range is due to the different grade of ores used. Only if the uranium consumed by the nuclear energy system has been extracted from rich ores, does nuclear generation emit less CO2 than gas based generation, giving the impression that the application of nuclear energy would solve the global warming problem. However, uranium is a limited resource; it is estimated to last for 50 to 70 years with current generation technology and demand. And when rich ores become exhausted this ratio increases until it ﬁnally becomes larger than one, making the use of nuclear energy unfavorable compared to simply burning the (remaining) fossil fuels directly. In the coming decades, indirect CO2 emissions from nuclear power plants will moreover increase considerably because more fossil energy will have to be used to mine uranium. In view of this trend, nuclear power plants will no longer have any advantage over modern gas-ﬁred power plants, let alone in comparison to the advantages offered by increased energy efﬁciency or greater use of renewable energies, especially when the latter are used in cogeneration plants. ‘‘In the long term the use of nuclear energy provides us with no solution to the problem’’ (Storm van Leeuwen 2007). And Robert Rosner (2009), Director of Argonne National Laboratory, added: ‘‘Nuclear power is unlikely to play a critical role in limiting CO2 equivalent concentrations in the atmosphere (y) No realistic plan foresees a reactor build rate that allows nuclear power to stay below 550 ppme2 CO2 within the next 30–40 years.’’ Nuclear power plants also contribute to climate change by emitting radioactive isotopes such as tritium or carbon 14. And the radioactive noble gas krypton 85, a product of nuclear ﬁssion, ionizes the air more than any other radioactive substance. Krypton 85 is produced in nuclear power plants and is released on a massive scale in reprocessing. The concentration of krypton 85 in the earth’s atmosphere has soared over the last few years as a result of nuclear ﬁssion, reaching record levels. Even though krypton 85 may have an impact on the climate (Kollert & Donderer 1994), these emissions have not received any attention in international climate-protection negotiations to this very day. As for the assertion that nuclear power is needed to promote climate protection, exactly the opposite would appear to be the case: nuclear power plants must be closed down quickly in order to exert pressure on operators and the power plant industry to redouble efforts at innovation in the development of sustainable and socially compatible energy technologies—especially the use of smart energy services.

#### Nuclear doesn’t solve warming—waste heat is more important than CO2

ScienceDaily (July 13, 2009) “Trapping Carbon Dioxide Or Switching To Nuclear Power Not Enough To Solve Global Warming Problem, Experts Say” <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/07/090713085248.htm>

Bo Nordell and Bruno Gervet of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Luleå University of Technology in Sweden have calculated the total energy emissions from the start of the industrial revolution in the 1880s to the modern day. They have worked out that using the increase in average global air temperature as a measure of global warming is an inadequate measure of climate change. They suggest that scientists must also take into account the total energy of the ground, ice masses and the seas if they are to model climate change accurately. The researchers have calculated that the heat energy accumulated in the atmosphere corresponds to a mere 6.6% of global warming, while the remaining heat is stored in the ground (31.5%), melting ice (33.4%) and sea water (28.5%). They point out that net heat emissions between the industrial revolution circa 1880 and the modern era at 2000 correspond to almost three quarters of the accumulated heat, i.e., global warming, during that period. Their calculations suggest that most measures to combat global warming, such as reducing our reliance on burning fossil fuels and switching to renewables like wind power and solar energy, will ultimately help in preventing catastrophic climate change in the long term. But the same calculations also show that trapping carbon dioxide, so-called carbon dioxide sequestration, and storing it deep underground or on the sea floor will have very little effect on global warming. "Since net heat emissions accounts for most of the global warming there is no or little reason for carbon dioxide sequestration," Nordell explains, "The increasing carbon dioxide emissions merely show how most net heat is produced. The "missing" heat, 26%, is due to the greenhouse effect, natural variations in climate and/or an underestimation of net heat emissions, the researchers say. These calculations are actually rather conservative, the researchers say, and the missing heat may be much less. The researchers also point out a flaw in the nuclear energy argument. Although nuclear power does not produce carbon dioxide emissions in the same way as burning fossil fuels it does produce heat emissions equivalent to three times the energy of the electricity it generates and so contributes to global warming significantly, Nordell adds.

#### Expanded international agreements are key but every major party faces massive political roadblocks to increased involvement

Schreurs ’12 Miranda A. Schreurs, Director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Free University of Berlin, “Breaking the impasse in the international climate negotiations: The potential of green technologies,” Energy Policy 48, September 2012, pp. 5-12, Elsevier

The Durban outcome has kept the international negotiation process alive, but does not reﬂect the urgency of the problem at hand. That no post-Kyoto agreement is expected to enter into force until 2020 and the content of the agreement still needs to be developed also raises the question of whether the international community will be able to put a break on rising greenhouse gas emissions, let alone reduce them on the order that will be necessary to stay within the 1.5 to 2.0 degree Centrigrade temperature goal. The general scientiﬁc consensus is that if the rise in greenhouse gases is not halted by 2020 and then reduced on the order of 50% below 1990 levels by 2050, then it will be next to impossible to maintain the rise in greenhouse gases to within the 2 degrees Centigrade range. One very major challenge to the future agreement is the domestic political situation in the United States, which makes passage of national climate legislation, let alone ratiﬁcation of a global climate agreement highly unlikely in the near future. Already in Cancun, Japan made it clear that it opposes a second phase for the Kyoto Protocol. Yoshito Sengoku, Japan’s Chief Cabinet Secretary, announced that Japan would ‘‘sternly oppose debate for extending the Kyoto Protocol into a second phase which is unfair and ineffective.’’ (United Press International (UPI), 2010; MOFA, 2010). With its rapidly rising greenhouse gas emissions tied to the extraction of oil from tar sands in Alberta, Canada has pulled out of the agreement. Also problematic is the resistance of many developing countries to the establishment of binding emission reduction targets and timetables. India strongly pushed the perspective of per capita equity arguing that it should not be held captive by a problem largely caused by other countries. With its low per capita greenhouse gas emission levels as a result of high levels of poverty, India will be reluctant to accept commitments that could affect its economic growth perspectives.

#### Entrenched political forces prevent broad climate reform in the US

Schreurs ’12 Miranda A. Schreurs, Director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Free University of Berlin, “Breaking the impasse in the international climate negotiations: The potential of green technologies,” Energy Policy 48, September 2012, pp. 5-12, Elsevier

The Obama administration’s efforts were directed at framing climate change as a serious threat and linking policy action to the development of a cleaner, greener energy infrastructure that would make the U.S. more energy independent and sustainable. Green energy policy change has been portrayed by the Obama White House as an economic opportunity, and a possible way out of the ﬁnancial crisis ailing the country in terms of creating new jobs and securing the states’ economies. Still, Obama’s efforts to win over climate skeptics has proven difﬁcult, and conservative forces continue to challenge his environmental agenda. Politicians from states with large coal, oil, manufacturing, and/or agricultural industries, regardless of party afﬁliation, have been inclined to vote against climate legislation because they see it as a threat to their state’s economy and jobs. They have even taken steps to curb the federal government’s ability to conduct climate change programs.

#### No anthropogenic consensus

Christopher Walter, former policy advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, "Consensus? What Consensus?" Science and Public Policy Institute, July 2007, accessed 1/8/10 http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/consensus.pdf

There is indeed a consensus that humankind is putting large quantities of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere; that some warming has resulted; and that some further warming can be expected. However, there is less of a consensus about whether most of the past half-century’s warming is anthropogenic, which is why, rightly, Oreskes is cautious enough to circumscribe her definition of the “consensus” about the anthropogenic contribution to warming over the past half-century with the qualifying adjective “likely”. There is no scientific consensus on how much the world has warmed or will warm; how much of the warming is natural; how much impact greenhouse gases have had or will have on temperature; how sea level, storms, droughts, floods, flora, and fauna will respond to warmer temperature; what mitigative steps – if any – we should take; whether (if at all) such steps would have sufficient (or any) climatic effect; or even whether we should take any steps at all. Campaigners for climate alarm state or imply that there is a scientific consensus on all of these things, when in fact there is none. They imply that Oreskes’ essay proves the consensus on all of these things. Al Gore, for instance, devoted a long segment of his film *An Inconvenient Truth* to predicting the imminent meltdown of the Greenland and West Antarctic ice-sheets, with a consequent global increase of 20 feet (6 m) in sea level that would flood Manhattan, Shanghai, Bangladesh, and other coastal settlements. He quoted Oreskes’ essay as proving that all credible climate scientists were agreed on the supposed threat from climate change. He did not point out, however, that Oreskes’ definition of the “consensus” on climate change did not encompass, still less justify, his alarmist notions. Let us take just one example. The UN’s latest report on climate change, which is claimed as representing and summarizing the state of the scientific “consensus” insofar as there is one, says that the total contribution of ice-melt from Greenland and Antarctica to the rise in sea level over the whole of the coming century will not be the 20 feet luridly illustrated by Al Gore in his movie, but just 2 inches. Gore’s film does not represent the “consensus” at all. Indeed, he exaggerates the supposed effects of ice-melt by some 12,000 per cent. The UN, on the other hand, estimates the probability that humankind has had any influence on sea level at little better than 50:50. The BBC, of course, has not headlined, or even reported, the UN’s “counterconsensual” findings. Every time the BBC mentions “climate change”, it shows the same tired footage of a glacier calving into the sea – which is what glaciers do every summer.

#### Warming impacts overstated—new data

Taylor ’11 James Taylor, senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism,” Forbes, 7/27/2011, http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-reviewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict. When objective NASA satellite data, reported in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, show a “huge discrepancy” between alarmist climate models and real-world facts, climate scientists, the media and our elected officials would be wise to take notice. Whether or not they do so will tell us a great deal about how honest the purveyors of global warming alarmism truly are.

### Solvency

#### Nuclear is shockingly expensive, has no economies of scale, and cannot become cost competitive with other technologies

Mez September 20**12**—Lutz Mez [Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universitat Berlin] “Nuclear energy–Any solution for sustainability and climate protection” Energy Policy 48 (2012) 56–63

In contrast to other energy technologies, there are no positive economies of scale in the construction of nuclear power plants. On the contrary, speciﬁc investment costs have become ever more expensive. Moreover, plants have had considerable cost overruns— and not only in the USA. In the early phase from 1966 to 1967, estimated overnight costs were $ 560/kW, but actual overnight costs turned out to be $ 1,170/kilowatt, i.e. 209 percent more. In the years from 1974 to 1975, estimated overnight costs of $ 1,156/kilowatt were assumed, but actual overnight costs turned out to be $ 4,410/ kilowatt—i.e. 381 percent more (Gielecki & Hewlett 1994). On top of this, current data on construction costs are only available in Western Europe and North America. The costs of construction projects in China, India and Russia are either not available or not comparable. Because construction costs for power plants have risen con- siderably over the last few years, especially due to the major expansion in conventional coal-ﬁred power plants in China and India, speciﬁc construction costs for nuclear power plant projects have risen many times over. The nuclear power industry esti- mated construction costs at $ 1,000/kilowatt for new generation IIIþ nuclear power plants by 2002. However, this cost level has turned out to be completely unrealistic. The contractual price for the European Pressurized Reactor ordered from AREVA NP in 2004 for the Finnish site in Olkiluoto was already h 2,000/kW—at the time this was $ 3,000/kW. ‘‘The project is four years behind schedule and at least 90 percent over budget, reaching a total cost estimate of h 5.7 billion ($ 8.3 billion) or close to h 3,500 ($ 5,000) per kilowatt’’ (Schneider, Froggatt, Thomas 2011: 8). As a result of this trend, estimates in the USA for 2007/2008 have soared to $ 5,000/kW: Asked about challenges facing construction of new nuclear and coal power plants, the US Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Chairman, Jon Wellinghoff, allowed that ‘‘we may not need any, ever. That’s a ‘theoretical question’ because I don’t see anybody building these things until costs get to a reasonable level’’ (Platts 22 April 2009). He characterized the projected costs of new nuclear plants as prohibitive, citing estimates of roughly $ 7,000/kW. These estimates were conﬁrmed in 2009 as well by the detailed offers tendered for the construc- tion of a nuclear power plant in Ontario, the Ontario Nuclear Procurement Project: between $ 6,700/kW and $ 10,000/kW, which of course killed the project—especially as it did not even take into account the fact that cost estimates in the past were always below actual construction costs. The estimates of power plant capital and operating cost, updated by the U.S. Energy Information Administration in November 2010, are shown in table 3: In comparison nuclear power plants, even with the low estimate of overnight costs of 5,335 $/kW, are more expensive than traditional fossil ﬁred power stations. Onshore wind, solar PV and hydro have much lower ﬁxed operating & maintaining costs and zero variable costs. The leading rating agencies Standard & Poor’s and Moody’s also voiced misgivings over the last few years regarding the economic viability of new nuclear power plants: the leading credit-rating company, Standard & Poor’s, warned as far back as 2007: ‘‘In the past, engineering, procurement, and construction contracts were easy to secure. However, with increasing raw material costs, a depleted nuclear-specialist workforce, and strong demand for capital projects worldwide, construction costs are increasing rapidly’’( Schneider 2008). Moody’s also revealed its skepticism in an analysis of possible new construction projects in the USA: ‘‘Moody’s does not believe the sector will bring more than one or two new nuclear plants online by 2015.’’ (ibid.) It based its assessment on the year 2015 because this is the date which most companies trumpeting their nuclear ambitions at present use. Moody’s afﬁrmed that many of the current expecta- tions for nuclear power were ‘‘overly ambitious.’’ It had more bad news for the industry when its June Global Credit Research paper concluded that ‘‘the cost and complexity of building a new nuclear power plant could weaken the credit metrics of an electric utility and potentially pressure its credit ratings several years into the project.’’(ibid.) Even the Nuclear Energy Institute (2008), the nuclear industry’s trade organization, stated in August 2008 that ‘‘there is considerable uncertainty about the capital cost of new nuclear generating capacity.’’(ibid). In conclusion, these would not appear to be very rosy pro- spects for a technology which was developed in the 1950s and 1960s and which could have scarcely survived down to the present without massive government subsidies in Western and democratic industrialized countries.

## 2NC

### Econ Adv

#### empirical patterns prove no correlation

Miller 2k Morris Miller, "Poverty as a cause of wars?" Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25 Issue 4, Winter 2000, proquest

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

### Prolif DA

#### Fuel supply controls won’t work

Acton 2009 -- James M. Acton [Ph.D in theoretical physics at Cambridge University, senior associate in the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment] “The myth of proliferation-resistant Technology” BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, VOL. 65, NO. 6, NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2009 EBSCO

Enrichment and economics. Advocates of GNEP have recently broadened the concept of proliferation re- sistance to include more than just techni- cal approaches meant to complicate the diversion and misuse of nuclear material. The context for their argument is the vi- sion that a small number of “fuel supplier” nations could provide comprehensive fuel services (e.g., the provision of fresh fuel and the removal of spent fuel) to all the others. In the original vision of GNEP, one of several proposed fuel-supply arrange- ments, only states that already had enrich- ment and reprocessing technologies would be eligible to become suppliers and other “consumer nations” were not to enrich or reprocess, although this requirement was later dropped when no state agreed to it. Against this background, the Energy Department has argued that despite the potential ineffectiveness of intrinsic proliferation-resis- tant measures, the closed fuel cycle has positive externalities—ben- efits that accrue to parties not directly involved in the transaction— that, on balance, could promote nonproliferation. 10 Energy argues that closing the fuel cycle by recycling plutonium and using it as fuel would have the positive externality of reducing the amount of uranium enrichment needed for each unit of electrical energy pro- duced. 11 Slowing the rise in demand for enrichment services—so the argument goes—makes the enrichment business less lucrative and therefore less likely to attract new entrants. One problem with this line of reasoning is that the principal bar- rier to entering the enrichment market—the large research and development costs of building economically viable centrifuges— is probably already high enough to deter anyone looking to make money. Indeed, the two companies planning to enter the global centrifuge business have been able to do so only by shortcutting the R&D process. Areva simply bought the technology off the Ang- lo-Dutch-German consortium Urenco under a “black box” arrange- ment, and the U.S. Enrichment Corporation (formally known as USEC) program is built on the back of an extensive government re- search effort that was cancelled in 1985. Furthermore, the price of enrichment is likely to drop with the retirement of expensive gas- eous diffusion facilities, further increasing the barriers to entry. 1 If demand for enrichment rises, it is likely to be much cheaper for existing suppliers to expand capacity than for new players to enter the market. Thus, there are unlikely to be any major new enrich- ment firms, whether or not reprocessing becomes widespread. The second problem with Energy’s argument is that none of the small-scale enrichment programs that have been the cause of so much recent concern were started with the goal of making money. Some programs, such as those in Pakistan, Iraq (prior to 1991), and purportedly North Korea, were unquestionably set up to produce highly enriched uranium for nuclear weapons. Iran’s enrichment pro- gram appears, at the very least, to be a nuclear weapons hedging op- tion. A nuclear weapons option also drove Brazil’s program, which has been sustained largely for prestige. It is implausible to suggest that reducing the global demand for enrichment services by closing the fuel cycle would have altered any of these states’ decisions.

### Capitalism K

#### Evaluate the debate as a dialectical materialist—human progress is determined by economic conditions

Tumino ‘1 Stephen Tumino, professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before,” Red Critique, Spring 2001, http://redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory. Finally, it is only Orthodox Marxism that recognizes the inevitability and also the necessity of communism—the necessity, that is, of a society in which "from each according to their ability to each according to their needs" (Marx) is the rule.

#### Total enmity is key—the plan’s reformism kills revolutionary politics by giving capitalism a progressive face

Katz 2k Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.” Pg. 127-128.

Virno does recognize the danger that a politics predicated upon Exodus, by downgrading the “absolute enmity” implicit in the traditional Marxist assumption that class struggle in its revolutionary form issues in civil war, leads to the assumption that one is “swimming with the current” or is be­ing driven “irresistibly forward” (1996, 203). A politics aimed at the estab­lishment of liberated zones within capitalism under the assumption that the state will wither away without actually being “smashed” leads to the problematic one sees over and over again in postmodern cultural studies: “doing what comes naturally” as radical praxis. To counter this, Virno re­defines the “unlimitedly reactive” “enmity” of the “Multitude” in terms of the “right to resistance” (206): What deserve to be defended at all costs are the works of “friendship.” Vio­lence is not geared to visions of some hypothetical tomorrow, but functions to ensure respect and a continued existence for things that were mapped out yesterday. It does not innovate, but acts to prolong things that are already there: the autonomous expressions of “acting-in-concert” that arise out of general intellect, organisms of non-representative democracy, forms of mu­tual protection and assistance (welfare, in short) that have emerged outside of and against the realm of State Administration. In other words, what we have here is a violence that is conservational (206). The decisiveness of the question of absolute enmity becomes clear if we ask a rather obvious question: What distinguishes autonomous expres­sions from any privatized space (say, Internet chat rooms) that withdraws from the common in the name of friendships, mutual aid, or, for that mat­ter, networks, gated communities, or whatever? In short, nothing can lead more directly to the death of revolutionary politics than the assumption that the days of absolute enmity are over. Autonomous expressions neces­sarily lead to the esoteric and the singular as the paths of least resistance. Therefore (as in all Left-Nietzscheanisms), they take as their main enemy the programmatic and the decidable, transforming liberation into a pri­vate, simulacral affair, regardless of their denunciations of capitalism. I will return to this issue in the next two chapters, but I want to conclude this discussion by stressing that only theory and action that establish spaces that bring the common out into the open—before an outside (theory and judgment) so as to make visible the concentrated political-economic force of the ruling class—can count as a genuinely “new” politics.

#### Vacillation is a nuclear war DA to the perm

Herod ‘4 James Herod, World-Renowned Anarchist. Fourth Edition, January 2004. “Getting Free: A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it.” http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/index.htm

#### Infinitely regressive and still links – accepting capitalism some of the time is exactly the kind of heterodox method that dooms the left

Tumino ‘1 Stephen Tumino, professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh, "What is Orthodox Marxism and why it matters now more than ever," Red Critique, Spring 2001, accessed 1/3/10 http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

#### Any acceptance of the free market is the death knell for environmental politics—tech-fixes are inseparable from a system which incentivizes environmental destruction and resource imperialism

Clark and York ‘8 Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University, and Richard York, coeditor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, “Rifts and Shifts: Getting to the Root of Environmental Crises,” Monthly Review, Vol. 60, Issue 06, November 2008

Humans depend on functioning ecosystems to sustain themselves, and their actions affect those same ecosystems. As a result, there is a necessary “metabolic interaction” between humans and the earth, which influences both natural and social history. Increasingly, the state of nature is being defined by the operations of the capitalist system, as anthropogenic forces are altering the global environment on a scale that is unprecedented. The global climate is rapidly changing due to the burning of fossil fuels and deforestation. No area of the world’s ocean is unaffected by human influence, as the accumulation of carbon, fertilizer runoff, and overfishing undermine biodiversity and the natural services that it provides. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment documents how over two-thirds of the world’s ecosystems are overexploited and polluted. Environmental problems are increasingly interrelated. James Hansen, the leading climatologist in the United States, warns that we are dangerously close to pushing the planet past its tipping point, setting off cascading environmental problems that will radically alter the conditions of nature.1 Although the ecological crisis has captured public attention, the dominant economic forces are attempting to seize the moment by assuring us that capital, technology, and the market can be employed so as to ward off any threats without a major transformation of society. For example, numerous technological solutions are proposed to remedy global climate change, including agrofuels, nuclear energy, and new coal plants that will capture and sequester carbon underground. The ecological crisis is thus presented as a technical problem that can be fixed within the current system, through better ingenuity, technological innovation, and the magic of the market. In this view, the economy will be increasingly dematerialized, reducing demands placed on nature.2 The market will ensure that new avenues of capital accumulation are created in the very process of dealing with environmental challenges. Yet, this line of thought ignores the root causes of the ecological crisis. The social metabolic order of capitalism is inherently anti-ecological, since it systematically subordinates nature in its pursuit of endless accumulation and production on ever larger scales. Technical fixes to socio-ecological problems typically have unintended consequences and fail to address the root of the problems: the political-economic order. Rather than acknowledging metabolic rifts, natural limits, and/or ecological contradictions, capital seeks to play a shell game with the environmental problems it generates, moving them around rather than addressing the root causes. One obvious way capital shifts around ecological problems is through simple geographic displacement—once resources are depleted in one region, capitalists search far and wide to seize control of resources in other parts of the world, whether by military force or markets. One of the drivers of colonialism was clearly the demand for more natural resources in rapidly industrializing European nations. However, expanding the area under the control of global capitalism is only one of the ways in which capitalists shift ecological problems around. There is a qualitative dimension as well, whereby one environmental crisis is “solved” (typically only in the short term) by changing the type of production process and generating a different crisis, such as how the shift from the use of wood to plastic in the manufacturing of many consumer goods replaced the problems associated with wood extraction with those associated with plastics production and disposal. Thus, one problem is transformed into another—a shift in the type of rift. We illustrate these issues here by focusing on the soil crisis Marx identified in his time, which continues to the present, and our contemporary energy and climate crisis.

#### Nuclear power is a capitalist shell game to trick massive subsidies out of the government and sustain imperial domination

ICC ’11 “Nuclear energy, capitalism and communism,” International Communist Current, 8/16/2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear

The potential to use nuclear fission or fusion to produce power has been known about for around a century but it was only after the Second World War that it was actually realised. Thus, while its general context is that outlined above, the specific context is the post-war situation dominated by the rivalry between the USA and USSR and the nuclear arms race that resulted. The development of nuclear power is thus not only inextricably linked to that of nuclear weapons but was arguably a smokescreen for the latter. In the early 1950s the American government was concerned about the public’s response to the danger of the nuclear arsenal it was assembling and the strategy of first strike that was being propounded. It’s response was to organise a campaign known as Operation Candor to win the public over through adverts across the media (including comic books) and a series of speeches by President Eisenhower that culminated in the announcement at the UN General Assembly of the ‘Atoms for Peace’ programme to “encourage world-wide investigation into the most effective peacetime uses of fissionable materials.”[19] The plan included sharing information and resources, and the US and USSR jointly creating an international stockpile of fissionable material. In the years that followed the arms race went on unabated and nuclear weapons spread to other powers, often under the guise of a civilian nuclear power programme, as in Israel and India. The initial reactors produced large quantities of material for nuclear weapons and small amounts of very expensive electricity. The sharing of nuclear knowledge became part of global imperialist struggles; thus in the late 1950s Britain secretly supplied Israel with heavy water for the reactor it was building with French assistance.[20] Despite talk about energy too cheap to meter, nuclear power has never fulfilled this promise and has relied on state support to cover its real cost. Even where private companies build and run plants there are usually large open or hidden subsidies. For example privatisation of the nuclear industry in Britain failed when Thatcher attempted it in the 1980s because private capital identified there were unquantifiable costs and risks. It was only in 1996, when the ageing Magnox reactors that would soon need decommissioning were excluded from the deal that private investors were prepared to buy British Energy at a knockdown price of £2bn. Six years later the company had to be bailed out with a £10bn government loan.[21] While advocates of nuclear energy today argue that it is cheaper than other sources this remains a questionable assertion. In 2005 the World Nuclear Association, stated that “In most industrialized countries today, new nuclear power plants offer the most economical way to generate base-load electricity even without consideration of the geopolitical and environmental advantages that nuclear energy confers” and published a range of data to support the claim that construction, financing, operating and waste and decommissioning costs have all reduced.[22] Between 1973 and 2008 the proportion of energy from nuclear reactors grew from 0.9% of the global total to 5.8%.[23] A report published in 2009, commissioned by the German Federal Government,[24] makes a far more critical evaluation of the economics of nuclear power and questions the idea that there is a nuclear renaissance underway. The report points out that the number of reactors has fallen over the last few years in contrast to the widespread forecasts of increases in both reactors and the power produced. The increase in the amount of power generated that has taken place during this period is the result of upgrading the existing reactors and extending their operational life. It goes on to argue that there is a lot of uncertainty about the reactors currently described as being ‘under construction’, with a number having been in this position for over 20 years. The number under construction has fallen from the peak of over 200 in 1980 to below 50 in 2006. As regards the economics of nuclear power, the report points to the high level of uncertainty in all areas including financing, construction, operation and decommissioning. It shows that the state remains central to all nuclear projects, regardless of who they are formally owned and operated by. One aspect of this is the various forms of subsidy provided by the state to support capital costs, waste management and plant closure and price support. Another has been the necessity for the state to limit the liability of the industry in order for the private sector to accept the risks. Thus in 1957 the US government stepped in when insurance companies refused to agree insurance because they were unable to quantify the risk.[25] Today it is estimated that “In general national limits are in the order of a few hundred million Euro, less than 10% of the cost of building a plant and far less than the cost of the Chernobyl accident.”[26] The dangers of nuclear energy are as fiercely debated as the costs and the scientific evidence seems to be very variable. This is particularly the case with the Chernobyl disaster where the estimates of the deaths that resulted vary widely. A World Health Organisation Report found that 47 the 134 emergency workers initially involved had died as a result of contamination by 2004[27] and estimated that there would be just under 9,000 excess deaths from cancer as a result of the disaster.[28] A report by Russian scientists published in the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences estimated that from the date of the accident until 2006 some 985,000 additional deaths had resulted from the accident from cancer and a range of other diseases.[29] For those without specialist medical and scientific knowledge this is difficult to unravel, but what is less questionable is the massive level of secrecy and falsification that runs from the decision by the British government to withhold publication of the report into one of the first accidents in the industry at Windscale in 1957 to Fukishima today where the true scale of the disaster only emerged slowly. Returning to Chernobyl, the Russian government did not report the accident for several days, leaving the local population to continue living and working amidst the radiation. But it was not only Russia. The French government minimised the radiation levels reaching the country[30] and told its population that the radiation cloud that spread across the whole of Europe had not passed over France![31] Meanwhile the British government reassured the country that there was no risk to health, reporting levels of radiation that were forty times lower than they actually were[32], and then quarantined hundreds of farms. As late as 2007 374 farms in Britain still remained under the special control scheme.[33] Nuclear energy is being pushed by various governments as a ‘green’ solution to the problems associated with fossil fuels. This is largely a smokescreen to hide the real motives, which are concerns about the possible exhaustion of oil, the increasing price of oil and the risks associated with a dependence on energy resources outside the state’s control. This green facade is slipping as the economic crisis leads states to return to coal[34] and to push down the costs of exploiting new sources of oil, much of which is physically hard to access, or requires processes that pollute and despoil the environment, such as coal-tar sands. Energy supplies have also been a factor in the imperialist struggles over recent years and it seems likely that this may increase in the period ahead. Nuclear energy then comes back to where it started as a source of fissile material and a cover for weapons programmes.

This anti-ideological description is, of course, patently false: the very notion of capitalism as a neutral social mechanism is ideology (even utopian ideology) at its purest. The moment of truth in this description is nonetheless that, as Alain Badiou has put it, capitalism is effectively not a civilization of its own, with a specific way of rendering life meaningful. Capitalism is the first socio-economic order which de-totalizes meaning: it is not global at the level of meaning (there is no global "capitalist world view:' no "capitalist civilization" proper; the fundamental lesson of globalization is precisely that capitalism can accommodate itself to all civilizations, from Christian to Hindu and Buddhist). Capitalism's global dimension can be formulated only at the level of truth-without-meaning, as the "Real" of the global market mechanism. The problem here is not, as Sorman claims, that reality is always imperfect, and that people always need to entertain dreams of impossible perfection. The problem is one of meaning, and it is here that religion is now reinventing its role, rediscovering its mission of guaranteeing a meaningful life to those who participate in the meaningless functioning of the capitalist machine. This is why Sorman's description of the fundamental difficulty of capitalist ideology is so misplaced: From the intellectual and political standpoint, the great difficulty in administering a capitalist system is that it does not give rise to dreams: no one descends to the street to manifest in its favor. It is an economy which changed completely the human condition, which has saved humanity from misery, but no one is ready to convert himself into a martyr of this system. We should learn to deal with this paradox of a system which nobody wants, and which nobody wants because it doesn't give rise to love, which is not enchanting, not a seducer. This description is, again, patently untrue: if there was ever a system which enchanted its subjects with dreams (of freedom, of how your success depends on yourself, of the run of luck which is just around the corner, of unconstrained pleasures . . . ) , then it is capitalism. The true problem lies elsewhere: namely; how to keep people's faith in capitalism alive when the inexorable reality of a crisis has brutally crushed such dreams? Here enters the need for a "mature" realistic pragmatism: one should heroically resist dreams of perfection and happiness and accept bitter capitalist reality as the best (or the least bad) of all possible worlds. A compromise is necessary here, a combination of fighting illusory utopian expectations and giving people enough security to accept the system. Sorman is thus no market-liberal fundamentalist or extremist; he proudly mentions that some orthodox followers of Milton Friedman accused him of being a communist because of his ( moderate) support of the welfare state: There is no contradiction between State and economic liberalism; on the contrary, there is a complex alliance between the two. I think that the liberal society needs a welfare state, first, with regard to intellectual legitimacy-people will accept the capitalist adventure if there is an indispensable minimum of social security. Above this, on a more mechanic level, if one wants the destructive creativity of capitalism to function, one has to administer it. Rarely was the function of ideology described in clearer terms-to defend the existing system against any serious critique, legitimizing it as a direct expression of human nature: An essential task of democratic governments and opinion makers when confronting economic cycles and political pressure is to secure and protect the system that has served humanity so well, and not to change it for the worse on the pretext of its imperfection . . . . Still, this lesson is doubtless one of the hardest to translate into language that public opinion will accept. The best of all possible economic systems is indeed imperfect. Whatever the truths uncovered by economic science, the free market is finally only the reflection of human nature, itself hardly perfectible.

#### Encouring efficiency only postpones crisis by inducing temporary, unstable fixes to structural economic problems—this just buys time for more exploitation

Wolff ’11 Richard D. Wolff, Professor of Economics Emeritus, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and currently a Visiting Professor in the Graduate Program in International Affairs of the New School University in New York, “The Keynesian Revival: A Marxian Critique,” Alternate Routes, Vol 22 (2011), http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14420

In the modern history of capitalism, Keynesian counter-recessionary policies (broadly defined) have failed in two major ways. First, those policies have not consistently succeeded as means to end capitalism’s cyclical downturns. They failed, for example, to extract the US from the Great Depression of the 1930s. As this is written, their effectiveness in today’s global capitalist crisis is questionable. Second, the promise that has almost always accompanied each application of Keynesian policies everywhere—that it would also prevent future economic downturns—has never yet been kept. The Keynesian policies have included varying mixtures of monetary (easing) and fiscal (expansionary) policies and market regulations (especially in finance). They have sometimes included controls on capital flows as well as subsidies, bailouts, and outright nationalizations of private enterprises. Different combinations of these components characterize Keynesian policies in different countries and at different historical moments. The chief means that actually ended capitalism’s downturns have been declines in the following: productive laborers’ real wages, finished product inventories, means of production prices, and the associated costs of securing profits (managers and other non-productive workers’ wages and operating budgets, taxes, access to credit, rents, etc.). Once those declines sufficed to reach certain thresholds, capitalists could see profit possibilities and so resumed productive investment. That generated more or less “recovery” via multiplier and accelerator effects particular to each place and time. In short, capitalism is a systematically unstable economic system whose cycles are basic features of its normal functioning. Keynesian policies have never basically altered that systemic instability. Keynesian policies, I propose to argue, have largely provided quite secondary supports to the normal functioning of capitalist cycles. They marginally moderate the cycles’ amplitude and duration. They temporarily impose both costs and constraints on the profit-seeking activities of corporate boards of directors. In these ways, Keynesian policies successfully buy both political space and time for the capitalist cycle to run through its usual downward phase. In the current global capitalist crisis, massive Keynesian deficit spending, as well as credit-market bailouts have generated huge increases in many capitalist countries’ national debts. Lenders eventually balk at further loans to the most over-indebted nations, demanding that they raise taxes and/or cut spending to qualify for more loans. If and when that proves politically impossible for lenders to impose on borrowing nations, multilateral agencies offer less onerous terms for loan assistance but with the same demand for austerity conditions. Those conditions—conveniently imposed by others and not the national government—all serve to drive down wages and other costs of business and so once again set the stage for the usual capitalist cycle.

#### Efficiency measures accelerate rising consumption—Jevons’s Paradox proves

Foster et al. ’10 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at University of Oregon, Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University, and Richard York, associate professor of sociology at University of Oregon, “Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency,” Monthly Review, November 2010, Vol. 62, Issue 6, pp. 1-12

But there is one aspect of Jevons’s argument—the Jevons Paradox itself—that continues to be considered one of the pioneering insights in ecological economics.8 In chapter 7 of The Coal Question, entitled “Of the Economy of Fuel,” Jevons responded to the common notion that, since “the falling supply of coal will be met by new modes of using it efficiently and economically,” there was no problem of supply, and that, indeed, “the amount of useful work got out of coal may be made to increase manifold, while the amount of coal consumed is stationary or diminishing.” In sharp opposition to this, Jevons contended that increased efficiency in the use of coal as an energy source only generated increased demand for that resource, not decreased demand, as one might expect. This was because improvement in efficiency led to further economic expansion. “It is wholly a confusion of ideas,” he wrote, “to suppose that the economical use of fuel is equivalent to a diminished consumption. The very contrary is the truth. As a rule, new modes of economy will lead to an increase of consumption according to a principle recognised in many parallel instances….The same principles apply, with even greater force and distinctness, to the use of such a general agent as coal. It is the very economy of its use which leads to its extensive consumption.”9 “Nor is it difficult,” Jevons wrote, “to see how this paradox arises.” Every new technological innovation in the production of steam engines, he pointed out in a detailed description of the steam engine’s evolution, had resulted in a more thermodynamically efficient engine. And each new, improved engine had resulted in an increased use of coal. The Savery engine, one of the earlier steam engines, he pointed out, was so inefficient that “practically, the cost of working kept it from coming into use; it consumed no coal, because its rate of consumption was too high.”10 Succeeding models that were more efficient, such as Watt’s famous engine, led to higher and higher demand for coal with each successive improvement. “Every such improvement of the engine, when effected, does but accelerate anew the consumption of coal. Every branch of manufacture receives a fresh impulse—hand labour is still further replaced by mechanical labour, and greatly extended works can be undertaken which were not commercially possible by the use of the more costly steam-power.”11 Although Jevons thought that this paradox was one that applied to numerous cases, his focus in The Coal Question was entirely on coal as a “general agent” of industrialization and a spur to investment goods industries. The power of coal to stimulate economic advance, its accelerated use, despite advances in efficiency, and the severity of the effects to be expected from the decline in its availability, were all due to its dual role as the necessary fuel for the modern steam engine and as the basis for blast furnace technology. In the mid-nineteenth century, coal was the key material input for blast furnaces in the smelting of iron—the crucial industrial product and the foundation of industrial dominance.12 It was by virtue of its greater development in this area, as “the workshop of the world,” that Britain accounted for about half of world output of iron in 1870.13 Greater efficiency in the use of coal thus translated into a greater capacity to produce iron and expand industry in general, leading to spiraling demand for coal. As Jevons put it: If the quantity of coal used in a blast-furnace, for instance, be diminished in comparison with the yield, the profits of the trade will increase, new capital will be attracted, the price of pig-iron will fall, but the demand for it [will] increase; and eventually the greater number of furnaces will more than make up for the diminished consumption of each. And if such is not always the result within a single branch, it must be remembered that the progress of any branch of manufacture excites a new activity in most other branches, and leads indirectly, if not directly, to increased inroads upon our seams of coal.14 What made this argument so powerful at the time was that it seemed immediately obvious to everyone in Jevons’s day that industrial development depended on the capacity to expand iron production cheaply. This meant that a reduction in the quantity of coal needed in a blast furnace would immediately translate into an expansion of industrial production, industrial capacity, and the ability to capture more of the world market—hence more demand for coal. The tonnage of coal consumption by the iron and steel industries of Britain in 1869, 32 million tons, exceeded the combined amount used in both general manufactures, 28 million tons, and railroads, 2 million tons.15 This was the age of capital and the age of industry, in which industrial power was measured in terms of coal and pig iron production. Output of coal and iron in Britain increased basically in tandem in this period, both tripling between 1830 and 1860.16 As Jevons himself put it: “Next after coal…iron is the material basis of our power. It is the bone and sinews of our laboring system. Political writers have correctly treated the invention of the coal-blast furnace as that which has most contributed to our material wealth….The production of iron, the material of all our machinery, is the best measure of our wealth and power.”17 Hence none of Jevons’s readers could fail to perceive the multiplier effects on industry of an improvement in efficiency in the use of coal, or the “increased inroads” upon “seams of coal” that this would tend to generate. “Economy,” he concluded, “multiplies the value and efficiency of our chief material; it indefinitely increases our wealth and means of subsistence, and leads to an extension of our population, works, and commerce, which is gratifying to the present, but must lead to an earlier end.”18

#### This best explains present social and international conflicts

Everest ’12 Larry Everest, “WAR AND GLOBAL CAPITALISM: “Money for Jobs Not for War”: American Chauvinism and Reformist Illusions,” Global Research, 5/24/2012, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=31024

The slogan also promotes the idea that the political powers-that-be—if pressured by enough people—could scale back their military, stop attacking other countries, and instead use the money for jobs, education, and other social welfare programs at home. But that’s not how the system actually operates! Wars, invasions, and occupations are not policies of one set of politicians or another, or arbitrary choices made by this or that president. At this stage in history, capitalism is a global system, with the U.S. the world’s most dominant capitalist-imperialist power, presiding over a worldwide empire of exploitation. This empire rests on the domination of the oppressed countries where the vast majority of humanity lives, and on control of labor, markets, and resources. This entails the violent suppression of the masses of people in the dominated areas—and also entails fighting off challenges from other imperialists as well as rising forces in those countries that stand in the way. This requires a monstrously huge military that is deployed worldwide, with bases in over 100 countries, and wars when necessary. The wars for domination in the Middle East, Central Asia, and elsewhere don’t “interfere” with the functioning of U.S. capital—they’re absolutely essential to it, and to the U.S.’s overall global dominance. This is why the U.S. rulers are compelled—and willing to—spend trillions on the military, including during periods of severe economic and fiscal stress, no matter who happens to sit in the White House or Congress. This system of global capitalism-imperialism headed by the U.S. is the main source of the horrors that torment so many across the globe—from the ethnic cleansing and slow genocide of the Palestinian people by the U.S. and Israel, to the mass incarceration and slow genocide of Black people in the U.S.; from the rape of the planet to the systematic degradation and violence against women—here and around the world; from the extreme deprivation and starvation faced by billions across the planet to the growing poverty and desperation faced by millions in the U.S. The rulers in these imperial metropoles distribute some of the spoils of empire to provide a higher standard of living than in the oppressed countries and buy social peace and loyalty at home (which “Money for Jobs, Not For War” encourages). People in the U.S. should reject that foul pact! The vast majority in the U.S. have a profound interest in making common cause with oppressed people worldwide, not in siding with “their” rulers. That means fostering a morality that declares: “American lives are not more important than other people’s lives!”—not pandering to American chauvinism, which strengthens the system responsible for so much misery. It means people shouldn’t appeal to those on the top to “spend more on jobs,” but to clearly and unequivocally demand a STOP to the horrors the U.S. is committing around the world.

#### Monopoly capitalism’s tendancy towards short-term growth leads to long-run stagnation—wealth centralization in corporations and finance restricts macro-level liquidity and intellectual innovation

Foster and McChesney ’12 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at University of Oregon, and Robert W. McChesney, Gutgsell Endowed Professor of Communication, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, “The Endless Crisis,” Monthly Review, May 2012, vol. 64, issue 1, pp. 1-28

Our own analysis in this book begins in many ways where Sweezy (and Harry Magdoff) left off, and carries forward as well the analysis of John Bellamy Foster and Fred Magdoff in The Great Financial Crisis: Causes and Consequences (2009).40 What Sweezy called the “intricately related” aspects of monopolization, stagnation, financialization, and globalization have produced a new historical phase, which we refer to as “monopoly- finance capital.” In this period the Triad economies are locked in a stagnation-financialization trap, while linked to the growth in the emerging economies via the global labor arbitrage—whereby multinational corporations exploit the differences in wage levels in the world in order to extract surplus profits. The result is the worsening of the overall problem of surplus capital absorption and financial instability in the center of the world economy. In this book we are particularly concerned with how this is working out at the global level, with considerable focus (in the later chapters) on how this is related to the Chinese economy. Yet, the central problem remains overaccumulation within the Triad, where the United States, despite its declining hegemony, still constitutes the trend-setting force in the world system of accumulation. The deepening effects of stagnation in the U.S. economy can be seen in Chart 2, showing the long-run downward trend in the growth rate of industrial production in the United States. Nor is the United States alone in this respect. Since the 1960s West Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Japan have all seen even larger declines, when compared to the United States, in their trend-rates of growth of industrial production. In the case of Japan industrial production rose by 16.7 percent in 1960–70 and by a mere 0.04 percent in 1990–2010.41 The story shown in Chart 2 is one of deepening stagnation of production— already emphasized by Sweezy and Magdoff in the 1970s and ‘80s. Chart 3, in contrast, reveals that this led—especially from the 1980s on—to a shift in the economy from production to speculative finance as the main stimulus to growth. Thus the FIRE (finance, insurance, and real estate) portion of national income expanded from 35 percent of the goods-production share in the early 1980s to over 65 percent in recent years. The so-called economic booms of the 1980s and ‘90s were powered by the rapid growth of financial speculation leveraged by increasing debt, primarily in the private sector. The dramatic rise in the share of income associated with finance relative to goods production industries has not, however, been accompanied by an equally dramatic rise of the share of jobs in financial services as opposed to industrial production. Thus employment in FIRE as a percentage of employment in goods production over the last two decades has remained flat at about 22 percent. This suggests that the big increase in income associated with finance when compared to production has resulted in outsized gains for a relatively few income recipients rather than a corresponding increase in jobs.42 The rapid expansion of FIRE in relation to goods production in the U.S. economy is a manifestation of the long-run financialization of the economy, i.e., the shift of the center of gravity of economic activity increasingly from production (and production-related services) to speculative finance. In the face of market saturation and vanishing profitable investment opportunities in the “real economy,” capital formation or real investment gave way before the increased speculative use of the economic surplus of society in pursuit of capital gains through asset inflation. As Magdoff and Sweezy explained as early as the 1970s, this could have an indirect effect in stimulating the economy, primarily by spurring luxury consumption. This has become known as the “wealth effect,” whereby a portion of the capital gains associated with asset appreciation in the stock market, real estate market, etc. is spent on goods and services for the well-to-do, adding to the effective demand in the economy.43 Yet, the stimulus provided by financialization has not prevented a multi-decade decline in the role of investment in the U.S. economy. Thus net private nonresidential fixed investment dropped from 4 percent of GDP in the 1970s to 3.8 percent in the ‘80s, 3 percent in the ‘90s, and 2.4 percent in 2000–2010.44 At the heart of the matter is the declining long-term growth rate of investment in manufacturing, and more particularly in manufacturing structures (construction of new or refurbished manufacturing plants and facilities), as shown in Chart 4.45 Even with declining rates of investment growth, productivity increases in industry have continued, leading to the expansion of excess productive capacity (an indication of the overaccumulation of capital). This can be seen in Chart 5 showing the long-term slide in capacity utilization in manufacturing. High and rising levels of unused (or excess) capacity have a negative effect on investment since corporations are naturally reluctant to invest in industries where a large portion of the existing capacity is standing idle. The U.S. automobile industry leading up to and during the Great Recession (like the worldwide industry) was faced with huge amounts of unused capacity—equal to approximately onethird of its total capacity. A 2008 Businessweek article underscored the global auto glut: “With sales tanking from Beijing to Boston, automakers find themselves in an embarrassing position. Having indulged in a global orgy of factory-building in recent years, the industry has the capacity to make an astounding 94 million vehicles each year. That’s about 34 million too many based on current sales, according to researcher CSM Worldwide, or the output of about 100 plants.”46 The decreasing utilization of productive capacity is paralleled by what we referred to in 2004 as “The Stagnation of Employment,” or the growing unemployment and underemployment that characterizes both the U.S. economy and the economies of the Triad in general. According to the alternative labor underutilization measure, U6, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a full 14.9 percent of the civilian work force (plus marginally attached workers) were unemployed or underemployed on a seasonally adjusted basis in the United States in February 2012.47 In these circumstances, the U.S. economy, as we have seen, has become chronically dependent on the ballooning of the financial superstructure to keep things going. Industrial corporations themselves have became financialized entities, operating more like banks in financing sales of their products, and often engaging in speculation on commodities and currencies. Today they are more inclined to pursue the immediate, surefire gains available through merger, acquisition, and enhanced monopoly power than to commit their capital to the uncertain exigencies associated with the expansion of productive activity. Political-economic power has followed the financial growth curve of the economy, with the economic base of political hegemony shifting from the real economy of production to the financial world, and increasingly serving the interests of the latter, in what became known as the neoliberal age.48 The main key to understanding these developments, however, remains the Sweezy Normal State. The long-term trends associated with economic growth, industrial production, investment, financialization, and capacity utilization (as shown in Charts 1–5 above) all point to the same phenomenon of a long-term economic slowdown in the U.S. and the other advanced industrial economies. A central cause of this stagnation tendency is the high, and today rapidly increasing, price markups of monopolistic corporations, giving rise to growing problems of surplus capital absorption. Taking the nonfarm business sector as a whole, the price markup on unit labor costs (the ratio of prices to unit labor costs) for the U.S. economy over the entire post-Second World War period averaged 1.57, with a low of around 1.50 in the late 1940s. However, from the late 1990s to the present the markup on unit labor costs—what the great Polish economist Michal Kalecki referred to as the “degree of monopoly”— has climbed sharply, to 1.75 in the final quarter of 2011. As stated in The Economic Report of the President, 2012: “The markup has now risen to its highest level in post-World War II history, with much of that increase taking place over the past four years. Because the markup of prices over unit labor costs is the inverse of the labor share of output, saying that an increase in the price markup is the highest in postwar history is equivalent to saying that the labor share of output has fallen to its lowest level.”49

## 1NR

### Warming Adv

#### Nuclear power contributes to global warming via waste heat. Prefer this evidence—statistical analysis peer reviewed in a major journal about global warming

Nordell and Gervet 09 – Bo Nordell\* and Bruno Gervet [Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Luleå University of Technology] “Global energy accumulation and net heat emission” Int. J. Global Warming, Vol. 1, Nos. 1/2/3, 2009, <http://www.zo.utexas.edu/courses/THOC/Nordell-Gervet2009ijgw.pdf>

Independent of what causes global warming, it should be considered in terms of accumulated energy. The performed estimations of global heat accumulation in the air, ground and global net heat emissions only include the years from 1880 to 2000. The data used in estimating global heat accumulation in the air, ground and melting of land ice are relatively reliable, while the melting of sea ice might be overestimated. The main uncertainty concerns sea temperature increase, which means that sensible heat accumulation in sea water might be underestimated. It was found that the air only contains 6.6% of the globally accumulated heat, of which 45% is distributed over the land area, though it accounts for about 30% of Earth’s total area. The remaining heat is accumulated in the ground (31.5%), sea water (28.5%), melting of sea ice (11.2%) and melting of land ice (22.2%) (Figure 4). The melting of ice has absorbed 33.4% of the total global warming. The heat stored by sea water, the melting of sea ice and in the air over oceans accounts for almost 43% of the global heat accumulation, while the corresponding value for the land area is about 35% if ~22% of land ice, which is mainly in Greenland, is treated separately. It is concluded that net heat emissions contributes to 74% of global warming. The missing heat (26%) must have other causes, e.g., the greenhouse effect, natural variations in the climate and/or the underestimation of net heat emissions. The performed calculations are conservative, i.e., both the global heat accumulation and heat emissions are underestimated. Each of these means that the missing heat in Figure 4 is too high. These uncertainties are discussed in more detail in Appendix B. Most measures that already have been taken to combat global warming are also beneficial for the current explanation. Renewable energy should be promoted instead of using fossil fuels. However, CO2 sequestration and subsequent storage will have very little effect on global warming. It is also concluded that nuclear power is not a solution to (but part of) the problem. The underestimated heat accumulation means that the missing heat in Figure 4 is too high. Also, the underestimation of net heat emission gives the same result.

### Solvency

#### Don’t believe their low ball cost estimates. Nuclear costs billions per reactor.

Jackson 2008 — David Jackson [PhD. Professor (Adjunct) of Engineering Physics at McMaster University] The cost of the new reactors for Canada June 24, 2008, <http://reactorscanada.com/2008/06/24/the-cost-of-the-new-reactors-for-canada/>

What will the new reactors proposed for Canada cost? That’s very much of a “how long is a string” type of question but I’ll try to give an answer. The joke used to be that one should multiply by pi any cost estimate given by project proponents. This just reflects the time honoured tactic to low ball projects to get them approved. Increases in the prices of raw materials such as steel (40% higher than last year), concrete (50% increase in last two years) and copper (a factor of four in five years) are driving up the costs of all power plants. Reactor vendors in sales mode prefer to talk about two numbers namely the price of the electricity their machine will produce and the capital cost per kW (electrical) both are considered more palatable to buyers than the multi-billion dollar price tags that come up at contract signing. Personally I find the projected electricity cost approach to be particularly misleading since it depends on a great many factors including the capital cost and others outside the control of the reactor vendors. Concepts such as Levelized Unit Electricity Cost (LEUC) may be useful for comparing various energy options but for a nuclear station the capital cost dominates. The unit of dollars per kW (e) can be somewhat more helpful since they it is a way of expressing capital costs especially in this case since the proposed AREVA unit has higher power than its two rivals. However, there are fixed costs in reactor construction such as environmental assessments, site preparation, licensing, fuel storage, security arrangements and others that don’t necessarily scale with reactor power. It’s better just to look at the prices for reactors already sold.

### Elections DA

#### Probability—incredibly likely flashpoint for global escalation

Williams, Professor –Social Sciences - Indian Institute of Technology, 10 (Peril Awaits at the Strait of Hormuz, <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/2557996/posts>)

The Gulf-Southwest Asia region has always been a **hyper-**flash point of **global** conflict due to the dual strategic persistence of the Arab-Israel conflict and the geo-strategic and geo-economic rivalries over oil and its supplies across the critical sea gates of Straits of Hormuz and the Bab-el-Mandab straits. This has resulted in the near permanent forward basing of US and allied naval and air forces in the region with dedicated theater commands along with naval air assets with prepositioned amphibious and expeditionary capabilities. In recent years, the stakes of heightened conflict has increased by vast proportions by the intertwining of the conflicts in Iraq, the nuclear and missile proliferation in Iran and the domino effect that has followed by the Arab states. Iran holds the position of a pivotal state in the Gulf Region and has been energized in its quest to seek a great power status leveraging its Shiite ideology over the vast numbers of the Sunni dominated Southwest Asian region. Iran also has a civilization complex of being the Persian civilization and its affirmed superiority over the Arabs in its geo-historical contexts. Controlling the Straits of Hormuz and the sea gates in the region that has the densest energy-laden shipping and leveraging its enormous oil and natural gas assets into a regional geo-economic and geo-strategic grand strategy matrix has been Iran’s ambitions. Contending Iran in its aggressive quest of power expansion in its geo-strategic and religious ideology has been the US-western allied Arab states and the lone free democratic state of Israel. Geo-strategic importance of the Strait: The maritime archipelagic framework of the Gulf-Southwest Asian region is characterized by the Persian Gulf (also known as “Gulf” avoiding the contending Persian and Arab nomenclature claims), Strait of Hormuz and Gulf of Oman constituting a primary jugular of the sea way of the region. The topography of the Strait is complex with the narrowest point the Strait being 21 miles wide. The shipping lanes consist of two-mile wide channels for inbound and outbound tanker traffic, as well as a two-mile wide buffer zone. Iran’s access to the Strait and the pivotal role as a littoral state to control shipping movements with the capability to jeopardize international shipping has been a critical sinew of strength. In terms of its power profile, Iran could marshal its economic, military and demographic power to overwhelm the fragile states of the Arabian Peninsula that includes the regional giant Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States. The geo-strategic significance of the Strait of Hormuz would continue to increase in its criticality owing to Iranian motivations-capabilities of blocking oil shipping in the event of punitive actions against Tehran through very robust asymmetric naval capabilities of the Iranian navy and the sea-based elements of the IRGC (Iranian Revolutionary Guards Council). Adding to these capabilities, would be Iranian ballistic and cruise missiles with nuclear or other WMD payloads that constitutes the critical gravity of threat in the region to the regional states, international shipping and for powers like China and India which have very critical hydrocarbon stakes in the region. The Iranian move to close the strait would have a very steep impact of jeopardizing the oil trade 6 External powers like France and India have increased considerable offshore access and basing presence in the region with naval support facilities for France in the United Arab Emirates where French naval special operation forces have access facilities along with forward deployment of French warships. Similarly, India has access and naval support facilities in Qatar. The Indian commitment includes a substantive naval security guarantee that would secure the offshore assets of Qatar and provides for the joint venture in production of weapons and military equipment. The maritime cooperation agreement provides India with a strategic naval base in the Gulf region. The India-Qatar maritime security initiative provides India and Qatar with a convergence of Indian naval power with Qatari naval forces to combat the variety of maritime asymmetric threats of terrorism, piracy and securing the offshore oil installations. It thus brings India into the Gulf Region with a secure access agreement. Four, the role of the Israeli Navy in the region adds to the interesting complexity and power balance in the naval theatre. Even as the Iranian clandestine nuclear weapons program races ahead, with the possible targeting of Iranian nuclear-industrial estate being contemplated by the US and allied western powers, Israel has an autonomous naval role in the region with several of its Saar-V class warships outfitted with Delilah standoff missiles with high powered microwave warheads and its German Dolphin class submarines armed with its Popeye Cruise missiles (of ranges 1500km) with a nuclear payload of 200kg have been in frequent deployment in the Gulf Region. This deployment brings to fore the increasing critical importance of nuclear tipped land attack cruise missiles in preemptive strikes against hardened Iranian targets in a prospective joint US-led strike against Iranian nuclear installations. Five, In an event of a conflagration in the Strait of Hormuz, there are increasing possibilities of an Iranian asymmetric move to use chemical or even radiation tipped warheads that could completely wreck civilian shipping with enormous primary and collateral loss and the crippling of shipping leading to an intense bottleneck preventing the entry of US-lead western allied intervention forces. The possibilities of such scenarios serve as important operational options for an Iranian leadership that is determined to stall a US-led preemptive strike. These naval operational realities cloud and condition the naval theatre of the Strait of Hormuz that is increasingly vulnerable and prone to assertive asymmetric strikes / counter strikes by Iran. Sources of Iranian Conduct and Responses: Iran’s template of operational conduct and responses is influenced by several political, economic, religious-ideological, regional rivalry and military factors. Iran is being painted as an irrational actor with an overdose obsession on brinkmanship. While the radical religious clerical leadership and the vanguard of the revolution viz: IRGC (Iranian Revolutionary Guards Council) would like to ratchet and escalate the conflicts in the region by the attempt of a WMD strike in the Strait of Hormuz and even daring targeting Israel, the Iranians in their strategic calculus have always been calculated in their responses. The penchant of an Iranian overdrive by an asymmetric operational strategy either by missile strikes or by naval disruptions could be either as an initiative to subdue the militarily weaker but the oil-rich Sunni Gulf Arab states and Saudi Arabia or as an attempt to deflect US-Israeli targeting by inciting the Hezbollah-Hamas terrorist brigades which are in effect the auxiliary units of the IRGC. A second source of Iranian strategic conduct emerges from its maritime aspirations to control the Gulf and Caspian Sea. With both seas being critically important as oil and natural gas rich repositories, Iran would prefer to maintain sea-control and sea-denial capabilities employing an asymmetric operational approach of sea-based strike missiles, submarines and aggressive naval posturing that could dent the effectiveness of any naval interventionist force. The third possible source of Iranian asymmetric conduct could come from its keen interest in developing EMP weapons (Electromagnetic Pulse) that could have perilous consequences both for onshore and offshore assets. In the last eight years, Iran has tested its missiles over the Caspian Sea with a potential EMP effect. With such serious intent, an Iranian attempt either to launch a Shahab-3 missile with an EMP payload off the US coasts from an innocent looking freighter or even using the same in the approaches of the Strait of Hormuz off the Arabian Sea coast could simply paralyze all interventionist forces. Iranian responses to an offensive strike could include the intense barrage of sea-skimming supersonic anti-ship missiles. The Iranian arsenal includes anti-ship missiles like the C-802 and Kowsar (the Chinese Silkworms and the Russian Sunburns) The C-802 anti-ship missiles are missiles that originate from China. Kowsar anti-ship missiles are basically land-based anti-ship missiles (land-to-sea missiles) which can dodge electronic jamming systems. Deploying an aggressive package of supersonic anti-ship cruise missiles and the employ of EMP weapons could be a deadly cocktail that would complicate intervention and set the stage for more escalation of strikes against Iran and counter strikes that would cripple the maritime oil commerce skyrocketing the oil price over US $300 per barrel or even more dealing with a decimation to the global economy.

#### Strikes devastate US economic recovery

Hussain 9-12 Murtaza Hussain, Toronto-based writer and analyst focused on issues related to Middle Eastern politics, “Why war with Iran would spell disaster,” Al-Jazeera, 9/12/2012, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/09/201291194236970294.html

The fragile American economic recovery would be completely upended were Iran to target global energy supplies in the event of war, an act which would be both catastrophic and highly likely if US Iran hawks get their way. Not only does the country itself sit atop some of the largest oil and natural gas reserves on the planet, its close proximity to the shipping routes and oil resources of its neighbours means that in the event of war, its first response would likely be to choke off the global supply of crude; a tactic for which its military defences have in fact been specifically designed. The Strait of Hormuz, located in the Persian Gulf is the shipping point for more than 20 per cent of the world's petroleum. Iran is known to have advanced Silkworm missile batteries buried at strategic points around the strait to make it impassable in the event of war, and has developed "swarming" naval tactics to neutralise larger, less mobile ships such as those used by the US Navy. While Iran could never win in straightforward combat, it has developed tactics of asymmetrical warfare that can effectively inflict losses on a far stronger enemy and render the strait effectively closed to naval traffic. The price of oil would immediately skyrocket, by some estimates upwards several hundred dollars a barrel, shattering the already tenuous steps the US and other Western economies are taking towards recovery. Former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has said a war with Iran could drag out years and would have economic consequences "devastating for the average American"; but these facts are conspicuously absent in public discussion of the war.

#### That also turns warming

Victor 9 (David, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, is professor of law at Stanford Law School and director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, Dirty Coal is Winning, http://www.newsweek.com/id/177684)

Saving the planet was never going to be easy. Avoiding the most catastrophic effects of climate changes will require cutting carbon emissions by 50 to 80 percent over the next four decades, scientists say. After years of deadlock, 2009 was shaping up to be the year the world got its environmental act together. Now it's looking like the global environment may be one of the biggest losers in the current financial crisis. Lower prices for oil—which some analysts predict will hit $25 a barrel—is bad news for investors in green energy. But the big winner is likely to be dirty coal. It already accounts for about 40 percent of the world's emissions of carbon dioxide, the leading cause of global warming. The fuel is plentiful, and its price has fallen about one third since last summer's peak to $80 per ton. In China, the world's largest coal burner, prices have fallen by half and are likely to plummet further. All the top emitters of greenhouse gases depend mainly on coal for electric power. Dirty coal is now getting cheaper relative to other fossil fuels, such as natural gas and oil. New "clean coal" plants would capture carbon and store it away underground, or at least to extract as much energy as possible for each kilogram of carbon pollution. The problem is that clean-coal plants are a lot more expensive than conventional "dirty coal" technology, and the financial crisis is obliterating schemes that would have paid the extra cost. Before the crisis, a team at Stanford University found that the world was investing only about 1 percent of what's needed on advanced coal technologies to meet carbon-emissions targets. Now a spate of canceled projects darkens the picture.

#### And, Obama’s winning now but the race is tight – domestic developments cut into his momentum and swing the election to Romney

Charlie Cook, editor Cook Political Report, columnist for Washington Quarterly and political analyst for NBC, “Obama’s a good bet” National Journal 9/13/12 [http://www.nationaljournal.com//columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-s-a-good-bet-to-win-20120913?print=true](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-s-a-good-bet-to-win-20120913?print=true)

The presidential race is still close and, in a tight election, either candidate can win. Any number of events, not the least of which are debates, campaign gaffes, and domestic or international developments, could put President Obama or Mitt Romney over the top. Although it is pretty clear that Obama has an edge over Romney in national and swing-state polling, the size of his advantage remains in doubt. Every event or development should be judged on whether it might change the path of this election.¶ My view is that if Obama is reelected, it will be despite the economy and because of his campaign; if Mitt Romney wins, it will be because of the economy and despite his campaign. This economy is an enormous millstone around Obama’s neck, yet he and his campaign have managed to secure the upper hand—albeit with a very tenuous grip. At the same time, despite an enormous advantage that the sluggish economy and the sentiment for change affords him, Romney and his campaign, to an astonishing degree, seem to have squandered too many opportunities and undermined his chances of winning.¶ It should be emphasized again and again that this campaign isn’t over and that the race is still awfully close. But without a change in the trajectory, it’s a good bet that Obama will come out on top. The questions are whether the opportunity will arise for that trajectory to change and whether the Romney campaign be able to effectively capitalize on it.

#### Polling agrees – Obama narrowly up

New York Times, “Poll: Obama holds narrow edge over Romney” 9/14/12 <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/14/poll-obama-holds-narrow-edge-over-romney/>

President Obama holds a narrow three-point advantage over Mitt Romney among Americans most likely to vote in November, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll.¶ With their back-to-back political conventions behind them and the general election season fully engaged, the poll found Mr. Obama and Mr. Romney running essentially even among those seen as the most probable to vote. Including those who lean toward a specific candidate, the president has 49 percent and Mr. Romney has 46 percent, a difference within the margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points on each candidate.¶ The nationwide poll was conducted during a turbulent week in the campaign, with a new wave of television ads from Mr. Romney, a disappointing jobs report for Mr. Obama and both candidates reacting to turmoil and deadly violence in Egypt, Libya and across the Arab world.¶ Mr. Obama has an advantage among likely voters of 12 percentage points among women, the poll found, while Mr. Romney holds the upper hand among men by eight percentage points. Mr. Obama leads his Republican rival across all ages of voters, except those who are 65 or older, who favor Mr. Romney by 15 percentage points.

#### There’s zero support for nuclear – also takes out solvency

Knowledge@Wharton 11 (Knowledge@Wharton, the online research and analysis journal of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, Mar 30, [knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=2743], jam)

A Decline in Public Support Yet Fukushima has no doubt had an impact. Italy put a one-year moratorium on its plans to re-establish a nuclear energy program. Germany idled seven of its 17 nuclear reactors for safety checks as protesters clamor for an end to nuclear power. China, which had planned to quadruple its nuclear energy capacity by 2020, temporarily suspended all project approvals. For projects in the United States, an uphill climb has become even steeper. According to a poll released March 21 from Pew Research Center, public support for the increased use of nuclear power has declined since the earthquake in Japan. More than half (52%) now oppose the increased use of nuclear power, while 39% favor it. That compares to 47% in favor and 47% opposed in October. "As for the long-term prospects for the industry, I think the implications of Japan will be long-lasting," says Chris Lafakis, an energy economist at Moody's Analytics. It will be more difficult to get approval for a plant and more difficult to obtain financing. Although the federal government is pushing for loan guarantees, projects would still need support from a financial institution to get financed, he points out. "And the large banks are in no hurry to extend credit for a plant knowing the regulatory environment" and current public sentiment, he says. There may not be a "formal moratorium" against new nuclear power plants, "but I think there's an effective one." Even before the Japanese earthquake, the nuclear industry was struggling to expand in the U.S. because of a sluggish economy and a sudden abundance of cheap natural gas. Based on recent shale discoveries, the U.S. Energy Information Administration estimates the country's recoverable shale gas resources are more than double the volume it assumed just one year ago. "Cheap natural gas makes it difficult to pull the trigger on nuclear investment," Chris Hansen, director of strategy and initiatives at IHS Cambridge Energy Research Associates, noted during a panel discussion at the Wharton Energy Conference in October 2010. "The outlook is that the 'Shale Gale' will really increase the chance for natural gas to grow its market share." Japan's nuclear crisis will not create that much more additional delay, Hansen told Knowledge@Wharton in a follow-up interview. Low gas prices had already slowed down proposed projects because investors were hesitant to commit billions of dollars that might not pay off. Safety reviews will simply be added to an already delayed process. "I see market share in the U.S. probably eroding for the next 10 years," Hansen says. "All of the new build will be gas, so nuclear will slip." Economics prevented the much-touted "nuclear renaissance" from ever taking hold in the United States, adds Debra K. Decker, a research associate with the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. "Like all business, the nuclear business is about risks and returns," says Decker, who studies nuclear proliferation and proposals for reform. "The risk of getting approvals has been high enough in the United States, and the electricity business has been deregulated enough, that the risk-return ratio has not really supported new builds. When you factor in the high upfront capital costs of nuclear and the still relatively inexpensive gas and coal options, the economics are not there. Nuclear does not come out as an attractive option without supports."

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

Ramana ’11 M.V. Princeton University Program on Science and Global Security Physicist, August 3, “Nuclear power and the public,” <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/nuclear-power-and-the-public>

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.

#### Opposition is staunch and bipartisan – would flip multiple votes to Romney

ABC News 11 April20, “Nuclear Power: Po Nuclear Power: Opposition Spikes After Japan Earthquake,” <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/nuclear-power-opposition-grows-japan-earthquake-abc-news/story?id=13412262#.UAnUlWHZATY>

Americans by a 2-1 margin oppose building more [nuclear power plants in the United States](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/japan-nuclear-emergency-sparks-worries-united-states/story?id=13133047), an 11-point spike in opposition from a few years ago. In the aftermath of Japan's nuclear plant crisis, 64 percent in this ABC News/Washington Post poll oppose new nuclear plant construction, while 33 percent support it. "Strong" opposition now far outstrips strong support, 47-20 percent. Opposition is up from 53 percent in a 2008 poll, and strong opposition is up even more, by 24 points. The results reflect the significant [challenges facing the nuclear power industry](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/us-nuclear-power-plants-safe/story?id=13256973), which had been reaching for greater acceptance on the basis of factors including high oil prices, environmental concerns prompted by the Gulf oil spill a year ago and efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Opposition is not merely a not-in-my-back-yard phenomenon. The[survey](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/nuclear-power-opposition-grows-japan-earthquake-abc-news/story?id=13412262), conducted for ABC News by [Langer Research Associates](http://www.langerresearch.com/), finds that 67 percent of Americans oppose construction of a nuclear plant within 50 miles of their home -- not significantly different than the number who oppose it regardless of location. Resistance is bipartisan, with majorities of Democrats, Republicans and independents alike opposed to new nuclear plant construction. Still, there are differences among groups; opposition is higher among Democrats (75 percent, vs. 59 percent of Republicans and independents combined), women (73 percent, vs. 53 percent of men) and liberals (74 percent, vs. 60 percent of moderates and conservatives). Support for building more nuclear plants has fluctuated in the past, showing sensitivity to nuclear crises. Starting at 61 percent in the mid-1970s, support fell sharply after the Three Mile Island accident in 1979 and bottomed out at just 19 percent in May 1986 after the Chernobyl crisis (which began 25 years ago next week).

#### Independent voters are the largest voting bloc --- spending kills support

Schoen ’12 Douglas Schoen, pollster for President Clinton, 2-8-2012, The Forgotten Swing Voter, Politico, p. http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=7ED8592F-2122-4A55-AA3B-C5460134BE4A

Neither party focuses on issues that matter most to people: reviving the economy, promoting job creation, balancing the budget, reducing debt and taking on entitlements. Both Republicans and Democrats are virtually ignoring the concerns of swing voters, now close to 20 percent of the electorate, and independents, now at least 40 percent of the electorate and, according to Gallup, the single largest voting bloc. These two groups share similar interests. And both give Republican and Democratic leaders net negative ratings. Independents disapprove of how Obama is doing his job, 52 percent to 37 percent, according to a recent New York Times/CBS poll. Just 31 percent had a favorable opinion of Obama, with two-thirds saying he has not made progress fixing the economy. Six in 10 independents say Obama does not share their priorities for the country. The president’s improved standing in the recent Washington Post poll has probably been overstated and has more to do with Romney’s weakness than with some dramatic turnaround in Obama’s own numbers. A majority of independents still disapprove of his job performance and a clear majority of the electorate disapproves of his handling of the economy, his performance in creating jobs and his efforts to balance the budget. Independents have similar negative impressions of leading GOP presidential candidates Romney and Gingrich, according to a recent Washington Post poll. Independents look unfavorably on Romney, 51 percent to 23 percent, and have an unfavorable impression of Gingrich, 53 percent to 23 percent. Another ominous sign for Romney, still the presumed nominee, is that voter turnout decreased about 15 percent in Florida’s primary from four years ago, and almost 40 percent of the voters said they were not satisfied with the current field. It’s crucial the GOP candidates address these voter concerns. A recent national survey I conducted sheds light on who the swing voters are and what they want from government — which meshes closely with the independents’ policy preferences. I isolated swing voters by looking at those voters who supported Bill Clinton in an imaginary trial heat against Romney but didn’t support Obama in a trial heat against Romney. This came to 15 percent of the electorate. In a two-way race for president between Clinton and Romney, an overwhelming majority prefers Clinton, 60 percent to 24 percent. Meanwhile, between Obama and Romney, voters split almost evenly — with Obama at 45 percent and Romney at 43 percent. A detailed assessment of swing voters shows that they are not liberal Democrats. Over three-quarters (76 percent) are moderates or conservatives, and close to two-thirds (65 percent) are Republicans or independents. Slightly less than half (49 percent) are Southerners. This data underscore the voters’ desire for politicians who advocate for bipartisanship and coalition-building in a polarized country. The substantial degree of support for Clinton versus Romney shows that the more bipartisan, centrist and fiscally conservative the appeal, the broader the support. A Third Way survey conducted after the midterms supports my findings. Sixty percent of voters who supported Obama in 2008, but voted Republican in 2010, feel that Obama is too liberal. About 66 percent say that Obama and the Democrats in Congress tried to have government do too much. A USA Today/Gallup Poll released late last year also shows that the electorate believes Obama is too far left ideologically. Americans were asked to rate their own ideology as well as that of the major presidential candidates on a 5-point scale. Most rated themselves at 3.3 (slightly right of center), and Obama at 2.3 (left of center) — further away than all other major presidential candidates. A majority of Americans, 57 percent, see Obama as liberal, while only 23 percent see him as moderate. Indeed, recent polling shows that independents want to rein in the size and scope of government. Gallup reports that 64 percent of independents say Big Government is the biggest threat to the country. Which may be one reason for Santorum’s growing support. Three-quarters are dissatisfied with the size and power of the federal government, while just 24 percent are satisfied. Other polling shows that these voters want policies that emphasize economic growth and budget reduction. In the wake of the crippling economic downturn, 82 percent believe it is extremely or very important to expand the economy, according to recent Gallup polling. Seventy percent say the federal budget deficit should be cut by a combination of spending cuts and modest tax increases — with many polls showing these voters feel spending cuts are key. Independents do not support more government spending. My polling last year shows independents believe government should refrain from spending money to stimulate the economy, given the large deficit we face, 62 percent to 24 percent. Independents, according to Gallup, are looking for government to expand the economy (82 percent), and promote equality of opportunity (69 percent). They are not looking for government to promote equality of outcome, since just 43 percent say they want to reduce the income gap between the rich and the poor. By 50 percent to 47 percent, they say the divide between the rich and the poor is an acceptable part of the economic system. So it’s clear what these voters are looking for, and also that neither party is addressing their concerns. To be sure, independent voters want conciliation and compromise. Some are more conservative and market-oriented. Others are ready to accept government stimulus spending for our economic recovery. But all share the desire for economic growth, job creation and a path to fiscal stability. The two parties cannot continue to ignore swing voters. Without them, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to win in November. Moreover, to win without addressing their concerns will almost certainly promise four more years of the same gridlock.

#### Merely the absence of Obama pressure causes Israeli strikes—triggers our impacts

Hayden 12 Tom is a writer and blogger. “The coming war with Iran Is GOP rhetoric setting the stage for an Israeli attack?” 2/19/12 <http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/coming-war-with-iran/content?oid=5104826>

Standing in the way, according to the article, is President Barack Obama, whom the Israelis suspect “has abandoned any aggressive strategy that would ensure the prevention of a nuclear Iran and is merely playing a game of words to appease them.” The same conclusion has been suggested elsewhere. So the stage is set for nuclear brinksmanship in an American presidential-election year. The role of Republican candidates is to ensure that the second condition is met, that of “tacit support” for an Israeli strike, even if forced by political pressure. The balance of forces is lopsided at present, with most Americans worried about Iran and unprepared to resist a sudden outbreak of war, Congress—dominated by supporters of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee—and the media are not prepared to oppose a strike. A short “successful” war—a highly dubious prospect—would be accepted by American public opinion until serious consequences set in afterward. Any public expression of protest against this war is far better than silence, of course. But the greatest opportunity for protest may be in the arena of the presidential-election drama now playing out. It is fair and accurate to say both Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich are collaborating, for political reasons, to push Obama into war during the presidential election, with Rick Santorum on the bench if needed. The New York Times has also now documented, in a front-page story, the millions spent by casino billionaire Sheldon Adelson and his Israeli wife to save Gingrich’s presidential campaign. Adelson was pleased when Gingrich, seemingly out of nowhere, recently condemned the Palestinians as “an invented people.” Adelson owns a newpaper chain in Israel supportive of the Netanyahu government and is a vocal opponent of a negotiated settlement. No one in the mainstream media so far has written the story of Romney’s past consulting and business partnership with Israel’s Prime Minister Netanyahu at Boston Consulting Group, but his campaign rhetoric echoes Netanyahu’s position, that Obama can’t be trusted to prevent Iran from getting the bomb. The Romney and Gingrich campaigns create an unrelenting pressure on Obama to support an attack on Iran with little countervailing pressure. But neither the Republicans nor the Israeli hawks are comfortable being charged with using political pressure to start a war. Santorum, whose Republican ranking is third, is equal to Romney and Gingrich in his hawkish position toward Iran. Santorum has deep support from right-wing Christian groups who believe that war in the Middle East will hasten the Second Coming. Avoiding war with Iran may be Obama’s best option in policy and politics, if he can navigate the campaign winds. The question is whether any organized force has his back.

#### Obama prevents Israeli first strike

Hayden 12 Tom is a writer and blogger. “The coming war with Iran Is GOP rhetoric setting the stage for an Israeli attack?” 2/19/12 <http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/coming-war-with-iran/content?oid=5104826>

Standing in the way, according to the article, is President Barack Obama, whom the Israelis suspect “has abandoned any aggressive strategy that would ensure the prevention of a nuclear Iran and is merely playing a game of words to appease them.” The same conclusion has been suggested elsewhere. So the stage is set for nuclear brinksmanship in an American presidential-election year. The role of Republican candidates is to ensure that the second condition is met, that of “tacit support” for an Israeli strike, even if forced by political pressure. The balance of forces is lopsided at present, with most Americans worried about Iran and unprepared to resist a sudden outbreak of war, Congress—dominated by supporters of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee—and the media are not prepared to oppose a strike. A short “successful” war—a highly dubious prospect—would be accepted by American public opinion until serious consequences set in afterward. Any public expression of protest against this war is far better than silence, of course. But the greatest opportunity for protest may be in the arena of the presidential-election drama now playing out. It is fair and accurate to say both Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich are collaborating, for political reasons, to push Obama into war during the presidential election, with Rick Santorum on the bench if needed. The New York Times has also now documented, in a front-page story, the millions spent by casino billionaire Sheldon Adelson and his Israeli wife to save Gingrich’s presidential campaign. Adelson was pleased when Gingrich, seemingly out of nowhere, recently condemned the Palestinians as “an invented people.” Adelson owns a newpaper chain in Israel supportive of the Netanyahu government and is a vocal opponent of a negotiated settlement. No one in the mainstream media so far has written the story of Romney’s past consulting and business partnership with Israel’s Prime Minister Netanyahu at Boston Consulting Group, but his campaign rhetoric echoes Netanyahu’s position, that Obama can’t be trusted to prevent Iran from getting the bomb. The Romney and Gingrich campaigns create an unrelenting pressure on Obama to support an attack on Iran with little countervailing pressure. But neither the Republicans nor the Israeli hawks are comfortable being charged with using political pressure to start a war. Santorum, whose Republican ranking is third, is equal to Romney and Gingrich in his hawkish position toward Iran. Santorum has deep support from right-wing Christian groups who believe that war in the Middle East will hasten the Second Coming. Avoiding war with Iran may be Obama’s best option in policy and politics, if he can navigate the campaign winds. The question is whether any organized force has his back.

#### Romney will authorize a military strike on Iran

Berman 12 Ari is is a contributing writer for *The Nation* magazine and an [Investigative Journalism Fellow at The Nation Institute](http://www.nationinstitute.org/bios/ari_berman). He has written extensively about American politics, foreign policy and the intersection of money and politics. His stories have also appeared in the *New York Times*, *Rolling Stone*and *The Guardian*, and he is a frequent guest and political commentator on MSNBC, C-Span and NPR. His first book,*Herding Donkeys: The Fight to Rebuild the Democratic Party and Reshape American Politics*, was published in October 2010 by Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. He graduated from the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University with a [degree](http://www.thenation.com/authors/ari-berman) in journalism and political science. 6/19/12 “[Romney: Bomb, Bomb, Bomb, Bomb, Bomb Iran](http://www.thenation.com/blog/168478/romney-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-iran)” [http://www.thenation.com/blog/168478/romney-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-iran#](http://www.thenation.com/blog/168478/romney-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-iran)

Over the weekend, Jamie Fly and Bill Kristol, two high-profile neoconservatives, wrote an article in the[*Weekly Standard*](http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/no-iranian-nukes_647326.html?nopager=1) urging President Obama to “ask Congress for an Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iran’s nuclear program.” Fly is executive director of the [Foreign Policy Initiative](http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2009/03/26/37087/kristol-kagan-fpi/), a neoconservative advocacy group that is a successor to the [Project for the New American Century](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Project_for_the_New_American_Century), which laid the intellectual groundwork for the US invasion of Iraq. Kristol is an FPI board member. Fellow FPI board members Eric Edelman, Robert Kagan and Dan Senor are [foreign policy advisers](http://www.thenation.com/article/167683/mitt-romneys-neocon-war-cabinet?page=full) to the Romney campaign. Romney was asked about the Fly/Kristol article on [*Face the Nation*](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-3460_162-57454827/face-the-nation-transcripts-june-17-2012-gov-romney-senator-graham-gov-dean/?pageNum=3&amp;tag=contentMain;contentBody) on Sunday. He responded: I can assure you if I'm President, the Iranians will have no question but that I would be willing to take military action, if necessary, to prevent them from becoming a nuclear threat to the world. I don't believe at this stage, therefore, if I'm President, that we need to have war powers approval or a special authorization for military force. The President has that capacity now. It’s worth pausing a moment to consider the magnitude of this statement. Romney is saying that he doesn’t need Congressional approval for a US attack on Iran. Notes [Andrew Sullivan](http://andrewsullivan.thedailybeast.com/2012/06/the-cheney-in-mitt-romney.html): “Remember that this was Cheney's position vis-a-vis Iraq. Bush over-ruled him. Romney is to the neocon right of George W. Bush in foreign affairs.” He’s also to the right of Bill Kristol, which is no small feat. Perhaps this shouldn’t be surprising, considering that Romney has chosen a team of neoconservative advisers hellbent on resurrecting the hawkish unilateralism of the early Bush years. As I reported in [*The Nation*](http://www.thenation.com/article/167683/mitt-romneys-neocon-war-cabinet) in May, nearly a dozen Romney advisers have urged the US to consider a military strike against Iran. Top Romney adviser [John Bolton](http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/06/05/495088/bolton-fortunately-no-breakthrough-iran-talks/), who many neocons hope will be secretary of state in a Romney administration, has been advocating war with Iran since 2008 and recently wrote that he wanted diplomatic talks between Iran and the international community to fail. “John’s wisdom, clarity and courage are qualities that should typify our foreign policy,” Romney said when Bolton endorsed him last January. (Less hawkish members of Romney’s foreign policy team have urged a [negotiated settlement with Iran](http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/06/14/499762/williamson-iran-obama-negotiated-settlement/) along the lines the Obama administration is currently pursuing.) One could argue that the Obama administration’s refusal to seek Congressional approval for the NATO incursion in [Libya](http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2012/06/blame-congress-if-president-attacks-iran) set a precedent for Romney to sidestep Congress on Iran. But the Libya mission had the support of the Arab League and the United Nations Security Council, which wouldn’t be the case with an Iran attack. And a military strike against Iran would be far more dangerous and risky than taking out the Qaddafi regime. That’s why the administration and its diplomatic partners are trying to peacefully resolve what has unnecessarily become a brewing conflict. On Saturday, Romney once again ridiculed Obama’s Middle East policy. “I think, by and large, you can just look at the things the president has done and do the opposite," Romney [told](http://www.centredaily.com/2012/06/16/3231783/romney-attacks-presidents-positions.html) the Faith and Freedom Coalition, a Christian right group run by Ralph Reed. If Obama seeks peace with Iran, then Romney and his ilk want yet another war.

# Rd 3 vs Stanford PS

## 1NC

### Capitalism K

#### First, framing:

#### The judge is a historian seeking social patterns of human existence—you should evaluate the aff as a dialectical materialist.

Tumino ‘1 Stephen Tumino, professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before,” Red Critique, Spring 2001, http://redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory. Finally, it is only Orthodox Marxism that recognizes the inevitability and also the necessity of communism—the necessity, that is, of a society in which "from each according to their ability to each according to their needs" (Marx) is the rule.

#### Links:

#### Energy production is inseparable from capitalist growth—quick tech fixes to scarcity are temporary at best and exclude radical historical critique

Clark and York ‘8 Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University, and Richard York, coeditor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, “Rifts and Shifts: Getting to the Root of Environmental Crises,” Monthly Review, Vol. 60, Issue 06, November 2008

The development of energy production technologies provides one of the best examples of rifts and shifts, as technological fixes to energy problems create new ecological crises in the attempt to alleviate old ones. Biomass, particularly wood, has, of course, been one of the primary energy sources humans have depended on throughout their history. The development of more energy intensive processes, such as the smelting of metals, was, therefore, connected with greater pressure on forests, as trees were fed to the fires. By the time the Industrial Revolution began to emerge in Europe, vast regions of the continent had already been deforested, particularly in areas close to major sites of production, and much of this deforestation was driven by the demand for fuel. As industrialization advanced, new sources of power were desired to fuel the machines that allowed for production to take place on a growing scale. Whole forests could be devoured at an unprecedented rate, making wood ever more scarce. The tension between the desire of the capitalist owners of the new industrial technologies for expanding the accumulation of capital and the biophysical limits of Earth were apparent from the start of the Industrial Revolution. However, capitalists did not concern themselves with the internal contradictions of capitalism, except insofar as they were barriers to be transcended. Thus, efforts to achieve what we would today call sustainability were not even considered by the elite. Rather, coal (and subsequently other fossil fuels) quickly became the standard fuel of industry, temporarily sidestepping the fuelwood crisis (although forests continued to fall due to the many demands placed on them) but laying the foundations for our current global climate change crisis by dramatically increasing the emission of carbon dioxide.16 The pattern has remained similar to how it was in the early years of the Industrial Revolution. Oil was quickly added to coal as a fuel source and a variety of other energy sources were increasingly exploited. Among these was hydropower, the generation of which requires damming rivers, and thus destroying aquatic ecosystems. For example, the expansion of hydropower over the twentieth century in the U.S. Pacific Northwest was the primary force leading to the widespread depletion and extinction of salmon runs. Nuclear power was, of course, the most controversial addition to the power mix. Despite initial claims that it would provide clean, unlimited power that would be too cheap to meter, it proved to be an expensive, risky power source that produced long-lived highly radioactive waste for which safe long-term storage sites have been nearly impossible to develop. Now, in the twenty-first century, with global climate change finally being recognized by the elite as a serious problem, the proposed solutions are, as we would expect, to shift the problem from one form of energy to a new form of energy. Nuclear power, despite its drop in popularity toward the end of the last century, due to high costs and widespread public opposition, is now very much back on the agenda, with new promises of how the new nuclear plants are safer—never mind the issue of radioactive waste. We are also regaled with promises of agrofuels, ironically bringing us back to the pre-coal energy crisis. Recent scientific reports note that growing crops for agrofuel to feed cars may actually increase the carbon emitted into the atmosphere.17 But even this ignores the fact that the production of agrofuel would be based on unsustainable agricultural practices that demand massive inputs of fertilizers and would only further the depletion of soil nutrients, bringing us back to the metabolic rift that Marx originally addressed. Two recent examples of technical approaches to mitigating climate change are particularly illustrative of how technological optimism distracts us from the political-economic sources of our environmental problems. Nobel laureate Paul Crutzen, who admirably played a central role in identifying and analyzing human-generated ozone depletion in the stratosphere, recently argued that climate change can be avoided by injecting sulfur particles into the stratosphere to increase the albedo of the Earth, and thus reflect more of the sun’s energy back into space, which would counter the warming stemming from rising concentrations of greenhouse gases. Although no doubt offered sincerely and out of desperation stemming from the failure of those in power adequately to address the mounting climate crisis, the technical framing of the climate change issue makes it easy for political and business leaders to avoid addressing greenhouse gas emissions, since they can claim that technical fixes make it unnecessary to take action to preserve forests and curtail the burning of fossil fuels. Engineering the atmosphere on this scale is likely to have many far-reaching consequences (acid rain being only the most obvious), many of which have not been anticipated. In a similar vein, well-known physicist Freeman Dyson recently suggested that we can avoid global climate change by replacing one-quarter of the world’s forests with genetically engineered carbon-eating trees. The ecological consequences of such an action would likely be extraordinary. Both of these so-called solutions avoid addressing the dynamics of an economic system that is largely structured around burning fossil fuels, that must constantly renew itself on a larger scale, and that runs roughshod over nature. Often techno-solutions are proposed in a manner that suggests they are completely removed from the world as it operates. The irony is that such narrowly conceived “solutions” would only serve as a means to prop up the very forces driving ecological degradation, allowing those forces to continue to operate, as they create additional ecological rifts.18

#### Efficiency increases energy consumption because price decreases yield higher demand—this is essential to capitalist growth

Foster et al. ’10 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at University of Oregon, Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University, and Richard York, associate professor of sociology at University of Oregon, “Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency,” Monthly Review, November 2010, Vol. 62, Issue 6, pp. 1-12

The Jevons Paradox is the product of a capitalist economic system that is unable to conserve on a macro scale, geared, as it is, to maximizing the throughput of energy and materials from resource tap to final waste sink. Energy savings in such a system tend to be used as a means for further development of the economic order, generating what Alfred Lotka called the “maximum energy flux,” rather than minimum energy production.34 The deemphasis on absolute (as opposed to relative) energy conservation is built into the nature and logic of capitalism as a system unreservedly devoted to the gods of production and profit. As Marx put it: “Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!”35 Seen in the context of a capitalist society, the Jevons Paradox therefore demonstrates the fallacy of current notions that the environmental problems facing society can be solved by purely technological means. Mainstream environmental economists often refer to “dematerialization,” or the “decoupling” of economic growth, from consumption of greater energy and resources. Growth in energy efficiency is often taken as a concrete indication that the environmental problem is being solved. Yet savings in materials and energy, in the context of a given process of production, as we have seen, are nothing new; they are part of the everyday history of capitalist development.36 Each new steam engine, as Jevons emphasized, was more efficient than the one before. “Raw materials-savings processes,” environmental sociologist Stephen Bunker noted, “are older than the Industrial Revolution, and they have been dynamic throughout the history of capitalism.” Any notion that reduction in material throughput, per unit of national income, is a new phenomenon is therefore “profoundly ahistorical.”37 What is neglected, then, in simplistic notions that increased energy efficiency normally leads to increased energy savings overall, is the reality of the Jevons Paradox relationship—through which energy savings are used to promote new capital formation and the proliferation of commodities, demanding ever greater resources. Rather than an anomaly, the rule that efficiency increases energy and material use is integral to the “regime of capital” itself.38 As stated in The Weight of Nations, an important empirical study of material outflows in recent decades in five industrial nations (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, and Japan): “Efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth.”39

#### Funding big oil is basically funneling money straight into climate change denialism propaganda—turns warming

Farley ’12 John W. Farley, teaches physics at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, “Petroleum and Propaganda,” Monthly Review, May 2012, Vol. 64, Issue 1, pp. 40-53

James Powell was inspired to write this important new book because of a remarkable paradox: among climate scientists, there is a near-unanimous consensus that global warming is occurring now, is largely manmade, and will cause very severe environmental problems if humanity continues business as usual. However, among the lay public the picture is much more mixed: only about half of the U.S. public agrees with the climate scientists. Why the enormous discrepancy? Powell argues that “in the denial of global warming, we are witnessing the most vicious, and so far most successful, attack on science in history.” Although Powell himself is not a climate science researcher, he has an appropriate background to understand the field: he holds a doctorate in geochemistry from MIT and became a geology professor, teaching at Oberlin College for over twenty years. He has been a college president at three institutions, and served for a dozen years on the National Science Board. Powell’s book is a sharp attack on the global-warming denial “industry,” a network comprised of corporate funding, think tanks, popularizers, and propagandists, who all work with a compliant mass media. Corporate Funders Powell details the support of ExxonMobil for denialism, but omits the combative Koch brothers, owners of Koch Energy, the world’s largest privately held energy company. ExxonMobil is the biggest funder of global-warming denialism, spending nearly $16 million on more than forty organizations over the period 1998–2005. Powell also mentions in passing funding by ideological conservative foundations, motivated by opposition to government regulation of the economy. Think Tanks Chapter nine describes “Toxic Tanks”—think tanks that promote global-warming denial. These toxic tanks have swell-sounding names (e.g., “Frontiers of Freedom”) that do not hint they are climate-change deniers. Powell describes in detail four (out of a much larger number) of these fossil-fuel-company-funded think tanks. 1. The now-defunct Global Climate Coalition (GCC) included Exxon- Mobil, Amoco, Chevron, American Petroleum Institute, Shell, Texaco, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Chrysler, General Motors, Ford, and the American Forest and Paper Association. The GCC, established in 1989, operated from the offices of the National Association of Manufacturing. The GCC hired a PR firm which produced a video to combat the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. However, some of its member companies left the GCC; they thought it too risky to be publicly identified with global-warming denial, and feared the fate of Big Tobacco; it had ended up losing lawsuits for health-care costs of smokers, ultimately settling for damages of $251 billion. Beset by the defections, the GCC disbanded in 2001. During its lifetime, the GCC established a research arm, the Science and Technology Assessment Committee, which was staffed by industry scientists. A committee led by Mobil Oil chemical engineer L. C. Bernstein produced a confidential 1995 report which was circulated to the members of GCC: oil and coal companies, electric utilities, attorneys, National Mining Association, etc. In a stunning admission, the Bernstein Report concluded that “the scientific basis for the greenhouse effect and the potential impact of human emissions of greenhouse gases such as CO2 on climate is well established and cannot be denied.” The report knocked down one of the most popular contrarian arguments: that global warming could be attributed to changes in the Sun’s brightness. In opposition to the contrarian view, the Bernstein Report stated that changes in the brightness of the Sun were too small by at least a factor of five to cause the temperature change observed in the last 120 years. It pointed out that the deniers had no alternative theory of their own, saying “The contrarian theories raise interesting questions about our total understanding of climate processes, but they do not offer convincing arguments against the conventional model of greenhouse gas emission-induced climate change.” Thus, while the oil companies and their hired hands were proclaiming in public that global warming was not caused by burning fossil fuels, their own scientists were saying exactly the opposite in private. If you have never heard of the Bernstein Report, you have lots of company. It did not surface until 2007, a dozen years after it was written, during a discovery process in a California court proceeding. 2. Another ExxonMobil-funded think tank discussed by Powell is the Chicago-based Heartland Institute, which originated as a Libertarian propaganda outfit supported by Big Tobacco. The manager for industry affairs for Philip Morris, Roy E. Marden, served for years on the Heartland board of directors. The Heartland Institute raised $676,500 from ExxonMobil between 1996 and 2006; after 2006 Heartland stopped identifying their contributors. The institute published a slim booklet, The Skeptic’s Handbook, whose publication costs were paid by “an anonymous donor,” and whose author, “Joanna Nova,” is a pseudonym. Vast numbers of the handbook were distributed for free—and in total over 150,000 copies have been distributed in fifteen languages. The recipients include 850 journalists, 26,000 schools, and 19,000 leaders and politicians. The largest single recipients are black churches (over 25,000 copies) and trustees at colleges and universities (over 20,000 copies). In addition, over 60,000 free copies have been downloaded from their website. In February 2012, too late for inclusion in Powell’s book, confidential documents from the Heartland Institute were leaked to bloggers. Damaging revelations included the identification of some corporate funders of Heartland: Microsoft, tobacco giant Altria, the pharmaceutical giant GlaxoSmithKline, and the General Motors Foundation. The documents describe payments by Heartland to some contrarian scientists: for example, Craig Idso, head of an organization of climate change deniers in Arizona, was receiving over $139,000 annually. The documents also describe Heartland’s plans for a “Global Warming Curriculum for K-12 Classrooms,” and the planned “curriculum that shows that the topic of climate change is controversial and uncertain—two key points that are effective at dissuading teachers from teaching science.”

#### Impacts:

#### Imperialism is necessitated by the growth imperative—hegemony conceals the worst of socioeconomic exploitation and justifies constant interventionism

Meszaros ‘7 Istvan Meszaros, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and Professor Emeritus at U. Sussex. “The Only Viable Economy,” Monthly Review, 2007 http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm

The quixotic advocacy of freezing production at the level attained in the early 1970s was trying to camouflage, with vacuous pseudo-scientific model-mongering pioneered at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the ruthlessly enforced actual power relations of U.S. dominated postwar imperialism.  That variety of imperialism was, of course, very different from its earlier form known to Lenin.  For in Lenin's lifetime at least half a dozen significant imperialist powers were competing for the rewards of their real and/or hoped for conquests.  And even in the 1930s Hitler was still willing to share the fruits of violently redefined imperialism with Japan and Mussolini's Italy.  In our time, by contrast, we have to face up to the reality -- and the lethal dangers -- arising from global hegemonic imperialism, with the United States as its overwhelmingly dominant power.[7](http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn7%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)  In contrast to even Hitler, the United States as the single hegemon is quite unwilling to share global domination with any rival.  And that is not simply on account of political/military contingencies.  The problems are much deeper.  They assert themselves through the ever-aggravating contradictions of the capital system's deepening structural crisis.  U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism is an -- ultimately futile -- attempt to devise a solution to that crisis through the most brutal and violent rule over the rest of the world, enforced with or without the help of slavishly "willing allies," now through a succession of genocidal wars.  Ever since the 1970s the United States has been sinking ever deeper into catastrophic indebtedness.  The fantasy solution publicly proclaimed by several U.S. presidents was "to grow out of it."  And the result: the diametrical opposite, in the form of astronomical and still growing indebtedness.  Accordingly, the United States must grab to itself, by any means at its disposal, including the most violent military aggression, whenever required for this purpose, everything it can, through the transfer of the fruits of capitalist growth -- thanks to the global socioeconomic and political/military domination of the United States -- from everywhere in the world.  Could then any sane person imagine, no matter how well armored by his or her callous contempt for "the shibboleth of equality," that U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism would take seriously even for a moment the panacea of "no growth"?  Only the worst kind of bad faith could suggest such ideas, no matter how pretentiously packaged in the hypocritical concern over "the Predicament of Mankind." For a variety of reasons there can be no question about the importance of growth both in the present and in the future.  But to say so must go with a proper examination of the concept of growth not only as we know it up to the present, but also as we can envisage its sustainability in the future.  Our siding with the need for growth cannot be in favor of unqualified growth.  The tendentiously avoided real question is: what kind of growth is both feasible today, in contrast to dangerously wasteful and even crippling capitalist growth visible all around us?  For growth must be also positively sustainable in the future on a long-term basis.

#### The impact is nuclear war and environmental destruction

Foster ‘5 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, "Naked Imperialism," Monthly Review, Vol. 57 No. 4, 2005

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue.

#### Alt:

#### Vote negative in favor of classist politics

#### Revolutionary theory is a prior question—the aff is irrelevant in the grand scheme of capitalism—we should instead affirm the historical necessity of communism

Tumino ’12 Stephen Tumino, more marxist than Marx himself, “Is Occupy Wall Street Communist,” Red Critique 14, Winter/Spring 2012, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/isoccupywallstreetcommunist.htm

Leaving aside that the purpose of Wolff's speech was to popularize a messianic vision of a more just society based on workplace democracy, he is right about one thing: Marx's original contribution to the idea of communism is that it is an historical and material movement produced by the failure of capitalism not a moral crusade to reform it. Today we are confronted with the fact that capitalism has failed in exactly the way that Marx explained was inevitable.[4] It has "simplified the class antagonism" (The Communist Manifesto); by concentrating wealth and centralizing power in the hands of a few it has succeeded in dispossessing the masses of people of everything except their labor power. As a result it has revealed that the ruling class "is unfit to rule," as The Communist Manifesto concludes, "because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him." And the slaves are thus compelled to fight back. Capitalism makes communism necessary because it has brought into being an international working class whose common conditions of life give them not only the need but also the economic power to establish a society in which the rule is "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Programme). Until and unless we confront the fact that capitalism has once again brought the world to the point of taking sides for or against the system as a whole, communism will continue to be just a bogey-man or a nursery-tale to frighten and soothe the conscience of the owners rather than what it is—the materialist theory that is an absolute requirement for our emancipation from exploitation and a new society freed from necessity! As Lenin said, "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" (What Is To Be Done?). We are confronted with an historic crisis of global proportions that demands of us that we take Marxism seriously as something that needs to be studied to find solutions to the problems of today. Perhaps then we can even begin to understand communism in the way that The Communist Manifesto presents it as "the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority" to end inequality forever.

#### Don’t mistake the alt for utopian weakness—the true absurdity is the idea that capital is the end of history. A negative ballot affirms the necessity of a better future.

Zizek 2k Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, 2000. Contingency, Hegemony, Universality, p. 323-24.

How, then, are we to answer today’s predominant consensus accord­ing to which the age of ideologies — of grand ideological projects like Socialism or Liberalism — is over, since we have entered the post-ideo­logical era of rational negotiation and decision-making, based upon the neutral insight into economic, ecological, etc. necessities? This consen­sus can assume different guises, from the neoconservative or Socialist refusal to accept it and consummate the loss of grand ideological proj­ects by means of a proper ‘work of mourning’ (different attempts to resuscitate global ideological projects) up to the neoliberal opinion according to which the passage from the age of ideologies to the post-ideological era is part of the sad but none the less inexorable process of the maturation of humanity —just as a young man has to learn to accept the loss of grand enthusiastic adolescent plans and enter the everyday adult life of realistic compromises, the collective subject has to learn to accept the withering-away of global utopian ideological projects and the entry into the post-utopian realist era . The first thing to note about this neoliberal cliché is that the neutral reference to the necessities of the market economy, usually invoked in order to categorize grand ideological projects as unrealistic utopias, is itself to be inserted into the series of great modern utopian projects. That is to say — as Fredric Jameson has pointed out — what characterizes utopia is not a belief in the essential goodness of human nature , or some similar naive notion, but, rather, belief in some global mechanism which, applied to the whole of society, will automatically bring about the balanced state of progress and happiness one is longing for — and, in this precise sense, is not the market precisely the name for such a mechanism which, properly applied, will bring about the optimal state of society? So, again, the first answer of the Left to those - Leftists themselves —who bemoan the loss of the utopian impetus in our societies should be that this impetus is alive and well — not only in the Rightist ‘fundamen­talist’ populism which advocates the return to grass-roots democracy, but above all among the advocates of the market economy themselves.’2 The second answer should be a clear line of distinction between utopia and ideology: ideology is not only a utopian project of social transfor­mation with no realistic chance of actualization; no less ideological is the anti-utopian stance of those who ‘realistically’ devalue every global proj­ect of social transformation as ‘utopian’, that is, as unrealistic dreaming and/or harbouring ‘totalitarian’ potential— today’s predominant form of ide­ological ‘closure’ takes the precise form of mental block which prevents us from imagining a fundamental social change, in the interests of an allegedly ‘realistic’ and mature’ attitude.

#### We control uniqueness for all offense - capitalism generates internal contradictions that make social upheaval inevitable - there's only a question of whether socialism or barbarism emerge victorious

Tumino ‘1 Stephen Tumino, professor of English at the University of Pittsburgh, "What is Orthodox Marxism and why it matters now more than ever," Red Critique, Spring 2001, accessed 1/3/10 http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

It is only Orthodox Marxism that explains socialism as an historical inevitability that is tied to the development of social production itself and its requirements. Orthodox Marxism makes socialism scientific because it explains how in the capitalist system, based on the private consumption of labor-power (competition), the objective tendency is to reduce the amount of time labor spends in reproducing itself (necessary labor) while expanding the amount of time labor is engaged in producing surplus-value (surplus-labor) for the capitalist through the introduction of machinery into the production process by the capitalists themselves to lower their own labor costs. Because of the competitive drive for profits under capitalism it is historically inevitable that a point is reached when the technical mastery—the amount of time socially necessary on average to meet the needs of society through the processing of natural resources—is such that the conditions of the workers worsen relative to the owners and becomes an unbearable global social contradiction in the midst of the ever greater mass of wealth produced. It is therefore just as inevitable that at such a moment it obviously makes more sense to socialize production and meet the needs of all to avoid the explosive social conflicts perpetually generated by private property than to maintain the system at the risk of total social collapse on a world scale. "Socialism or barbarism" (Luxemburg) is the inevitable choice faced by humanity because of capitalism. Either maintain private property and the exploitation of labor in production, in which case more and more social resources will go into policing the growingly desperate surplus-population generated by the technical efficiency of social production, or socialize production and inaugurate a society whose founding principle is "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program, Selected Works, 325) and "in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Manifesto of the Communist Party, Selected Works, 53).

#### Economic stimulus policies distract the public from the problems of the economy by giving the cutthroat nature of capitalist politics a compassionate face

Wolff ’11 Richard D. Wolff, Professor of Economics Emeritus, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and currently a Visiting Professor in the Graduate Program in International Affairs of the New School University in New York, “The Keynesian Revival: A Marxian Critique,” Alternate Routes, Vol 22 (2011), http://www.alternateroutes.ca/index.php/ar/article/view/14420

Besides their secondary role, Keynesian policies also serve an important diversionary function. Governments appear to be working mightily to “overcome the economic crisis” by implementing those policies with great fanfare. They thereby distract publics from yet another repetition of the normal capitalist’s cyclical downturn. Exploding national debts, like other Keynesian policy programs constitute an elaborate diversionary political theater. As capitalist crises deepen and last, politicians of most persuasions increasingly express concern, compassion, and/or anger about mass unemployment, home foreclosures, bankruptcies, poverty, etc. They engage in heavily publicized debates and legislative contests over the appropriate monetary, fiscal, regulatory, subsidy, bailout, capital control, and private-enterprise- take-over policies to be executed by the state. These theatrics usually absorb the political energies of many left and right forces that might otherwise, separately or together, make the capitalist system itself the object of opposition, struggle, and transformation. Left-tilting inflections of Keynesian policies often include, for example, direct state subsidies to or hiring’s of un/underemployed workers, controls over private investment flows, and enterprise nationalizations. Right-tilting inflections often include, for example, restrictions on immigration, reduced taxes on small businesses, and spending on business-friendly infrastructure construction.

#### Growth logic makes warming inevitable by prioritizing short term gains over long term sustainability

Ahmed ’8 Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, professor of international relations at the School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies at the University of Sussex, "Capitalism, Consumerism and Materialism: The Value Crisis," World Prout Assembly, 28 February 2008, accessed 1/28/10 http://www.worldproutassembly.org/archives/2008/03/capitalism\_cons.html

The global economic, ecological and energy crises we face – as well as associated crises (terrorism, conflict, and so on) -- are not separate but fundamentally interlinked: at the source of our ills is an excessive exploitation of hydrocarbon resources that is tied to the escalation of CO2 emissions with no recognition of limits or boundaries, fuelling global warming and the acceleration of climate change, devastating eco-systems, facilitating the deaths of millions of people and the extinction of thousands of species. The logic of “growth” is simultaneously driving us to deplete hydrocarbon and other natural resources at unprecedented, and unsustainable, rates – such that oil and gas are for all intents and purposes running dry. Both climate change and energy crises are impacting on our ability to sustain global food production. Water shortages and hotter weather are destroying the viability of agriculture, while portended fuel shortages are set to undermine the continuity of agribusiness which is heavily dependent on oil and gas. The increasing inability of food production to meet consumer demand is also linked to the destructive “growth”-driven technologies of a hierarchical agribusiness industry monopolized by short-sighted corporate conglomerates, within a skewered international system of food distribution that marginalizes two-thirds of the world population. Finally, the world economy on its own terms is on the verge of self-imploding. Geared to serve the interests of corporate profit maximization, the world economy systematically generates widening inequalities that result not only in the deprivation of the majority of the world’s population, but death-by-deprivation on an increasing scale. But in doing so, the economic system ignores its own internal contradictions, even while leading financial analysts from within the IMF to Morgan Stanley are now warning of an imminent global economic meltdown.

#### Capitalism tends toward stagnation—market interventions and innovative spurts only produce contradictions of greater depth and complexity.

Foster and McChesney ’12 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at University of Oregon, and Robert W. McChesney, Gutgsell Endowed Professor of Communication, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, “The Endless Crisis,” Monthly Review, May 2012, vol. 64, issue 1, pp. 1-28

Nearly twenty years later, Sweezy, writing with Paul Baran, published their now classic study, Monopoly Capital, which was to have a strong influence on New Left economics in the 1970s. “The normal state of the monopoly capitalist economy,” they declared, “is stagnation.”28 According to this argument, the rise of the giant monopolistic (or oligopolistic) corporations had led to a tendency for the actual and potential investment-seeking surplus in society to rise. The very conditions of exploitation (or high price markups on unit labor costs) meant both that inequality in society increased and that more and more surplus capital tended to accumulate actually and potentially within the giant firms and in the hands of wealthy investors, who were unable to find profitable investment outlets sufficient to absorb all of the investment-seeking surplus. Hence, the economy became increasingly dependent on external stimuli such as higher government spending (particularly on the military), a rising sales effort, and financial expansion to maintain growth.29 Such external stimuli, as Sweezy was later to explain, were “not part of the internal logic of the economy itself,” falling “outside the scope of mainstream economics from which historical, political, and sociological considerations are carefully excluded.”30 All of these external stimuli were self-limiting, and/or generated further long-run contradictions, leading to the resumption of stagnation tendencies. Sending capital investment abroad did little to abate the problem since the return flow of profits and other business returns, under conditions of unequal exchange between global North and South and U.S. hegemony in general, tended to overwhelm the outward flow. A truly epoch-making innovation, playing the role of the steam engine, the railroad, or the automobile in the nineteenth and early-to-midtwentieth centuries, might alter the situation. But such history-changing innovations of the kind that would alter the entire geography and scale of accumulation were not to be counted on and were probably less likely under mature monopoly-capitalist conditions. The result was that the economy, despite its ordinary ups and downs, tended to sink into a normal state of long-run slow growth, rather than the robust growth assumed by orthodox economics. In essence an economy in which decisions on savings and investment are made privately tends to fall into a stagnation trap: existing demand is insufficient to absorb all of the actual and potential savings (or surplus) available, output falls, and there is no automatic mechanism that generates full recovery.31 Stagnation theory, in this sense, did not mean that strong economic growth for a time was impossible in mature capitalist economies—simply that stagnation was the normal case and that robust growth had to be explained as the result of special historical factors. This reversed the logic characteristic of neoclassical economics, which assumed that rapid growth was natural under capitalism, except when outside forces, such as the state or trade unions, interfered with the smooth operation of the market. Stagnation also did not necessarily mean deep downturns with negative growth, but rather a slowing down of the trend-rate of growth due to overaccumulation. Net investment (i.e., investment beyond that covered by depreciation funds) atrophied, since with rising productivity what little investment was called for could be met through depreciation funds alone. Stagnation thus assumed steady technological progress and rising productivity as its basis. It was not that the economy was not productive enough; rather it was too productive to absorb the entire investment-seeking surplus generated within production.

#### Ethical obligation to reject capital—all economic calculus understates its destructive power

Daly ‘4 Glyn Daly, senior lecturer in politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College Northampton, Conversations With Zizek, 2004, pp. 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 breaks with these types of positions 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 bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor­bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, 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 fetish. 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 population. 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 judgement in a neutral marketplace. 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 to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

#### Monopoly capitalism’s tendancy towards short-term growth leads to long-run stagnation—wealth centralization in corporations and finance restricts macro-level liquidity and intellectual innovation

Foster and McChesney ’12 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at University of Oregon, and Robert W. McChesney, Gutgsell Endowed Professor of Communication, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, “The Endless Crisis,” Monthly Review, May 2012, vol. 64, issue 1, pp. 1-28

Our own analysis in this book begins in many ways where Sweezy (and Harry Magdoff) left off, and carries forward as well the analysis of John Bellamy Foster and Fred Magdoff in The Great Financial Crisis: Causes and Consequences (2009).40 What Sweezy called the “intricately related” aspects of monopolization, stagnation, financialization, and globalization have produced a new historical phase, which we refer to as “monopoly- finance capital.” In this period the Triad economies are locked in a stagnation-financialization trap, while linked to the growth in the emerging economies via the global labor arbitrage—whereby multinational corporations exploit the differences in wage levels in the world in order to extract surplus profits. The result is the worsening of the overall problem of surplus capital absorption and financial instability in the center of the world economy. In this book we are particularly concerned with how this is working out at the global level, with considerable focus (in the later chapters) on how this is related to the Chinese economy. Yet, the central problem remains overaccumulation within the Triad, where the United States, despite its declining hegemony, still constitutes the trend-setting force in the world system of accumulation. The deepening effects of stagnation in the U.S. economy can be seen in Chart 2, showing the long-run downward trend in the growth rate of industrial production in the United States. Nor is the United States alone in this respect. Since the 1960s West Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Japan have all seen even larger declines, when compared to the United States, in their trend-rates of growth of industrial production. In the case of Japan industrial production rose by 16.7 percent in 1960–70 and by a mere 0.04 percent in 1990–2010.41 The story shown in Chart 2 is one of deepening stagnation of production— already emphasized by Sweezy and Magdoff in the 1970s and ‘80s. Chart 3, in contrast, reveals that this led—especially from the 1980s on—to a shift in the economy from production to speculative finance as the main stimulus to growth. Thus the FIRE (finance, insurance, and real estate) portion of national income expanded from 35 percent of the goods-production share in the early 1980s to over 65 percent in recent years. The so-called economic booms of the 1980s and ‘90s were powered by the rapid growth of financial speculation leveraged by increasing debt, primarily in the private sector. The dramatic rise in the share of income associated with finance relative to goods production industries has not, however, been accompanied by an equally dramatic rise of the share of jobs in financial services as opposed to industrial production. Thus employment in FIRE as a percentage of employment in goods production over the last two decades has remained flat at about 22 percent. This suggests that the big increase in income associated with finance when compared to production has resulted in outsized gains for a relatively few income recipients rather than a corresponding increase in jobs.42 The rapid expansion of FIRE in relation to goods production in the U.S. economy is a manifestation of the long-run financialization of the economy, i.e., the shift of the center of gravity of economic activity increasingly from production (and production-related services) to speculative finance. In the face of market saturation and vanishing profitable investment opportunities in the “real economy,” capital formation or real investment gave way before the increased speculative use of the economic surplus of society in pursuit of capital gains through asset inflation. As Magdoff and Sweezy explained as early as the 1970s, this could have an indirect effect in stimulating the economy, primarily by spurring luxury consumption. This has become known as the “wealth effect,” whereby a portion of the capital gains associated with asset appreciation in the stock market, real estate market, etc. is spent on goods and services for the well-to-do, adding to the effective demand in the economy.43 Yet, the stimulus provided by financialization has not prevented a multi-decade decline in the role of investment in the U.S. economy. Thus net private nonresidential fixed investment dropped from 4 percent of GDP in the 1970s to 3.8 percent in the ‘80s, 3 percent in the ‘90s, and 2.4 percent in 2000–2010.44 At the heart of the matter is the declining long-term growth rate of investment in manufacturing, and more particularly in manufacturing structures (construction of new or refurbished manufacturing plants and facilities), as shown in Chart 4.45 Even with declining rates of investment growth, productivity increases in industry have continued, leading to the expansion of excess productive capacity (an indication of the overaccumulation of capital). This can be seen in Chart 5 showing the long-term slide in capacity utilization in manufacturing. High and rising levels of unused (or excess) capacity have a negative effect on investment since corporations are naturally reluctant to invest in industries where a large portion of the existing capacity is standing idle. The U.S. automobile industry leading up to and during the Great Recession (like the worldwide industry) was faced with huge amounts of unused capacity—equal to approximately onethird of its total capacity. A 2008 Businessweek article underscored the global auto glut: “With sales tanking from Beijing to Boston, automakers find themselves in an embarrassing position. Having indulged in a global orgy of factory-building in recent years, the industry has the capacity to make an astounding 94 million vehicles each year. That’s about 34 million too many based on current sales, according to researcher CSM Worldwide, or the output of about 100 plants.”46 The decreasing utilization of productive capacity is paralleled by what we referred to in 2004 as “The Stagnation of Employment,” or the growing unemployment and underemployment that characterizes both the U.S. economy and the economies of the Triad in general. According to the alternative labor underutilization measure, U6, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a full 14.9 percent of the civilian work force (plus marginally attached workers) were unemployed or underemployed on a seasonally adjusted basis in the United States in February 2012.47 In these circumstances, the U.S. economy, as we have seen, has become chronically dependent on the ballooning of the financial superstructure to keep things going. Industrial corporations themselves have became financialized entities, operating more like banks in financing sales of their products, and often engaging in speculation on commodities and currencies. Today they are more inclined to pursue the immediate, surefire gains available through merger, acquisition, and enhanced monopoly power than to commit their capital to the uncertain exigencies associated with the expansion of productive activity. Political-economic power has followed the financial growth curve of the economy, with the economic base of political hegemony shifting from the real economy of production to the financial world, and increasingly serving the interests of the latter, in what became known as the neoliberal age.48 The main key to understanding these developments, however, remains the Sweezy Normal State. The long-term trends associated with economic growth, industrial production, investment, financialization, and capacity utilization (as shown in Charts 1–5 above) all point to the same phenomenon of a long-term economic slowdown in the U.S. and the other advanced industrial economies. A central cause of this stagnation tendency is the high, and today rapidly increasing, price markups of monopolistic corporations, giving rise to growing problems of surplus capital absorption. Taking the nonfarm business sector as a whole, the price markup on unit labor costs (the ratio of prices to unit labor costs) for the U.S. economy over the entire post-Second World War period averaged 1.57, with a low of around 1.50 in the late 1940s. However, from the late 1990s to the present the markup on unit labor costs—what the great Polish economist Michal Kalecki referred to as the “degree of monopoly”— has climbed sharply, to 1.75 in the final quarter of 2011. As stated in The Economic Report of the President, 2012: “The markup has now risen to its highest level in post-World War II history, with much of that increase taking place over the past four years. Because the markup of prices over unit labor costs is the inverse of the labor share of output, saying that an increase in the price markup is the highest in postwar history is equivalent to saying that the labor share of output has fallen to its lowest level.”49

### Warming Adv

Carbon sequestration doesn’t solve warming – they don’t take into account net heat emissions

ScienceDaily (July 13, 2009) “Trapping Carbon Dioxide Or Switching To Nuclear Power Not Enough To Solve Global Warming Problem, Experts Say” <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/07/090713085248.htm>

Bo Nordell and Bruno Gervet of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Luleå University of Technology in Sweden have calculated the total energy emissions from the start of the industrial revolution in the 1880s to the modern day. They have worked out that using the increase in average global air temperature as a measure of global warming is an inadequate measure of climate change. They suggest that scientists must also take into account the total energy of the ground, ice masses and the seas if they are to model climate change accurately. The researchers have calculated that the heat energy accumulated in the atmosphere corresponds to a mere 6.6% of global warming, while the remaining heat is stored in the ground (31.5%), melting ice (33.4%) and sea water (28.5%). They point out that net heat emissions between the industrial revolution circa 1880 and the modern era at 2000 correspond to almost three quarters of the accumulated heat, i.e., global warming, during that period. Their calculations suggest that most measures to combat global warming, such as reducing our reliance on burning fossil fuels and switching to renewables like wind power and solar energy, will ultimately help in preventing catastrophic climate change in the long term. But the same calculations also show that trapping carbon dioxide, so-called carbon dioxide sequestration, and storing it deep underground or on the sea floor will have very little effect on global warming. "Since net heat emissions accounts for most of the global warming there is no or little reason for carbon dioxide sequestration," Nordell explains, "The increasing carbon dioxide emissions merely show how most net heat is produced. The "missing" heat, 26%, is due to the greenhouse effect, natural variations in climate and/or an underestimation of net heat emissions, the researchers say. These calculations are actually rather conservative, the researchers say, and the missing heat may be much less. The researchers also point out a flaw in the nuclear energy argument. Although nuclear power does not produce carbon dioxide emissions in the same way as burning fossil fuels it does produce heat emissions equivalent to three times the energy of the electricity it generates and so contributes to global warming significantly, Nordell adds.

#### CCS can’t solve warming

Nordell and Gervet 09 – Bo Nordell\* and Bruno Gervet [Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Luleå University of Technology] “Global energy accumulation and net heat emission” Int. J. Global Warming, Vol. 1, Nos. 1/2/3, 2009, <http://www.zo.utexas.edu/courses/THOC/Nordell-Gervet2009ijgw.pdf>

Independent of what causes global warming, it should be considered in terms of ¶ accumulated energy. The performed estimations of global heat accumulation in the air, ¶ ground and global net heat emissions only include the years from 1880 to 2000. ¶ The data used in estimating global heat accumulation in the air, ground and melting ¶ of land ice are relatively reliable, while the melting of sea ice might be overestimated. ¶ The main uncertainty concerns sea temperature increase, which means that sensible heat ¶ accumulation in sea water might be underestimated. It was found that the air only ¶ contains 6.6% of the globally accumulated heat, of which 45% is distributed over the land ¶ area, though it accounts for about 30% of Earth’s total area. The remaining heat is ¶ accumulated in the ground (31.5%), sea water (28.5%), melting of sea ice (11.2%) and ¶ melting of land ice (22.2%) (Figure 4). ¶ The melting of ice has absorbed 33.4% of the total global warming. The heat stored ¶ by sea water, the melting of sea ice and in the air over oceans accounts for almost 43% of ¶ the global heat accumulation, while the corresponding value for the land area is about ¶ 35% if ~22% of land ice, which is mainly in Greenland, is treated separately. ¶ It is concluded that net heat emissions contributes to 74% of global warming. The ¶ missing heat (26%) must have other causes, e.g., the greenhouse effect, natural variations ¶ in the climate and/or the underestimation of net heat emissions. ¶ The performed calculations are conservative, i.e., both the global heat accumulation ¶ and heat emissions are underestimated. Each of these means that the missing heat in ¶ Figure 4 is too high. These uncertainties are discussed in more detail in Appendix B. ¶ Most measures that already have been taken to combat global warming are also ¶ beneficial for the current explanation. Renewable energy should be promoted instead of ¶ using fossil fuels. However, CO2 sequestration and subsequent storage will have very ¶ little effect on global warming. It is also concluded that nuclear power is not a solution ¶ to (but part of) the problem. The underestimated heat accumulation means that the ¶ missing heat in Figure 4 is too high. Also, the underestimation of net heat emission gives ¶ the same result.

#### Expanded international agreements are key but every major party faces massive political roadblocks to increased involvement

Schreurs ’12 Miranda A. Schreurs, Director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Free University of Berlin, “Breaking the impasse in the international climate negotiations: The potential of green technologies,” Energy Policy 48, September 2012, pp. 5-12, Elsevier

The Durban outcome has kept the international negotiation process alive, but does not reﬂect the urgency of the problem at hand. That no post-Kyoto agreement is expected to enter into force until 2020 and the content of the agreement still needs to be developed also raises the question of whether the international community will be able to put a break on rising greenhouse gas emissions, let alone reduce them on the order that will be necessary to stay within the 1.5 to 2.0 degree Centrigrade temperature goal. The general scientiﬁc consensus is that if the rise in greenhouse gases is not halted by 2020 and then reduced on the order of 50% below 1990 levels by 2050, then it will be next to impossible to maintain the rise in greenhouse gases to within the 2 degrees Centigrade range. One very major challenge to the future agreement is the domestic political situation in the United States, which makes passage of national climate legislation, let alone ratiﬁcation of a global climate agreement highly unlikely in the near future. Already in Cancun, Japan made it clear that it opposes a second phase for the Kyoto Protocol. Yoshito Sengoku, Japan’s Chief Cabinet Secretary, announced that Japan would ‘‘sternly oppose debate for extending the Kyoto Protocol into a second phase which is unfair and ineffective.’’ (United Press International (UPI), 2010; MOFA, 2010). With its rapidly rising greenhouse gas emissions tied to the extraction of oil from tar sands in Alberta, Canada has pulled out of the agreement. Also problematic is the resistance of many developing countries to the establishment of binding emission reduction targets and timetables. India strongly pushed the perspective of per capita equity arguing that it should not be held captive by a problem largely caused by other countries. With its low per capita greenhouse gas emission levels as a result of high levels of poverty, India will be reluctant to accept commitments that could affect its economic growth perspectives.

#### Entrenched political forces prevent broad climate reform in the US

Schreurs ’12 Miranda A. Schreurs, Director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Free University of Berlin, “Breaking the impasse in the international climate negotiations: The potential of green technologies,” Energy Policy 48, September 2012, pp. 5-12, Elsevier

The Obama administration’s efforts were directed at framing climate change as a serious threat and linking policy action to the development of a cleaner, greener energy infrastructure that would make the U.S. more energy independent and sustainable. Green energy policy change has been portrayed by the Obama White House as an economic opportunity, and a possible way out of the ﬁnancial crisis ailing the country in terms of creating new jobs and securing the states’ economies. Still, Obama’s efforts to win over climate skeptics has proven difﬁcult, and conservative forces continue to challenge his environmental agenda. Politicians from states with large coal, oil, manufacturing, and/or agricultural industries, regardless of party afﬁliation, have been inclined to vote against climate legislation because they see it as a threat to their state’s economy and jobs. They have even taken steps to curb the federal government’s ability to conduct climate change programs.

#### CCS is too risky for businesses and it diverts funding from other renewable turning warming – assumes EOR

Greenpeace International 8 (Greenpeace, independent global campaigning organisation that acts to change attitudes and behavior, "False Hope," May, [www.greenpeace.org/usa/Global/usa/report/2008/5/false-hope-why-carbon-capture.pdf], jam)

Cost estimates for CCS vary considerably depending on factors such as power station configuration, CCS technology, fuel costs, size of project and location. One thing is certain, CCS is expensive. It requires significant funds to construct the power stations and necessary infrastructure to transport and store carbon. The IPCC sets costs between US$15-75 per ton of captured CO2. 127 A recent US DOE report found installing carbon capture systems to most modern plant technologies resulted in a near doubling of plant costs. 128 Such costs are estimated to increase the price of electricity anywhere from 21-91%. 129 For transport, pipeline networks will need to be built to move CO2 to storage sites. The construction of a network of pipelines for CCS is likely to require a considerable outlay of capital. 130 Costs will vary depending on a number of factors, including pipeline length, diameter and specific steel components (corrosion-resistant) as well as the volume of CO2 to be transported. Pipelines built near population centres or on difficult terrain (such as marshy or rocky ground) are more expensive. 131 The IPCC estimates a cost range for pipelines between US$1-8/ton of CO2 transported (see Table 5). 132 A United States Congressional Research Services report calculated capital costs for an 11-mile (18 km) pipeline in the midwestern part of the country at approximately US$6 million. The same report estimates that a dedicated interstate pipeline network in North Carolina would cost upwards of US$5 billion due to the limited geological sequestration potential in that part of the country. 133 Storage and subsequent monitoring and verification costs are estimated to range from US$0.5-8/tCO2 injected and US$0.1-0.3/tCO2 injected, respectively. 134 The overall cost of CCS could serve as another barrier to its deployment. 135 EOR has been suggested as a way to offset the costs but as “Oil fails to pay for CCS” (page 28) shows, in reality this is questionable. 136 CCS diverts resources away from real solutions In recent years, the share of research and development budgets in countries pursuing CCS has ballooned, with CCS often included as part of renewable energy packages. Meanwhile, funding for real renewable technologies and efficiency has stagnated or declined. The US DOE’s fiscal year 2009 budget seeks a 26.4% increase (US$493.4 million in FY 2008 vs. US$623.6 million in FY 2009) in funding for CCS-related programmes, at the same time it is scaling back programmes tied to renewable energy and efficiency research and cutting budgets by 27.1% (US$211.1 million in FY 2008 vs. US$146.2 million in FY 2009). 137 Australia has three cooperative Research Centres for fossil fuels, one particularly committed to CCS. There is not one for renewable energy technology. 138 In Norway, petroleum-based research receives over five times more funds than renewable energy research. A recent commitment of more than 20 billion NOK (US$4 billion) for two CCS projects aimed at capturing 2 MtCO2 annually (see ”How CCS has crippled the Norwegian energy debate”, page 29) further widens the gap.

### Oil Dependence Adv

#### Middle East conflict is impossible—their ev is biased

Kahn ’11 Jeremy Kahn, “Crude reality,” Boston Globe, 2/13/2011, http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2011/02/13/crude\_reality/?page=full

In their Security Studies paper, Gholz and Press argue that there are indeed a few threats in the Persian Gulf that might overwhelm the oil market and threaten US energy security. One of these would be an attempt by a single power to conquer the majority of the region. Another is Iran blocking the Strait of Hormuz, the only irreplaceable sea channel. The third is revolution in Saudi Arabia. The first two scenarios are highly unlikely, Press and Gholz argue, and could be countered by moving in US forces stationed elsewhere in the world, such as the neighboring Mediterranean and Indian Ocean. (There is debate among security analysts about whether Iran has the military capability to close the strait, or could itself economically survive such a move.) A revolt in Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, is looking increasingly possible given the recent events in Tunisia and Egypt — but it could not be prevented by the US military deployed in the Gulf. Our presence could even make such unrest more likely, if soldiers became flashpoints for revolutionary anger. Gholz’s and Press’s argument has gained some currency in academic circles. “I have believed for a long time that the US presence in the Gulf has been ‘under argued’ strategically,” Barry Posen, a professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where both Gholz and Press received their PhDs, wrote in an e-mail response to questions about this topic. “Press and Gholz undermine the usual ‘simple’ arguments for being there. That leaves us looking for other arguments that may be the ‘true’ ones, or suspecting that there is no strong argument.” But it has gained little traction so far either on Capitol Hill or in the corridors of the Pentagon. “Did it immediately change people’s minds? Not really,” Gholz said of his paper. Auerswald, who has grown frustrated by the lack of response to his own research on this topic, said that the problem is that the fear of Middle Eastern oil shocks is now politically useful to a whole spectrum of powerful interest groups. “This argument is like the familiar old jeans of American politics,” he said. “They are nice and cozy and comfortable and everyone can wear them. Because of ethanol, the farm lobby loves it; for coal, well it’s their core argument; for the offshore drilling folks, they love it.” Even the environmental movement relies on it, he said, because they use it as bogeyman to scare Americans into taking renewable energy and energy conservation more seriously. As for the US military, “The US Navy is not interested in hearing that one of their two main theaters of operation has no justification for being,” Auerswald said. The costs to US foreign policy, of course, cannot be calculated in dollars and cents alone, although certainly the cost here has been very high. But it looks even higher when one considers the lost opportunities and squandered chances — what we could be achieving if we weren’t so concerned about a threat that looks increasingly like an illusion. “If we are going to commit our troops to prevent something from happening, it should be something that would be an existential threat to the United States,” said Auerswald. “Having people wait in line for five days for gas in one part of the US is not an existential threat.”

#### U.S. oil production is at a record high and is only getting higher – we’re nearly energy independent

Brodrick 12 (Sean, Weiss Research’s small-cap specialist, concentrating in natural resources, is the editor of the company’s Red-Hot Global Resources, Global Resource Hunter, as well as a regular contributor to the daily investment e-newsletter, Uncommon Wisdom, "3 Reasons Why Oil Prices Will Go Lower Short-Term," Jun 14, [http://www.uncommonwisdomdaily.com/3-reasons-why-oil-prices-will-go-lower-short-term-14427], jam)

#1. Saudi Arabia Could Tell OPEC to Take a Hike.¶ Recently, Saudi Arabia increased its production to 10 million barrels a day to pick up the slack from sanctions against fellow OPEC member Iran. What’s more, Saudi Oil Minister Ali al-Naimi said the desert kingdom saw increased oil production (and lower prices) as a “stimulus” for the sputtering global economy.¶ What’s more, Mr. al-Naimi said Saudi Arabia’s analysis “suggests we will need a higher (production) ceiling than currently exists.”¶ While the Saudis will see how other OPEC members react before formulating a position, Mr. al-Naimi added that his country needs to be allowed to produce more than it currently does. Saudi Arabia says it has spare capacity of another 2.5 million barrels per day.¶ Is Mr. Luaibi, the oil minister for Iraq, going to tell the Saudis otherwise? Iraq’s oil exports are expected to rise to 2.9 million barrels-per-day next year, from 2.4 million barrels this year. So, Mr. Luaibi might have trouble convincing the Saudis to cut back.¶ It may all be a wash because Saudi Arabia said it is going into the meeting planning not to ask for OPEC to raise the production level. But that won’t stop it from cheating like a bandit … indeed, any OPEC country that can produce more oil seems to be ready to do so, regardless of quotas.¶ Also, Saudi Arabia has every incentive to keep prices low enough to discourage a search for alternative fuels and keep demand high for its oil.¶ Sources say while Iran needs $117 oil to balance its budget, Saudi Arabia is happy with $100 oil. I think the Saudis might be happier with even-lower prices than that, considering that they can pump oil for an estimated cost of $20 per barrel.¶ Think about it: If the Saudis keep the price of oil low enough, long enough, a lot of expensive deepwater-oil projects will have to be shelved.¶ Compare their $20-per-barrel cost with North Sea fields that have a marginal cost of about $60 per barrel, while other new deepwater discoveries can cost from $70 to $90 per barrel.¶ That means more market share for the Saudis, who can ride prices back up again after they put some deepwater competitors out of business.¶ #2. U.S. Oil Production Soars; Imports Drop.¶ U.S. oil production has risen 25% since 2008 (an additional 1.6 million barrels per day), and last year, the United States registered the largest increase in oil production of any country outside of OPEC. America’s oil production could increase by 600,000 barrels per day this year.¶ Hydraulic fracturing has led to a monumental increase in U.S. natural gas and oil production, which will only increase further as the country’s demand for those resources grows.¶ Result: We are becoming more independent of imported oil. Net petroleum imports have fallen from 60% of total consumption in 2005 to 42% today. Here’s a chart I picked up from economics professor Mark J. Perry’s excellent Carpe Diem blog …¶ What’s more, the composition of our imported oil is changing. The output of Canadian oil sands has tripled since 2000. Not only is Canada a friendly country, but Canada’s production is already hooked into the North American oil grid. So, more production from Canada lowers U.S. oil prices, which already trade at a steep discount to the Brent crude international benchmark.¶ I’m not saying we’re going to be free of imported oil, or even free of importing oil from countries that hate us. I’m saying that the more independence we get with our energy supply, the better off we are.¶ Does more oil supply here in the U.S. translate to lower prices at the gas pump? Bet on it! The average price for a gallon of regular gasoline in the United States fell 15.9 cents to $3.624 in the past three weeks.¶ #3. Global Economic Growth Is Slowing Down.¶ The debt crisis is just one problem Europe is grappling with. Another is that economies all over Europe are slowing down rapidly, including the engine of Europe, Germany.¶ This economic slowdown — with a threat of recession — is weighing on oil demand and prices. In fact, Europe’s fuel demand has fallen so fast that nearly a quarter of Europe’s refinery capacity was taken offline in May, as refiners responded to declining demand for gasoline and diesel.¶ The euro zone accounts for just 12% of global oil demand, or about half as much as the United States. But since oil prices are made on the margins, a euro-zone recession will be a heavy weight on crude.¶ Meanwhile, in China, imports went up 0.4% in May to a record 6 million barrels, but that’s because China is building up oil stockpiles. In fact, the most bullish news for oil is that China diverted 40 million barrels to its strategic petroleum reserve and could add another 85 to 110 million barrels in the second half of the year.¶ But China’s economy is hitting the brakes. China’s inflation dipped to a two-year low in May while economic activity remained weak. Steel production fell 2.5% in May compared to April. Iron ore spot import prices fell 8% through most of May. And output of copper fell 1.4% month-on-month, its second-consecutive month of decline.¶ Here in the U.S., our economy is still growing. But job creation slipped alarmingly in April and May, and manufacturing orders slid lower in the last two months.¶ I don’t know if we’re going into another recession. In fact, I hope we can avoid it, and one thing that will help us avoid a recession is lower oil prices. But the fear of a recession should be enough to cause traders to make bearish bets on oil prices. And that could send oil prices lower, faster than anyone thinks possible.¶ OPEC has a poor record of halting such dives. Deutsche Bank data shows that, over the past 20 years, OPEC has slashed production 13 times to try and prop up prices. Three-quarters of the time, the tactic has succeeded within three months. There are three notable exceptions: 1998, 2001 and 2008. In each instance, amid a worldwide economic slump, it took an average of 15 months for the cuts to work.

#### A Mideast war would not escalate or go nuclear

Elizabeth Stevens, September 19, 2002, http://infomanage.com/nonproliferation/najournal/israelinucs.html

Thus far, Israel has confronted continuous hostility with a strong conventional superiority. It is doubtful that it would resort to a nuclear weapon given the fact that it could repel the attack of any one of its Arab opponents and probably a combination of them. Israel has signed a peace treaty with Egypt, and moderating forces in Jordan are strong. The recent peace treaty with the PLO and differences between Iraq and Syria further reduce the possibility of a united Arab attack. It would appear that Israel does not need a nuclear arsenal.

#### Can’t escalate—empirics and deterrence checks

Ferguson ‘6 (Niall, Professor of History at Harvard University, Senior Research Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, and Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford, LA Times, July 24)

Could today's quarrel between Israelis and Hezbollah over Lebanon produce World War III? That's what Republican Newt Gingrich, the former speaker of the House, called it last week, echoing earlier fighting talk by Dan Gillerman, Israel's ambassador to the United Nations. Such language can — for now, at least — safely be dismissed as hyperbole. This crisis is not going to trigger another world war. Indeed, I do not expect it to produce even another Middle East war worthy of comparison with those of June 1967 or October 1973. In 1967, Israel fought four of its Arab neighbors — Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq. In 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. Such combinations are very hard to imagine today. Nor does it seem likely that Syria and Iran will escalate their involvement in the crisis beyond continuing their support for Hezbollah. Neither is in a position to risk a full-scale military confrontation with Israel, given the risk that this might precipitate an American military reaction. Crucially, Washington's consistent support for Israel is not matched by any great power support for Israel's neighbors. During the Cold War, by contrast, the risk was that a Middle East war could spill over into a superpower conflict. Henry Kissinger, secretary of State in the twilight of the Nixon presidency, first heard the news of an Arab-Israeli war at 6:15 a.m. on Oct. 6, 1973. Half an hour later, he was on the phone to the Soviet ambassador in Washington, Anatoly Dobrynin. Two weeks later, Kissinger flew to Moscow to meet the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev. The stakes were high indeed. At one point during the 1973 crisis, as Brezhnev vainly tried to resist Kissinger's efforts to squeeze him out of the diplomatic loop, the White House issued DEFCON 3, putting American strategic nuclear forces on high alert. It is hard to imagine anything like that today. In any case, this war may soon be over. Most wars Israel has fought have been short, lasting a matter of days or weeks (six days in '67, three weeks in '73). Some Israeli sources say this one could be finished in a matter of days. That, at any rate, is clearly the assumption being made in Washington.

#### No Middle East war—political shifts are stable

Paul Salem, Director of the Carnegie Middle East Center. PhD from Harvard, “'Arab Spring' Has Yet to Alter Region's Strategic Balance,” Los Angeles Times, 5/9/2011, http://carnegie-mec.org/publications/?fa=43907

Despite their sweeping repercussions for both domestic and international players, the Arab uprisings have not led to a dramatically new regional order or a new balance of power. This could change, particularly if developments in Syria continue to escalate. While Iran has welcomed uprisings against Western-backed regimes in Egypt and Tunisia, it dealt harshly with its own protesters and has been worried about recent events in Syria. Moreover, countries that threw out pro-Western dictators are not moving closer to Iran. Egypt's and Tunisia’s future foreign policies are more likely to resemble Turkey's in becoming more independent while remaining allied with the West. And Iran's soft power has decreased as its regime looks increasingly repressive and new models of revolutionary success have emerged in Tunisia, Egypt, and other parts of the Arab world. Turkey, for its part, bungled the opportunity to take advantage of this historic shift to bolster its influence in the Arab world. The Arab uprisings are effectively calling for the Arab world to be more like Turkey: democratic, with a vibrant civil society, political pluralism, secularism alongside Islam, and a productive and fairly balanced economy. However, after expressing clear support for Egyptian protesters, Turkey has hedged its bets in Libya and Syria. Turkey has over $15 billion in business contracts with Moammar Kadafi's Libya and has built a close relationship with Syrian President Bashar Assad. Turkey's foreign policy of "zero problems" with neighbors is becoming harder to implement as peoples and governments in the neighborhood are increasingly on opposite sides. Although Arab public opinion has held Turkey in very high esteem in past years, recent events have tarnished that image. This could have been Turkey's moment in the Middle East; the moment was lost. Saudi Arabia has been taken aback by the loss of old allies and remains worried about increased Iranian influence, but has maintained its sphere of influence. Its military intervention in Bahrain shows that Riyadh is extremely worried not only about Iranian influence but about the wave of democratic change, and still has not figured out a way to achieve a balance between addressing growing demands by citizens for better governance and social justice, while keeping Iranian influence out of the Gulf Cooperation Council. Although the United States has generally suffered setbacks from the events of the past months, it is adjusting quickly to the new realities and stands to remain a key player in the coming period. It has not lost its leverage despite the demise of its main Egyptian and Tunisian allies, and has expressed support for protests after realizing they were not dominated by radical groups and that they echoed Western values. Emerging global powers such as Russia, China, India and Brazil have had mixed reactions to the "Arab Spring." All were reluctant to approve Western-led military intervention in Libya, expressing concerns ranging from the risk of higher oil prices to a potential spillover effect on their shores. As for Israel, even though its peace treaty with Egypt will remain in place, it no longer has any friends in the region after the departure of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, its declining relations with Turkey and growing unrest in Jordan. The recent Fatah-Hamas accord underlines Israel's predicament. Two difficult challenges lie ahead: The Palestinian Authority's unilateral move to declare Palestinian statehood by the end of the year and a potential Palestinian popular uprising encouraged by the success of neighboring populations. Although the Arab Spring has been largely about internal democracy and reform, it has affected all of the major regional and international actors. However, so far there has been no major shift in the balance of power or the basic pattern of regional relations.

## 2NC

#### The “environmental” justification for air capture oil production are capitalist tools to serve a product in need of a market. Against the backdrop of contemporary capitalism will result only increased warming

Gunther 12 – By Marc Gunther [longtime journalist and speaker whose focus is business and sustainability] Direct air carbon capture: Oil's answer to fracking? Published March 12, 2012 http://www.greenbiz.com/blog/2012/03/12/direct-air-carbon-capture-oil-answer-fracking

The conference was the strongest sign yet that direct air capture is becoming a business -- for better or worse.¶ For better? Because air capture technology has enormous potential to reduce CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere, albeit very slowly and at considerable expense. The costs remain unknown, with estimates ranging wildly from $30 per ton of CO2 captured, which is almost surely too low, to more than $600 a ton, which is almost surely too high, although the bigger number comes from a report [PDF, download] from the respected American Physical Society.¶ For worse? Because as air capture transitions from academia into the marketplace, the startups will need to generate revenues to stay alive, even if those revenues enable more oil to be pumped out of the ground. Put another way, air-capture technology has become a solution in search of a market, while its backers wait for the world to get serious about climate threat.¶ Not coincidentally, all four air-capture startups at the conference, which was organized by the Institute for Sustainable Energy, Environment and Economy at the University of Calgary, were founded by academics and financed by well-to-do investors who are concerned about climate. Lackner started Kilimanjaro with the backing of the late Gary Comer, founder of Lands End. David Keith of the University of Calgary and Harvard started Carbon Engineering, with an investment from Gates. Peter Eisenberger and Graciela Chichilnisky started Global Thermostat, where Bronfman is the lead investor and board chair. ClimeWorks was spun out of ETH Zurich, where its co-founder, Christophe Gebald was a grad student.¶ The startups are deploying different, proprietary technologies (see their websites for details) but all share a bold, long-term vision: recycling CO2 from the air and combining it with hydrogen to make zero-carbon hydrocarbons, and using low-carbon wind, solar or nuclear energy to power the process. “Closing the carbon cycle” is how Eisenberger describes it, and he says air capture will enable any country, anywhere in the world, to make its own sustainable transportation fuels. ExxonMobil, where Eisenberger once toiled, would survive, but OPEC would be no more.¶ But that’s the very long term plan. Meantime, the companies want to capitalize on existing demand for CO2, which is a valuable commodity as well as a waste product. There’s substantial, unmet demand for CO2 -- most of it from the oil industry -- at prices that can occasionally top $100 a ton, all agree. Injecting CO2 into the ground to extract oil, while unseemly at first glance, produces oil with no more than half the carbon footprint of conventional oil, assuming the CO2 stays underground. “There are real environmental benefits,” says Keith, whose plan is to sell the fuel to California, where it would command a premium because of the state’s Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Summit Power, which develops low carbon energy projects, including a $2-billion “clean coal’ project in Texas, is also interested in air capture, said Sasha Mackler, the firm’s vice president for carbon capture.¶ Kilimanjaro’s Ned David, for his part, talked about capturing CO2 to feed algae, a business he knows well as a co-founder of algae startup Sapphire Energy. Global Thermostat, too, is working on an algae project, with startup Algae Systems and IHI, a Japanese industrial conglomerate. Boeing, meanwhile, is talking to all of the startups about developing ways to make fuels for the army at remote military bases or the navy on aircraft carriers. Military buyers are willing to pay a premium for fuel, particularly if they can eliminate long, costly and dangerous supply lines.¶ Goldman Sachs and Warburg Pincus didn’t show up in Calgary, but insiders tell me that Goldman is advising Global Thermostat, as it negotiates with an array of partners and potential investors, including Warburg, which is talking about a $75-million equity investment in GT. One investor who did make the trip was Nigel Tuersley, a London-based entrepreneur and ecologist who plans to buy a stake in Keith’s Carbon Engineering. “I’m impressed by the tenacity and the sheer inventiveness of the people here,” Tuersley said. “This is very exciting virgin territory, and it has all the hallmarks of a potentially important industry.”¶ Environmentalists still need some convincing. David Hawkins, the veteran climate campaigner with the Natural Resources Defense Council, observed that air capture has “morphed very rapidly from a technology whose purpose is to remove CO2 to a technology whose purpose is to produce CO2.” There’s a risk, he said, that commercial imperatives could lead the startups to drift away from their environmental mission. “We didn’t decide to pursue scrubbers by relying on the market for gypsum as the driver,” he said.¶ Steve Hamburg, chief scientist of the Environmental Defense Fund, said the air-capture industry needs to be clear about how it is measuring CO2 benefits, if any, and transparent about its needs for energy, water and land.¶ “It’s a promising technology,” Hamburg acknowledged. “But promising for what?”

#### Saying it’s a good idea to *not* question is ludicrous. Your argument is question begging—if we win your ideology is problematic then the K already implicates your framework.

Meszaros ’89 Istvan Meszaros, Chair of philosophy @ U. of Sussex, The Power of Ideology, 1989 p. 232-234

Nowhere is the myth of ideological neutrality – the self-proclaimed *Wertfeihert* or value neutrality of so-called ‘rigorous social science’ – stronger than in the field of methodology. Indeed, we are often presented with the claim that the adoption of the advocated methodological framework would automatically exempt one from all controversy about values, since they are systematically excluded (or suitably ‘bracketed out’) by the scientifically adequate method itself, thereby saving one from unnecessary complication and securing the desired objectivity and uncontestable outcome. Claims and procedures of this kind are, of course, extremely problematical. For they circularly *assume* that their enthusiasm for the virtues of ‘methodological neutrality’ is bound to yield ‘value neutral’ solutions with regard to highly contested issues, without first examining the all-important question as to the conditions of *possibility* – or otherwise – of the postulated systematic neutrality at the plane of methodology itself. The unchallengeable validity of the recommended procedure is supposed to be *self-evident* on account of its *purely methodological* character. In reality, of course, this approach to methodology is heavily loaded with a conservative ideological substance. Since, however, the plane of *methodology* (and ‘meta-theory’) is said to be *in principle* separated from that of the *substantive* issues, the methodological circle can be conveniently closed. Whereupon the mere insistence on the purely methodological character of the criteria laid down is supposed to establish the claim according to which the approach in question is neutral because everybody can adopt it as the common frame of reference of ‘rational discourse’. Yet, curiously enough, the proposed methodological tenets are so defined that vast areas of vital social concern are a priori excluded from this rational discourse as ‘metaphysical’, ‘ideological’, etc. The effect of circumscribing in this way the scope of the one and only admissible approach is that it automatically disqualifies, in the name of *methodology* itself, all those who do not fit into the stipulated framework of discourse. As a result, the propounders of the ‘right method’ are spared the difficulties that go with acknowledging the real divisions and incompatibilities as they necessarily arise from the contending social interests at the roots of alternative approaches and the rival sets of values associated with them. This is where we can see more clearly the social orientation implicit in the whole procedure. For – far from offering an adequate scope for critical enquiry – the advocated general adoption of the allegedly neutral methodological framework is equivalent, in fact, to consenting not even to raise the issues that really matter. Instead, the stipulated ‘common’ methodological procedure succeeds in transforming the enterprise of ‘rational discourse’ into the dubious practice of producing *methodology for the sake of methodology*: a tendency more pronounced in the twentieth century than ever before. This practice consists in sharpening the recommended methodological knife until nothing but the bare handle is left, at which point a new knife is adopted for the same purpose. For the ideal methodological knife is not meant for cutting, only for sharpening, thereby interposing itself between the critical intent and the real objects of criticism which it can obliterate for as long as the pseudo-critical activity of knife-sharpening for its own sake continues to be pursued. And that happens to be precisely its inherent ideological purpose. **6.1.2** Naturally, to speak of a ‘common’ methodological framework in which one can resolve the problems of a society torn by irreconcilable social interest and ensuing antagonistic confrontations is delusory, at best, notwithstanding all talk about ‘ideal communication communities’. But to define the methodological tenets of all rational discourse by way of transubstantiating into ‘ideal types’ (or by putting into methodological ‘brackets’) the discussion of contending social values reveals the ideological colour as well as the extreme fallaciousness of the claimed rationality. For such treatment of the major areas of conflict, under a great variety of forms – from the Viennes version of ‘logical positivism’ to Wittgenstein’s famous ladder that must be ‘thrown away’ at the point of confronting the question of values, and from the advocacy of the Popperian principle of ‘little by little’ to the ‘emotivist’ theory of value – inevitably always favours the established order. And it does so by declaring the fundamental structural parameters of the given society ‘out of bounds’ to the potential contestants, on the authority of the ideally ‘common’ methodology. However, even on a cursory inspection of the issues at stake it ought to be fairly obvious that to consent not to question the fundamental structural framework of the established order is radically different according to whether one does so as the beneficiary of that order or from the standpoint of those who find themselves at the receiving end, exploited and oppressed by the overall determinations (and not just by some limited and more or less easily corrigible detail) of that order. Consequently, to establish the ‘common’ identity of the two, opposed sides of a structurally safeguarded hierarchical order – by means of the reduction of the people who belong to the contending social forces into fictitious ‘rational interlocutors’, extracted from their divided real world and transplanted into a beneficially shared universe of ideal discourse – would be nothing short of a methodological miracle. Contrary to the wishful thinking hypostatized as a timeless and socially unspecified rational communality, the elementary condition of a truly rational discourse would be to acknowledge the legitimacy of contesting the given order of society in substantive terms. This would imply the articulation of the relevant problems not on the plan of self-referential theory and methodology, but as inherently practical issues whose conditions of solution point towards the necessity of radical structural changes. In other words, it would require the explicit rejection of all fiction of methodological and meta-theoretical neutrality. But, of course, this would be far too much to expect precisely because the society in which we live is a deeply divided society. This is why through the dichotomies of ‘fact and value’, ‘theory and practice’, ‘formal and substantive rationality’, etc., the conflict-transcending methodological miracle is constantly stipulated as the necessary regulative framework of ‘rational discourse’ in the humanities and social sciences, in the interest of the *ruling ideology*. What makes this approach particularly difficult to challenge is that its value-commitments are mediated by methodological precepts to such a degree that it is virtually impossible to bring them into the focus of the discussion without openly contesting the framework as a whole. For the conservative sets of values at the roots of such orientation remain several steps removed from the ostensible subject of dispute as defined in logico/methodological, formal/structural, and semantic/analytical terms. And who would suspect of ideological bias the impeccable – methodologically sanctioned – credentials of ‘procedural rules’, ‘models’ and ‘paradigms’? Once, though, such rules and paradigms are adopted as the common frame of reference of what may or may not be allowed to be considered the legitimate subject of debate, everything that enters into the accepted parameters is necessarily constrained not only by the scope of the overall framework, but simultaneously also by the inexplicit ideological assumptions on the basis of which the methodological principles themselves were in the first place constituted. This is why the allegedly ‘non-ideological’ ideologies which so successfully conceal and exercise their apologetic function in the guise of neutral methodology are doubly mystifying. Twentieth-century currents of thought are dominated by approaches that tend to articulate the social interests and values of the ruling order through complicated – at time completely bewildering – mediations, on the methodological plane. Thus, more than ever before, the task of ideological demystification is inseparable from the investigation of the complex dialectical interrelationship between methods and values which no social theory or philosophy can escape.

#### Vacillation is a nuclear war DA to the perm

Herod ‘4 James Herod, World-Renowned Anarchist. Fourth Edition, January 2004. “Getting Free: A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it.” http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/index.htm

But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

#### Their stubborn pragmatism conceals a fetish for the system—universalism shatters this

Johnston ‘4 Adrian Johnston, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory University, December 2004, Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture & Society, v9 i3 p259

Furthermore, Zizek claims, the fetishist, by clinging to some object endowed with an excessive, disproportionate significance, is able to appear to others, not as a delusional pervert adrift upon the clouds of his/her peculiar fantasies, but, rather, as a hardened, pragmatic realist. The fetishist is someone who can, whether through stoicism or sarcasm, tolerate the harshness and difficulty of daily existence--"fetishists are not dreamers lost in their private worlds, they are thoroughly "realists," able to accept the way things effectively are--since they have their fetish to which they can cling in order to cancel the full impact of reality" (Zizek, 2001c, p 14). However, if the fetish-object is taken away from the fetishist, this cynical facade of pragmatic resignation disintegrates, plunging the subject into depression, despair, or even psychosis (in other words, the fetishist, bereft of his/her fetish, undergoes what Lacan calls "subjective destitution"; see Zizek, 2001c, p 14). The upshot of all this is the proposal of a specific guideline for a hermeneutics of suspicion to be exercised with respect to the manifest, fashionable attitudes of cynical resignation and pessimistic realism prevalent amongst the denizens of today's capitalist polis--"So, when we are bombarded by claims that in our post-ideological cynical era nobody believes in the proclaimed ideals, when we encounter a person who claims he is cured of any beliefs, accepting social reality the way it is, one should always counter such claims with the question: OK, but where is the fetish that enables you to (pretend to) accept reality "the way it is?"" (Zizek, 2001c, p 15). Naturally, Zizek reminds readers that Marx himself already understood the essentially fetishistic nature of money and commodities (Marx's descriptions of these entities make reference to "magic," "mystification," and "perversion," to the obfuscation of the actual conditions of material reality by pathological fantasies condensed into the form of objects circulating within the socio-economic process of exchange; see Marx, 1906, pp 81, 105; 1967b, pp 826-827). The implication is hence that if the small salaries and various little techno-gadget toys of today's late-capitalist subjects were to be taken away from them, their pretense to being realistically accepting of the status quo would be dropped immediately (Zizek, 1999b, p 68). In the Zizekian contemporary world, fetishism isn't an aberrant, deviant phenomenon, but, instead, a virtually innate structural feature of social reality, a necessary coping technique for the subjects of reigning ideologies. Although one might have the distinct impression that these concepts are meant to be specific to the historical conditions of late-capitalist societies, Zizek speaks of the dynamic involving cynicism, fetishism, and the displacement of belief as an ahistorical necessity, a universal feature of the human condition--"the phenomenon of the "subject supposed to believe" is ... universal and structurally necessary" (Zizek, 1997, p 106). He then proceeds to stipulate that, "by means of a fetish, the subject "believes through the other"" (Zizek, 1997, p 120). So, fetishism and the "subject supposed to believe" are inherent to any and every human reality. At this level, Zizek alights upon an answer to the question as to why capitalism in particular appears to have become so triumphantly successful in ideologically marketing itself as the only tenable socio-economic option around. As Zizek himself remarks, the contemporary political imagination has reached a point of debilitating closure; barring a cataclysmic breakdown prompted by an internal economic implosion or an externally imposed catastrophe (whether imposed by nature or "terror"), capitalism appears, in the social imaginary, as the new "thousand year Reich," as capable of enduring indefinitely in the absence of any contingent traumatic disruptions. Predominant collective fantasies concerning contemporary politics thus terminate with the forced choice of "capitalism or nothing": either the positive socio-economic program of capitalist, liberal-democratic ideology, or the negative alternative of an anarchic, apocalyptic lack of any system whatsoever (rather than, for example, the choice between competing ideological visions such as capitalism versus communism). According to this pervasive mindset, capitalism may very well be rotten, but it's the only viable alternative going (Zizek, 1999b, p 55; 2000c, p 10). One cannot help but hear echoes of this dilemma summed up in the title of Lacan's nineteenth seminar: "... ou pire" ("... or worse") (see Zizek, 1989, p 18; 1996, p 4; 1997, p 105, 120; 2001b, p 166). One is similarly reminded of Winston Churchill's comments regarding democracy (made during his November 11th, 1947 speech to the British House of Commons)--"No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time."

#### History is not over. We represent the global majority who are oppressed by capital. The failure of revolutionary politics is not a historical necessity—we can still win

Murphy et al. ‘4 John Murphy, Professor of Sociology at the University of Miami, Manuel Caro Associate Professor of Sociology at Barry University, and Jung Min Choi, Professor of Sociology at San Diego State Universty, “Globalization With A Human Face,” 2004 p2-3

What is diabolical is that the market is touted to hold everyone’s future. Because persons no longer direct history, but are simply products of this process, there appears to be no alternative to the spread of markets and their worldwide integration. And anyone who chooses another approach to conceptualizing order—an alternative social or economic logic—is simply obstinate and denying reality. The logic of the market is deemed irrefutable. Furthermore, the image that is emanating from most political leaders in Europe and North America is that utopian thought is passé. The days of what Marcuse called the “Great Refusal” are long past.4 For many observers, history has delivered the best of possible worlds—an economic windfall to select groups that will eventually enhance everyone. What persons need now are patience and perseverance, and the magic of the market will do the rest. But many groups are becoming restless. In their opinion, the ideology of the market has become stale and an impediment to achieving a better life. Stated simply, they have not abandoned their utopian ideals of fairness and justice, and are looking for ways to realize these aims. In some cases, revolutionary fervor persists. But in general, they have decided to challenge the inherent ability of history to deliver a more propitious future. They are saying “enough,” and are searching for alternative models of economic regulation and social order. As a result, large numbers of persons have been protesting in most major cities over the spread and costs of neoliberalism. Although most mainstream politicians have been deaf to these calls for a more responsible order, the chants for a new direction continue. And contrary to the claims made by many pundits, these protesters have not abandoned their utopian impulse and have decided to make a different history. In other words, they have recognized that only ideology can bring history to an end, and that the recent picture created by this political device is an illusion. They have understood, accordingly, that history ends only when no more persons are left to decide their own fate. The invitation extended to join the globalized world is thus considered by many to be a ruse to get persons to jettison their own perspectives on the future. To prosper, all they have to do is assimilate to specific political mandates that have been cloaked in historical necessity. But critics of globalization have decided to change the rules of history and defy this view of progress. Their refusal, however, will not necessarily destroy civilization, as some conservative critics claim, but merely expose how the newly globalized world has been rigged in favor of the rich and ignores the needs and desires of most persons. The powerful and their supporters scream that these challenges are irrational and doomed to fail. Without a doubt, if these powerful forces continue to meddle in the social experiments of others, defeats will likely occur. But these failures have nothing to do with flaunting the laws of history or human nature. They occur most often because the rich and powerful want to discredit alternatives to their worldview and thus undermine any threats to their social or economic privileges.

#### Saying there’s no alt to cap is the real utopian fantasy—prefer dialectical theory

Johnston ‘4 Adrian Johnston, professor of philosophy at University of New Mexico, "The Cynic's Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief," International Journal of Zizek Studies, Vol. 1, 2004

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.

#### Capitalism will continually appeal to fear of collapse to justify its existence - these rely on a logic that is epistemologically disabling and self-fulfilling

Zizek ’97 Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Ljubljana and Codirector of the Center for Humanities at Birkbeck College, "Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism," New Left Review, No. 224, 1997, pp.25-27

Today, financial crisis is a permanent state of things the reference to which legitimizes the demands to cut social spending, health care, support of culture and scientific research, in short, the dismantling of the welfare state. Is, however, this permanent crisis really an objective feature of our socio-economic life? Is it not rather one of the effects of the shift of balance in the ‘class struggle’ towards Capital, resulting from the growing role of new technologies as well as from the direct internationalization of Capital and the co- dependent diminished role of the Nation-State which was further able to impose certain minimal requirements and limitations to exploitation? In other words, the crisis is an ‘objective fact’ if and only if one accepts in advance as an unquestionable premise the inherent logic of Capital—as more and more left-wing or liberal parties have done. We are thus witnessing the uncanny spectacle of social-democratic parties which came to power with the between-the-lines message to Capital ‘we will do the necessary job for you in an even more efficient and painless way than the conservatives’. The problem, of course, is that, in today’s global socio-political circumstances, it is practically impossible effectively to call into question the logic of Capital: even a modest social-democratic attempt to redistribute wealth beyond the limit acceptable to the Capital ‘effectively’ leads to economic crisis, inflation, a fall in revenues and so on. Nevertheless, one should always bear in mind how the connection between ‘cause’ (rising social expenditure) and ‘effect’ (economic crisis) is not a direct objective causal one: it is always-already embedded in a situation of social antagonism and struggle. The fact that, if one does not obey the limits set by Capital, a crisis ‘really follows’, in no way ‘proves’ that the necessity of these limits is an objective necessity of economic life. It should rather be conceived as a proof of the privileged position Capital holds in the economic and political struggle, as in the situation where a stronger partner threatens that if you do X, you will be punished by Y, and then, upon your doing X, Y effectively ensues.

#### The transition away from capitalist society doesn’t entail the violence described in your cheesy impact turns – the first step toward change is a radical rejection of reformist half-steps that only buy time for capital.

Kovel ‘2 Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002, The Enemy of Nature, p. 167-69

Do we call, then, for the immediate abolition of money, wage labour and commodity exchanges, along with all market relations and businesses? Absolutely not: measures of this sort recapitulate the Pol Pot or Stalinist solution, and they ride as heavily over humanity and nature as did slavery. They are forms of violence that tear apart ecosystems human and natural alike. An ecocentric people will not need to repress the accumulation of capital because such a people will be free from exploitation, and the drive to accumulate will not arise from the ground of freely associated labour. The problem is to get to that ground, in the course of which present ways of production need to be traversed and transformed and not knocked over. But first it must be envisioned. To create that vision, a radical rejection of capitalist ways is necessary. We should reject, therefore, the phoney tolerance espoused by green economics toward preserving a ‘diversity’ that gives a substantial role to capitalist firms. One might as well try to raise weasels and chickens in the same pen. In this real world, all forms of capital, including the oxymoronic ‘natural capital’ that is supposed to rescue us, are swiftly caught up in the flood-tide of accumulation. My intention is not at all to disparage the virtue of a small economic or community unit. Quite the contrary: as we shall explore in the last chapter, small-size enterprises are an essential part of the path towards an ecological society, as well as the building blocks of that society There is a question, rather, about perspective: whether the small units are to be capitalist or socialist in orientation, and whether they are seen as ends in themselves or integrated with a more universal vision. For both of these sets of choices, I would argue for the latter position: the units need to be consistently anti-capitalist, and they need to exist in a dialectic with the whole of things. For human beings are not rodents, who live in burrows. Nor are we insects, creatures who thrive at a small scale, because of which they cannot use skeletons or lungs, or any of the organs necessary for larger organisms. Humans are, by nature, large, expansive, universalizing creatures. We need different degrees of realization to express our being, grandeur as well as intimacy, the large grain as well as the fine. We need the equivalent of skeletons to support us, and specialized organs to meet our species’ needs. Thus I should think that in an ecologically realized world there would exist significant sectors of large-scale activity, for example, rail and communica­tions systems and power grids, just as world cities would flourish as sites of universality. I hope I may be forgiven for insisting that New York, Paris, London and Tokyo not be taken down in an ecological society, but more fully realized; and that the nightmare cities of global capital the Jakartas and Mexico Citys — will be restored to similar states of being. This restoration in its many forms comes back to the question of the emancipation of labour, and not just waged labour, but all compulsive forms of our creativity, including most definitely the alienation of women’s house­hold work, and the stifling of children in schools. The fact is that the great bulk of humankind are throttled in their humanity, and overcoming this is far more significant than any tinkering from above with a corrupt economy. This truth is either lost on the ecological economists or mystified out of existence. Any sense of real people, and real popular struggle, are abstracted from mandarin texts such as An Introduction to Ecological Economics. Yes, the authors do call for a ‘living democracy’, which is certainly a good thing. But life is struggle, especially in a class society where antagonisms are built into the social process. Yet for Ecological Economics, living democracy is ‘a broad process to discuss and achieve consensus on these important issues. This is distinct from the polemic and divisive political process that seems to hold sway in many countries today’ Thus we need ‘to engage all members of society in a substantive dialogue about the future they desire and the policies and instruments necessary to bring it about’.25 The image evoked is like one of the official murals that decorate post offices in which the European settlers/invaders are solemnly greeted by the Indians to deliberate on matters of mutual concern. Where sweatshops re-impose slavery within the capitalist system while untold millions of people in the middle are consigned to mall culture and the rat race, consensus is not exactly an illuminating term, and some divisive polemics, well-chosen and coupled with proper action, can do a great deal of good. False reconciliation is not the path out of a world as unjust as this. The demand for justice is the pivot about which labour will be emancipated; it must also be a foundation of overcoming the ecological crisis.

#### Merely the process of theorizing life outside of capital is enough to access all of our impacts

Johnston ‘7 Adrian Johnston, interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory University, “The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the Dynamics of Belief,” International Journal of Zizek Studies, Vol. 1 No. 0., 24 August 2007, pp. 93-94, accessed 1/27/10 http://www.zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/view/8/24

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Zizek's recent writings isn't a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Zizek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance (Zizek, 2001d, pp 22-23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Zizek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of "magic," that is, the belief in money's social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance's powers. The "external" obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, "internally" believe in it--capitalism's life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others' belief in the socio-performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism's frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic's fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism, makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Zizek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing). Or, the more disquieting possibility to entertain is that some people today, even if one succeeds in exposing them to the underlying logic of their position, might respond in a manner resembling that of the Judas-like character Cypher in the film The Matrix (Cypher opts to embrace enslavement by illusion rather than cope with the discomfort of dwelling in the "desert of the real"): faced with the choice between living the capitalist lie or wrestling with certain unpleasant truths, many individuals might very well deliberately decide to accept what they know full well to be a false pseudo-reality, a deceptively comforting fiction ("Capitalist commodity fetishism or the truth? I choose fetishism").
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### Topicality

#### A. Interpretation – the affirmative must increase energy production

#### B. Violation – the affirmative increases energy expenditure, which is distinct

#### Energy is work, not expenditure – your aff is against utility and thus not topical

California Energy Commission, 11 Energy Glossary, “E”, http://www.energy.ca.gov/glossary/glossary-e.html, accessed 5-18-12, AFB] Cited by Adrienne Brovero [Debate Coach at University of Mary Washington] in Generic Terms-Energy Committee Report-6-1-12

ENERGY - The capacity for doing work. Forms of energy include: thermal, mechanical, electrical and chemical. Energy may be transformed from one form into another.

#### C. Standards

#### 1. Aff and neg ground – they don’t have to utilize the USFG, their advocacy just has to be an increase in energy production – as long as they are in the *direction* of the topic, we have access to all of our generic negative arguments

#### 2. Predictable limits – we were prepared to debate energy production, not doing so is avoidance – the impact is education with argumentative clash as the critical internal link

#### Competing interpretations is the only objective way to evaluate topicality – reasonability encourages judge intervention

#### K vs. policy is a false divide. Incorporating your args into topical advocacy forces you to negotiate your own positions and better test their intellectual merit

Galloway ‘7 Ryan Galloway, assistant professor of communication studies and director of debate at Samford University, “DINNER AND CONVERSATION AT THE ARGUMENTATIVE TABLE: RECONCEPTUALIZING DEBATE AS AN ARGUMENTATIVE DIALOGUE,” Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, Vol. 28 (2007), ebsco

This journal previously (2004) addressed issues regarding the growing divide in policy debate. However, the role of the debate resolution in the clash of civilizations was largely ignored. Here, I defend the notion that activist approaches of critical debaters can best flourish if grounded in topical advocacy defined in terms of the resolution. This approach encourages the pedagogical benefits of debates about discourse and representations while preserving the educational advantages of switch-side debate. Debaters’ increased reliance on speech act and performativity theory in debates generates a need to step back and re-conceptualize the false dilemma of the “policy only” or “kritik only” perspective. Policy debate’s theoretical foundations should find root in an overarching theory of debate that incorporates both policy and critical exchanges. Here, I will seek to conceptualize debate as a dialogue, following the theoretical foundations of Mikhail Bakhtin (1990) and Star Muir (1993) that connects the benefits of dialogical modes of argument to competitive debate. Ideally, the resolution should function to negotiate traditional and activist approaches. Taking the resolution as an invitation to a dialogue about a particular set of ideas would preserve the affirmative team’s obligation to uphold the debate resolution. At the same time, this approach licenses debaters to argue both discursive and performative advantages. While this view is broader than many policy teams would like, and certainly more limited than many critical teams would prefer, this approach captures the advantages of both modes of debate while maintaining the stable axis point of argumentation for a full clash of ideas around these values.

### Zizek

#### For the aff our society has not exchanged enough. Liberal capitalism, we are told, is problematic only in that’s economy is a restricted one. If only we wasted more, consumed more, had more things would be better. This world of sufficient consumption is just over the horizon. Solar power is here already and consumptive enough. This expenditure without reserve is the modern capitalist ethic par excellence—transgression is recentered as the object of desire which is always sought but never exhausted, all while capital churns out more ‘meaningless’ knick-knacks for your potlatch tomfoolery

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 2000, The Fragile Absolute, p. 23-25

This example brings home the inherent link between three notions: that of Marxist surplus-value, that of the Lacanian objet petit a as surplus-enjoyment (the concept that Lacan elaborated with direct reference to Marxian surplus-value), and the paradox of the superego, perceived long ago by Freud: the more Coke you drink, the thirstier you are; the more profit you make, the more you want; the more you obey the superego command, the guiltier you are — in all three cases, the logic of balanced exchange is dis­turbed in favour of an excessive logic of ‘the more you give (the more you repay your debts), the more you owe’ (or ‘the more you have what you long for, the more you lack, the greater your crav­ing’; or — the consumerist version — ‘the more you buy, the more you have to spend’): that is to say, of the paradox which is the very opposite of the paradox of love where, as Juliet put it in her immortal words to Romeo, ‘the more I give, the more I have’. The key to this disturbance, of course, is the surplus-enjoyment, the object petit a, which exists (or, rather, persists) in a kind of curved space — the nearer you get to it, the more it eludes your grasp (or the more you possess it, the greater the lack).’2 Perhaps sexual difference comes in here in an unexpected way: the reason why the superego is stronger in men than in women is that it is men, not women, who are intensely related to this excess of the surplus-enjoyment over the pacifying func­tioning of the symbolic Law. In terms of the paternal function, the opposition between the pacifying symbolic Law and the excessive superego injunction is, of course, the one between the Name-of-the-Father (symbolic paternal authority) and the ‘primordial father’ who is allowed to enjoy all women; and it is crucial here to recall that this rapist ‘primordial father’ is a male (obsessional), not feminine (hysterical) fantasy: it is men who are able to endure their integration into the symbolic order only when this integration is sustained by some hidden reference to the fantasy of the unbridled excessive enjoyment embodied in the unconditional superego injunction to enjoy, to go to the extreme, to transgress and constantly to force the limit. In short, it is men in whom the integration into the symbolic order is sustained by the superego exception. This superego-paradox also allows us to throw a new light on to the functioning of today’s artistic scene. Its basic feature is not only the much-deplored commodification of culture (art objects produced for the market), but also the less noted but perhaps even more crucial opposite movement: the growing ‘culturalization’ of the market economy itself. With the shift towards the tertiary econ­omy (services, cultural goods), culture is less and less a specific sphere exempted from the market, and more and more not just one of the spheres of the market, but its central component (from the software amusement industry to other media productions). What this short circuit between market and culture entails is the waning of the old modernist avant-garde logic of provocation, of shocking the establishment. Today, more and more, the cul­tural—economic apparatus itself, in order to reproduce itself in competitive market conditions, has not only to tolerate but directly to provoke stronger and stronger shocking effects and products. Just think of recent trends in the visual arts: gone are the days when we had simple statues or framed paintings — what we get now are exhibitions of frames without paintings, dead cows and their excrement, videos of the insides of the human body (gastroscopy and colonoscopy), the inclusion of olfactory effects, and so on.13 Here again, as in the domain of sexuality, perversion is no longer subversive: such shocking excesses are part of the system itself; the system feeds on them in order to reproduce itself. Perhaps this is one possible definition of post- modern as opposed to modernist art: in postmodernism, the transgressive excess loses its shock value and is fully integrated into the established artistic market.”’

#### And the idea that this distillation of exchange from its utilitarian perversion is a desperate attempt to prevent contact with the Real of desire, namely the fact that desire is never sufficient—we can never GIVE enough, never WASTE enough. This leads to the subject’s total annihilation in a desperate attempt to stave off the horrifying aspects of the Real.

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, 2002, For They Know Not What They Do: Enjoyment as a Political Factor, p. lxxiv-lxxvi

As Badiou demonstrated in his discussion of the Stalinist show trials, this violent effort to distil the pure Real from elusive reality necessarily ends up in its opposite — in the obsession with pure appearance: in the Stalinist universe, the passion for the Real (ruthless enforcement of Socialist development) thus culminates in ritualistic stagings of a theatrical spectacle in the truth of which no one believes. The key to this reversal lies in the ultimate impossibility of drawing a clear distinction between deceptive reality and some firm positive kernel of the Real: every positive bit of reality is a priori suspicious, since (as we know from Lacan) the Real Thing is ultimately another name for the Void. The pursuit of the Real thus equals total annihilation, a (self-)destructive fury within which the only way to trace the distinction between the semblance and the Real is, precisely, to stage it in a fake spectacle. The fundamental illusion here is that once the violent work of purification is done, the New Man will emerge ex nihilo, freed from the filth of past corruption. Within this horizon, “really existing men” are reduced to the stock of raw material which can be ruthlessly exploited for the construction of the new — the Stalinist revolutionary definition of man is a circular one: “Man is what is to be crushed, stamped on, mercilessly worked over, in order to produce a new man.” Here we have the tension between the series of “ordinary” elements (“ordinary” men as the “material” of history) and the exceptional “empty” element (the Socialist ‘New Man”, which is at first nothing but an empty place to be filled with positive content through the revolutionary turmoil). In a revolution, there is no a priori positive determination of this New Man: a revolution is not legitimized by the positive notion of what Man’s essence —“alienated” in present conditions, and to be realized through the revolutionary process — is: the only legitimization of a revolution is negative, a will to break with the Past. We should formulate things in a very precise way: the reason why the Stalinist fury of purification is so destructive 1ies in the very fact that it is sustained by the belief that once the destructive work of purification has been accomplished, something will remain: the sublime “indivisible remainder”, the paragon of the New —or, to quote Fernando Pessoa again: “The more Life putrefies now, the more manure there will be for the Future.” It is in order to conceal the fact that there is nothing beyond that, in a strictly perverse way, the revolutionary has to cling to violence as the only index of his authenticity; and it is on this level that critics of Stalinism usually misinterpret the cause of the Communist’s attach­ment to the Party. In 1939—41, when pro-Soviet Communists had to change their Party line twice overnight (after the Nazi-Soviet Pact, it was imperialism, not fascism, which was elevated to the role of the main enemy; from 22 June 1941, when Germany attacked the Soviet Union, it was again the popular front against the fascist beast), the brutality of the imposed changes of position was what attracted them. Along the same lines, the purges them­selves exerted an uncanny fascination, especially on intellectuals: their “irrational” cruelty served as a kind of ontological proof, bearing witness to the fact that we are dealing with the Real, not just with empty plans – the Party is ruthlessly brutal, so it must mean business. . . .

#### The alt is to condemn the aff.

#### Condemnation acts upon the ethical necessity of criticism by bringing to the fore practices of violence which we are complicit with. We should reject their move of affirmation to best confront the failings of reformist politics and the violent context of the 1AC.

Dean ‘5 Jodi Dean, Department of Political Science Hobart and William Smith Colleges, “A politics of avoidance: the limits of weak ontology,” The Hedgehog Review, published by the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture at the University of Virginia, Vol. 7, No. 2, Summer 2005, <http://jdeanicite.typepad.com/i_cite/2005/05/butler_and_weak.html>

The ethical disposition Butler finds in the context of address may arise. Or, it may not. It may well be the case that sometimes something more is called for—judgment or perhaps even condemnation. Butler allows for this when she observes that judgment does not “exhaust the sphere of ethics” and when she says that judgments are necessary for political life (36). Yet, Butler holds back, avoiding the political task of condemning those persons and practices, those norms and desires upon which our poorly arranged world depends. For example, she writes, . . . condemnation can work precisely against self-knowledge inasmuch as it moralizes a self through disavowal; although self-knowledge is surely limited, that is not a reason to turn against it as a project; but condemnation tends to do precisely this, seeking to purge and externalize one’s own opacity, and in this sense failing to own its own limitations, providing no felicitous basis for a reciprocal recognition of human begins as constitutively limited (36). It isn’t clear to me why Butler says this. For surely the fact that condemnation can work against self-knowledge does not mean that condemnation everywhere and always does so. And surely it is not always the case that condemnation moralizes a self through disavowal, that it necessarily seeks to purge and externalize opacity and necessarily fails to own its limitations. Can we not imagination a condemnation capable of acknowledging its own limits? Can we not imagination a condemnation born of failure, indeed, a condemnation indebted and responsible to failure? If I condemn racism, homophobia, or cruelty in another, am I necessarily disavowing racism, homophobia, or cruelty in myself? Might I not be addressing it in myself as I confront it in another? Or, better, might I not be calling into question, condemning, practices in which I, as well as those I condemn, am implicated such that I recognize this condemnation as a self-condemnation, a condemnation of us and of our practices? And could it not be the case that such condemnation is my ethical responsibility insofar as it seeks to transform those contexts of address that will and do exceed my own? If I condemn someone for pursuing preventive war, or for defending a notion of preventive war, I need not base this condemnation on a sense that my knowledge is more certain. Indeed, I can base it on the sense that the pursuer of preventive war aims to produce a future that I reject or, that even if these are not his aims, that I fear will arise in the course of its pursuit. My condemnation, again, may be a way of grappling with, of confronting, additional elements of the contexts of address, elements that involve power, hierarchy, and responsibility for other futures, other contexts, other beings. Failure to condemn, then, may risk disavowal of relations of power as well as confrontation with my own complicity. Rather than a responsive ethics, such failure may involve a politics of avoidance. Butler does not always and necessarily avoid condemnation. In fact, important to my argument is the fact that her ethics need not preclude condemnation and that it can and should be sharpened so as to account for such divisive, political moments. Yet, it is striking to me that when Butler does condemn, it’s as if she finds herself in that moment trapped within a discourse she rejects, to which she can only gain access through a condemnation. Thus, in Precarious Life, she condemns “on several bases the violence done against the United States and do[es] not see it as ‘just punishment’ for prior sins.” In her analysis of US policies of indefinite detention in Guantanamo Bay, US violence against Afghanistan, the US’s “shock and awe” attacks on Iraq, and the Bush administration’s hegemonization of political discourse after September 11th in terms of its own position as victim, however, she does not condemn. Rather, she analyzes, explains, contextualizes, interprets, interrogates, and, in so doing, critiques. For me this raises the question of Butler’s separation of condemnation and critique and the political place and function of each. Butler presumes that condemnation involves closure. That is, she treats condemnation as unlike other speech acts, as if condemnation were an act of sovereignty already bent on effacing its own supporting conditions, its own vulnerability and dependence. So even as she recognizes judging as a mode of address and thus premised on the context of address that “can and should provide a sustaining condition of ethical deliberation, judgment, and conduct,” she reads condemnation as essentially an act of violence, one that “erodes the capacity of the addressed subject for both self-reflection and social-recognition” and works to “paralyze and deratify the critical capacities of the subject to whom it is addressed” (37). If the condemned is already positioned in a prior relation of subordination such erosion and paralysis may result. But not necessarily. The condemned may reject the bases, the terms, of condemnation—“I am not who you say I am” or “Because I am who you say I am, you are the one who ultimately suffers, who is left shattered and bereft in condemning me.” The condemned may also accept the words of the condemnation, but challenge the suppositions supporting these words, the suppositions that give it an ethical valence beyond a mere statement of fact—“Yes, I am a godless communist, so?” Condemnation, in other words, may not succeed. Its effects on the addressee as well as its relation to other acts and interpretations cannot be determined in advance. Likewise, if the condemned is in fact more powerful, the President of a mighty military power, say, then associating condemnation with paralysis and deratification surely overstates the power of the address. One could wish that condemnation had such effects, and with respect to Bush’s unconscionable, immoral, unjustified, illegal, imperialist war against Iraq, I certainly do. Bush’s persistence in his preemptive war against Iraq in the face of the condemnation of millions throughout the world, however, points to the weakness and inefficacy of condemnation unbacked by force. In sum, condemnation is not as powerful and efficacious as Butler implies. And, insofar as it occurs within a context of address, condemnation is citational, relying for its efficacy on a set of prior norms that it reiterates, a set of prior practices and values to which it connects. Condemnation does not occur ex nihilo but is based on something, something shared. As with other utterances, condemnation is “uncontrollable, appropriable, and able to signify otherwise and in excess of its animating intentions.” To condemn, then, is to appeal to a prior set of connections as it basis and thereby to open up this basis for investigation, critique, and, potentially, condemnation.

### Trash the aff

#### Embracing excess is intellectual masturbation whose value is instantly collapsed the minute it is deployed as academic currency in a debate round

Paul Mann, Literature prof @ Pomona, 1999, Masocriticism, p. 67-69

I would like at one and the same time to affirm this model and to dismiss it as the most desperate alibi of all. For “sacrificial consumption” can never become an explicit critical motive.13 At the moment it presents itself as a proper element of some critical method, it degenerates into another useful trope, another bit of intellectual currency, another paper-thin abyss, another proxy transgression; and the force of transgression moves elsewhere, beneath a blinder spot in the critical eye.’4 Questions of motive or understanding, the fact that one might be self-critical or at least aware of recuperation, are immaterial: what is at stake here is not self-consciousness but economics, material relations of appropriation and exclusion, assimilation and positive loss. Whatever transgression occurs in writing on Bataille does so only through the stupid recuperation and hence evacuation of the whole rhetoric and dream of transgression, only insofar as the false profundity of philosophy or theory evacuates the false profundities it apes. To justify this as the sublime loss of loss is merely to indulge a paradoxical figure. Excess is not a project but a by-product of any discourse; the interest of Bataillean discourse lies chiefly in the compulsive and symptomatic way it plays with its feces. The spectacle of critics making fools of themselves does not reveal the sovereign truth of death: it is only masocritical humiliation, a pathological attempt to disavow the specter of death. As for the present essay, it makes no claims to any redeeming sacrifice. Far from presenting you with a truer Bataille, far from speaking in his voice more clearly than his other readers, this essay pleads guilty to the indictment against every appropriation. Until philosophy and theory squeal like a pig before Bataille’s work, as he claims to have done before Dali’s canvases, there will be no knowledge of Bataille. In the end, one might have to take an even stricter view: there is no discourse of transgression, either on or by Bataille. None at all. It would be necessary to write a ‘Postscript to Transgression” were it not for the fact that Foucault already wrote it in his ‘Preface,” were it not for the fact that Bataille himself wrote it the moment before he first picked up his pen. It makes no difference whether one betrays Bataille, because one is hip to heterology or does it by accident, whether one lip syncs Bataille’s rhetoric or drones on in the most tedious exposition. All of these satellite texts are not heliotropic in relation to the solar anus of Bataille’s writing, or the executioners he hoped (really?) would meet him in the Bois de Boulogne, or dépensives in spite of themselves. It would be sentimental to assign them such privileges. They merely fail to fail. They are symptoms of a discourse in which everyone is happily transgressing everyone else and nothing ever happens, traces of a certain narcissistic pathos that never achieves the magnificent loss Bataille’s text conveniently claims to desire, and under whose cover it can continue to account for itself, hoarding its precious debits in a masocriticism that is anything but sovereign and gloriously indifferent. What is given to us, what is ruinously and profitably exchanged, is a lie. Heterology gives the lie to meaning and discourse gives the lie to transgression, in a potlatch that reveals both in their most essential and constitutive relation. Nothing is gained by this communication except profit-taking from lies. We must indict Bataille as the alibi that allows all of this writing to go on and on, pretending it is the nothing it is not, and then turn away from Bataille as from a sun long since gone nova, in order to witness the slow freezing to death of every satellite text. The sacrificial consumption of Bataille has played itself out; the rotten carcass has been consumed: no more alibis. What is at stake is no longer ecstatic sexuality or violent upheavals or bloody sacrifices under the unblinking eye of the sun; nor was it ever, from the very beginning of Bataille’s career. These are merely figures in the melodramatic theater of what is after all a “soft expenditure” (Hollier 1989, xv), a much more modest death, a death much closer to home. It has never been more than a question of the death of theory and of theory itself as death. Of theory-death. A double fatality.

#### Alt: vote negative to trash the aff.

#### Is there a not a certain paradox in spending a bunch of time cutting cards and prepping arguments to win round arguing for the value of waste? Why read the 1AC at all, why not dump it on the side of the road before coming to the tournament? Perhaps the right reading of the aff is as a display of wealth, a demonstration of the excess argument produced by hours of labor over the summer.

#### If so, then this strategic, instrumental, bourgeoisie, attitude towards production is replicated by Bataille himself in his support for Stalinist terror in the name of political expediency. This mechanized efficiency is the end point of the aff.

#### Instead we suggest you trash the aff. Leave the 1AC in the trash pan of history. At the very least, ignore the remaining aff speeches: get up for a smoke during the 2AC. You don’t need to listen to them anymore.

#### Our alternative is the reciprocal response to reading the Bataille aff. The affirmative as masters of excess should have to live in fear of us peasant hordes rioting and burning their elegant display of wealth.

Not Bored ‘3. Not Bored, an autonomous, situationist-inspired, low-budget, irregularly published, photocopied journal, July 2003 issue, “Trashing Georges Bataille, "Accursed" Stalinist” <http://www.notbored.org/bataille.html>

Though we have only commented upon them once before, Bataille's books, especially the ones on art and politics, have long been of interest to us here at NOT BORED! We were excited by the prospect of reading Volume I (hereafter referred to as The Accursed Share) because it clearly marked a return to the subject matter -- unproductive ("wasteful") expenditures, human sacrifices, potlatch, and the critique of classical utility -- Bataille first explored in one of our favorite essays, "The Notion of Expenditure" (written in 1933 and published in English translation in Visions of Excess, a collection of essays Bataille wrote between 1927 and 1939).¶ It's pretty damn strange that Bataille's "Theoretical Introduction" to The Accursed Share mentions neither "The Notion of Expenditure" nor any of his previous writings. It's as if (Bataille wants us to believe that) this is the very first time that he is pointing out that 1) classical political economy is built on the unquestioned and yet demonstrably false premises that scarcity is the defining aspect of the economy, that individuals will always act according to their self-interest, and that self-interest always involves growth, the accumulation of wealth, and a reduction of waste; but that 2) a study of non-European, non-Christian cultures shows that surplus is actually the defining aspect of the economy, that growth can never be an end in itself, that wealth can indeed be accumulated but precisely for the purposes of deliberately wasting it in spectacular displays of power (human sacrifices, wars, religious monuments, festivals and mass entertainments); and that, in any case, 3) waste is unavoidable. And Bataille (almost) gets away with it, too: he introduces so much new material, material not covered in "The Notion of Expenditure" -- Islam, Buddhism and the 13th Dalai Lama, and the connections between Calvinism and Marxism -- that his 1933 essay is apparently outmoded, superceded, discarded and forgotten. Bataille has discretely tried to place "The Notion of Expenditure" into the proverbial "Trashcan of History," hoping that no one would notice or care.¶ Bataille also wants to pretend (wants us to believe) that the entire book, all of The Accursed Share, might also have ended up in the trash. In his preface, he writes:¶ Writing this book in which I was saying that energy finally can only be wasted, I myself was using my energy, my time, working; my research answered in a fundamental way the desire to add to the amount of wealth acquired for mankind. Should I say that under these conditions I sometimes could only respond to the truth of my book and could not go on writing it? A book that no one awaits, that answers no formulated question, that the author would not have written if he had followed its lesson to the letter -- such is the oddity that today I offer the reader. This invites distrust at the outset [...]¶ It's a fitting conceit, a pretty good joke, and it's irony certainly brings a smile; but it does indeed invite distrust at the outset. Note the (intentional?) ambiguity of "Should I say that under these conditions I sometimes could only respond to the truth of my book and could not go on writing it?" The only response to this evasively rhetorical question is: "Look, Georges: You should say that you stopped writing it, but only if it's true. If it isn't true, then you shouldn't say it."¶ Bataille doesn't say why he decided to put aside his reservations and complete all three volumes of The Accursed Share. He certainly didn't finish Volume I because of the uniqueness of the Marshall Plan, which is the subject of its very last chapter, or because of the unprecedented scale and extent of the devastation during the Second World War. Bataille finished the book because, like Breton, Aragon, Eluard and others in the Surrealist movement, he'd become a Stalinist (15 years after the others!), and because Stalin -- the whole Soviet Union, even -- really needed people like Georges to come to its defense.¶ Though many radical artists and intellectuals in France and elsewhere in Europe were Trotskyists in 1949 (Cornelius Castoriadis, for example), very few were open supporters of Stalinism. Andre Breton and most of the others had distanced themselves from or openly denounced Stalinism (if not the Communist Party, as well) because of the Soviet Union's murderous campaign to "collectivize" the kulaks in 1937 (an infamous example of what Karl Marx called primitive accumulation) and because of the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939. The same may be said for 1967, when The Accursed Share was first re-printed: though there (still) were Trotskyists in France, there were very few Stalinists. Those who were Stalinists -- Jean Paul Sartre, among them -- were denounced by the Situationist International. But there is no denunciation of Bataille in Internationale Situationniste, Guy Debord's La Societe du Spectacle or one of the books by his one-time colleague, Henri Lefebvre. The only thing Allan Stoekl -- the editor and translator of the Visions of Excess collection -- can say on the subject of Batatille's post-War writings is: "In his later writings (of the 1940s and 50s) Bataille is no longer overtly Marxist." While this remark might be taken as indirect evidence that Stalin himself wasn't much of a Marxist, it doesn't even admit that Bataille was a Stalinist.¶ In the chapter called "Soviet Industrialization," Bataille writes:¶ The collectivization of lands is in theory the most questionable part of the changes in economic structure. There is no doubt that it cost dearly; indeed, it is regarded as the cruelest moment of an endeavour that was never mild. But if one judges this development of Russian resources in a general way, one risks forgetting the conditions in which it was begun and the necessity that compelled it [...] These considerations had all the more force since industrialization always demands a large displacement of the population to the cities [...] But a sudden [industrial] development creates a call for manpower to which the response cannot long be delayed. Only agrarian "collectivism," coupled with mechanization, could ensure the maintenance and growth of agricultural production; without them, the proliferation of factories would have only led to disequilibrium [...] Situations arise in which, wrongly or rightly, acts of cruelty, harming individuals, seem negligible in view of the misfortunes they are meant to avoid [...] Today it is easy to see that the Soviets organizing production were replying in advance to a question of life and death. I do not mean to justify, but to understand; given that purpose, it seems superficial to me to dwell on horror [...] Apparently the Soviet Union, and, even, speaking more generally, Russia -- owing to the czarist legacy -- would not have been able to survive without a massive allocation of its resources to industrial equipment. Apparently, if this allocation had been even a little less rigorous, even a little less hard to bear than Stalin made it, Russia could have foundered [...] And we would rather die than establish a reign of terror; but a single man can die, and an immense population is faced with no other possibility than life. The Russian world had to make up for the backwardness of czarist society and this was necessarily so painful, it demanded an effort so great, that the hard way -- in every sense the most costly way -- became its only solution.¶ What's most striking about this chilling passage -- aside from its monstrous cynicism -- is the fact that, despite the passing reference to costliness in the last sentence, it has nothing to do with the discussions that introduced them. Forced social displacement on a massive scale, systematic theft of land by the State and mass murder ("terror") aren't "understood" here in scientific or empirical terms, that is, in terms of the structural unavoidability of waste and the stark contrast between "primitive" practices such as potlatch and the puritanical maintenance of accounts in modern capitalist society. Ironically, these terms only come (back) into play when Bataille turns to the Marshal Plan, which he asserts was a potlatch-like response -- not to the poverty created by the defeat of the Nazi regime -- but to the success of the Russian Army at Stalingrad.¶ No, Bataille justifies Stalinist terror in the calculating, moralizing, ideological terms of political expediency. Despite the radicality of some of Bataille's ideas, here he doesn't question anything of real importance: neither the historical inevitability of Bolshevism, the political legitimacy of the so-called Soviet Union itself (the Soviets themselves were forcibly suppressed in the early 1920s), the necessity of industrialization (both in general and in the specific case of the Russian economy), nor the desirability of Russia's survival. As Bataille himself showed in a preceding chapter, the Aztecs were conquered; Islam declined; Tibet was undermined. The United States, Bataille says, is also doomed. Why shouldn't Russia meet the same (unavoidable) fate?¶ It's also striking that Bataille's argument includes the following remark: "But if one judges this development of Russian resources in a general way, one risks forgetting the conditions in which it was begun and the necessity that compelled it" (italics added). In other words, one must concentrate on specific circumstances, not the general situation. This plainly contradicts two other remarks made by Bataille -- "Situations arise in which, wrongly or rightly, acts of cruelty, harming individuals, seem negligible in view of the misfortunes they are meant to avoid," and "[B]ut a single man can die, and an immense population is faced with no other possibility than life" -- as well as the central premise of general economy. "Are there not causes and effects that will appear only provided that the general data of the economy are studied?" Bataille had asked, rhetorically, in his introductory remarks concerning "the meaning" of general economy. "Will we be able to make ourselves the masters of such dangerous activity (and one that we could not abandon in any case) without having grasped its general consequences? Should we not, given the constant development of economic forces, pose the general problems that are linked to the movement of energy on the globe?" Yes, Georges, we should, even when looking at a "special case" such as Stalinist Russia.¶ And so, it's regrettable that Bataille decided to persevere and complete Volume I of The Accursed Share. Even though this Stalinist's analyses of eroticism and sovereignty are no doubt fascinating, we will nevertheless refrain from reading Volumes II and III of his trilogy. And we will also be quick to question those who say they are avid readers of Bataille's books to see if they know about his apologies for Stalinism.¶ But trashing The Accursed Share doesn't necessarily entail discarding everything that Bataille ever wrote. We still value the essays contained in Visions of Excess, especially "The Notion of Expenditure," which speaks of "revolution" and "class struggle" against bourgeois society as a whole in precisely those places that The Accursed Share speaks of the "evolution" of "socialism" in the Soviet Union and a "dynamic peace" between the USSR and America.¶ One notes [Bataille wrote in 1933] that in primitive societies, where the exploitation of man by man is still fairly weak, the products of human activity not only flow in great quantities to rich men because of the protection or social leadership services these men supposedly provide, but also because of the spectacular collective expenditures for which they must pay. In so-called civilized societies, the fundamental obligation of wealth disappeared only in a fairly recent period [...] Everything that was generous, orgiastic, and excessive has disappeared; the themes of rivalry upon which individual activity still depends develop in obscurity, and are as shameful as belching. The representatives of the bourgeoisie have adopted an effaced manner; wealth is now displayed behind closed doors, in accordance with depressing and boring conventions [...] Such trickery has become the principle reason for living, working, and suffering for those who lack the courage to condemn this moldy society to revolutionary destruction [...] As the class that possesses the wealth -- having received with wealth the obligation of functional expenditure -- the modern bourgeoisie is characterized by the refusal in principle of this obligation. It has distinguished itself from the aristocracy through the fact that it has consented only to spend for itself, and within itself -- in other words, by hiding its expenditures as much as possible from the other classes [...] In opposition, the people's consciousness is reduced to maintaining profoundly the principle of expenditure by representing bourgeois existence as the shame of man and as a sinister cancellation [...] As for the masters and exploiters, whose function is to create the contemptuous forms that exclude human nature -- causing this nature to exist at the limits of the earth, in other words in mud -- a simple law of reciprocity requires that they be condemned to fear, to the great night when their beautiful phrases will be drowned out by death screams in riots.

### Poststructuralists for Plan Texts

#### Interpretation: The aff should win if hypothetical enactment of a topical plan would be better than the status quo or competitive negative advocacies.

#### Sovereignty might get a bad rap from the aff but it isn’t nearly as bad as they make it out to be. Discourses of the law’s violent underside obscures its potential to get stuff done. Making the trains run on time is how we get to go to debate tournaments. Recognition of this fact means that we don’t have to resist—we can see rules as strategic.

Jacques Derrida, Directeur d’Etudes at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, and Professor of Philosophy, French and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, 2004, For What Tomorrow? A Dialogue With Elisabeth Roudinesco, p. 91-92

J.D.: A moment ago you spoke of regicide as the necessity of an ex­ception, in sum. Well, yes, one can refer provisionally to Carl Schmitt (whatever one may think of him, his arguments are always useful for prob­lematizing the “political” or the “juridical”; I examined this question in Pol­itics of Friendship). He says in effect that a sovereign is defined by his capacity to decide the exception. Sovereign is he who effectively decides the exception. The revolutionaries decided that at that moment that it was nec­essary to suspend justice and—in order to establish the law [droit] and to give the Revolution its rights—to suspend the rule of law [l’Etat de droit]. Schmitt also gives this definition of sovereignty: to have the right to sus­pend the law, or the rule of law, the constitutional state. Without this cate­gory of exception, we cannot understand the concept of sovereignty. Today, the great question is indeed, everywhere, that of sovereignty. Omnipresent in our discourses and in our axioms, under its own name or another, liter­ally or figuratively, this concept has a theological origin: the true sovereign is God. The concept of this authority or of this power was transferred to the monarch, said to have a “divine right.” Sovereignty was then delegated to the people, in the form of democracy, or to the nation, with the same the­ological attributes as those attributed to the king and to God. Today, wher­ever the word “sovereignty” is spoken, this heritage remains undeniable, whatever internal differentiation one may recognize in it. How do we deal with this? Here we return to the question of heritage with which we began. It is necessary to deconstruct the concept of sover­eignty, never to forget its theological filiation and to be ready to call this fil­iation into question wherever we discern its effects. This supposes an in­flexible critique of the logic of the state and of the nation-state. And yet—hence the enormous responsibility of the citizen and of the heir in general, in certain situations—the state, in its actual form, can resist cer­tain forces that I consider the most threatening. What I here call “responsibility” is what dictates the decision to be sometimes for the sovereign state and sometimes against it, for its deconstruction (“theoretical and practical,” as one used to say) according to the singularity of the contexts and the stakes. There is no relativism in this, no renunciation of the injunction to “think” and to deconstruct the heritage. This aporia is in truth the very condition of decision and responsibility—if there is any. I am thinking for example of the incoherent but organized coalition of international capitalist forces that, in the name of neoliberalism or the market,31 are taking hold of the world in conditions such as the “state” form; this is what can still resist the most. For the moment. But it is neces­sary to reinvent the conditions of resistance. Once again, I would say that according to the situations, I am an antisovereignist or a sovereignist—and I vindicate the right to be antisovereignist at certain times and a sovereignist at others. No one can make me respond to this question as though it were a matter of pressing a button on some old-fashioned machine. There are cases in which I would support a logic of the state, but I ask to examine each situation before making any statement. It is also necessary to recognize that by requiring someone to be not unconditionally sovereignist but rather soyvereignist only under certain conditions, one is already calling into question the principle of sovereignty. Deconstruction begins there. It demands a dif­ficult dissociation, almost impossible but indispensable, between uncondi­tionality (justice without power) and sovereignty (right, power, or potency). Deconstruction is on the side of unconditionaliry, even when it seems im­possible, and not sovereignty, even when it seems possible.

#### The aff relies on a false opposition between legal violence and non-violent resistance – this attempt to purge politics of violence is the height of ethical irresponsibility

Alex Thomson, lecturer in English at the University of Glasgow, 2005, Deconstruction and Democracy, p. 171-73

What Derrida proposes is not the end of revolution, however, but an extension and revision of the concept: What I am saying is anything but conservative and anti-revolutionary. For beyond Benjamin’s explicit purpose I shall propose the interpreta­tion according to which the very violence of the foundation or position of law must envelop the violence of conservation and cannot break with it. It belongs to the structure of fundamental violence that it calls for the repetition of itself and founds what ought to be conserved, conservable, promised to heritage and tradition, to be shared. [FoL 38 / 93—4] Benjamin’s opposition of a ‘law-making’ to a ‘law-conserving’ violence depends on the revolutionary situation — his example is the general strike —in which a new founding of the law is at stake [FoL 34—5 / 84—5]. However, for Derrida, we cannot know whether or not we are in the middle of a law-founding moment; precisely because such a moment can never be said to be ‘present’. The event and the effects of a decision can only be revealed in retrospect: ‘those who say “our time”, while thinking “our present in light of a future anterior present do not know very well, by definition, what they are saying’. Instead, as I have shown in relation to the decision, for Derrida ‘the whole history of law’ is that of its continual refoundation and reformulation: but crucially, ‘This moment always takes place and never takes place in a presence’ [FoL 36 / 89]. Like the decision, which calls for its own reaffirmation, for another decision, but which becomes law as soon as it has been done, so the violent foundation of the law calls for confirmation and conservation which is also violence. On the one hand, the violence of the suspension of all laws, on the other hand the violent suspension of that sus­pension in the rule of law: ‘Deconstruction is also the idea of— and the idea adopted by necessity of — this difirantielle contamination’ [FoL 39 / 95]. Politics is the mixture of these two forms of decision, two forms of violence which cannot be opposed in the manner Benjamin wishes (rigorously) or in terms of Greek and Judaic origins. This suggests a complete revision of the concept of revolution. By analogy with Schmitt, we might say that the moment of revolution or of violent overthrow is the possibility of a pure and present politicization. The danger of such an analysis is that it will tend to a glorification of violence for its own sake. But for Derrida there can be no question of such a politics. His own overturning of the logic of the revolu­tionary could in some ways be considered more radical, if it didn’t subvert the traditional concept of the ‘radical’ as well. Instead of the moment of revolution becoming the defining moment of the political, every moment, every decision is to be considered revolutionary. The revolutionary moment of the exception, the suspension of all rules, can no longer be imagined to be something that could or would take place, and therefore no longer something to call for or aim at. Revolutionary politicization can no longer be thought of as something that could be made present, it is not of the order of possibility. Instead the revolutionary is the order of the perhaps. But this ‘perhaps’ is not found in the exceptional moment, but makes an exception of every moment and every decision. If there is a politics of Derrida’s work it lies here, in his insistence on the revolutionary act of interpretation, of foundation of the law, of negotiation and calculation. This is where we must work most patiently to show that his messianism without messiah, which he is at pains to distinguish from that of Benjamin, is a messianism without content, without expectation of any thing coming: no revolution, no God, nothing.7 But by relocating the mes­sianic to the structure of event-hood itself, to the everyday negotiation with the law, with responsibility and duty, Derrida radicalizes the possibility of thinking politically. If the political is the moment of absolute uncertainty, but such uncertainty that we do not know where it is to be found, then the political is both the most common and the least common experience. The possibility of change, of something else happening, of justice, of more equal distribution of wealth or power is witnessed to and attested to by every event; although this possibility is indissociable from the threat of less justice, less equality, less democracy. The challenge of deconstruction is to find ways of thinking and acting which are adequate to this not-knowing, to the radical condition of the perhaps. Alexander Garcia Duttmann suggests to Derrida that this is the case: ‘on the one hand, we could be talking in the name of reformism, because each decision calls for another one. We face an ongoing process of reform after reform after reform. But at the same time we could radicalise that thought into something like a permanent revolution.’ Derrida confirms his proposal, echoing the passage from ‘Psyche: Inventions of the Other’ with which I concluded my introduction: ‘When I referred a moment ago to messianicity without messianism, I was describing a revolutionary experience. ..... But when I insisted on the fact that we must nevertheless prepare the revolution, it was because we must not simply be open to what­ever comes. The revolution, however unpredictable it may be, can and must be prepared for in the most cautious slow and labourious [sic] way.’8 Such a thought of depoliticization will always be open to two accusations. The first is that it is too theological, too messianic, too abstract, or not concrete enough. Yet clearly from Derrida’s point of view, any theory which presumes to label, identify or name a present politics, a determinate concept of the political, is being more messianic, in seeking to make some particular future arrive, to make something in particular happen. The other potential accusation would be that this is not radical at all, since it is not radical according to traditional political paths and codes. Certainly, if the degree of radicality of a theory were to be measured in term of the incomprehension and misunderstanding that have accrued to it then we would quite easily be able to prove that Derrida’s revolutionary politics is more radical than tradi­tional concepts of revolution. As Geoffrey Bennington comments: ‘the need to compromise, negotiate, with the most concrete detail of current arrange­ments of right: this is what defines deconstruction as radically political’.9 Deconstruction is an affirmation of what happens, and of the revolutionary reinvention at work in every political decision, and so clearly cannot be simply opposed to politics as it already exists. As I argued in the discussion of radical democracy in Chapter 3, this means thinking politics within the state as much as against the state; and as I emphasized in Chapter 6, deconstruction demands an intensive engagement with the law, both within and beyond the state.

#### Our contest should be over demands on the state. Legal institutions allow us to enforce our will while demands and right claims are the ultimate act of agonism. This is the best way to affirm human living

Lawrence J. Hatab [philosophy prof somewhere] “Prospects For A Democratic Agon: Why We Can Still Be Nietzscheans” The Journal of Nietzsche Studies 24 (2002) 132-147, on muse

Moreover, the structure of an agon conceived as a contest can readily underwrite political principles of fairness. Not only do I need an Other to prompt my own achievement, but the significance of any "victory" I might achieve demands an able opponent. As in athletics, defeating an incapable or incapacitated competitor winds up being meaningless. So I should not only will the presence of others in an agon, I should also want that they be able adversaries, that they have opportunities and capacities to succeed in the contest. And I should be able to honor the winner of a fair contest. Such is the logic of competition that contains a host of normative features, which might even include active provisions for helping people in political contests become more able participants. 25 In addition, agonistic respect need not be associated with something like positive regard or equal worth, a dissociation that can go further in facing up to actual political conditions and problematic connotations that can attach to liberal dispositions. Again allow me to quote my previous work. Democratic respect forbids exclusion, it demands inclusion; but respect for the Other as other can avoid a vapid sense of "tolerance," a sloppy "relativism," or a misplaced spirit of "neutrality." Agonistic respect allows us to simultaneously affirm our beliefs and affirm our opponents as worthy competitors [End Page 142] in public discourse. Here we can speak of respect without ignoring the fact that politics involves perpetual disagreement, and we have an adequate answer to the question "Why should I respect a view that I do not agree with?" In this way beliefs about what is best (aristos) can be coordinated with an openness to other beliefs and a willingness to accept the outcome of an open competition among the full citizenry (demos). Democratic respect, therefore, is a dialogical mixture of affirmation and negation, a political bearing that entails giving all beliefs a hearing, refusing any belief an ultimate warrant, and perceiving one's own viewpoint as agonistically implicated with opposing viewpoints. In sum, we can combine 1) the historical tendency of democratic movements to promote free expression, pluralism, and liberation from traditional constraints, and 2) a Nietzschean perspectivism and agonistic respect, to arrive at a postmodern model of democracy that provides both a nonfoundational openness and an atmosphere of civil political discourse. 26 An agonistic politics construed as competitive fairness can sustain a robust conception of political rights, not as something "natural" possessed by an original self, but as an epiphenomenal, procedural notion conferred upon citizens in order to sustain viable political practice. Constraints on speech, association, access, and so on, simply insure lopsided political contests. We can avoid metaphysical models of rights and construe them as simply social and political phenomena: social in the sense of entailing reciprocal recognition and obligation; political in the sense of being guaranteed and enforced by the state. We can even defend so-called positive rights, such as a right to an adequate education, as requisite for fair competition in political discourse. Rights themselves can be understood as agonistic in that a right-holder has a claim against some treatment by others or for some provision that might be denied by others. In this way rights can be construed as balancing power relations in social milieus, as a partial recession of one's own power on behalf of the power of others—which in fact is precisely how Nietzsche in an early work described fairness and rights (D 112). And, as is well known, the array of rights often issues conflicts of different and differing rights, and political life must engage in the ongoing balancing act of negotiating these tensions, a negotiation facilitated by precisely not defining rights as discrete entities inviolably possessed by an originating self. Beyond political rights, a broader conception of rights, often designated as human rights as distinct from political practice, can also be defended by way of the kind of nonfoundational, negative sense of selfhood inspired by Nietzsche. For Nietzsche, the self is a temporal openness infused with tragic limits, rather than some metaphysical essence, stable substance, or eternal entity. A via negativa can be utilized to account for rights as stemming not from what we are but from what we are not. So much of abusive or exclusionary treatment is animated by confident designations and reductions as to "natures" having to do with race, gender, class, role, character, and so on. [End Page 143] Nonfoundational challenges to "identity" may seem unsettling, but if we consider how identities figure in injustices, a good deal of work can be done to reconfigure rights as based in resistance. It is difficult to find some positive condition that can justify rights and do so without excluding or suppressing some other conditions. But a look at human history and experience can more readily understand rights and freedom as emerging out of the irrepressible tendency of human beings to resist and deny the adequacy of external attributions as to what or who they "are." It may be sufficient to defend rights simply in terms of the human capacity to say No.

#### Praxis can be hard. In all our critiquing, destabilizing, and disrupting, we risk losing sight of the important goals our critiques suggest—the material changes necessary to reorient institutions and social relations in less violent fashions. This obviates particular strategies for change in conjunction with broadening our theoretical lenses.

Bryant ’12 Levi Bryant, teaches philosophy at Collin College, “RSI, Discursivity, Critique, and Politics,” Larval Subjects, 7/18/2012, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/07/18/rsi-discursivity-critique-and-politics/

If I get worked up about these issues, then this is because I think they’ve created serious lacuna in our political theory and practice. Suppose I focus on norms, for example. Great, I’ve developed a theory of norms and how they contribute to the social fabric. Yet while Kant claims that “ought implies can”, I’m not so sure. You’ve shown that something is unjust or that this would be the reasonable way to proceed. But at the real-material level people are caught in sticky networks that suck them into life in particular ways. They ought, for example, to drive an electric car, but what if it’s not available where they are or what if they can’t afford it? Well they should do whatever they can to get it? But what of their other obligations such as eating, sheltering themselves, taking care of their children, paying their medical bills, etc? It would be so nice if we just had mistaken beliefs or failed to recognize the right norms. Things would be so easy then. But there’s life, there’s the power of things. Sometimes the issues aren’t ones of ideology– and yes, of course, I recognize that ideology is probably involved in making electric cars expensive and hard to obtain, but not for them always –sometimes they’re simply issues of the power of things. And if we treat things as blank screens we’ll have difficulty seeing this and we’ll miss out on other opportunities for engagement. Long ago I used to keep track of my blog. I had a map that showed me where all my visits were coming from about the world. I noticed that the interior portions of the United States were largely dark with no visits and that the coasts and cities had a high volume of traffic. Given that my blog talks about all sorts of things ranging from weather patterns to beavers to mantis shrimps to octopi (I get all these random visits from folks searching for these things), it followed that the absence of traffic from these regions of the country couldn’t be explained in terms of a lack of interest in French and continental philosophy (yes, I recognize that there are also cultural reasons folks from these reasons might shy away from such things). What then was it? I think the answer must be that there’s a lack easy and inexpensive internet access from these portions of the country. Notice also that these regions of the country are also the most conservative regions of the country. Could there be a relation between lack of access and conservatism? I am not suggesting that lack of access is the cause of conservatism and fundamentalism. Clearly there’s a whole history in these regions and an entire set of institutions that exercise a particular inertia. I’m saying that if the only voices you hear are those in your immediate community, how much opportunity is there to think and imagine otherwise? You’re only exposed to the orthodoxy of your community and their sanctions. I am also not saying that if you give people the internet they’ll suddenly become radical leftists. Minimally, however, they’ll have a vector of deterritorialization that allows them to escape the constraints of their local social field. All of this begs the question of who critique is for. If it can’t get to the audience that you want to change, what’s it actually doing? Who’s it addressed to? Sometimes you get the sense that the practice of radical political philosophy and critical theory is a bit like the Underpants Gnomes depicted in South Park: The Underpants Gnomes have a plan for success: collect underwear —>; ? [question mark] —->; profit. This is like our critical theorists: debunk/decipher —>; ? [question mark] —->; revolution! The problem is the question mark. We’re never quite sure what’s supposed to come between collecting the underwear and profit, between debunking and revolution. This suggests an additional form of political engagement. Sometimes the more radical gesture is not to debunk and critique, but to find ways to lay fiber optic cables, roads, plumbing, etc. How, for example, can a people rise up and overturn their fundamentalist dictators if they’re suffering from typhoid and cholera as a result of bad plumbing and waste disposal? How can people overturn capitalism when they have to support families and need places to live and have no alternative? Perhaps, at this point, we need a little less critique and a little more analysis of the things that are keeping people in place, the sticky networks or regimes of attraction. Perhaps we need a little more carpentry. This has real theoretical consequences. For example, we can imagine someone writing about sovereignty, believing they’re making a blow against nationalism by critiquing Schmitt and by discussing Agamben, all the while ignoring media of communication or paths of relation between geographically diverse people as if these things were irrelevant to nationalism occurring. Ever read Anderson on print culture and nationalism? Such a person should. Yet they seem to believe nationalism is merely an incorporeal belief that requires no discussion of material channels or media. They thereby deny themselves of all sorts of modes of intervention, hitching everything on psychology, attachment, and identification. Well done!

### Case

#### Their argument is incoherent – it’s based on a contradictory understanding of the economy of excess

Mark Osteen, English prof @ Loyola, 2002, The Question of the Gift, p. 27

Unfortunately, Bataille’s intriguing ideas are plagued by a central incoherence. He sometimes suggests that expenditure comprises an orgy of freedom from which nothing is recovered. Thus it would equal absolute loss. But at other times he states that the extravagant losses in the potlatch are merely converted into prestige or rank (1988: 68-9). As Pecora observes, Bataille’s “general economy” makes sense only if one accepts his radical division between economic and symbolic capital (Pecora 1997: 249), a distinction that, Frow notes, boils down to little more than clever “sleight of hand” (Frow 1997:118). More compelling – and more important for our purposes – than Bataille’s inconsistencies is his association of expenditure with art. For Bataille, the word “poetry” must be applied to “the least degraded and least intellectualized forms of the expression of a state of loss” (1985: 120): “poetry” refers to whatever expresses an impulse toward the gift. Poetry, like sacrifice, creates value out of expenditure, turning loss into gain.

#### The inevitability of death solves 100% of their link – it’s not necessary to sacrifice the lives of others to recognize your finitude, because confrontation with death and suffering are a permanent feature of existence. This also means that trying to improve the world by preventing the suffering of others is actually awesome.

Jean-Luc Nancy 1991, Professor of Political Philosophy and Media Aesthetics at the European Graduate School, “The Unsacrificeable,” Yale French Studies 79

On the one hand, what is at stake since the beginning of the Western sublation of sacrifice should definitively be acknowledged: strictly speaking we know nothing decisive about the old sacrifice. We need to admit that what we consider as a mercenary exchange (“Here is the butter . . . sustained and gave meaning to billions of individual and collective existences, and we do not know how to think about what founds this gesture. (We can only guess, confusedly, that this barter in itself goes beyond barter.) On the contrary, we know that, for us, it is absolutely impossible to declare: “here are the lives, where are the others?” (all the others: our other lives, the life of a great Other, the other of life and the other life in general). Consequently, on the other hand, it should be definitively acknowledged that the Western economy of sacrifice has come to a close, and that it is closed by the decomposition of the sacrificial apparatus itself, that bloody transgression by which the “moment of the finite” would be transcended and appropriated infinitely. But finitude is not a “moment” in a process or an economy. A finite existence does not have to let its meaning spring forth through a destructive explosion of its finitude. Not only does it not have to do SO; in a sense it cannot even do so: thought rigorously, thought according to its Ereignis, “finitude” signifies that existence cannot he sacrificed. It cannot be sacrificed because, in itself, it is already, not sacrificed, but offered to the world. There is a resemblance, and the two can be mistaken for one another; and yet, there is nothing more dissimilar. One could say: existence is in essence sacrificed. To say this would be to reproduce, in one of its forms, the fundamental utterance of Western sacriflee. And we would have to add this major form, which necessarily follows: that existence is, in its essence, sacrifice. To say that existence is offered is no doubt to use a word from the sacrificial vocabulary (and if we were in the German language, it would be the same word: Opfer, Aufopf erung). But it is an attempt to mark that, if we have to say that existence is sacrificed, it is not in any case sacrificed by anyone, nor is it sacrificed to anything. “Existence is offered” means the finitude of existence. Finitude is not negativity cut out of being and granting access, through this cutting, to the restored integrity of being or to sovereignty. Finitude utters what Bataille utters in saying that sovereignty is nothing. Finitude simply corresponds to the generative formula of the thought of existence, which is the thought of the finitude of being, or the thought of the meaning of being as the finitude of meaning. This formula states: “the “essence” of Dasein lies in its existence.22 If its essence (in quotation marks) is in its existence, it is that the existent has no essence. It cannot be returned to the trans-appropriation of an essence. But it is offered, that is to say, it is presented to the existence that it is. The existence exposes being in its essence disappropriated of all essence, and thus of all “being:” the being that is not. Such negativity, however, does not come dialectically to say that it shall be, that it shall finally be a transappropriated Self. On the contrary, this negation affirms the inappropriate as its most appropriate form of appropriation, and in truth as the unique mode of all appropriation. Also, the negative mode of this utterance: “being is not” does not imply a negation but an ontological affirmation. This is what is meant by Ereignis. The existent arrives, takes place, and this is nothing but a being-thrown into the world. In this being-thrown, it is offered. But it is offered by no one, to no one. Nor is it self-sacrificed, if nothing—no being, no subject—precedes its being-thrown. In truth, it is not even offered or sacrificed to a Nothing, to a Nothingness or an Other in whose abyss it would come to enjoy its own impossibility of being impossibly. It is exactly at this point that both Bataille and Heidegger must be relentlessly corrected. Corrected, that is: withdrawn from the slightest tendency towards sacrifice. For this tendency towards sacrifice, or through sacrifice, is always linked to a fascination with an ecstasy turned towards an Other or towards an absolute Outside, into which the subject is diverted/spilled the better to be restored. Western sacrifice is haunted by an Outside of finitude, as obscure and bottomless as this “outside” may be. But there is no “outside.” The event of existence, the “there is,” means that there is nothing else. There is no “obscure God.” There is no obscurity that would be God. In this sense, and since there is no longer any clear divine epiphany, I might say that what technique presents us with could simply be: clarity without God. The clarity, however, of an open space in which an open eye can no longer be fascinated. Fascination is already proof that something has been accorded to obscurity and its bloody heart. But there is nothing to accord, nothing but “nothing.”“Nothing” is not an abyss open to the outside. “Nothing” affirms finitude, and this “nothing” at once returns existence to itself and to nothing else. It de-subjectivizes it, removing all possibility of trans-appropriating itself through anything but its own event, advent. Existence, in this sense, its proper sense, is unsacrificeable. Thus there is room to give meaning to the infinite absence of appropriable meaning. Once again, “technique” could well constitute such an horizon. That is once more to say, there must be no retreat: the closure of an immanence. But this immanence would not have lost or be lacking transcendence. In other words, it would not be sacrifice in any sense of the word. What we used to call “transcendence” would signify rather that appropriation is imnrnnent, but that “immanence” is not some indistinct coagulation: it is made only from its horizon. The horizon holds existence at a distance from itself, in the gap or the “between” that constitutes it: between birth and death, between one and the others. One does not enter the between, which is also the space of the play of mimesis and of methexis. Not because it would be an abyss, an altar, or an impenetrable heart, but because it would be nothing other than the limit of finitude; and lest we confuse it with, say, Hegelian “finiteness,” this limit is a limit that does not soar above nothingness. Existence alone breaks away from even itself. Does this mean rejoicing in a mediocre and limited life? Surely such a suspicion could itself come only from a mediocre and limited life. And it is this same life that could suddenly be exalted, fascinated, by sacrifice. Neither pain nor death are to be denied. Still less, if possible, are these to be sought after in view of some trans-appropriation. At issue, rather, is a pain that no longer sacrifices, and which one no longer sacrifices. True pain, doubtless, and perhaps even the truest of all. It does not efface joy (nor enjoyment), and yet, it is not the latter’s dialectical or sublimating thresh- hold either. There is no threshhold, no sublime and bloody gesture, that will cross it. After all, Western sacrifice has almost always known, and almost always been ready to say, that it sacrificed to nothing. That is why it has always tended to say that true sacrifice was no longer sacrifice. Yet henceforth it is incumbent upon us to say—after Bataile, with him and beyond him—that there is no “true” sacrifice, that veritable existence is unsacrificeable, and that finally the truth of existence is that it cannot be sacrificed.

#### Death first—we should condemn ruthless slaughter—being alive is a prerequisite to conscious expenditure

Itzkowitz ’99 Kenneth Itzkowitz, “To Witness Spectacles of Pain: The Hypermorality of Georges Bataille,” College Literature, Vol. 26, Issue 1, Winter 1999, ebsco

Yet in our lives there are also limits. It is unlikely that Bataille would applaud Manson for the same reason he ultimately rejects Sade. They are both indiscriminate; they both go too far. "Continuity is what we are after," Bataille confirms, but generally only if that continuity which the death of discontinuous beings can alone establish is not the victor in the long run. What we desire is to bring into a world founded on discontinuity all the continuity such a world can sustain. De Sade's aberration exceeds that limit. (Bataille 1962, 13) In other words, our wasteful consumption must also have limits. To actually approve of our own self-destruction goes too far. Later on in Death and Sensuality, Bataille continues, Short of a paradoxical capacity to defend the indefensible, no one would suggest that the cruelty of the heroes of Justine and Juliette should not be wholeheartedly abominated. It is a denial of the principles on which humanity is founded. We are bound to reject something that would end in the ruin of all our works. If instinct urges us to destroy the very thing we are building we must condemn those instincts and defend ourselves from them. (Bataille 1962, 179-80) This passage is crucial for understanding Bataille's ethics. Usually Bataille writes on behalf of the violence that remains unaffected by absolute prohibitions. Prohibitions cannot obviate this transformative violence. There is always ample motive to produce the experiences of sacred transformation, i.e., to transgress the prohibitions. Yet self-preservation is also a fundamental value for Bataille; there is also ample motive to resist the violence that denies the value of the well being of life itself. As he says in the second of the above passages, we must condemn what threatens to destroy us; our sovereign aspirations can be taken too far. In another passage he speaks of our need "to become aware of . . . [ourselves] and to know clearly what . . . [our] sovereign aspirations are in order to limit their possibly disastrous consequences" (1962, 181). It is when we are ignorant of these aspirations that we are most vulnerable to them, enacting them anyway, albeit inattentively.

## 2NC

### Poststructuralists for Plan Texts

#### Law is not all bad. It gets stuff done. They totalize the law into a thing that must be resisted, thus replicating the worst aspect of sovereign violence. Instead we should make demands on the law. Ethics proceeds any particular engagement and is thus not actualizeable, none the less we have an obligation to try.

Jacques Derrida, Directeur d’Etudes at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, and Professor of Philosophy, French and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, 2003, Philosophy in a Time of Terror, p. 128-30

Borradori: Tolerance thus amounts to granting someone permission to continue living on? Derrida: Indeed, and so a limited tolerance is clearly prefer­able to an absolute intolerance. But tolerance remains a scrutinized hospitality, always under surveillance, parsimonious and protective of its sovereignty. In the best of cases, it’s what I would call a conditional hospitality, the one that is most commonly practiced by individuals, families, cities, or states. We offer hospitality only on the condition that the other follow our rules, our way of life, even our language, our cul­ture, our political system, and so on. That is hospitality as it is com­monly understood and practiced, a hospitality that gives rise, with cer­tain conditions, to regulated practices, laws, and conventions on a national and international—indeed, as Kant says in a famous text, a “cosmopolitical”—scale.2” But pure or unconditional hospitality does not consist in such an invitation (“I invite you, I welcome you into my home, on the condition that you adapt to the laws and norms of my ter­ritory, according to my language, tradition, memory, and so on”). Pure and unconditional hospitality, hospitality itself opens or is in advance open to someone who is neither expected nor invited, to whomever ar­rives as an absolutely foreign visitor, as a new arrival, nonidentifiable and unforeseeable, in short, wholly other. I would call this a hospitality of visitation rather than invitation. The visit might actually be very dangerous, and we must not ignore this fact, but would a hospitality without risk, a hospitality backed by certain assurances, a hospitality protected by an immune system against the wholly other, be true hos­pitality? Though it’s ultimately true that suspending or suppressing the immunity that protects me from the other might be nothing short of life-threatening. An unconditional hospitality is, to be sure, practically impossible to live; one cannot in any case, and by definition, organize it. Whatever happens, happens, whoever comes, comes (ce qui arrive arrive), and that, in the end, is the only event worthy of this name. And I well rec­ognize that this concept of pure hospitality can have no legal or politi­cal status. No state can write it into its laws. But without at least the thought of this pure and unconditional hospitality, of hospitality itself we would have no concept of hospitality in general and would not even be able to determine any rules for conditional hospitality (with its ritu­als, its legal status, its norms, its national or international conventions). Without this thought of pure hospitality (a thought that is also, in its own way, an experience), we would not even have the idea of the other, of the alterity of the other, that is, of someone who enters into our lives without having been invited. We would not even have the idea of love or of “living together (vivre ensemble)” with the other in a way that is not a part of some totality or “ensemble.” Unconditional hospitality, which is neither juridical nor political, is nonetheless the condition of the political and the juridical. For these very reasons, I am not even sure whether it is ethical, insofar as it does not even depend on a deci­sion. But what would an “ethics” be without hospitality? Paradox, aporia: these two hospitalities are at once heterogeneous and indissociable. Heterogeneous because we can move from one to the other only by means of an absolute leap, a leap beyond knowledge and power, beyond norms and rules. Unconditional hospitality is tran­scendent with regard to the political, the juridical, perhaps even to the ethical. But—and here is the indissociability—I cannot open the door, I cannot expose myself to the coming of the other and offer him or her anything whatsoever without making this hospitality effective, without, in some concrete way, giving something determinate. This determina­tion will thus have to re-inscribe the unconditional into certain condi­tions. Otherwise, it gives nothing. What remains unconditional or ab­solute (unbedingi, if you will) risks being nothing at all if conditions (Bedingungen) do not make of it some thing (Ding). Political, juridical, and ethical responsibilities have their place, if they take place, only in this transaction—which is each time unique, like an event—between these two hospitalities, the unconditional and the conditional.

#### The impact to our formalism argument is extinction

Nick Smith, Professor of Philosophy at the University of New Hampshire, Spring/Summer 1997, Buffalo Law Review, 45 Buffalo L. Rev. 503, p. 546-47

Nussbaum believes that this Platonic ethical science, and its offspring in certain proposals in ethics and economic theory, could actually lead, if followed and lived with severity and rigor, to the end of life as we know it. Here the parallels to Levinas are most arresting. First, other people in the world will appear radically different for those looking through the lens of commensurating ethical science as compared to those committed to incommensurability. For the Platonist, "a body, a person, will seem to be nothing but a pure container or location for a certain quantity of value," since to understand another person as anything more would be to raise "motivational complications that this scheme wishes to avoid." n151 For Levinas this total conflation of others into qualitative clones denies them any particularity or difference from me or each other, and the Other is thus stripped bare of any semblance of independent identity. This imprisonment of the Other within imperialistic cognitive categories is exactly the type of extermination of alterity that Levinas so passionately denounces and calls us to resist. As we have seen, the entirety of Levinas' work searches for a way to respect difference in order to maintain an ethical relationship with the other, while Plato and other commensurability theorists think that the best way to make ethical and evaluative decisions is to distill everything to varying amounts of the same essential element, be it a mathematical equation, a sunny day, or the person across from you. Indeed, it is no accident that Nussbaum locates and abhors the most extreme version of commensurability in Plato, for it is he who Levinas charges with initiating the philosophical impulse to control. Second, and still more insidious from a Levinasian perspective, Plato calls for us to reduce Others in this way for our own mental hygiene, so that we are not bothered with the troubling complexities of relating to the "strangeness" of others. For Plato this violent commensurating of others frees us up from the agitating nature of alterity, and therefore "it is mindless not to take the step . . . to homogeneity because this step is so helpful to the personality, relaxing tensions that have become difficult to bear." n152 Thus for Plato, my relation with the other should be guided by that which is easiest for me, simplifies my life, and saves me from the headaches of incommensurability. Levinas and Derrida could not disagree more wholeheartedly with this outlook, since deconstruction hopes to heighten our confusion, undecidability, and the tension we experience in ethical and political decisionmaking, for in Derrida's words, "there can be no moral or political responsibility without this trail and this passage by way of the undecidable." n153 For deconstruction, apprehension causes us to feel the gravity of our ethical situations, and the very distress we feel in the face of an ethical decision is central to responsible relations. As I have noted, for Levinas "morality begins when freedom, instead of being justified by itself, feels itself to be arbitrary and violent." n154 Levinasian ethics calls me to be accountable for and to resist my egocentrism, and I should be preoccupied with these responsibilities. Whereas Plato wants to "relax" our ethical deliberation, Levinas wants us to be deeply troubled by and concerned with the difficulties presented to us by the Other. In the name of certainty, conformity, and strength of will, Plato seeks to suppress genuine difference, and for Nussbaum and other incommensurability theorists, such "evasiveness is not progress." n155 Instead, such a systematic obliteration of alterity for the sake of uniformity invites authoritarianism. Just as Plato believes that an ethical science of commensurability would transform our character and actions, incommensurability theorists believe that the recognition of the inability to respect alterity will similarly revolutionize our ethical and political behavior. As I have already laid out the types of ethical responsibilities and personal reformations that Levinas believes are triggered by alterity, the conclusion of this note will bring into focus some legal and political strategies that supplement deconstruction and incommensurability theory.

#### Ethics is constitutive of language and subjectivity—value can only emerge from openness to difference. This means ethics is prior to their K.

Amit Pinchevski, PhD candidate in the Graduate Program in Communications at McGill University, Montreal, Diacritics 31.2, Summer 2001, p. 77

In order to reencounter the Other's side of the freedom to speak, it is necessary to recognize that the ontological structure of being-with is precisely what overshadows the Other's side of this practice. Levinas's contention is radical: one is first in relation with the Other and only later a self. Subjectivity is essentially response-able, or as Buber contends, the first word one says is "You" rather than "Me." The Other appears before the rise of the self, before its history, before the self is its own—the Other is "prehistorical," before the origin of the self. And before here does not merely refer to temporality. As Richard Cohen suggests, this ethical relation is better than being, better than ontology [8], better because it does not meet social structures, power, calculations, and reason on the same plane; it transcends and precedes them. The culs-de-sac to which the ontological situation of being-with the Other leads confront one with the realization that ethical relation comes before knowledge of what is: "The grounds for ethics cannot be found in the self's being; neither can they be found in the self's knowledge . . . [ethics] is secondary to nothing: neither to being, nor to the knowledge of being. It resides before and outside them" [Bauman, Effacing the Face 16]. I am therefore always already in communication with the Other; I am concerned with the Other before I am concerned with myself, I am a tympanum before I am a speaker, I am for-the-Other before I am for-myself. Thus, subjectivity is ethical: I am responsible not despite the fact that I have emerged as a self, but because I am a self. Responsibility for the Other—always as the ability to respond to his or her call—is the fundamental structure of subjectivity. Ethics comes second to nothing, not even to freedom, for I cannot will the freedom of the Other from my own freedom. If ethics, as described by Levinas, is indeed "First Philosophy," I am first responsible and only later free: The freedom of another could never begin in my freedom, that is, abide in the same present, be contemporary, be representable to me. The responsibility for the other cannot have begun with my commitment, in my decision. The unlimited responsibility in which I find myself comes from the hither side of my freedom, from a "prior to every memory." . . . The responsibility for the other is the null-site of subjectivity, where the privilege of the question "Where?" no longer holds. The time of the said and of essence there lets the pre-original saying be heard, answers to transcendence. [OBBE 10] The realm of ethical discourse is in the for-the-Other, in a realm beyond ontology, from which discourse reaches out to the Other. The realm of being for-the-Other is where speech breaks from its Ulyssian circle—it does not return to its origin; instead, it leaves its sender and is forbidden from returning and reinstating it. Speech here is already a response, an address free from rhetoric: it unfolds itself for-the-Other, and regardless of the actual content delivered, its first word is "Welcome."

#### Calculation is inevitable, but should still calculate in times of importance. The radical alerity of the other, and the radicality of the state, is without measure and cannot be waved away. If you think “USFG” is in the topic, and not in the plan text, then they don’t meet.

Derrida ‘2 Jacques Derrida, Directeur d’Etudes at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, and Professor of Philosophy, French and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, 2002, Acts of Religion, p. 255-57

This excess of justice over law and calculation, this overflowing of the unpre­sentable over the determinable, cannot and should not [ne peut pas et ne doit pas] serve as an alibi for staying out of juridico-political battles, within an institution or a state, between institutions or states. Abandoned to itself, the incalculable and giv­ing [donatrice] idea of justice is always very close to the bad, even to the worst for it can always be reappropriated by the most perverse calculation. It is always possible, and this is part of the madness of which we were speaking. An absolute assurance against this risk can only saturate or suture the opening of the call to justice, a call that is always wounded. But incalculable justice commands calculation. And first of all, closest to what one associates with justice, namely, law, the juridical field that one cannot isolate within sure frontiers, but also in all the fields from which one cannot separate it, which intervene in it and are no longer simply fields: the ethical, the political, the economical, the psycho-sociological, the philosophical, the liter­ary, etc. Not only must one [il faut] calculate, negotiate the relation between the calculable and the incalculable, and negotiate without a rule that would not have to be reinvented there where we are “thrown’ there where we find ourselves; but one must [il faut] do so and take it as far as possible, beyond the place we find our­selves and beyond the already identifiable zones of morality, politics, or law, beyond the distinctions between national and international, public and private, and so on. The order of this il faut does not properly belong either to justice or to law. It only belongs to either realm by exceeding each one in the direction of the other—which means that, in their very heterogeneity, these two orders are undis­sociable: de facto and de jure [en fait et en droit]. Politicization, for example, is interminable even if it cannot and should not ever be total. To keep this from being a truism, or a triviality, one must recognize in it the following consequence: each advance in politicization obliges one to reconsider, and so to reinterpret the very foundations of law such as they had previously been calculated or delimited. This was true for example in the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, in the abolition of slavery, in all the emancipatory battles that remain and will have to remain in progress, everywhere in the world, for men and for women. Nothing seems to me less outdated than the classical emancipatory ideal. One cannot attempt to disqualify it today, whether crudely or with sophistication, without at least some thoughtlessness and without forming the worst complicities. It is true that it is also necessary to re-elaborate, without renouncing, the concept of eman­cipation, enfranchisement, or liberation while taking into account the strange structures we have been describing. But beyond these identified territories of juridico-politicization on the grand geo-political scale, beyond all self-serving misappropriations and hijackings, beyond all determined and particular reappropria­tions of international law, other areas must constantly open up that can at first resemble secondary or marginal areas. This marginality also signifies that a vio­lence, even a terrorism and other forms of hostage taking are at work. The exam­ples closest to us would be found in the area of laws [lois] on the teaching and practice of languages, the legitimization of canons, the military use of scientific research, abortion, euthanasia, problems of organ transplant, extra-uterine con­ception, bio-engineering, medical experimentation, the “social treatment” of AIDS, the macro- or micro-politics of drugs, homelessness, and so on, without forgetting; of course, the treatment of what one calls animal life, the immense question of so-called animality. On this last problem, the Benjamin text that I am coming to now shows that its author was not deaf or insensitive to it, even if his propositions on this subject remain quite obscure or traditional.

#### Opposition between general and restricted economy is a false one—encloses all economy within a closed totality of “general expenditure.”

Newman 2001 [Saul, Sociology @ Macquarie University, Philosophy & Social Criticism 27: 3, pp. 4-6]

It must be made clear, however, that Derrida does not simply want to invert the terms of these binaries so that the subordinated term becomes the privileged term. He does not want to put writing in the place of speech, for instance. Inversion in this way leaves intact the hierarchical, authoritarian structure of the binary division. Such a strategy only re- affirms the place of power in the very attempt to overthrow it. One could argue that Marxism fell victim to this logic by replacing the bour- geois state with the equally authoritarian workers’ state. This is a logic that haunts our radical political imaginary. Revolutionary political theories have often succeeded only in reinventing power and authority in their own image. However, Derrida also recognizes the dangers of subversion – that is, the radical strategy of overthrowing the hierarchy altogether, rather than inverting its terms. For instance, the classical anarchist’s critique of Marxism went along the lines that Marxism neglected political power – in particular the power of the state – for economic power, and this would mean a restoration of political power in a Marxist revolution. Rather, for anarchists, the state and all forms of political power must be abolished as the first revolutionary act. However, Derrida believes that subversion and inversion both culminate in the same thing – the reinvention of authority, in different guises. Thus, the anarchist critique is based on the Enlightenment idea of a rational and moral human essence that power denies, and yet we know from Derrida that any essential identity involves a radical exclusion or sup- pression of other identities. Thus, anarchism substituted political and economic authority for a rational authority founded on an Enlighten- ment-humanist subjectivity. Both radical politico-theoretical strategies then – the strategy of inversion, as exemplified by Marxism, and the strategy of subversion, as exemplified by anarchism – are two sides of the same logic of logic of ‘place’. So for Derrida: What must occur then is not merely a suppression of all hierarchy, for an- archy only consolidates just as surely the established order of a metaphys- ical hierarchy; nor is it a simple change or reversal in the terms of any given hierarchy. Rather the Umdrehung must be a transformation of the hierar- chical structure itself. In other words, to avoid the lure of authority one must go beyond both the anarchic desire to destroy hierarchy, and the mere reversal of terms. Rather, as Derrida suggests, if one wants to avoid this trap the hierar- chical structure itself must be transformed. Political action must invoke a rethinking of revolution and authority in a way that traces a path between these two terms, so that it does not merely reinvent the place of power. It could be argued that Derrida propounds an anarchism of his own, if by anarchism one means a questioning of all authority, including textual and philosophical authority, as well as a desire to avoid the trap of reproducing authority and hierarchy in one’s attempt to destroy it. This deconstructive attempt to transform the very structure of hier- archy and authority, to go beyond the binary opposition, is also found in Nietzsche. Nietzsche believes that one cannot merely oppose auth- ority by affirming its opposite: this is only to react to and, thus, affirm the domination one is supposedly resisting. One must, he argues, tran- scend oppositional thinking altogether – go beyond truth and error, beyond being and becoming, beyond good and evil. For Nietzsche it is simply a moral prejudice to privilege truth over error. However, he does not try to counter this by privileging error over truth, because this leaves the opposition intact. Rather, he refuses to confine his view of the world to this opposition: ‘Indeed what compels us to assume that there exists any essential antithesis between “true” and “false”? Is it not enough to suppose grades of apparentness and as it were lighter and darker shades and tones of appearance?’ Nietzsche displaces, rather than replaces, these oppositional and authoritarian structures of thought – he displaces place. This strategy of displacement, similarly adopted by Derrida, provides certain clues to developing a non-essentialist theory of resist- ance to power and authority. Rather than reversing the terms of the binary opposition, one should perhaps question, and try to make prob- lematic, its very structure.

#### The aff relies on a false opposition between legal violence and non-violent resistance – this attempt to purge politics of violence is the height of ethical irresponsibility

Alex Thomson, lecturer in English at the University of Glasgow, 2005, Deconstruction and Democracy, p. 171-73

What Derrida proposes is not the end of revolution, however, but an extension and revision of the concept: What I am saying is anything but conservative and anti-revolutionary. For beyond Benjamin’s explicit purpose I shall propose the interpreta­tion according to which the very violence of the foundation or position of law must envelop the violence of conservation and cannot break with it. It belongs to the structure of fundamental violence that it calls for the repetition of itself and founds what ought to be conserved, conservable, promised to heritage and tradition, to be shared. [FoL 38 / 93—4] Benjamin’s opposition of a ‘law-making’ to a ‘law-conserving’ violence depends on the revolutionary situation — his example is the general strike —in which a new founding of the law is at stake [FoL 34—5 / 84—5]. However, for Derrida, we cannot know whether or not we are in the middle of a law-founding moment; precisely because such a moment can never be said to be ‘present’. The event and the effects of a decision can only be revealed in retrospect: ‘those who say “our time”, while thinking “our present in light of a future anterior present do not know very well, by definition, what they are saying’. Instead, as I have shown in relation to the decision, for Derrida ‘the whole history of law’ is that of its continual refoundation and reformulation: but crucially, ‘This moment always takes place and never takes place in a presence’ [FoL 36 / 89]. Like the decision, which calls for its own reaffirmation, for another decision, but which becomes law as soon as it has been done, so the violent foundation of the law calls for confirmation and conservation which is also violence. On the one hand, the violence of the suspension of all laws, on the other hand the violent suspension of that sus­pension in the rule of law: ‘Deconstruction is also the idea of— and the idea adopted by necessity of — this difirantielle contamination’ [FoL 39 / 95]. Politics is the mixture of these two forms of decision, two forms of violence which cannot be opposed in the manner Benjamin wishes (rigorously) or in terms of Greek and Judaic origins. This suggests a complete revision of the concept of revolution. By analogy with Schmitt, we might say that the moment of revolution or of violent overthrow is the possibility of a pure and present politicization. The danger of such an analysis is that it will tend to a glorification of violence for its own sake. But for Derrida there can be no question of such a politics. His own overturning of the logic of the revolu­tionary could in some ways be considered more radical, if it didn’t subvert the traditional concept of the ‘radical’ as well. Instead of the moment of revolution becoming the defining moment of the political, every moment, every decision is to be considered revolutionary. The revolutionary moment of the exception, the suspension of all rules, can no longer be imagined to be something that could or would take place, and therefore no longer something to call for or aim at. Revolutionary politicization can no longer be thought of as something that could be made present, it is not of the order of possibility. Instead the revolutionary is the order of the perhaps. But this ‘perhaps’ is not found in the exceptional moment, but makes an exception of every moment and every decision. If there is a politics of Derrida’s work it lies here, in his insistence on the revolutionary act of interpretation, of foundation of the law, of negotiation and calculation. This is where we must work most patiently to show that his messianism without messiah, which he is at pains to distinguish from that of Benjamin, is a messianism without content, without expectation of any thing coming: no revolution, no God, nothing.7 But by relocating the mes­sianic to the structure of event-hood itself, to the everyday negotiation with the law, with responsibility and duty, Derrida radicalizes the possibility of thinking politically. If the political is the moment of absolute uncertainty, but such uncertainty that we do not know where it is to be found, then the political is both the most common and the least common experience. The possibility of change, of something else happening, of justice, of more equal distribution of wealth or power is witnessed to and attested to by every event; although this possibility is indissociable from the threat of less justice, less equality, less democracy. The challenge of deconstruction is to find ways of thinking and acting which are adequate to this not-knowing, to the radical condition of the perhaps. Alexander Garcia Duttmann suggests to Derrida that this is the case: ‘on the one hand, we could be talking in the name of reformism, because each decision calls for another one. We face an ongoing process of reform after reform after reform. But at the same time we could radicalise that thought into something like a permanent revolution.’ Derrida confirms his proposal, echoing the passage from ‘Psyche: Inventions of the Other’ with which I concluded my introduction: ‘When I referred a moment ago to messianicity without messianism, I was describing a revolutionary experience. ..... But when I insisted on the fact that we must nevertheless prepare the revolution, it was because we must not simply be open to what­ever comes. The revolution, however unpredictable it may be, can and must be prepared for in the most cautious slow and labourious [sic] way.’8 Such a thought of depoliticization will always be open to two accusations. The first is that it is too theological, too messianic, too abstract, or not concrete enough. Yet clearly from Derrida’s point of view, any theory which presumes to label, identify or name a present politics, a determinate concept of the political, is being more messianic, in seeking to make some particular future arrive, to make something in particular happen. The other potential accusation would be that this is not radical at all, since it is not radical according to traditional political paths and codes. Certainly, if the degree of radicality of a theory were to be measured in term of the incomprehension and misunderstanding that have accrued to it then we would quite easily be able to prove that Derrida’s revolutionary politics is more radical than tradi­tional concepts of revolution. As Geoffrey Bennington comments: ‘the need to compromise, negotiate, with the most concrete detail of current arrange­ments of right: this is what defines deconstruction as radically political’.9 Deconstruction is an affirmation of what happens, and of the revolutionary reinvention at work in every political decision, and so clearly cannot be simply opposed to politics as it already exists. As I argued in the discussion of radical democracy in Chapter 3, this means thinking politics within the state as much as against the state; and as I emphasized in Chapter 6, deconstruction demands an intensive engagement with the law, both within and beyond the state.

#### Deconstruction and democracy

Thomson ‘5 Alex Thomson, lecturer in English at the University of Glasgow, Deconstruction and Democracy, 2005, p. 196-197

The affirmation of this kind of analysis would need to be articulated with whatever directly strategic interventions are possible: for example either the affirmation of particular cosmopolitan or internationalist treaties and organizations, or their critique. The task of thought would be to judge as best one can which moment is most propitious for either. I have shown that Derrida’s comments on hospitality, the cosmopolitical and international law are consistent with this proposition. Such work would mean translating deconstruction not only from one institutional context to another, or showing deconstruction to be already at work there, but from one national or state context to another, and from one philosophical idiom to another. But in addition to its more familiar form as intellectual genealogy, a negotiation with the tradition of inherited political concepts, I have suggested that deconstruction might also be the model for a mode of political analysis, which would be concerned with the political event as a combination of a set of depoliticizing tendencies, which together testify to the possibility of a repoliticization. This is a project which exceeds the scope of this book. It also remains essentially ambiguous, and highly susceptible to the necessary and inevitable institutionalization of deconstruction which Derrida describes in his paper ‘Some statements and truisms ...’, and which can itself be understood as more or less equivalent to what I have designated as depoliticization. Such analyses would have to develop out of the events themselves, rather than approaching a particular political problem with a predetermined deconstructive grid to lay over it. Derrida’s insistence that deconstruction is what happens, that deconstruction is democracy, means not only that deconstruction can be considered as a political practice. It must lead us not only to see deconstruction as politics, but politics as deconstruction. Indeed, a deconstructive account of politics might focus not so much on what deconstruction has to say about politics, as on what politics has to tell us about deconstruction. The structure I have set out in this chapter is well described in these remarks: All that a deconstructive point of view tries to show, is that since conventions, institutions and consensus are stabilizations, this means they are stabilizations of something essentially unstable and chaotic. Thus it becomes necessary to stabilize precisely because stability is not natural; it is because there is instability, that stabilization is necessary; it is because there is chaos that there is a need for stability. Now this chaos and instability, which is fundamental, founding and irreducible, is at once naturally the worst against which we struggle with laws, rules, conventions, politics and provisional hegemony, but at the same it is a chance, a chance to change, to destabilize. If there were continual stability, there would be no need for politics, and it is to the extent that stability is not natural, essential or substantial, that politics exists and ethics is possible. Chaos is at once a risk and a chance, and it is here that the possible and the impossible cross each other. [DAP 83-4] In this context we can understand depoliticization as the effect of a stabilization in the political field. ‘Chaos and instability’ becomes another name for what Derrida calls ‘democracy-to-come’ and ‘justice’ elsewhere. Depoliticizing stabilizations of this field of forces are necessary; but until we think chaos itself as fundamental, no kind of political thought will be able to grasp the 'chance to change’ or destabilize. This is what deconstruction offers to political theory, and it depends directly on the apparent refusal to repoliticize, to introduce a new ontology of politics. Deconstruction is apparently both the most radical and the most ascetic alternative to such theories as those of Schmitt and Benjamin, by seeking to discover a revolutionary potential in the everyday, to discern the possibility of destabilization attested to in the maintenance of the law, and to put into question political theory as in and of itself depoliticizing. Yet Derrida insists that repoliticization only has a chance if a decision could be thought without criteria, without rules or any defined or expected outcome. In the vocabulary of his essay 'Psyche: Inventions of the Other’, ‘the only possible invention is the invention of the impossible’ but ‘an invention of the impossible is impossible [.. .] It is in this paradoxical predicament that a deconstruction gets under way [qu'est engagée]’ [PSY 60 / 59]. But this is not to resign ourselves to just anything happening. As Derrida argues in ‘Force of Law’, ‘incalculable justice requires us to calculate’ [POL 28 / 61]. This calculation will not be without risk, but even in the worst circumstances, ‘there is no ethico-political decision or gesture without what [Derrida] would call a “Yes” to emancipation' [DAP 82].

#### Law must heed the call of the other – even if it cannot fully respond to infinite ethical demands, law still must be leveraged to act on our responsibility

Colin Perrin, PhD in Law and Philosophy from the University of Kent, held research positions at the University of New South Wales and the University of Durham, 2004, Social and Legal Studies, Vol. 13, No. 1, p. 138-141

Explicitly it is a matter of ‘speaking for those who . . . can no longer speak for themselves’ and in this respect of attesting to their suffering or dying because they cannot do so. Their suffering takes place ‘in secret’ and ‘after dark’, in ‘remote cells’ and above all in silence. And so language is required in order to ‘expose’ this violence and this suffering that without it would remain hidden and would continue to take place in silence. How though can one speak for the other without effacing his or her otherness, without silencing his or her silence in a speech that would take the other’s place and in which, therefore, it would be as if the other had not been silenced at all? While the implication here is that one could only do justice – or at least avoid doing this injustice – to the other by not speaking, by keeping silent and thereby keeping the other’s place, it is exactly because the other cannot represent his or herself that here one is called upon to speak. But since this is not the call for an articulate or ‘fine-sounding’ response, again: what is the nature of this demand for language and of the language it demands? These questions, I suggest, can be addressed and answered via a consideration of what Maurice Blanchot (1986) calls ‘the disaster’. Here, I am forced to simplify his account which concerns the fact that the disaster cannot present ‘itself’. The disaster ruins its own possibility for – like silence – it refutes or negates ‘itself’ as it ruins – or silences – the very terms in which it could be or be represented as a disaster. The disaster is so destructive that it destroys any trace of its occurrence. This is the immeasurable or incalculable extent of its disastrousness and it is for this reason that one cannot say or even decide that ‘there is’ the disaster. As Blanchot (1981) says of death: ‘when we die, we leave behind not only the world but also death . . . it is the loss of the person, the annihilation of the being; and so it is also the loss of death’ (p. 55). But what in this respect Blanchot goes on to call ‘the impossibility of dying’ – the impossibility of experiencing, or of being the subject of, one’s own death – is also true of a suffering that he says is less something ‘I’ go through than something that goes through ‘me’: ‘Suffering is suffering when one can no longer suffer it’ (Blanchot, 1993: 44). Above all therefore the disaster is so overwhelming that there can be no attesting to it. To present it or to represent it is to efface the very disastrousness that makes it a disaster. Thought, experience, language: all are inadequate to the disaster. How then can one bear witness to it? Or as Blanchot (1986) asks: ‘How can thought be made the keeper of the Holocaust where all was lost, including guardian thought?’ (p. 47, emphasis removed). For Blanchot, this ‘thought’ of the disaster does not produce a resignation to the impossibility of presentation or representation. Rather it imposes a demand or an obligation insofar as it ‘exposes us to a certain idea of passivity’ (Blanchot, 1986: 3). But this passivity bears the ruin and self-ruin that characterize the disaster. Its being is similarly impossible and so it is to this impossibility, to the idea of a ‘self-refuting’ passivity, that the disaster exposes ‘us’. I will come back to this. But now I want to indicate the relevance of this thought for the obligation to calculate that Derrida traces to the incalculability of justice, as well as for the relativist or postmodernist idea of difference indicated at the very beginning of my discussion. It is also a certain idea of ‘passivity’ that Derrida (2002a) takes up in the name of what he calls an ‘incalculable and giving [donatrice] idea of justice’ (p. 257); an idea of justice that implies the sense in which ‘being just’ means being just or responsive or true to something in its difference or its singularity. 12 Again I will have to simplify Derrida’s argument which concerns the impossible realization of this idea in a decision that, as ‘finite’, would always interrupt or cut into the infinite calculation that justice requires (p. 255).13 Such a decision is for this reason always violent. But while it is never just, it is, for Derrida, nevertheless necessary. There is, he says, and here after Pascal, no justice before law: ‘Justice isn’t justice, it is not achieved, if it does not have the force to be “enforced”; a powerless justice is not justice’ (p. 238). ‘It is necessary then to combine justice and force’ and in accordance with this necessity ‘justice demands, as justice, recourse to force’ (p. 239, emphasis added). Derrida’s claim, therefore – and here it recalls the argument that silence requires language if it is to ‘be’ – is that justice can only come into ‘being’ in law, and as it is enforced by law. According to this force, law or the decision cannot be just. But what Derrida discerns here is a command to calculate or to decide that is – now recalling the fact that for Amnesty International the other can no longer speak for him or herself – ‘founded’ upon the fact that justice cannot present ‘itself’, that it cannot be ‘itself’, before or outside of law. Restated, Derrida’s argument here is that the ‘difference’ in the name of which (an extreme) relativism would reject human rights is, before any calculation, beyond its determination even as difference. ‘Difference’ appears as difference only if it has already been calculated, only if it has already been determined and so at the same time violated in its ‘difference’. Again, without this determination, without this decision, difference could not appear at all. And so it is according to this ‘decision’ – a decision that is as violent as it is necessary, as excessive as it is unavoidable – that relativism must also calculate; or, more precisely, it must have already calculated. Without law there can be no justice. And so one has to decide; one has to speak. Why? I am already at the most crucial point of Derrida’s argument: ‘Abandoned to itself, the incalculable and giving [donatrice] idea of justice is always very close to the bad, even to the worst’ (Derrida, 2002a: 257). To begin to explain this point, I return to Blanchot’s thought of the disaster: for the insight of this thought consists in the fact that as the disaster ruins its own possibility, so its occurrence, its presence, would be unverifiable. There would be no difference between its presence and its absence. And it is this unverifiability that Amnesty International invokes as the impossibility of interpreting or representing the difference between ‘one’ absence or silence and ‘another’. ‘You’ve probably never heard of the Marsh Arabs before. You probably never will again’; ‘Kids. You can never find them when you want them’. And so on. In this undecidable absence or silence, it is impossible to tell whether the disaster has, or has not, taken place. Again, it is impossible to tell the difference between its presence and its absence and it is because of this impossibility, I suggest, that in not speaking or deciding one comes very close to ‘the worst’. In this passivity, in this attempt to respond or do justice to the disastrousness of the disaster, one’s silence would constitute a ‘killing silence’ in the sense that it would be ‘complicit’ with the disaster (in its unverifiability). What Amnesty International refers to as ‘the silence of good people’ is, for them, ‘the deadliest enemy’ for this reason: exactly because it cannot be told apart from that non-response which reflects a lack of concern with the other’s suffering or with his or her death, and which results from a failure or a refusal to have been or felt touched by it.14 Unheard, ‘the silence of good people’ remains indistinguishable from a ‘silence’ – or more precisely an absence of silence – that does not ‘expose’ the other’s suffering and thereby allows it to continue in silence. For as Derrida (2002a) says, it is in its proximity to the worst that the incalculable and giving idea of justice can ‘always be reappropriated by the most perverse calculation’ (p. 257). In ‘silence’, silence cannot be heard at all. Or, after Blanchot, the passivity of this ‘silence’ would be so passive that it would be unable to bear witness to anything, even to its own passivity. Exposed to this idea of passivity, passivity exposes ‘us’ to its demand: for as Blanchot (1986) says, ‘passivity is a task’ (p. 27). It is only in speech or in writing that the ‘justice’ of one response can be distinguished from the injustice of none. And, against Scarry’s characterization, the language demanded by Amnesty International may be understood on this ‘basis’: already acknowledging its own inadequacy and its own imprecision, it is – recalling Derrida – the language to which silence, as silence, must have recourse.

## 1NR

### Topicality

#### capacity for work

EIA, no date [Glossary, “E”, http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm?id=E, accessed 5-20-12, AFB] Cited by Adrienne Brovero [Debate Coach at University of Mary Washington] in Generic Terms-Energy Committee Report-6-1-12

Energy: The capacity for doing work as measured by the capability of doing work (potential energy) or the conversion of this capability to motion (kinetic energy). Energy has several forms, some of which are easily convertible and can be changed to another form useful for work. Most of the world's convertible energy comes from fossil fuels that are burned to produce heat that is then used as a transfer medium to mechanical or other means in order to accomplish tasks. Electrical energy is usually measured in kilowatthours, while heat energy is usually measured in British thermal units (Btu).

#### capacity to do work

Heinberg, Post Carbon Institute senior fellow in residence, 9 [“Searching for a Miracle”, September, 2009,

http://www.ifg.org/pdf/Searching%20for%20a%20Miracle\_web10nov09.pdf , p. 10, accessed 5-22-12, AFB], Cited by Adrienne Brovero [Debate Coach at University of Mary Washington] in Generic Terms-Energy Committee Report-6-1-12

Energy: The capacity of a physical system to do work, measured in joules or ergs. (See expanded definition, next page.)

#### Switch-side debate is good – bolsters the value of personal convictions and subjects them to scrutiny by opponents tasked with employing the best possible responses to them—this best augments and develops individual beliefs

Galloway ‘7 Ryan Galloway, assistant professor of communication studies and director of debate at Samford University, “DINNER AND CONVERSATION AT THE ARGUMENTATIVE TABLE: RECONCEPTUALIZING DEBATE AS AN ARGUMENTATIVE DIALOGUE,” Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, Vol. 28 (2007), ebsco

The argument that debaters should not argue in favor of ideas that they do not believe treats debate as with a normal public speaking event. This controversy was discussed thoroughly in various speech journals throughout the 1950s and 1960s, with most authors coming to the conclusion that debate is a unique public speaking event, where participants and observers disassociate the debater from their role. Richard Murphy lays out the case that students should not be forced to say something they do not believe, a concept quite similar to modern-day advocates of the notion that affirmatives should not have to defend the topic (1957; 1963). Murphy contends, “The argument against debating both sides is very simple and consistent. Debate…is a form of public speaking. A public statement is a public commitment” (1957, p. 2). Murphy believed students should discuss and research an issue until they understood their position on the issue and then take the stand and defend only that side of the proposition. Murphy’s fear was that students risk becoming a “weather vane,” having “character only when the wind is not blowing” (1963, p. 246). In contrast, Nicholas Cripe distinguished between speaking and debating (1957, p. 210). Cripe contended that, unlike a public speaker, a debater is “not trying to convince the judges, or his opponents” of the argument but merely to illustrate that their team has done the superior debating (p. 211). Debating in this sense exists with an obligation to give each position its best defense, in much the way an attorney does for a client. Here, the process of defending a position for the purposes of debate is distinct from their advocacy for a cause in a larger sense. As such, they are like Socrates in the Phaedrus, speaking with their heads covered so as not to anger the gods (Murphy 1957, p. 3). Additionally, debate is unlike public speaking since it happens almost always in a private setting. There are several distinctions. First, very few people watch individual contest rounds. The vast majority of such rounds take place with five people in the room—the four debaters, and the lone judge. Even elimination rounds with the largest audiences have no more than approximately one hundred observers, almost all of whom are debaters. Rarely do people outside the community watch debates. Also, debate has developed a set of norms and procedures quite unlike public speaking. While some indict these norms (Warner 2003), the rapid rate of speed and heavy reliance on evidence distinguishes debate from public speaking. Our activity is more like the closed debating society that Murphy admits can be judged by “pedagogical, rather than ethical, standards” (1957, p. 7). When debates do occur that target the general public (public debates on campus for example), moderators are careful to explain that debaters may be playing devil’s advocate. Such statements prevent confusion regarding whether or not a debater speaks in a role or from personal conviction. While speaking from conviction is a political act, speaking in accordance with a role is a pedagogical one (Klopf & McCroskey, 1964, p. 37). However, this does not mean that debaters are victims. The sophistication of modern argument and the range of strategic choices available to modern debaters allow them to choose positions that are consistent with their belief structures. The rise of plan-inclusive counterplans, kritiks, and other strategies allow negative teams to largely align themselves with agreeable affirmative cases while distinguishing away narrow slivers of arguments that allow debaters to rarely argue completely against their convictions. While some contend that this undermines the value of switch-side debate (Ellis, 2008b; Shanahan, 2004), in fact, the notion that debaters employ nuanced answers to debate topics illustrates the complexity of modern debate resolutions. Those who worry that competitive academic debate will cause debaters to lose their convictions, as Greene and Hicks do in their 2005 article, confuse the cart with the horse. Conviction is not a priori to discussion, it flows from it. A. Craig Baird argued, “Sound conviction depends upon a thorough understanding of the controversial problem under consideration (1955, p. 5). Debate encourages rigorous training and scrutiny of arguments before debaters declare themselves an advocate for a given cause. Debate creates an ethical obligation to interrogate ideas from a neutral position so that they may be freely chosen subsequently.

#### Stable locus of debate is key to clash, fairness, and education—limits are inevitable, only the topic establishes predictable limits that best allow both teams to fairly engage each other

Harrigan ‘8 Casey Harrigan, Associate Debate Coach at the University of Georgia, NDT winner (duh), “AGAINST DOGMATISM: A CONTINUED DEFENSE OF SWITCH SIDE DEBATE,” Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, vol. 29, 2008, ebsco

A second exception to the rule of free expression must be made to limit irrelevant discussion and establish a common starting point for debate. In the rhetorical tradition, the belief in the necessity of a mutual topic of disagreement, known as stasis (meaning “standing” and derived from a Greek word meaning “to stand still”), has a long history dating back to Aristotle. Through several modes of proceeding, the topic of controversy between interlocutors is established and an implicit contract—that here is the shared point of disagreement—is created. Without stasis, opponents may argue back and forth without really disagreeing with each other because they are not truly speaking about the same subject. For example, when one debater argues that the United States should refuse to negotiate with North Korea to avoid legitimating its harmful human rights policies and the opponent responds that President Clinton’s accommodation of North Korea in the 1990s was the source of its current human rights dilemma, there is no true disagreement. Each position can be entirely true without discounting the other. In this instance, the truth-generating function of deliberation is short-circuited. To eliminate errors, fallacies must gradually be replaced by truths, correct positions must win out over incorrect ones, and strong arguments must gain more acceptance than weak ideas. This process requires conflict; it necessitates rejection. To determine that something is “true” requires that its converse is “false.” The statement that “snow is cold” requires the dismissal of its contrary. Such choices can only be made when there is a point of disagreement for debate to revolve around. Without stasis, the productive potential of deliberation is profoundly undermined. To avoid this scenario of “two ships passing in the night,” argumentation scholars have recognized the importance of a mutual agreement to disagree and have attempted to create guidelines to facilitate productive discussion. “Some agreed upon end or goal must be present to define and delimit the evaluative ground within which the interchange is to proceed,” writes Douglas Ehninger, “When such ground is lacking, argument itself … becomes impossible” (1958). Shively concurs, stating that, “we must agree about what it is that is being debated before we can debate it” (2000). In the academic context, policy debates create stasis by utilizing a year-long resolution that sets the topic for discussion. Affirmative teams must present a topical advocacy (one that fits within the bounds of the resolution) or they are procedurally disqualified. In public forums, the task falls upon moderators and discussion facilitators to set clear lines of relevance. Advocates, who frequently have strategic political incentives to avoid direct disagreement, need to be institutionally constrained by the framework for discussion. A position that favors a limited form of argumentative pluralism undermines the claims made by those who oppose SSD and wish to render certain controversial issues “off limits” from debate. Limits should be placed on the content of debate only because such choices as to what is debatable are inevitable, and, given that, it is preferable to choose the path that best protects the forum for deliberation by minimizing exclusion. The arbitrary choice about what content should and should not be “up for debate” threatens to render deliberation impossible–either all issues are up for debate, or none can be.

#### Topicality’s good—finding agreement on terms of argument is key to substantive engagement—otherwise we can’t fully understand each other

Kemerling ’97 Garth Kemerling, professor of philosophy at Newberry College, 1997 online: http://www.philosophypages.com/lg/e05.htm

We've seen that sloppy or misleading use of ordinary language can seriously limit our ability to create and communicate correct reasoning. As philosopher John Locke pointed out three centuries ago, the achievement of human knowledge is often hampered by the use of words without fixed signification. Needless controversy is sometimes produced and perpetuated by an unacknowledged ambiguity in the application of key terms. We can distinguish disputes of three sorts: Genuine disputes involve disagreement about whether or not some specific proposition is true. Since the people engaged in a genuine dispute agree on the meaning of the words by means of which they convey their respective positions, each of them can propose and assess logical arguments that might eventually lead to a resolution of their differences. Merely verbal disputes, on the other hand, arise entirely from ambiguities in the language used to express the positions of the disputants. A verbal dispute disappears entirely once the people involved arrive at an agreement on the meaning of their terms, since doing so reveals their underlying agreement in belief. Apparently verbal but really genuine disputes can also occur, of course. In cases of this sort, the resolution of every ambiguity only reveals an underlying genuine dispute. Once that's been discovered, it can be addressed fruitfully by appropriate methods of reasoning. We can save a lot of time, sharpen our reasoning abilities, and communicate with each other more effectively if we watch for disagreements about the meaning of words and try to resolve them whenever we can. Kinds of Definition The most common way of preventing or eliminating differences in the use of languages is by agreeing on the definition of our terms. Since these explicit accounts of the meaning of a word or phrase can be offered in distinct contexts and employed in the service of different goals, it's useful to distinguish definitions of several kinds: A lexical definition simply reports the way in which a term is already used within a language community. The goal here is to inform someone else of the accepted meaning of the term, so the definition is more or less correct depending upon the accuracy with which it captures that usage. In these pages, my definitions of technical terms of logic are lexical because they are intended to inform you about the way in which these terms are actually employed within the discipline of logic. At the other extreme, a stipulative definition freely assigns meaning to a completely new term, creating a usage that had never previously existed. Since the goal in this case is to propose the adoption of shared use of a novel term, there are no existing standards against which to compare it, and the definition is always correct (though it might fail to win acceptance if it turns out to be inapt or useless). If I now decree that we will henceforth refer to Presidential speeches delivered in French as "glorsherfs," I have made a (probably pointless) stipulative definition. Combining these two techniques is often an effective way to reduce the vagueness of a word or phrase. These precising definitions begin with the lexical definition of a term but then propose to sharpen it by stipulating more narrow limits on its use. Here, the lexical part must be correct and the stipulative portion should appropriately reduce the troublesome vagueness. If the USPS announces that "proper notification of a change of address" means that an official form containing the relevant information must be received by the local post office no later than four days prior to the effective date of the change, it has offered a (possibly useful) precising definition.

#### Literal interpretation of the statis point is the only way to give it meaning

Panetta et. al ’10 Chair Edward M. Panetta, Director of Debate and Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Georgia, written with a bunch of other debate all-stars, William Mosley-Jensen, Dan Fitzmier, Sherry Hall, Kevin Kuswa, Ed Lee, David Steinberg, Fred Sternhagen, John Turner, “Controversies in Debate Pedagogy: Working Paper,” Navigating Opportunities: Policy Debate in the 21st Century, 2010, p. 220

For adherents to the traditional mode of debate, when one retreats from grounding stasis in the annual proposition, there are two predicted intellectual justifications that surface. First, there is the claim that the existence of a resolution (without substantive content) and time limits is enough of a point of departure to allow for a debate. For traditionalists, this move seems to reduce the existing stasis to the point that it has no real meaning. How does the resolution mold the argument choices of students when one team refuses to acknowledge the argumentative foundation embedded in the sentence? What educational benefit is associated with the articulation of a two-hour and forty-five minute limit for a debate and decision where there is not an agreed point of departure for the initiation of the debate? Second, advocates of moving away from a resolution-based point of stasis contend that valuable arguments do take place. Yes, but that argumentation does not meet some of the core assumptions of a debate for someone who believes that treatment of a stated proposition is a defining element of debate. Participants in a debate need to have some type of loosely shared agreement to focus the clash of arguments in a round of debate. Adherence to this approach does not necessarily call for the rejection of innovative approaches, including the use of individual narratives as a form of support or the metaphorical endorsement of the proposition. This perspective on contest debate does, however, require participants to make an effort to relate a rhetorical strategy to the national topic.

# Octos vs UNLV JS

## 1NC

### Bataille K

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should establish a permanent Wind Waste Tax Credit.

#### Energy production under the sign of utility denies constitutive excess through the fiction of infinite accumulation. This necessitates conflict outbreak and nuclear escalation to discharge its built-up excess

Stoekl ‘7 Allan Stoekl, Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Penn State University, Bataille’s Peak: Energy, Religion, and Postsustainability, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2007, p. 56-58

Just as there are two energetic sources of economic value, then—muscle power and inanimate fuel power—so too there are two kinds of expenditure. The stored and available energy derived from fossil or inanimate fuel expenditure, for production or destruction, is different in quality, not merely in quantity, from muscular energy. The latter is profoundly more and other than the mere “power to do work.” No intimacy (in the Bataillean sense) can be envisaged through the mechanized expenditure of fossil fuels. The very use of fossil and nonorganic fuels—coal, oil, nuclear— implies the effort to maximize production through quantification, the augmentation of the sheer quantity of things. Raw material becomes, as Heidegger put it, a standing reserve, a measurable mass whose sole function is to be processed, used, and ultimately discarded.28 It is useful, nothing more (or less), at least for the moment before it is discarded; it is related to the self only as a way of aggrandizing the latter’s stability and position. There is no internal limit, no angoisse or pain before which we shudder; we deplete the earth’s energy reserves as blandly and indifferently as the French revolutionaries (according to Hegel) chopped off heads: as if one were cutting off a head of cabbage. “Good” duality has completely given way to “bad.” As energy sources become more efficiently usable—oil produces a lot more energy than does coal, in relation to the amount of energy needed to extract it, transport it, and dispose of waste (ash and slag)—more material can be treated, more people and things produced, handled, and dumped. Consequently more food can be produced, more humans will be born to eat it, and so on (the carrying capacity of the earth temporarily rises). And yet, under this inanimate fuels regime, the very nature of production and above all destruction changes. Even when things today are expended, they are wasted under the sign of efficiency, utility. This very abstract quantification is inseparable from the demand of an efficiency that bolsters the position of a closed and demanding subjectivity. We “need” cars and SUVs, we “need” to use up gas, waste landscapes, forests, and so on: it is all done in the name of the personal lifestyle we cannot live without, which is clearly the best ever developed in human history, the one everyone necessarily wants, the one we will fight for and use our products (weapons) to protect. We no longer destroy objects, render them intimate, in a very personal, confrontational potlatch; we simply leave items out for the trash haulers to pick up or have them hauled to the junkyard. Consumption (la consommation) in the era of the standing reserve, the frame - work (Ge - Stell), entails, in and through the stockpiling of energy, the stockpiling of the human: the self itself becomes an element of the standing reserve, a thing among other things. There can hardly be any intimacy in the contemporary cycle of production -consumption -destruction, the modern and degraded version of expenditure. As Bataille put it, concerning intimacy: Intimacy is expressed only under one condition by the thing [la chose]: that this thing fundamentally be the opposite of a thing, the opposite of a product, of merchandise: a burn -off [consumation] and a sacrifice. Since intimate feeling is a burn -off, it is burning -off that expresses it, not the thing, which is its negation. (OC, 7: 126; AS 132: italics Bataille’s) War, too, reflects this nonintimacy of the thing: fossil fuel and nuclear - powered explosives and delivery systems make possible the impersonal destruction of lives in great numbers and at a great distance. Human beings are now simply quantities of material to be processed and destroyed in wars (whose purpose is to assure the continued availability of fossil fuel resources). Killing in modern warfare is different in kind from that carried out by the Aztecs. All the sacrificial elements, the elements by which the person has been transformed in and through death, have disappeared. Bataille, then, should have distinguished more clearly between intimate and impersonal varieties of useless squandries when it came to his discussion of the Marshall Plan.29 (In the same way, he should have distinguished between energy that is stockpiled and put to use and energy that is fundamentally “cursed” not only in and through bodily excess but in its ability to do “work.”)30 It is not merely a question of our attitude toward expenditure, our “self -consciousness”: also fundamental is how it is carried out. Waste based on the consumption of fossil or inanimate (nuclear) fuels cannot entail intimacy because it is dependent on the thing as thing, it is dependent on the energy reserve, on the stockpiled, planned, and protected self: “[This is] what we know from the outside, which is given to us as physical reality (at the limit of the commodity, available without reserve). We cannot penetrate the thing and its only meaning is its material qualities, appropriated or not for some use [utilité], understood in the productive sense of the term. (OC, 7: 126; AS, 132; italics Bataille’s) The origin of this destruction is therefore to be found in the maximizing of the efficiency of production; modern, industrialized waste is fundamentally only the most efficient way to eliminate what has been over - produced. Hence the Marshall Plan, proposing a gift -giving on a vast, mechanized scale, is different in kind from, say, a Tlingit potlatch ceremony. “Growth” is the ever -increasing rhythm and quantity of the treatment of matter for some unknown and unknowable human purpose and that matter’s subsequent disposal/ destruction. One could never “self -consciously” reconnect with intimacy through the affirmation of some form of indus-trial production-destruction. To see consumer culture as in some way the fulfillment of Bataille’s dream of a modern -day potlatch is for this reason a fundamental misreading of The Accursed Share.31 Bataille’s critique is always an ethics; it entails the affirmation of a “general economy” in which the particular claims of the closed subjectivity are left behind. The stockpiled self is countered, in Bataille, by the generous and death -bound movement of an Amélie, of a Sadean heroine whose sacrifice puts at risk not only an object, a commodity, but the stability of the “me.” To affirm a consumption that, in spite of its seeming delirium of waste, is simply a treatment of matter and wastage of fossil energy in immense quantities, lacking any sense of internal limits (angoisse), and always with a particular and efficacious end in view (“growth,” “comfort,” “personal satisfaction,” “consumer freedom”) is to misrepresent the main thrust of Bataille’s work. The point, after all, is to enable us to attain a greater “self -consciousness,” based on the ability to choose between modes of expenditure. Which entails the greatest intimacy? Certainly not nuclear devastation (1949) or the simple universal depletion of the earth’s resources and the wholesale destruction of ecosystems (today).

### Elections DA

#### Obama winning now: swing states, national polls

Nate Silver, NYT, “Sept 15: Waiting on Wisconsin” 9/15 <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/15/sept-15-waiting-on-wisconsin/?gwh=B6B06C32D77812C3AB3D694483091EA4>

Saturday was a much quieter day for polling than we’ve grown accustomed to — and the FiveThirtyEight forecast was unchanged to the decimal place, with President Obama given a 76.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, the same as in Friday’s forecast.¶ There was slightly more action beneath the surface. Mr. Obama’s projected margin of victory in the popular vote declined slightly to 3.3 percentage points — down from 3.5 points on Friday, and from a peak of just over 4 points immediately after the Democratic convention. However, Mr. Obama’s Electoral College chances held steady in the forecast because of a strong poll for him in Pennsylvania.¶ At the very least, Mr. Obama’s lead in the national polls no longer seems to be growing. If he gained additional ground following the attacks on Americans in Benghazi, Libya — or from Mitt Romney’s response to it — there has been no sign of it in the most recent national tracking surveys.¶ Instead, the question is to what extent, if any, Mr. Obama’s lead has declined. The Gallup national tracking poll now shows him ahead of Mr. Romney by four points — down from a peak of seven. And there has been a clearer reversal in the Rasmussen Reports tracking poll, which has now reverted to showing a two-point lead for Mr. Romney.¶ Two online tracking polls do not show any signs of decline for Mr. Obama, however. In the American Life Panel survey conducted by the RAND Corporation, Mr. Obama had a smaller bounce than in some other polls — but it has held steady over the past week, as he has continued to hold roughly a three-point lead among likely voters. The RAND poll differs from others in that it uses a panel of the same 3,500 respondents who are asked their opinions about the presidential race continually throughout the contest; it is therefore subject to less statistical noise than other surveys.¶ Mr. Obama also enjoyed his widest lead to date, seven points, in the last version of the Ipsos online tracking poll, which was published on Thursday — although the poll has not been updated over the past two days.¶ There’s also been a large volume of state polling to sort through. Our view is that the consensus of the evidence from these surveys has shown pretty good numbers for Mr. Obama — but not great ones — and tends to provide the most support for the hypothesis that Mr. Obama holds a lead in the national race of just under four percentage points right now.¶ The lone poll from a swing state to be published on Saturday was one to show more unambiguously impressive numbers for Mr. Obama, however. That survey, from The Philadelphia Inquirer, showed Mr. Obama with an 11-point lead there, up from 9 points before the conventions.

#### Wind is massively unpopular among the public—no risk of turns

Takahashi 12

Patrick is Director Emeritus of the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute at the University of Hawaii and co-founder of the Pacific International Center for High Technology Research. 6.6.12 “WHY IS WINDPOWER SUDDENLY UNPOPULAR?” <http://planetearthandhumanity.blogspot.com/2012/06/why-is-windpower-suddenly-unpopular.html>

In Hawaii, [across the nation](http://www.wind-watch.org/affiliates.php) and [throughout the world](http://www.epaw.org/), it seems like wind energy conversion systems have suddenly become an issue on the level of new coal and nuclear facilities. In the [50th State, "Big Wind"](http://www.npr.org/2011/02/01/133384379/hawaiis-big-wind-power-project-stirs-up-fans-foes) is roundly being criticized and even [Donald Trump](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/9209832/Donald-Trump-warns-MSPs-against-wind-farm-suicide.html) is warning about the evils of windpower, as related to China, tourism and Scotland. There were protesters about him being a windbag. Hey, give him a break, as he's having other more important problems, like with Miss Pennsylvania at his Miss USA pageant. Worse, the [U.S. Congress](http://grist.org/wind-power/congress-toys-with-the-future-of-wind-energy/), as broken as it is, seems currently negative on the production tax credit, the one piece of legislation that will make or break this technology. So what is really happening? Nothing much new. For one, when the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute advocated this form of renewable electricity a third of a century ago, we were criticized by the Audubon Society[(incidentally, they've since gotten smarter about this](http://policy.audubon.org/wind-power-frequently-asked-questions)) for killing birds, resorts (in Kahuku) spoke against this option at hearings for fear their investment would suffer from image problems, noise protesters were always present, more than a few felt that these ugly machines would affect their aesthetics and a few more depicted at the left protest ([this was in Canada in April](http://www.thestar.com/business/article/1156097--wind-power-crosswinds-blast-mcguinty-government)).

#### Independent voters are the largest voting bloc --- controversial spending kills support for Obama

Schoen ’12 Douglas Schoen, pollster for President Clinton, 2-8-2012, The Forgotten Swing Voter, Politico, p. http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=7ED8592F-2122-4A55-AA3B-C5460134BE4A

Neither party focuses on issues that matter most to people: reviving the economy, promoting job creation, balancing the budget, reducing debt and taking on entitlements. Both Republicans and Democrats are virtually ignoring the concerns of swing voters, now close to 20 percent of the electorate, and independents, now at least 40 percent of the electorate and, according to Gallup, the single largest voting bloc. These two groups share similar interests. And both give Republican and Democratic leaders net negative ratings. Independents disapprove of how Obama is doing his job, 52 percent to 37 percent, according to a recent New York Times/CBS poll. Just 31 percent had a favorable opinion of Obama, with two-thirds saying he has not made progress fixing the economy. Six in 10 independents say Obama does not share their priorities for the country. The president’s improved standing in the recent Washington Post poll has probably been overstated and has more to do with Romney’s weakness than with some dramatic turnaround in Obama’s own numbers. A majority of independents still disapprove of his job performance and a clear majority of the electorate disapproves of his handling of the economy, his performance in creating jobs and his efforts to balance the budget. Independents have similar negative impressions of leading GOP presidential candidates Romney and Gingrich, according to a recent Washington Post poll. Independents look unfavorably on Romney, 51 percent to 23 percent, and have an unfavorable impression of Gingrich, 53 percent to 23 percent. Another ominous sign for Romney, still the presumed nominee, is that voter turnout decreased about 15 percent in Florida’s primary from four years ago, and almost 40 percent of the voters said they were not satisfied with the current field. It’s crucial the GOP candidates address these voter concerns. A recent national survey I conducted sheds light on who the swing voters are and what they want from government — which meshes closely with the independents’ policy preferences. I isolated swing voters by looking at those voters who supported Bill Clinton in an imaginary trial heat against Romney but didn’t support Obama in a trial heat against Romney. This came to 15 percent of the electorate. In a two-way race for president between Clinton and Romney, an overwhelming majority prefers Clinton, 60 percent to 24 percent. Meanwhile, between Obama and Romney, voters split almost evenly — with Obama at 45 percent and Romney at 43 percent. A detailed assessment of swing voters shows that they are not liberal Democrats. Over three-quarters (76 percent) are moderates or conservatives, and close to two-thirds (65 percent) are Republicans or independents. Slightly less than half (49 percent) are Southerners. This data underscore the voters’ desire for politicians who advocate for bipartisanship and coalition-building in a polarized country. The substantial degree of support for Clinton versus Romney shows that the more bipartisan, centrist and fiscally conservative the appeal, the broader the support. A Third Way survey conducted after the midterms supports my findings. Sixty percent of voters who supported Obama in 2008, but voted Republican in 2010, feel that Obama is too liberal. About 66 percent say that Obama and the Democrats in Congress tried to have government do too much. A USA Today/Gallup Poll released late last year also shows that the electorate believes Obama is too far left ideologically. Americans were asked to rate their own ideology as well as that of the major presidential candidates on a 5-point scale. Most rated themselves at 3.3 (slightly right of center), and Obama at 2.3 (left of center) — further away than all other major presidential candidates. A majority of Americans, 57 percent, see Obama as liberal, while only 23 percent see him as moderate. Indeed, recent polling shows that independents want to rein in the size and scope of government. Gallup reports that 64 percent of independents say Big Government is the biggest threat to the country. Which may be one reason for Santorum’s growing support. Three-quarters are dissatisfied with the size and power of the federal government, while just 24 percent are satisfied. Other polling shows that these voters want policies that emphasize economic growth and budget reduction. In the wake of the crippling economic downturn, 82 percent believe it is extremely or very important to expand the economy, according to recent Gallup polling. Seventy percent say the federal budget deficit should be cut by a combination of spending cuts and modest tax increases — with many polls showing these voters feel spending cuts are key. Independents do not support more government spending. My polling last year shows independents believe government should refrain from spending money to stimulate the economy, given the large deficit we face, 62 percent to 24 percent. Independents, according to Gallup, are looking for government to expand the economy (82 percent), and promote equality of opportunity (69 percent). They are not looking for government to promote equality of outcome, since just 43 percent say they want to reduce the income gap between the rich and the poor. By 50 percent to 47 percent, they say the divide between the rich and the poor is an acceptable part of the economic system. So it’s clear what these voters are looking for, and also that neither party is addressing their concerns. To be sure, independent voters want conciliation and compromise. Some are more conservative and market-oriented. Others are ready to accept government stimulus spending for our economic recovery. But all share the desire for economic growth, job creation and a path to fiscal stability. The two parties cannot continue to ignore swing voters. Without them, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to win in November. Moreover, to win without addressing their concerns will almost certainly promise four more years of the same gridlock.

#### Romney win causes Iran strikes—causes escalating conflict

Hussain 9-12 Murtaza Hussain, Toronto-based writer and analyst focused on issues related to Middle Eastern politics, “Why war with Iran would spell disaster,” Al-Jazeera, 9/12/2012, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/09/201291194236970294.html

Leading members of the House and Congress from both parties as well as the closest advisers to Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney have called for attacking Iran, with some high-ranking GOP advisers even suggesting that the time is now for a Congressional resolution formally declaring war on the country. Romney and many other leading Republican figures have called for pre-emptive war against Iran, and have continually upped the ante in terms of threats of military action throughout the election campaign. This alarming and potentially highly consequential rhetoric is occurring in a context where the American people are still recovering from the disastrous war in Iraq and winding down the US occupation of Afghanistan, while at the same time coping with the worst economic drought since the Great Depression. Public statements claiming that the extent of the conflict would be limited to targeted airstrikes on Iranian nuclear facilities are utterly disingenuous, ignoring the escalating cycle of retribution that such "limited" conflicts necessarily breed. As did the war in Libya start off with calls only for a benign "no-fly zone" to protect civilians and seamlessly turned into an all-out aerial campaign to topple Muammar Gaddafi, any crossing of the military threshold with Iran would also likely result in a far bigger conflagration than the public has been prepared for by their leaders. War with Iran would be no quick and clean affair, as many senior political and military figures have pointed out it would make the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, which cost trillions of dollars and the lives of thousands of soldiers and civilians, seem like "a cakewalk". The fact that it is becoming increasingly likely, inevitable in the eyes of many, and that it is high on the agenda of so many leading political figures warrants exploration of what such a conflict would really entail. Conflict on an unprecedented scale Not a war of weeks or months, but a "generations-long war" is how no less a figure than former Mossad chief Efraim Halevy describes the consequences of open conflict with Iran. In comparison with Iraq and Afghanistan, both countries with relatively small populations which were already in a state of relative powerlessness before they were invaded, Iran commands the eighth largest active duty military in the world, as well as highly trained special forces and guerilla organisations which operate in countries throughout the region and beyond. Retired US General John Abizaid has previously described the Iranian military as "the most powerful in the Middle East" (exempting Israel), and its highly sophisticated and battle-hardened proxies in Lebanon and Iraq have twice succeeded in defeating far stronger and better funded Western military forces. Any attack on Iran would assuredly lead to the activation of these proxies in neighbouring countries to attack American interests and would create a situation of borderless war unprecedented in any past US conflicts in the Middle East. None of this is to suggest that the United States would not "win" a war with Iran, but given the incredibly painful costs of Iraq and Afghanistan; wars fought again weak, poorly organised enemies lacking broad influence, politicians campaigning for war with Iran are leading the American people into a battle which will be guaranteed to make the past decade of fighting look tame in comparison. A recent study has shown that an initial US aerial assault on Iran would require hundreds of planes, ships and missiles in order to be completed; a military undertaking itself unprecedented since the first Gulf War and representative of only the first phase of what would likely be a long drawn-out war of attrition. For a country already nursing the wounds from the casualties of far less intense conflicts and still reeling from their economic costs, the sheer battle fatigue inherent in a large-scale war with Iran would stand to greatly exacerbate these issues. Oil shocks and the American economy The fragile American economic recovery would be completely upended were Iran to target global energy supplies in the event of war, an act which would be both catastrophic and highly likely if US Iran hawks get their way. Not only does the country itself sit atop some of the largest oil and natural gas reserves on the planet, its close proximity to the shipping routes and oil resources of its neighbours means that in the event of war, its first response would likely be to choke off the global supply of crude; a tactic for which its military defences have in fact been specifically designed. The Strait of Hormuz, located in the Persian Gulf is the shipping point for more than 20 per cent of the world's petroleum. Iran is known to have advanced Silkworm missile batteries buried at strategic points around the strait to make it impassable in the event of war, and has developed "swarming" naval tactics to neutralise larger, less mobile ships such as those used by the US Navy. While Iran could never win in straightforward combat, it has developed tactics of asymmetrical warfare that can effectively inflict losses on a far stronger enemy and render the strait effectively closed to naval traffic. The price of oil would immediately skyrocket, by some estimates upwards several hundred dollars a barrel, shattering the already tenuous steps the US and other Western economies are taking towards recovery. Former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has said a war with Iran could drag out years and would have economic consequences "devastating for the average American"; but these facts are conspicuously absent in public discussion of the war. Every conflict has blowback, but if US politicians are attempting to maneouver the country into a conflict of such potentially devastating magnitude, potentially sacrificing ordinary Americans' economic well-being for years to come, it would behoove them to speak frankly about these costs and not attempt to obfuscate or downplay them in order to make their case. Conflict across borders Finally, a war with Iran would be not be like conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya where the fighting was constrained to the borders of the country in question. Despite widespread resentment towards the country due to the perception of it as a regionally imperialist power as well sectarian animosity towards it as Shia Muslim theocracy, Iran maintains deep links throughout the Middle East and South Asia and can count on both popular support as well as assistance from its network of armed proxies in various countries. In a report for Haaretz, Ahmed Rashid noted that an attack on Iran would likely inflame anti-American sentiment throughout the region, across both Shia and Sunni Muslim communities. Despite Iran's poor human rights record and bellicose leadership, polls have consistently shown that Iranian and Iranian-backed leaders such as Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hassan Nasrallah remain among the most popular figures throughout the Arab and Muslim world. This popularity comes not necessarily out of respect for Iranian ideology, but from a perception that Iran is the only assertive power in the region and is the target of aggression from the United States and its allies. In Rashid's analysis, both the Middle East and South Asia would become unsafe for American citizens and their interests for years to come; popular anger would reach a level which would render these area effectively off-limits and would cause grave and immediate danger to both American businesses and troops based in the region. Again, this would be a situation quite different from the other wars of the past decade, fought against isolated regimes without the ability to call upon large and often well-funded numbers of regional sympathisers; a fact also rarely mentioned by war advocates. Not a political game Going to war with Iran would be an elective decision for the United States, but it is for too grave and consequential a choice to be left up to the whims of politicians seeking to win the approval of lobby groups and one-up each other to appeal to influential campaign donors who would like to see a war with Iran. Make no mistake, the possibility of war is very real and has become eminently more so in recent months. Many of the same politicians and political advisers responsible for engineering the Iraq War have returned to public life and are at the forefront of pushing a new American conflict with Iran. Mitt Romney's closest foreign policy advisers include leading hawks from the war with Iraq, including John Bolton, Eliot Cohen and Dan Senor. Many of them have enthusiastically and publicly expressed their desire to engineer a US military confrontation with Iran and have already begun to tout the inevitability of this action in a Romney presidency.

### States CP

#### The fifty states, relevant territories, and the District of Columbia should establish permanent wind production tax credits at a rate equivalent to the current federal Wind Production Tax Credit.

States can undergo energy projects—Massachusetts efforts prove feasibility.

Engineering 12 (Wire, Lexis, <http://www.power-eng.com/news/2012/08/06/united-states-new-massachusetts-law-boosts-wind-and-solar-energy.html> 8/6/12) CJQ

On August 3, 2012, Massachusetts Governor Patrick signed new energy legislation that, among other things, expands the incentives and opportunities for developing wind, solar, hydro and other forms of renewable power generation to serve the state's electricity consumers. This law, Senate Bill 2395, An Act relative to competitively priced electricity in the Commonwealth (the "Act"), also includes provisions that aim to manage some of the drivers of energy cost increases. In regard to renewable energy, the Act: more than doubles the amount of power supply that electric distribution companies must purchase from renewable generators under long term contracts,increases the opportunities for owners of distributed renewable energy facilities to sell their excess power at favorable rates, and increases the size of hydroelectric projects eligible for financial incentives under the state's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS). ML Strategies and Mintz Levin have been actively engaged with the Legislature and the Patrick Administration in the development of the Act. We welcome the opportunity to advise interested companies on the details and implications of the Act as well as on the development of regulations to implement it. In this alert, we summarize the provisions in the Act that will significantly expand the opportunities and incentives for renewable energy development. More Long-Term Contracts for Renewable Power The Act increases the overall percentage of electricity supply that electric distribution companies may purchase from renewable generating facilities under long-term contracts to 7%. The Green Communities Act (GCA) of 2008 previously required distribution companies to obtain up to 3% of their total annual supply from long-term contracts for renewable energy with terms of 10 to 15 years. The Act adds a new long-term contracting provision, Section 83A, to the GCA, that requires distribution companies to solicit proposals from renewable energy developers for long-term contracts with terms of 10 to 20 years for up to 4% of their annual load.1 By December 2016, electric distribution companies must conduct two rounds of joint solicitations for the new 10 to 20 year contracts. Achieving the overall 7% will require renewable energy developers to construct hundreds of megawatts of new renewable generation facilities. Wind farms are likely to be the form of generation that delivers the power to meet this additional demand for renewable generation, which RPS rules allow be built in any of the New England states, New York or nearby Canadian provinces. In another important modification of the GCA, the new Section 83A added by the Act requires distribution companies to develop the new round of contracts only though a competitive bidding process. By contrast, the existing Section 83 of the GCA allows distribution companies to develop contracts through individual negotiations with renewable energy developers. This provision, for example, allowed for the individual negotiations that led to the development of the power purchase agreements for the Cape Wind project. The new legislation also contains a provision that requires each distribution company to enter into long-term power purchase contracts with "newly developed, small, emerging or diverse renewable energy distributed generation facilities" located in its service territory. Of the additional 4% of electricity supply that must be procured from renewable generating facilities under Section 83A, 10% of that amount (0.4% of total supply) must be purchased from these small generators. To qualify, such generators must have a maximum capacity no greater than 6 megawatts and not be net metering facilities.

### Capitalism K

#### Efficiency increases energy consumption because price decreases yield higher demand—this is essential to capitalist growth

Foster et al. ’10 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at University of Oregon, Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University, and Richard York, associate professor of sociology at University of Oregon, “Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency,” Monthly Review, November 2010, Vol. 62, Issue 6, pp. 1-12

The Jevons Paradox is the product of a capitalist economic system that is unable to conserve on a macro scale, geared, as it is, to maximizing the throughput of energy and materials from resource tap to final waste sink. Energy savings in such a system tend to be used as a means for further development of the economic order, generating what Alfred Lotka called the “maximum energy flux,” rather than minimum energy production.34 The deemphasis on absolute (as opposed to relative) energy conservation is built into the nature and logic of capitalism as a system unreservedly devoted to the gods of production and profit. As Marx put it: “Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!”35 Seen in the context of a capitalist society, the Jevons Paradox therefore demonstrates the fallacy of current notions that the environmental problems facing society can be solved by purely technological means. Mainstream environmental economists often refer to “dematerialization,” or the “decoupling” of economic growth, from consumption of greater energy and resources. Growth in energy efficiency is often taken as a concrete indication that the environmental problem is being solved. Yet savings in materials and energy, in the context of a given process of production, as we have seen, are nothing new; they are part of the everyday history of capitalist development.36 Each new steam engine, as Jevons emphasized, was more efficient than the one before. “Raw materials-savings processes,” environmental sociologist Stephen Bunker noted, “are older than the Industrial Revolution, and they have been dynamic throughout the history of capitalism.” Any notion that reduction in material throughput, per unit of national income, is a new phenomenon is therefore “profoundly ahistorical.”37 What is neglected, then, in simplistic notions that increased energy efficiency normally leads to increased energy savings overall, is the reality of the Jevons Paradox relationship—through which energy savings are used to promote new capital formation and the proliferation of commodities, demanding ever greater resources. Rather than an anomaly, the rule that efficiency increases energy and material use is integral to the “regime of capital” itself.38 As stated in The Weight of Nations, an important empirical study of material outflows in recent decades in five industrial nations (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, and Japan): “Efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth.”39

#### Capitalism generates internal contradictions erupting in imperialism, nuclear war, and ecocide

Foster ‘5 John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, "Naked Imperialism," Monthly Review, Vol. 57 No. 4, 2005

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue.

#### Vote negative in favor of classist politics

#### Revolutionary theory is a prior question—the aff is irrelevant in the grand scheme of capitalism—we should instead affirm the historical necessity of communism

Tumino ’12 Stephen Tumino, more marxist than Marx himself, “Is Occupy Wall Street Communist,” Red Critique 14, Winter/Spring 2012, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/isoccupywallstreetcommunist.htm

Leaving aside that the purpose of Wolff's speech was to popularize a messianic vision of a more just society based on workplace democracy, he is right about one thing: Marx's original contribution to the idea of communism is that it is an historical and material movement produced by the failure of capitalism not a moral crusade to reform it. Today we are confronted with the fact that capitalism has failed in exactly the way that Marx explained was inevitable.[4] It has "simplified the class antagonism" (The Communist Manifesto); by concentrating wealth and centralizing power in the hands of a few it has succeeded in dispossessing the masses of people of everything except their labor power. As a result it has revealed that the ruling class "is unfit to rule," as The Communist Manifesto concludes, "because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him." And the slaves are thus compelled to fight back. Capitalism makes communism necessary because it has brought into being an international working class whose common conditions of life give them not only the need but also the economic power to establish a society in which the rule is "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Programme). Until and unless we confront the fact that capitalism has once again brought the world to the point of taking sides for or against the system as a whole, communism will continue to be just a bogey-man or a nursery-tale to frighten and soothe the conscience of the owners rather than what it is—the materialist theory that is an absolute requirement for our emancipation from exploitation and a new society freed from necessity! As Lenin said, "Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" (What Is To Be Done?). We are confronted with an historic crisis of global proportions that demands of us that we take Marxism seriously as something that needs to be studied to find solutions to the problems of today. Perhaps then we can even begin to understand communism in the way that The Communist Manifesto presents it as "the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority" to end inequality forever.

### Warming Adv

#### Warming impacts overstated—new data

Taylor ’11 James Taylor, senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism,” Forbes, 7/27/2011, http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-reviewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict. When objective NASA satellite data, reported in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, show a “huge discrepancy” between alarmist climate models and real-world facts, climate scientists, the media and our elected officials would be wise to take notice. Whether or not they do so will tell us a great deal about how honest the purveyors of global warming alarmism truly are.

#### Catastrophic warming inevitable

Hamilton ’10 Clive Hamilton, Professor of Public Ethics in Australia, Requiem for a Species: Why We Resist the Truth About Climate Change, 2010, p. 27-28

The conclusion that, even if we act promptly and resolutely, the world is on a path to reach 650 ppm is almost too frightening to accept. That level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will be associated with warming of about 4°C by the end of the century, well above the temperature associated with tipping points that would trigger further warming.58 So it seems that even with the most optimistic set of assumptions—the ending of deforestation, a halving of emissions associated with food production, global emissions peaking in 2020 and then falling by 3 per cent a year for a few decades—we have no chance of preventing emissions rising well above a number of critical tipping points that will spark uncontrollable climate change. The Earth's climate would enter a chaotic era lasting thousands of years before natural processes eventually establish some sort of equilibrium. Whether human beings would still be a force on the planet, or even survive, is a moot point. One thing seems certain: there will be far fewer of us. These conclusions arc alarming, co say the least, but they are not alarmist. Rather than choosing or interpreting numbers to make the situation appear worse than it could be, following Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows I have chosen numbers that err on the conservative side, which is to say numbers that reflect a more buoyant assessment of the possibilities. A more neutral assessment of how the global community is likely to respond would give an even bleaker assessment of our future. For example, the analysis excludes non-CO2, emissions from aviation and shipping. Including them makes the task significantly harder, particularly as aviation emissions have been growing rapidly and are expected to continue to do so as there is no foreseeable alternative to severely restricting the number of flights. And any realistic assessment of the prospects for international agreement would have global emissions peaking closer to 2030 rather than 2020. The last chance to reverse the trajectory of global emissions by 2020 was forfeited at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. As a consequence, a global response proportionate to the problem was deferred for several years.

#### Entrenched political forces prevent substantive climate reform

Schreurs ’12 Miranda A. Schreurs, Director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Free University of Berlin, “Breaking the impasse in the international climate negotiations: The potential of green technologies,” Energy Policy 48, September 2012, pp. 5-12, Elsevier

The Obama administration’s efforts were directed at framing climate change as a serious threat and linking policy action to the development of a cleaner, greener energy infrastructure that would make the U.S. more energy independent and sustainable. Green energy policy change has been portrayed by the Obama White House as an economic opportunity, and a possible way out of the ﬁnancial crisis ailing the country in terms of creating new jobs and securing the states’ economies. Still, Obama’s efforts to win over climate skeptics has proven difﬁcult, and conservative forces continue to challenge his environmental agenda. Politicians from states with large coal, oil, manufacturing, and/or agricultural industries, regardless of party afﬁliation, have been inclined to vote against climate legislation because they see it as a threat to their state’s economy and jobs. They have even taken steps to curb the federal government’s ability to conduct climate change programs.

#### The US has extended the PTC in the past—no reason why another year’s extension would overcome their uniqueness arg

#### Can’t solve soft power—massive budget cuts and lack of organization make single issues minute—their solvency takes decades

Nye ’11 Joseph Nye, invented ‘soft power’ and also Harvard University Distinguished Service Professor, “The War on Soft Power,” Foreign Policy, 4/12/2011, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/04/12/the\_war\_on\_soft\_power?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full

Last week, U.S. President Barack Obama and Congress struggled until the 11th hour to agree on budget cuts that would avert a government shutdown. The United States' budget deficit is a serious problem, and there have been serious proposals to deal with it, such as those by the bipartisan Bowles-Simpson Commission. But last week's efforts were not a serious solution. They were focused solely on the 12 percent of the budget that is non-military discretionary expenditure, rather than the big-ticket items of entitlements, military expenditure, and tax changes that increase revenue. Yet while last week's cuts failed to do much about the deficit, they could do serious damage to U.S. foreign policy. On Tuesday, the axe fell: The State Department and foreign operations budget was slashed by $8.5 billion -- a pittance when compared to military spending, but one that could put a serious dent in the United States' ability to positively influence events abroad. The sad irony is that the Obama administration had been moving things in the right direction. When Hillary Clinton became secretary of state, she spoke of the importance of a "smart power" strategy, combining the United States' hard and soft-power resources. Her Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, and her efforts (along with USAID chief Rajiv Shah) to revamp the United States' aid bureaucracy and budget were important steps in that direction. Now, in the name of an illusory contribution to deficit reduction (when you're talking about deficits in the trillions, $38 billion in savings is a drop in the bucket), those efforts have been set back. Polls consistently show a popular misconception that aid is a significant part of the U.S. federal budget, when in fact it amounts to less than 1 percent. Thus, congressional cuts to aid in the name of deficit reduction are an easy vote, but a cheap shot. In 2007, Richard Armitage and I co-chaired a bipartisan Smart Power Commission of members of Congress, former ambassadors, retired military officers, and heads of non-profit organizations at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. We concluded that America's image and influence had declined in recent years and that the United States had to move from exporting fear to inspiring optimism and hope. The Smart Power Commission was not alone in this conclusion. Even when he was in the George W. Bush administration, Defense Secretary Robert Gates called on Congress to commit more money and effort to soft-power tools including diplomacy, economic assistance, and communications because the military alone cannot defend America's interests around the world. He pointed out that military spending then totaled nearly half a trillion dollars annually, compared with a State Department budget of just $36 billion. In his words, "I am here to make the case for strengthening our capacity to use soft power and for better integrating it with hard power." He acknowledged that for the secretary of defense to plead for more resources for the State Department was as odd as a man biting a dog, but these are not normal times. Since then, the ratio of the budgets has become even more unbalanced. This is not to belittle the Pentagon, where I once served as an assistant secretary. Military force is obviously a source of hard power, but the same resource can sometimes contribute to soft-power behavior. A well-run military can be a source of prestige, and military-to-military cooperation and training programs, for example, can establish transnational networks that enhance a country's soft power. The U.S. military's impressive performance in providing humanitarian relief after the Indian Ocean tsunami and the South Asian earthquake in 2005 helped restore the attractiveness of the United States; the military's role in the aftermath of the recent Japanese earthquake and tsunami is having a similar effect. Of course, misusing military resources can also undercut soft power. The Soviet Union had a great deal of soft power in the years after World War II, but destroyed it by using hard power against Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Brutality and indifference to just-war principles of discrimination and proportionality can also eviscerate legitimacy. Whatever admiration the crisp efficiency of the Iraq invasion inspired in the eyes of some foreigners, it was undercut by the subsequent inefficiency of the occupation and the scenes of mistreatment of prisoners at Abu Ghraib. Smart power is the ability to combine the hard power of coercion or payment with the soft power of attraction into a successful strategy. U.S. foreign policy has tended to over-rely on hard power in recent years because it is the most direct and visible source of American strength. The Pentagon is the best-trained and best-resourced arm of the U.S. government, but there are limits to what hard power can achieve on its own. Democracy, human rights, and civil society are not best promoted with the barrel of a gun. It is true that the U.S. military has an impressive operational capacity, but the practice of turning to the Pentagon because it can get things done leads to the image of an over-militarized foreign policy. Moreover, it can create a destructive cycle, as the capacity of civilian agencies and tools gets hollowed out to feed the military budget. Today, the United States spends about 500 times more on its military than it does on broadcasting and exchanges combined. Congress cuts shortwave broadcasts to save the equivalent of one hour of the defense budget. Is that smart? It sounds like common sense, but smart power is not so easy to carry out in practice. Diplomacy and foreign assistance are often underfunded and neglected, in part because of the difficulty of demonstrating their short-term impact on critical challenges. The payoffs for exchange and assistance programs is often measured in decades, not weeks or months. American foreign-policy institutions and personnel, moreover, are fractured and compartmentalized, and there is not an adequate interagency process for developing and funding a smart-power strategy. Many official instruments of soft or attractive power -- public diplomacy, broadcasting, exchange programs, development assistance, disaster relief, military-to-military contacts -- are scattered around the government, and there is no overarching strategy or budget that even tries to integrate them.

#### Soft power fails - cultural influence doesn't spill over to political power

Josef Joffe, Marc and Anita Abramowitz Fellow in International Relations at Hoover Institution, "The Perils of Soft Power," Hoover Digest, No. 3, 2006, accessed 1/7/10 http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/4634921.html

There may be little or no relationship between America's ubiquity and its actual influence. Hundreds of millions of people around the world wear, listen, eat, drink, watch and dance American, but they do not identify these accouterments of their daily lives with America. A Yankees cap is the epitome of things American, but it hardly signifies knowledge of, let alone affection for, the team from New York or America as such. The same is true for American films, foods or songs. Of the 250 top-grossing movies around the world, only four are foreign-made: ''The Full Monty'' (U.K.), ''Life Is Beautiful'' (Italy) and ''Spirited Away'' and ''Howl's Moving Castle'' (Japan); the rest are American, including a number of co-productions. But these American products shape images, not sympathies, and there is little, if any, relationship between artifact and affection. If the relationship is not neutral, it is one of repulsion rather than attraction -- the dark side of the ''soft power'' coin. The European student movement of the late 1960's took its cue from the Berkeley free-speech movement of 1964, the inspiration for all post-1964 Western student revolts. But it quickly turned anti-American; America was reviled while it was copied. Now shift forward to the Cannes Film Festival of 2004, where hundreds of protesters denounced America's intervention in Iraq until the police dispersed them. The makers of the movie ''Shrek 2'' had placed large bags of green Shrek ears along the Croisette, the main drag along the beach. As the demonstrators scattered, many of them put on free Shrek ears. ''They were attracted,'' noted an observer in this magazine, ''by the ears' goofiness and sheer recognizability.'' And so the enormous pull of American imagery went hand in hand with the country's, or at least its government's, condemnation.

#### No solvency—unpredictable, means can’t meet public demand

EnerNex Corporation 06 (Leading energy company for the middle of America, additionally co-authored by the Midwest Independent System Operator for the Purpose of Minnesota’s economy. Probably objective and/or want Minnesota to have wind. Just sayin.)

[EnerNex Corporation & The Midwest Independent System Operator. "Final Report - 2006 Minnesota Wind Integration Study." (2006): n. pag. Print.] AMB

The high reliability of the electric power system is premised on having adequate supply ¶ resources to meet demand at any moment. In longer term planning, system reliability ¶ is often gauged in terms of the probability that the planned generation capacity will be ¶ sufficient to meet the projected system demand. It is recognized that conventional ¶ electric generating plants and units are not completely reliable – there is some ¶ probability that in a given future hour capacity from the unit would be unavailable or ¶ limited in capability due to a forced outage – i.e. mechanical failure. Even if the ¶ installed capacity in the control area exceeds the peak projected load, there is some ¶ non-zero probability that the available capacity might be insufficient to meet load in a ¶ given hour ¶ The capacity value of wind plants for long term planning analyses is currently a topic of ¶ significant discussion in the wind and electric power industries. Characterizing the ¶ wind generation to appropriately reflect the historical statistical nature of the plant ¶ output on hourly, daily, and seasonal bases is one of the major challenges. Several ¶ techniques that capture this variability in a format appropriate for formal reliability ¶ modeling have been proposed and tested. The lack of adequate historical data for the ¶ wind plants under consideration is an obstacle for these methods.

#### Wind farms drive multiple birds of prey to extinction

Ritter 5 [Ritter – staff writer – 1/4/2005 (John, “Wind turbines taking toll on birds of prey,” USA Today, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-01-04-windmills-usat_x.htm>)]

ALTAMONT PASS, Calif. — The big turbines that stretch for miles along these rolling, grassy hills have churned out clean, renewable electricity for two decades in one of the nation's first big wind-power projects. But for just as long, massive fiberglass blades on the more than 4,000 windmills have been chopping up tens of thousands of birds that fly into them, including golden eagles, red-tailed hawks, burrowing owls and other raptors. After years of study but little progress reducing bird kills, environmentalists have sued to force turbine owners to take tough corrective measures. The companies, at risk of federal prosecution, say they see the need to protect birds. "Once we finally realized that this issue was really serious, that we had to solve it to move forward, we got religion," says George Hardie, president of G3 Energy. The size of the annual body count — conservatively put at 4,700 birds — is unique to this sprawling, 50-square-mile site in the Diablo Mountains between San Francisco and the agricultural Central Valley because it spans an international migratory bird route regulated by the federal government. The low mountains are home to the world's highest density of nesting golden eagles. Scientists don't know whether the kills reduce overall bird populations but worry that turbines, added to other factors, could tip a species into decline. "They didn't realize it at the time, but it was just a really bad place to build a wind farm," says Grainger Hunt, an ecologist with the Peregrine Fund who has studied eagles at Altamont.

#### Top level predators are key to ecological health, which is key to human survival.

Carey 6 [LiveScience staff writer – 7/19/2006 (Bjorn, “Top predators key to ecosystem survival,” MSNBC, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/13939039>)]

Top-level predators strike fear in the hearts of the animals they stalk. But when a deer is being mauled by a wolf, at least it can know that it's giving its life for the greater good. A new study reveals how ecosystems crumble without the presence of top predators be keeping populations of key species from growing too large. It also provides a cautionary lesson to humans, who often remove top predators from the food chain, setting off an eventual collapse. The study is detailed in the July 20 issue of the journal Nature. The researchers studied eight natural food webs, each with distinct energy channels, or food chains, leading from the bottom of the web to the top. For example, the Cantabrian Sea shelf off the coast of Spain has two distinct energy channels. One starts with the phytoplankton in the water, which are eaten by zooplankton and fish, and so on up to what are called top consumer fish. The second channel starts with detritus that sinks to the sea floor, where it's consumed by crabs and bottom-dwelling fish, which are consumed by higher-up animals until the food energy reaches top-level consumers. The top predators play their role by happily munching away at each channel's top consumers, explained study leader Neil Rooney of the University of Guelph in Canada. "Top predators are kind of like the regulators of the food web—they keep each energy channel in check," Rooney told LiveScience. "The top predator goes back and forth between the channels like a game of Whac-a-Mole," a popular arcade game in which constantly appearing moles are smacked down with a mallet. Constant predation of the top consumers prevents a population from growing larger than the system can support. Boom or bust Removing a top predator can often alter the gentle balance of an entire ecosystem. Here's an example of what can happen: When an area floods permanently and creates a series of islands, not all the islands have enough resources to support top predators. Top consumers are left to gobble up nutrients and experience a reproductive boom. The boom is felt throughout the system, though, as the booming species out-competes others, potentially driving the lesser species to extinction and reducing biodiversity. Rooney refers to this type of ecosystem change as a "boom-and-bust cycle," when one species' population boom ultimately means another will bust. Bigger booms increased chances of a bust. “With each bust, the population gets very close to zero, and its difficult getting back," he said. Human role in 'boom-and-bust' Humans often play a role in initiating boom-and-bust cycles by wiping out the top predator.s For example, after gray wolves were hunted to near extinction in the United States, deer, elk, and other wolf-fearing forest critters had free reign and reproduced willy-nilly, gobbling up the vegetation that other consumers also relied on for food. Or, more recently, researchers found that when fish stocks in the Atlantic Ocean are over fished, jellyfish populations boom. While jellyfish have few predators, removing the fish frees up an abundance of nutrients for the jellyfish to feast on. Ecosystems provide us with the food we eat and help produce breathable air and clean water. But they're generally fragile and operate best when at a stable equilibrium, scientists say. "These are our life support systems," Rooney said. "We're relying on them. This study points to the importance of top predators and that we need to be careful with how we deal with them."

### Econ Adv

#### Economic crisis causes cooperation, not war – their ev is rhetoric

Barnett 9 (Thomas P.M., senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC and a contributing editor/online columnist for Esquire magazine, Aug 24, [www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/4213/the-new-rules-security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis] AD: 9-24-11, jam)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: \*No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); \*The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); \*Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); \*No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); \*A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and \*No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order. Do I expect to read any analyses along those lines in the blogosphere any time soon? Absolutely not. I expect the fantastic fear-mongering to proceed apace. That's what the Internet is for.

#### Empirics are on our side

Morris Miller, Professor of Administration @ the University of Ottawa, 2K

(Interdisciplinary Science Review, v 25 n4 2000 p ingenta connect)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study under- taken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### Multipolarity is here – “the rise of the rest” has reshaped the global economy and every international institution. The US is accommodating this in order to maintain influence

Berliner 10 (Jake, Deputy Policy Director of NDN’s Globalization Initiative, BA, Political Science from Tufts University, Apr 23, [ndn.org/essay/2010/04/rise-rest-how-new-economic-powers-are-reshaping-globe] AD: 9-24-11, jam)

The structure of the global economy has changed dramatically over the past two decades. Since the end of the Cold War, global commerce has connected the farthest reaches of the globe, resulting in a world economy marked by the ascendance of people and nations outside of the advanced industrialized world, a phenomenon Fareed Zakaria has termed “The Rise of the Rest.” This rise means that American people and businesses are competing with not just more, but more capable, connected, and innovative people and businesses than ever before. There can be no doubt that this heightened competition, fueled by the inextricable march of globalization, will shape the early part of the 21st century and help define the changing world. New People Join the Global Economy Two decades of globalization, facilitated by economic liberalization, have resulted in the rise not only of nations but of people. Global poverty levels have dropped and living standards have increased dramatically. China alone has pulled hundreds of millions out of poverty – in 1990, roughly 60 percent of Chinese lived on under $1.25 per day; by 2005 that number had fallen to 16 percent. Between 1990 and 2008, Gross National Income (GNI) per capita, adjusted for Purchasing Power Parity, increased more than seven-fold in China. Other emerging nations have seen impressive increases – GNI per capita approximately doubled in South Africa, Brazil, and Mexico, and more than tripled in India. New Economies Compete Globally Businesses in emerging economies also now play a much larger role in the global economy. Developing and emerging economies exported 42 percent of global merchandise in 2007, compared to just 28 percent in 1990. These same economies also compete with developed nations for global capital, nearly doubling their inward flow of global Foreign Direct Investment from 18 percent in 1990 to 33 percent in 2006. The rise of new economic players has resulted in an intensely more competitive global economy, a hallmark of which has been the emergence of multinational corporations based not just in the United States and other advanced industrialized nations, but emerging markets as well. Thirty-seven of the Fortune Global 500 are Chinese, compared with just eight in 2000. The world’s three largest banks (by market capitalization) – the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, China Construction Bank, and HSBC – are headquartered in China. (HSBC is British, but moved its headquarters to Hong Kong in 2009.) Most stunningly, according to The New York Times, 2009 – admittedly an unusual year – saw $34.8 billion in initial public offerings in China compared to $13.7 billion in the United States (as of November 13, 2009). Other regions and nations have seen similar developments – state owned oil and gas companies in Brazil, Russia, India, and China (the so-called BRICs) are major and in some cases dominant players in the global energy scene. The Asian “Tigers” – Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea, and Hong Kong – have rapidly become major global players in the technology and financial sectors, providing competition to Japan and serving as role models for other emerging regions. South Korea’s export growth over the past decade has been especially impressive; its 9.7% export growth over that period trails only China (at 20%) in growth for the world’s top ten exporters. Additionally, trends such as the emergence of Mobile Banking and Islamic Finance have the potential to extend powerful economic tools to areas of the globe that have yet to begin their rise. Rising Powers Emerge While notable for its changing economic relationships, the Rise of the Rest has resulted in a fundamentally new global structure that includes new power dynamics. Europe, which in the post war era had been able to rely on economic heft to ensure diplomatic sway, has seen a relative decline as economic might has shifted away, in large part to Asia. Outside of Asia, new regional powers have emerged as well, with Brazil, South Africa, and Mexico, among others, playing significant regional roles. These new power relationships are evident in formal organizations of global governance. The G-20 has replaced the G-8 as the primary global economic leadership body, and similar organizational changes have occurred at the International Monetary Fund (IMF). New security arrangements are likely not far behind. NATO’s membership has already been broadened to include emerging countries formerly anathema to NATO’s original mission, and rumblings persist about reform of the United Nations Security Council. In the most striking example of the weight of new powers in the diplomatic sphere, the pivotal negotiations during the recent Copenhagen climate conference involved only Brazil, South Africa, India, China (the so-called BASIC countries), and the United States, casting aside European nations, many of whom are the world’s leading champions for climate accords. The rise of new powers, particularly China, will not come without economic and political challenges on the international stage. China has created a number of questions about the ability of foreign multinational corporations to function in China following its recent breach of Google’s corporate networks. Additionally, China’s ongoing inability to fully satisfy its obligations to the rules-based global trading system has earned it the ire of both industrialized and developing countries, as its currency policies could quite literally beggar its developing neighbors. While China’s growth into a major player in the global economy is clearly a central development of the 21st century, the sustainability of its mercantilist orientation is open to question. Its dominance is also far from assured, and doomsday scenarios of a “Chinese Century” seem unrealistic, as China still lags far behind both the United States and Europe in military, economic, technological, and diplomatic clout. The Obama administration’s recent diplomatic approach to Chinese currency practices is a prime example of leadership in the age of the Rise of the Rest. Instead of releasing a Treasury Department report labeling China a currency manipulator, the Obama administration used nuance and multilateral diplomacy to thaw the previously icy Sino-American relationship. By publicly declaring its intention to engage through the G-20, a body whose membership includes countries more affected by China’s currency practices than the United States, the Obama administration demonstrated an effective use of modern international institutions representative of the new global economy.

#### Post-unipolarity is coming now but the aff’s widening of the power gap stalls that and causes blowback destroying US influence and legitimacy

Maher 11 (Richard, Max Weber postdoctoral fellow at the European University Institute, Ph.D in Political Science from Brown University, *Orbis*, 55(1), Winter, jam)

Since the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, world politics has been unipolar, defined by American preponderance in each of the core components of state power-military, economic, and technological. Such an imbalanced distribution of power in favor of a single country is unprecedented in the modern state system. This material advantage does not automatically translate into America's preferred political and diplomatic outcomes, however. Other states, if now only at the margins, are challenging U.S. power and authority. Additionally, on a range of issues, the United States is finding it increasingly difficult to realize its goals and ambitions. The even bigger challenge for policymakers in Washington is how to respond to signs that America's unquestioned preeminence in international politics is waning. This decline in the United States' relative position is in part a consequence of the burdens and susceptibilities produced by unipolarity. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, the U.S. position both internationally and domestically may actually be strengthened once this period of unipolarity has passed. On pure material terms, the gap between the United States and the rest of the world is indeed vast. The U.S. economy, with a GDP of over $14 trillion, is nearly three times the size of China's, now the world's second-largestnational economy. The United States today accounts for approximately 25 percent of global economic output, a figure that has held relatively stable despite steadily increasing economic growth in China, India, Brazil, and other countries. Among the group of six or seven great powers, this figure approaches 50 percent. When one takes discretionary spending into account, the United States today spends more on its military than the rest of the world combined. This imbalance is even further magnified by the fact that five of the next seven biggest spenders are close U.S. allies. China, the country often seen as America's next great geopolitical rival, has a defense budget that is oneseventh of what the United States spends on its military. There is also a vast gap in terms of the reach and sophistication of advanced weapons systems. By some measures, the United States spends more on research and development for its military than the rest of the world combined. What is remarkable is that the United States can do all of this without completely breaking the bank. The United States today devotes approximately 4 percent of GDP to defense. As a percentage of GDP, the United States today spends far less on its military than it did during the Cold War, when defense spending hovered around 10 percent of gross economic output. As one would expect, the United States today enjoys unquestioned preeminence in the military realm. No other state comes close to having the capability to project military power like the United States.And yet, despite this material preeminence, the United States sees its political and strategic influence diminishing around the world. It is involved in two costly and destructive wars, in Iraq and Afghanistan, where success has been elusive and the end remains out of sight. China has adopted a new assertiveness recently, on everything from U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, currency convertibility, and America's growing debt (which China largely finances). Pakistan, one of America's closest strategic allies, is facing the threat of social and political collapse. Russia is using its vast energy resources to reassert its dominance in what it views as its historical sphere of influence. Negotiations with North Korea and Iran have gone nowhere in dismantling their nuclear programs. Brazil's growing economic and political influence offer another option for partnership and investment for countries in the Western Hemisphere. And relations with Japan, following the election that brought the opposition Democratic Party into power, are at their frostiest in decades. To many observers, it seems that America's vast power is not translating into America's preferred outcome. As the United States has come to learn, raw power does not automatically translate into the realization of one's preferences, nor is it necessarily easy to maintain one's predominant position in world politics. There are many costs that come with predominance - material, political, and reputational. Vast imbalances of power create apprehension and anxiety in others, in one's friends just as much as in one's rivals. In this view, it is not necessarily *American* predominance that produces unease but rather American *predominance*. Predominance also makes one a tempting target, and a scapegoat for other countries' own problems and unrealized ambitions. Many a Third World autocrat has blamed his country's economic and social woes on an ostensible U.S. conspiracy to keep the country fractured, underdeveloped, and subservient to America's own interests. Predominant power likewise breeds envy, resentment, and alienation. How is it possible for one country to be so rich and powerful when so many others are weak, divided, and poor? Legitimacy-the perception that one's role and purpose is acceptable and one's power is used justly-is indispensable for maintaining power and influence in world politics. As we witness the emergence (or re-emergence) of great powers in other parts of the world, we realize that American predominance cannot last forever. It is inevitable that the distribution of power and influence will become more balanced in the future, and that the United States will necessarily see its relative power decline. While the United States naturally should avoid hastening the end of this current period of American predominance, it should not look upon the next period of global politics and international history with dread or foreboding. It certainly should not seek to maintain its predominance at any cost, devoting unlimited ambition, resources, and prestige to the cause. In fact, contrary to what many have argued about the importance of maintaining its predominance, America's position in the world-both at home and internationally-could very well be strengthened once its era of preeminence is over. It is, therefore, necessary for the United States to start thinking about how best to position itself in the "post-unipolar" world.

#### Economic status isn’t zero-sum—U.S. acceptance of China’s and Russia’s rising status is key to cooperation on prolif, terrorism, failed states, and the economy

Larson 10 (Debra Welch, Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Alexei Shevchenko, Assistant Professor of Political Science at California State University, Fullerton, Spring, [www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2010.34.4.63])

Since the end of the Cold War, scholars and foreign policy analysts have debated the type of world order that the United States should strive to create—a hegemonic system, a multilateral institutional system, or a great power concert. 1 Initially, a major issue was whether attempts to maintain U.S. primacy would stimulate counterbalancing from other states. 2 But since the 2003 Iraq War, a new consideration has emerged—how to persuade other states to cooperate with U.S. global governance. 3 States that do not oppose efforts by the United States to maintain stability may nonetheless decline to follow its leadership. This is a matter for concern because although the United States can act alone, it cannot succeed on such issues as controlling terrorism, curbing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), rebuilding failed states, or maintaining economic stability without help from other states. Among the states whose support is critical are China and Russia. China, which in modern times has never been accorded great power status, has experienced impressive economic growth and is rapidly rising in the international system. China’s ascendance creates expectations of an uncertain power transition in the Asia-Paciªc region and potentially in world politics, one that could be accompanied by dangerous competition. Then there is Russia, a former superpower and (after a decade of post-Soviet retrenchment complicated by gross internal mismanagement) most recently a resurgent power because of a rise in energy prices, a power that has not yet found a place in world politics. Obtaining cooperation from China and Russia is more complex and difªcult because they are outsiders from the liberal Western community, with differing values and interests. 4 In contrast, as a long-standing democracy, rising power India is more susceptible to appeals to common values, especially since the 2006 nuclear agreement with the United States recognized India’s status as a nuclear power. 5 With China and Russia, the problem is how to obtain their cooperation with U.S. global governance if they cannot be integrated into the West. The United States needs Chinese and Russian assistance to curb proliferation of WMD, control terrorism, maintain stable energy supplies, and stabilize Eurasia. China and Russia have permanent seats on the United Nations (UN) Security Council, allowing them to veto resolutions authorizing intervention or sanctions against would-be proliferators or aggressors. China and Russia also have political ties with Iran and North Korea that could make them useful intermediaries. Because of its economic aid and geographic proximity, China is an essential interlocutor with North Korea; Russia is a major arms supplier and economic partner with Iran. Russia has thousands of nuclear weapons and tons of nuclear materials, both coveted by rogue states and terrorist groups. As the second-largest oil exporter and the holder of the world’s largest gas reserves, Russia can affect global energy supplies and prices. Russia could provide help as a transit route for U.S. military supplies and source of intelligence for the U.S. effort to stabilize Afghanistan. As the dominant power in Central Asia, Russia can assist in maintaining stability in this energy-rich region, an area that is increasingly important to China as well. The United States needs to work with China to stabilize security relationships in the Asia-Paciªc region, head off regional rivalries, and prevent dangerous conºict resulting from a North Korean implosion. Scholars have debated whether future Chinese and Russian foreign policies will contribute to global stability. 6 Both states have been reluctant to agree to tough sanctions on North Korea and Iran to stop their nuclear programs. 7 As China’s consumption of energy has grown, Beijing has been actively competing for control of energy resources around the world, sometimes in rogue states such as Burma, Iran, and Sudan. 8 China has used the growing wealth of its economy to modernize its military, increasing its ability to coerce Taiwan or seize disputed territory in the East and South China Seas. 9 Russia has been trying to exert inºuence over the post-Soviet space by such means as cutting off the supply of oil and gas, 10 and most dramatically, its August 2008 incursion into Georgia followed by recognition of the breakaway republics Abkhazia and South Ossetia. 11 Both China and Russia have sold arms to objectionable regimes such as Burma, Iran, Syria, and Venezuela. 12 Securing Chinese and Russian cooperation requires understanding the objectives and logic of their grand strategies and devising effective policies to achieve that goal. In what follows, we demonstrate that despite apparent shifts and turns, Chinese and Russian foreign policies since the end of the Cold War have been motivated by a consistent objective—to restore both countries’ great power status. We argue that China and Russia will be more likely to participate in global governance if the United States can find ways to recognize their distinctive status and identities. States’ concerns about their relative status have been largely overlooked by the dominant theoretical approaches of neorealism and liberalism. 13 Neorealism focuses on material components of power, whereas liberalism is oriented around norms, institutions, and economic interdependence. These approaches have limited utility for persuading China and Russia to cooperate because neither country needs economic or security assistance from the West, and they do not subscribe to Western liberal democratic norms. For insights into the role of status in international politics, we draw on social identity theory (SIT), which explores how social groups strive to achieve a positively distinctive identity. 14 When a group’s identity is no longer favorable, it may pursue one of several strategies: social mobility, social competition, or social creativity. Social mobility emulates the values and practices of the higher-status group with the goal of gaining admission into elite clubs. Social competition tries to equal or surpass the dominant group in the area on which its claims to superior status rest. Finally, social creativity reframes a negative attribute as positive or stresses achievement in a different domain. Applied to international relations, SIT suggests that states may improve their status by joining elite clubs, trying to best the dominant states, or achieving preeminence outside the arena of geopolitical competition. 15 We apply a theoretical framework based on SIT to case studies of changes in Chinese and Russian grand strategy since the end of the Cold War as a plausibility probe. 16 Our study indicates that China and Russia initially sought great power status through partial acceptance of Western capitalist norms but were denied integration into elite Western clubs. Both states turned to more competitive policies but did not enhance their relative standing. Rather than adjust to the U.S.-led liberal democratic system, China and Russia sought to develop new, more positive images by contributing to global governance while maintaining distinctive identities. China has been remarkably successful in changing other states’ perceptions of its identity, whereas Russia’s cooperation was largely taken for granted. Russia’s foreign policy is currently in a transitional phase with some elements of social competition. Our case studies suggest that the desire for greater status may motivate rising powers to take on more responsibility for maintaining world order. For this outcome to occur, the dominant power, the United States, must offer recognition of the rising state’s more positive identity and status. Overall U.S. predominance allows the United States to recognize other countries’ achievements and contributions in the area of global governance without detracting from its own status. Use of status incentives should receive greater consideration as a tool of global governance. We begin by discussing the basic propositions of SIT, showing why groups are motivated to achieve positive distinctiveness. We then elaborate and conceptualize the SIT typology of identity management strategies, providing applications to international relations. This theoretical framework is then used to explain major shifts in Chinese and Russian grand strategy since the end of the Cold War, and especially the adoption of more cooperative policies. The conclusion identiªes contributions of SIT to understanding otherwise puzzling Chinese and Russian behavior.

#### Prolif causes extinction

Utgoff 2, Deputy Director of Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of Institute for Defense Analysis [Victor A., “Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions,” Survival, Summer, p. 87-90]

Further, the large number of states that became capable of building nuclear weapons over the years, but chose not to, can be reasonably well explained by the fact that most were formally allied with either the United States or the Soviet Union. Both these superpowers had strong nuclear forces and put great pressure on their allies not to build nuclear weapons. Since the Cold War, the US has retained all its allies. In addition, NATO has extended its protection to some of the previous allies of the Soviet Union and plans on taking in more. Nuclear proliferation by India and Pakistan, and proliferation programmes by North Korea, Iran and Iraq, all involve states in the opposite situation: all judged that they faced serious military opposition and had little prospect of establishing a reliable supporting alliance with a suitably strong, nuclear-armed state. What would await the world if strong protectors, especially the United States, were [was] no longer seen as willing to protect states from nuclear-backed aggression? At least a few additional states would begin to build their own nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them to distant targets, and these initiatives would spur increasing numbers of the world’s capable states to follow suit. Restraint would seem ever less necessary and ever more dangerous. Meanwhile, more states are becoming capable of building nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. Many, perhaps most, of the world’s states are becoming sufficiently wealthy, and the technology for building nuclear forces continues to improve and spread. Finally, it seems highly likely that at some point, halting proliferation will come to be seen as a lost cause and the restraints on it will disappear. Once that happens, the transition to a highly proliferated world would probably be very rapid. While some regions might be able to hold the line for a time, the threats posed by wildfire proliferation in most other areas could create pressures that would finally overcome all restraint. Many readers are probably willing to accept that nuclear proliferation is such a grave threat to world peace that every effort should be made to avoid it. However, every effort has not been made in the past, and we are talking about much more substantial efforts now. For new and substantially more burdensome efforts to be made to slow or stop nuclear proliferation, it needs to be established that the highly proliferated nuclear world that would sooner or later evolve without such efforts is not going to be acceptable. And, for many reasons, it is not. First, the dynamics of getting to a highly proliferated world could be very dangerous. Proliferating states will feel great pressures to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems before any potential opponent does. Those who succeed in outracing an opponent may consider preemptive nuclear war before the opponent becomes capable of nuclear retaliation. Those who lag behind might try to preempt their opponent’s nuclear programme or defeat the opponent using conventional forces. And those who feel threatened but are incapable of building nuclear weapons may still be able to join in this arms race by building other types of weapons of mass destruction, such as biological weapons. Second, as the world approaches complete proliferation, the hazards posed by nuclear weapons today will be magnified many times over. Fifty or more nations capable of launching nuclear weapons means that the risk of nuclear accidents that could cause serious damage not only to their own populations and environments, but those of others, is hugely increased. The chances of such weapons failing into the hands of renegade military units or terrorists is far greater, as is the number of nations carrying out hazardous manufacturing and storage activities. Worse still, in a highly proliferated world there would be more frequent opportunities for the use of nuclear weapons. And more frequent opportunities means shorter expected times between conflicts in which nuclear weapons get used, unless the probability of use at any opportunity is actually zero. To be sure, some theorists on nuclear deterrence appear to think that in any confrontation between two states known to have reliable nuclear capabilities, the probability of nuclear weapons being used is zero.’ These theorists think that such states will be so fearful of escalation to nuclear war that they would always avoid or terminate confrontations between them, short of even conventional war. They believe this to be true even if the two states have different cultures or leaders with very eccentric personalities. History and human nature, however, suggest that they are almost surely wrong. History includes instances in which states ‘known to possess nuclear weapons did engage in direct conventional conflict. China and Russia fought battles along their common border even after both had nuclear weapons. Moreover, logic suggests that if states with nuclear weapons always avoided conflict with one another, surely states without nuclear weapons would avoid conflict with states that had them. Again, history provides counter-examples Egypt attacked Israel in 1973 even though it saw Israel as a nuclear power at the time. Argentina invaded the Falkland Islands and fought Britain’s efforts to take them back, even though Britain had nuclear weapons. Those who claim that two states with reliable nuclear capabilities to devastate each other will not engage in conventional conflict risking nuclear war also assume that any leader from any culture would not choose suicide for his nation. But history provides unhappy examples of states whose leaders were ready to choose suicide for themselves and their fellow citizens. Hitler tried to impose a ‘victory or destruction’’ policy on his people as Nazi Germany was going down to defeat. And Japan’s war minister, during debates on how to respond to the American atomic bombing, suggested ‘Would it not be wondrous for the whole nation to be destroyed like a beautiful flower?” If leaders are willing to engage in conflict with nuclear-armed nations, use of nuclear weapons in any particular instance may not be likely, but its probability would still be dangerously significant. In particular, human nature suggests that the threat of retaliation with nuclear weapons is not a reliable guarantee against a disastrous first use of these weapons. While national leaders and their advisors everywhere are usually talented and experienced people, even their most important decisions cannot be counted on to be the product of well-informed and thorough assessments of all options from all relevant points of view. This is especially so when the stakes are so large as to defy assessment and there are substantial pressures to act quickly, as could be expected in intense and fast-moving crises between nuclear-armed states. Instead, like other human beings, national leaders can be seduced by wishful thinking. They can misinterpret the words or actions of opposing leaders. Their advisors may produce answers that they think the leader wants to hear, or coalesce around what they know is an inferior decision because the group urgently needs the confidence or the sharing of responsibility that results from settling on something. Moreover, leaders may not recognize clearly where their personal or party interests diverge from those of their citizens. Under great stress, human beings can lose their ability to think carefully. They can refuse to believe that the worst could really happen, oversimplify the problem at hand, think in terms of simplistic analogies and play hunches. The intuitive rules for how individuals should respond to insults or signs of weakness in an opponent may too readily suggest a rash course of action. Anger, fear, greed, ambition and pride can all lead to bad decisions. The desire for a decisive solution to the problem at hand may lead to an unnecessarily extreme course of action. We can almost hear the kinds of words that could flow from discussions in nuclear crises or war. ‘These people are not willing to die for this interest’. ‘No sane person would actually use such weapons’. ‘Perhaps the opponent will back down if we show him we mean business by demonstrating a willingness to use nuclear weapons’. ‘If I don’t hit them back really hard, I am going to be driven from office, if not killed’. Whether right or wrong, in the stressful atmosphere of a nuclear crisis or war, such words from others, or silently from within, might resonate too readily with a harried leader. Thus, both history and human nature suggest that nuclear deterrence can be expected to fail from time to time, and we are fortunate it has not happened yet. But the threat of nuclear war is not just a matter of a few weapons being used. It could get much worse. Once a conflict reaches the point where nuclear weapons are employed, the stresses felt by the leaderships would rise enormously. These stresses can be expected to further degrade their decision-making. The pressures to force the enemy to stop fighting or to surrender could argue for more forceful and decisive military action, which might be the right thing to do in the circumstances, but maybe not. And the horrors of the carnage already suffered may be seen as justification for visiting the most devastating punishment possible on the enemy.’ Again, history demonstrates how intense conflict can lead the combatants to escalate violence to the maximum possible levels. In the Second World War, early promises not to bomb cities soon gave way to essentially indiscriminate bombing of civilians. The war between Iran and Iraq during the 1980s led to the use of chemical weapons on both sides and exchanges of missiles against each other’s cities. And more recently, violence in the Middle East escalated in a few months from rocks and small arms to heavy weapons on one side, and from police actions to air strikes and armoured attacks on the other. Escalation of violence is also basic human nature. Once the violence starts, retaliatory exchanges of violent acts can escalate to levels unimagined by the participants before hand. Intense and blinding anger is a common response to fear or humiliation or abuse. And such anger can lead us to impose on our opponents whatever levels of violence are readily accessible. In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear ‘six-shooters’ on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations. This kind of world is in no nation’s interest. The means for preventing it must be pursued vigorously. And, as argued above, a most powerful way to prevent it or slow its emergence is to encourage the more capable states to provide reliable protection to others against aggression, even when that aggression could be backed with nuclear weapons.

#### Terrorism causes extinction

Wright, senior fellow at NAF, 7—prize winning author of best winning books. Visiting scholar at The University of Pennsylvania and Schwartz Senior Fellow at the New America Foundation. Attended TCU, finished his interdisciplinary degree in public and international affairs at Princeton (Robert, 4/28, Planet Of The Apes, http://select.nytimes.com/2007/04/28/opinion/28wright.html, AG)

(3) Terrorism. Alas, the negative-feedback loop -- bad outcomes lead to smart policies -- may not apply here. We reacted to 9/11 by freaking out and invading one too many countries, creating more terrorists. With the ranks of terrorists growing -- amid evolving biotechnology and loose nukes -- we could within a decade see terrorism on a scale that would make us forget any restraint we had learned from the Iraq war's outcome. If 3,000 deaths led to two wars, how many wars would 300,000 deaths yield? And how many new terrorists? Terrorism alone won't wipe out humanity. But with our unwitting help, it could strengthen other lethal forces. It could give weight to the initially fanciful ''clash of civilizations'' thesis. Muslim states could fall under the control of radicals and opt out of what might otherwise have become a global civilization. Armed with nukes (Pakistan already is), they would revive the nuclear Armageddon scenario. A fissure between civilizations would also sabotage the solution of environmental problems, and the ensuing eco-calamity could make people on both sides of the fissure receptive to radical messages. The worse things got, the worse they'd get. So while no one of the Big Three doomsday dynamics is likely to bring the apocalypse, they could well combine to form a positive-feedback loop, a k a the planetary death spiral. And the catalyst would be terrorism, along with our mishandling of it.

#### Hegemony causes China war

Glain 11 (Stephen, freelance writer with extensive experience as a foreign correspondent in Asia and the Middle East, Sep 8, [www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/stephen-glain/2011/09/08/why-a-us-war-with-china-may-be-inevitable], jam)

Meanwhile, Dan Blumenthal, a commissioner of the reliably alarmist U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, has cowritten a clarion call to preserve American hegemony in Asia and beyond. According to Blumenthal and his colleagues, the primary benefactor of the Pax Americana—China—is now doing everything possible to subvert it. In an essay posted on FP.Com this week, the authors warned a defense-spending floor of 4 percent of gross domestic product should be established to cope with the looming China threat. Otherwise, they argue, America will render itself vulnerable to Chinese prodding in Beijing’s own backyard. ("Can we thrive as a nation if we need China's permission to access Asia's trade routes?" the authors ask plaintively, as if Beijing was constructing a toll road through the South China Sea.) Even now, they warn, the Pentagon is forecasting strategic "shortfalls" of badly needed fighter aircraft, naval ships, and submarines. A failure of Congressional nerve to cover those deficits, according to Team Blumenthal, could "lead to Armageddon." As a Tokyo-based correspondent in the mid-1990s, I used to lament the "irony deficiency" of my hosts. Clearly, that ailment has gone viral and jumped the Pacific (along with stagnant economic growth and political dysfunction). Have we forgotten the fraudulent "bomber" and "missile" gaps peddled by the Defense Department during the 1950s to leach taxpayers for ever more powerful, and as it turned out, largely unnecessary, weaponry against the Soviet Union? If the events of the last 60 years has proven anything, it’s that threat inflation is as deeply entrenched an American tradition as predatory lending. Yet with the evaporation of one threat inevitably comes the rise of another. Just as radical Islam filled the vacuum created by the imploded Soviet Union as an existential core threat, so too has the degradation of al Qaeda cleared the decks for the coming war with China. [See a collection of political cartoons on Afghanistan.] In its annual report on China’s military modernization, the Pentagon this week expressed concerns about what it interprets as Beijing’s increasingly offensive posture and lack of transparency. (This from a bureaucracy that, according to its own inspector general, fails every year to account for hundreds of billions of dollars in unsupported expenditures.) No doubt China has its own hegemonic ambitions for a region that has been largely Sino-centric for the last three millennia. Washington meanwhile, appeals for a "peaceful" evolution of Chinese power even as it refuses to concede an inch of its own suzerainty over Asia’s seaways and air corridors. The two sides are talking past one another even as they engage in a menacing arms race; absent a diplomatic effort to reconcile their divergent positions, some kind of Sino-U.S. conflict is inevitable.

#### Extinction

Cheong 2k (Ching, senior journalist with the Strait Times, June 25, 2000, lexis, AD: 6/21/10)JM

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

#### Hegemony causes overstretch and miscalc – multipolarity solves

Maher 11 (Richard, Max Weber postdoctoral fellow at the European University Institute, Ph.D in Political Science from Brown University, *Orbis*, 55(1), Winter, jam)

Overextension. During its period of preeminence, the United States has found it difficult to stand aloof from threats (real or imagined) to its security, interests, and values. Most states are concerned with what happens in their immediate neighborhoods. The United States has interests that span virtually the entire globe, from its own Western Hemisphere, to Europe, the Middle East, Persian Gulf, South Asia, and East Asia. As its preeminence enters its third decade, the United States continues to define its interests in increasingly expansive terms. This has been facilitated by the massive forward presence of the American military, even when excluding the tens of thousands of troops stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan. The U.S. military has permanent bases in over 30 countries and maintains a troop presence in dozens more. 13 There are two logics that lead a preeminent state to overextend, and these logics of overextension lead to goals and policies that exceed even the considerable capabilities of a superpower. First, by definition, preeminent states face few external constraints. Unlike in bipolar or multipolar systems, there are no other states that can serve to reliably check or counterbalance the power and influence of a single hegemon. This gives preeminent states a staggering freedom of action and provides a tempting opportunity to shape world politics in fundamental ways. Rather than pursuing its own narrow interests, preeminence provides an opportunity to mix ideology, values, and normative beliefs with foreign policy. The United States has been susceptible to this temptation, going to great lengths to slay dragons abroad, and even to remake whole societies in its own (liberal democratic) image. 14 The costs and risks of taking such bold action or pursuing transformative foreign policies often seem manageable or even remote. We know from both theory and history that external powers can impose important checks on calculated risk-taking and serve as a moderating influence. The bipolar system of the Cold War forced policymakers in both the United States and the Soviet Union to exercise extreme caution and prudence. One wrong move could have led to a crisis that quickly spiraled out of policymakers' control.

## 2NC

### Warming Adv

#### Even major reductions have little effect

Times Online ‘8 "Copenhagen Consensus: global warming," Times Online (UK), 23 May 2008, accessed 1/8/10 http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article3992368.ece

There is unequivocal evidence that humans are changing the planet’s climate. We are already committed to average temperature increases of about 0.6°C, even without further rises in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. The world has focused on mitigation — reducing carbon emissions — a close look at the costs and benefits suggests that relying on this alone is a poor approach. Option One: Continuing focus on mitigation Even if mitigation — economic measures like taxes or trading systems — succeeded in capping emissions at 2010 levels, then the world would pump out 55 billion tonnes of carbon emissions in 2100, instead of 67 billion tonnes. It is a difference of 18 per cent: the benefits would remain smaller than 0.5 per cent of the world’s GDP for more than 200 years. These benefits simply are not large enough to make the investment worthwhile.

#### Massive deforestation

Howden '7 Daniel Howden, “Deforestation: The hidden cause of global warming,” The Independent, 14 May 2007, accessed 9/6/09 http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/deforestation-the-hidden-cause-of-global-warming-448734.html

Most people think of forests only in terms of the CO2 they absorb. The rainforests of the Amazon, the Congo basin and Indonesia are thought of as the lungs of the planet. But the destruction of those forests will in the next four years alone, in the words of Sir Nicholas Stern, pump more CO2 into the atmosphere than every flight in the history of aviation to at least 2025. Indonesia became the third-largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world last week. Following close behind is Brazil. Neither nation has heavy industry on a comparable scale with the EU, India or Russia and yet they comfortably outstrip all other countries, except the United States and China. What both countries do have in common is tropical forest that is being cut and burned with staggering swiftness. Smoke stacks visible from space climb into the sky above both countries, while satellite images capture similar destruction from the Congo basin, across the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and the Republic of Congo. According to the latest audited figures from 2003, two billion tons of CO2 enters the atmosphere every year from deforestation. That destruction amounts to 50 million acres - or an area the size of England, Wales and Scotland felled annually.

#### Expanded international agreements are key but every major party faces massive political roadblocks to increased involvement

Schreurs ’12 Miranda A. Schreurs, Director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre, Free University of Berlin, “Breaking the impasse in the international climate negotiations: The potential of green technologies,” Energy Policy 48, September 2012, pp. 5-12, Elsevier

The Durban outcome has kept the international negotiation process alive, but does not reﬂect the urgency of the problem at hand. That no post-Kyoto agreement is expected to enter into force until 2020 and the content of the agreement still needs to be developed also raises the question of whether the international community will be able to put a break on rising greenhouse gas emissions, let alone reduce them on the order that will be necessary to stay within the 1.5 to 2.0 degree Centrigrade temperature goal. The general scientiﬁc consensus is that if the rise in greenhouse gases is not halted by 2020 and then reduced on the order of 50% below 1990 levels by 2050, then it will be next to impossible to maintain the rise in greenhouse gases to within the 2 degrees Centigrade range. One very major challenge to the future agreement is the domestic political situation in the United States, which makes passage of national climate legislation, let alone ratiﬁcation of a global climate agreement highly unlikely in the near future. Already in Cancun, Japan made it clear that it opposes a second phase for the Kyoto Protocol. Yoshito Sengoku, Japan’s Chief Cabinet Secretary, announced that Japan would ‘‘sternly oppose debate for extending the Kyoto Protocol into a second phase which is unfair and ineffective.’’ (United Press International (UPI), 2010; MOFA, 2010). With its rapidly rising greenhouse gas emissions tied to the extraction of oil from tar sands in Alberta, Canada has pulled out of the agreement. Also problematic is the resistance of many developing countries to the establishment of binding emission reduction targets and timetables. India strongly pushed the perspective of per capita equity arguing that it should not be held captive by a problem largely caused by other countries. With its low per capita greenhouse gas emission levels as a result of high levels of poverty, India will be reluctant to accept commitments that could affect its economic growth perspectives.

### Econ Adv

#### Global economy is resilient

Zakaria ‘9 Fareed Zakaria, PhD in political science from Harvard, editor of Newsweek, serves on the board of the Council on Foreign Relations, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek, 12/11/2009, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html

One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all. A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

#### Overall empirical patterns prove

Miller 2k Morris Miller, "Poverty as a cause of wars?" Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25 Issue 4, Winter 2000, proquest

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### World War 2 counterexample is wrong

Ferguson ‘6 Niall Ferguson, Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University and senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 85, Issue 5, September/October 2006

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### Lack of resources would disable conflict

Bennet and Nordstrom 2k D. Scott Bennet and Timothy Nordstrom, Department of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University, "Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries," Journal of Conflict Resolution, February 2000, pp.33-61

Blainey offers the alternative hypothesis about economics and war that economically challenged countries are more likely to be the target of aggressive military acts than their initiator (1973, 86). Faced with a poor target in a bad economic situation, who is faced with an unhappy populace and possibly limited resources, potential conflict initiators are likely to see opportunity. The argument also parallels the historical notion that leaders would only go to war when their coffers were full—in bad times, leaders may simply not be able to afford to go to conflict. Blainey’s argument appears to pose a challenge to diversionary conflict theory in its emphasis on what is the most likely direction of conflict. Note, however, that its prediction (weak states become targets) differs from a strategic application of diversionary conflict theory.

China is already successfully resisting US influence – it’s only a question of whether we can cooperate with them

Hiro 9 (Dilip, analyst specializing in South Asia, Central Asia, the Middle East and Islamic affairs, masters degree from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, "After Empire: The Birth of a Multipolar World," p. 271-281, [yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/after-empire-birth-multipolar-world] AD: 9-25-11, jam)

Alarmists visualized the United States being replaced by the People’s Republic of China as the dominant superpower. They saw red in Beijing stacking up U.S. Treasury bonds with the malevolent intent of twisting Uncle Sam’s arm in the none-too-distant future. They pointed out that in a reconfigured East Asia, with one-third of the global population, the PRC had become not just the economic fountain-head, surpassing Japan, but also the leader in all non-military fields, pushing America off its perch. They failed to note that by over-reacting to 9/11 attacks and mounting two major wars while reducing taxes at home, it was Bush who had bolstered – albeit inadvertently – the power and glory of the Middle Kingdom. The other school of thought tried to calm popular nerves. It assailed the concept of the zero-sum game: the gain of non-American powers becoming the automatic loss of America, and vice versa. The U.S. was quite capable of accommodating the newly empowered countries – China being the prime example – into the exclusivist club of G8 (Group of Eight most industrialized nations), and acting as the chairperson who “gently” guides a group of freshly appointed independent directors, it argued. What both schools of thought had in common was their emotional ties with America, and their undying wish to see it remain the Number One even in radically changed times, while they kept the American audience in the foreground. This approach left untapped an intellectual field that did not revolve around the United States and was not dialectical – America versus China, the West against Asia, or democracies versus autocracies. And that is the area this book has tried to cover by offering a clear-eyed assessment of the major powers, setting out their respective strengths and weaknesses, and future trends. Furthermore, noting the contemporary world’s heavy dependence on hydrocarbons to sustain or raise living standards, this volume has also dealt with Venezuela and Iran. Endowed with vast quantities of oil and gas, these two countries provide political and economic models which are at variance with what the U.S. has to offer in South America and the hydrocarbon rich Gulf region. The multi-polar world sketched in the preceding chapters consists of several major players – America, the European Union, China, Russia, and India. Since power is multi-dimensional, no single country will continue to be dominant in all fields. The modus operandi of the future is accommodation between leading powers at certain times and deterrence at others – a flexible combination of the main actors emerging to thwart the excessive ambitions of one of them. In other words, an international set-up where great powers will be able to the thwart the unbridled aims of an aspiring superpower. Back to the age-old balance of power at work. Chinese leaders were probably the first to imagine a world along these lines. They were certainly the first to call on the scholars at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) to quantify Comprehensive National Power (CNP). Now, thanks to the Academy’s pioneering work, a scientific formula exists to measure a country’s CNP – a realistic evaluation, shorn of ideology. China’s Hard-Nosed Realism In 2006 the United States scored 90.62 out of 100 on the CNP scale whereas the PRC got only of 59.10. So the alarmist school in the U.S. can rest assured that Chinese leaders are by no means thinking of the PRC catching up with America much less overtaking it. They subscribe to the dictum of Sun Zi, the ancient author of The Art of War: “To defeat the enemy without fighting is the epitome of skill.” Unsurprisingly, therefore, most of the recent CASS articles offer either analyses of the salient features of U.S. power and influence or outline tactics to block, side-step, curtail or limit them. The latest insight into the thinking of CASS scholars and Chinese leader was given by an editorial in the official China Daily. Commenting on the inauguration of Barack Obama as president in January 2009, it said, “U.S. leaders have never been shy about talking about their country’s ambition. For them, it is divinely granted destiny no matter what other nations think.” It then predicted that “Obama’s defense of U.S. interests will inevitably clash with those of other nations.”[4] The general strategy for circumventing America or molding it to constrain its foreign policy, however, was laid out a decade earlier by Qiao Liang and Wang Xiang-Sui in their book Unrestricted Warfare. Combine non-military and trans-military means; apply them in an obfuscated fashion wherever you can; and use multinational, supra-national and non-state institutions to defeat a militarily superior adversary, they recommended. Using an amalgam of these methods, Beijing has succeeded in blunting Washington’s measures against Iran, North Korea, Myanmar, Sudan and Uzbekistan while furthering its economic and diplomatic interests. [5] The PRC’s drive to strengthen its commercial ties with America has not stopped it from consistently opposing Washington’s attempts to meddle in the internal affairs of other nations under the garb of United Nations Security Council resolutions. It persisted in opposing the U.S. at the UN Security Council even when it was the only permanent member of the Council to do so – as in the case of Iraq’s Kurds in 1991. It was much later, in 1998, that the Russian foreign ministry, led by Yevgeny Primakov, mustered enough courage to spike the Bill Clinton administration’s plan to foist its unilateral interpretation of an earlier resolution on Iraq to gain UN authorization for military action against Saddam Hussein’s regime after the repeated failures of the CIA-engineered coup attempts. When, Russia, backed by China, threatened to veto Washington’s draft resolution, Clinton retreated. Due to the collaboration of China and Russia – still economically dependent on America and U.S.-influenced International Monetary Fund – the international community received its first glimpse of the workings of a multi-polar world. It was an early example of the pattern likely to become established in the coming decades, with several major powers – America, the European Union , China, Russia, India and Brazil – active on the world stage. In August 2008, as the Russian Federation hit Georgia hard after Georgian Mikheil Saakashvili ordered the shelling of Tskhinvali, the capital of the breakaway region of South Ossetia, all President Bush did was to condemn the Kremlin’s military onslaught verbally. The Russian-Georgian spat signaled the end of the U.S. acting as the sole superpower militarily. By happenstance, America’s military hegemony lasted as many years – 1991 to 2008 – as did the supremacy of the Allies after World War I, from the 1919 Versailles Treaty to the remilitarization of the demilitarized Rhineland by resurgent Germany in 1936 in violation of the above treaty.

#### Retrenchment is inevitable

Layne 9 (Christopher, Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, Ph.D., Political Science, University of California at Berkeley, and Benjamin Schwarz, literary editor and national editor of The Atlantic, Sep 29, "After the Pax," Los Angeles Times, pg. A.25, jam)

The international order that emerged after World War II has rightly been termed the Pax Americana; it's a Washington-led arrangement that has maintained political stability and promoted an open global economic system. Today, however, the Pax Americana is withering, thanks to what the National Intelligence Council in a recent report described as a "global shift in relative wealth and economic power without precedent in modern history" -- a shift that has accelerated enormously as a result of the economic crisis of 2007-2009. At the heart of this geopolitical sea change is China's robust economic growth. Not because Beijing will necessarily threaten American interests but because a newly powerful China by necessity means a relative decline in American power, the very foundation of the postwar international order. These developments remind us that changes in the global balance of power can be sudden and discontinuous rather than gradual and evolutionary. The Great Recession isn't the cause of Washington's ebbing relative power. But it has quickened trends that already had been eating away at the edifice of U.S. economic supremacy. Looking ahead, the health of the U.S. economy is threatened by a gathering fiscal storm: exploding federal deficits that could ignite runaway inflation and undermine the dollar. To avoid these perils, the U.S. will face wrenching choices. The Obama administration and the Federal Reserve have adopted policies that have dramatically increased both the supply of dollars circulating in the U.S. economy and the federal budget deficit, which both the Brookings Institution and the Congressional Budget Office estimate will exceed $1 trillion every year for at least the next decade. In the short run, these policies were no doubt necessary; nevertheless, in the long term, they will almost certainly boomerang. Add that to the persistent U.S. current account deficit, the enormous unfunded liabilities for entitlement programs and the cost of two ongoing wars, and you can see that America's long-term fiscal stability is in jeopardy. As the CBO says: "Even if the recovery occurs as projected and stimulus bill is allowed to expire, the country will face the highest debt/GDP ratio in 50 years and an increasingly unsustainable and urgent fiscal problem." This spells trouble ahead for the dollar. The financial privileges conferred on the U.S. by the dollar's unchallenged reserve currency status -- its role as the primary form of payment for international trade and financial transactions -- have underpinned the preeminent geopolitical role of the United States in international politics since the end of World War II. But already the shadow of the coming fiscal crisis has prompted its main creditors, China and Japan, to worry that in coming years the dollar will depreciate in value. China has been increasingly vocal in calling for the dollar's replacement by a new reserve currency. And Yukio Hatoyama, Japan's new prime minister, favors Asian economic integration and a single Asian currency as substitutes for eroding U.S. financial and economic power. Going forward, to defend the dollar, Washington will need to control inflation through some combination of budget cuts, tax increases and interest rate hikes. Given that the last two options would choke off renewed growth, the least unpalatable choice is to reduce federal spending. This will mean radically scaling back defense expenditures, because discretionary nondefense spending accounts for only about 20% of annual federal outlays. This in turn will mean a radical diminution of America's overseas military commitments, transforming both geopolitics and the international economy. Since 1945, the Pax Americana has made international economic interdependence and globalization possible. Whereas all states benefit absolutely in an open international economy, some states benefit more than others. In the normal course of world politics, the relative distribution of power, not the pursuit of absolute economic gains, is a country's principal concern, and this discourages economic interdependence. In their efforts to ensure a distribution of power in their favor and at the expense of their actual or potential rivals, states pursue autarkic policies -- those designed to maximize national self-sufficiency -- practicing capitalism only within their borders or among countries in a trading bloc. Thus a truly global economy is extraordinarily difficult to achieve. Historically, the only way to secure international integration and interdependence has been for a dominant power to guarantee the security of other states so that they need not pursue autarkic policies or form trading blocs to improve their relative positions. This suspension of international politics through hegemony has been the fundamental aim of U.S. foreign policy since the 1940s. The U.S. has assumed the responsibility for maintaining geopolitical stability in Europe, East Asia and the Persian Gulf, and for keeping open the lines of communication through which world trade moves. Since the Cold War's end, the U.S. has sought to preserve its hegemony by possessing a margin of military superiority so vast that it can keep any would-be great power pliant and protected. Financially, the U.S. has been responsible for managing the global economy by acting as the market and lender of last resort. But as President Obama acknowledged at the London G-20 meeting in April, the U.S. is no longer able to play this role, and the world increasingly is looking to China (and India and other emerging market states) to be the locomotives of global recovery. - Going forward, the fiscal crisis will mean that Washington cannot discharge its military functions as a hegemon either, because it can no longer maintain the power edge that has allowed it to keep the ambitions of the emerging great powers in check. The entire fabric of world order that the United States established after 1945 -- the Pax Americana -- rested on the foundation of U.S. military and economic preponderance. Remove the foundation and the structure crumbles. The decline of American power means the end of U.S. dominance in world politics and the beginning of the transition to a new constellation of world powers.

#### Framing issue – All of their heg good impacts are descriptive of US influence – we internal link turn that because our argument is that disparities in power actually hurt the US’ ability to shape world politics

Maher 11 (Richard, Max Weber postdoctoral fellow at the European University Institute, Ph.D in Political Science from Brown University, *Orbis*, 55(1), Winter, jam)

Two Ways to Measure Power in World Politics Unipolarity and primacy are two ways to describe U.S. power in contemporary world politics.2 Unipolarity and primacy are alike, and not necessarily mutually exclusive, but they remain conceptually distinct and describe different features or elements of power. What is distinctive about this era of international politics is that the United States is finding it increasingly difficult to translate its enormous advantages in the first realm of power— material power—into the second kind of power—the ability to shape events and to realize its preferred outcomes. Unipolarity: Materialist Conception of Power. Unipolarity refers to the material distribution of power—economic, military, geographic, technological— in the international system. The international system has historically been characterized by multipolarity (three or more great powers), as in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the first half of the twentieth century, or by bipolarity (two great powers), as in the Cold War. A unipolar system is one in which one state possesses capabilities that far exceed those of any other state. The post-Cold War world has been unipolar. As one world leader put it, in today’s unipolar world there is ‘‘One single center of power. One single center of force. One single center of decision making. This is the world of one master, one sovereign.’’3 Polarity is rarely unambiguous, however, and there have been differences among international relations scholars over how to characterize world politics in the post-Cold War era, and over how long this period of world politics will last. Samuel Huntington characterized post-Cold War world politics not as strictly unipolar but as ‘‘unimultipolar.’’ There was one state whose power far exceeded all the rest—the United States—but there were a number of secondary powers—China, Russia, Germany, India—that possessed considerable resources and influence, real or potential.4 Others have acknowledged the fact of unipolarity, but have asserted this is but a momentary aberration. World politics does not like imbalances of power, and other states will take measures—either individually or in combination with others—to balance U.S. power. Soon world politics will revert to the historically more common form of bipolarity or even multipolarity. 5 Others look at the impressive economic growth rates in China, India, and elsewhere and see a world in which power will be distributed around the world more evenly in coming decades.6 When thinking about power in this sense, as the sum total of a state’s material resources, the United States continues to be in a class by itself. This position is deteriorating, however, both in absolute and relative terms. Primacy: The Ability to Influence Outcomes. The other way to think about power is the ability to realize one’s own preferences or preferred outcomes, or the ability to influence other actors—usually other states but not always—to do what you want them to do. When we think of power this way, we realize that the United States’ vast resources alone often are not sufficient to realize its preferred ends. There is no perfect correlation between the resources at one’s command and the ability to realize preferred outcomes. Perhaps no other period of world politics in recent memory represents this discrepancy more acutely than today. U.S. capabilities dwarf those of any other state. Politically, diplomatically, and economically the United States remains in a preeminent position. While it hardly gets everything it wants, no other country can match U.S. influence in these realms. At the same time, from Iran, to North Korea, Pakistan, Iraq, and Afghanistan, not to mention Russia and China, the United States is seemingly not getting its way on issues central to its interests. More states are unafraid to challenge the United States (if only at the margins), ignore its blandishments, or seek to decrease their reliance or dependence on American security guarantees.

#### Err neg on all questions of hegemony – preeminence causes serial policy failure

Maher 11 (Richard, Max Weber postdoctoral fellow at the European University Institute, Ph.D in Political Science from Brown University, *Orbis*, 55(1), Winter, jam)

Distraction. Preeminent states have a tendency to seek to shape world politics in fundamental ways, which can lead to conflicting priorities and unnecessary diversions. As resources, attention, and prestige are devoted to one issue or set of issues, others are necessarily disregarded or given reduced importance. There are always trade-offs and opportunity costs in international politics, even for a state as powerful as the United States. Most states are required to define their priorities in highly specific terms. Because the preeminent state has such a large stake in world politics, it feels the need to be vigilant against any changes that could impact its short-, medium-, or longterm interests. The result is taking on commitments on an expansive number of issues all over the globe. The United States has been very active in its ambition to shape the postCold War world. It has expanded NATO to Russia's doorstep; waged war in Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan; sought to export its own democratic principles and institutions around the world; assembled an international coalition against transnational terrorism; imposed sanctions on North Korea and Iran for their nuclear programs; undertaken "nation building" in Iraq and Afghanistan; announced plans for a missile defense system to be stationed in Poland and the Czech Republic; and, with the United Kingdom, led the response to the recent global financial and economic crisis. By being so involved in so many parts of the world, there often emerges ambiguity over priorities. The United States defines its interests and obligations in global terms, and defending all of them simultaneously is beyond the pale even for a superpower like the United States. Issues that may have received benign neglect during the Cold War, for example, when U.S. attention and resources were almost exclusively devoted to its strategic competition with the Soviet Union, are now viewed as central to U.S. interests.

#### Plan causes China war – that outweighs case

#### Causes nuclear war

Glaser ’11 Charles Glaser, Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at George Washington University, “Will China’s Rise Lead to War?” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 9, Iss. 2, March/April 2011

THE PROSPECTS for avoiding intense military competition and war may be good, but growth in China's power may nevertheless require some changes in U.S. foreign policy that Washington will find disagreeable--particularly regarding Taiwan. Although it lost control of Taiwan during the Chinese Civil War more than six decades ago, China still considers Taiwan to be part of its homeland, and unification remains a key political goal for Beijing. China has made clear that it will use force if Taiwan declares independence, and much of China's conventional military buildup has been dedicated to increasing its ability to coerce Taiwan and reducing the United States' ability to intervene. Because China places such high value on Taiwan and because the United States and China--whatever they might formally agree to--have such different attitudes regarding the legitimacy of the status quo, the issue poses special dangers and challenges for the U.S.-Chinese relationship, placing it in a different category than Japan or South Korea. A crisis over Taiwan could fairly easily escalate to nuclear war, because each step along the way might well seem rational to the actors involved. Current U.S. policy is designed to reduce the probability that Taiwan will declare independence and to make clear that the United States will not come to Taiwan's aid if it does. Nevertheless, the United States would find itself under pressure to protect Taiwan against any sort of attack, no matter how it originated. Given the different interests and perceptions of the various parties and the limited control Washington has over Taipei's behavior, a crisis could unfold in which the United States found itself following events rather than leading them. Such dangers have been around for decades, but ongoing improvements in China's military capabilities may make Beijing more willing to escalate a Taiwan crisis. In addition to its improved conventional capabilities, China is modernizing its nuclear forces to increase their ability to survive and retaliate following a large-scale U.S. attack. Standard deterrence theory holds that Washington's current ability to destroy most or all of China's nuclear force enhances its bargaining position. China's nuclear modernization might remove that check on Chinese action, leading Beijing to behave more boldly in future crises than it has in past ones. A U.S. attempt to preserve its ability to defend Taiwan, meanwhile, could fuel a conventional and nuclear arms race. Enhancements to U.S. offensive targeting capabilities and strategic ballistic missile defenses might be interpreted by China as a signal of malign U.S. motives, leading to further Chinese military efforts and a general poisoning of U.S.-Chinese relations.

#### Goes nuclear and global – draws in Russia and North Korea

Hunkovic 9 (Lee J., American Military University, "The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict," [www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf], jam)

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it. However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

#### A vast power gap makes overstretch inevitable – policymaker psychology will drive involvement in conflicts

Walt 2 (Stephen, professor of international affairs at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, *Naval War College Review*, 55, Spring, [www.irchina.org/xueren/foreign/view.asp?id=83] AD: 9-24-11, jam)

Hubris Can Hurt A second pitfall is the opposite of the first—when a nation is as strong as the United States, there is a tendency for its leaders to assume that they can do almost anything. Public support for an ambitious foreign policy may be thin, but U.S. leaders may ignore that fact if they believe they can accomplish a great deal at a relatively low cost. They may also find it difficult to avoid being dragged into various quagmires and responsibilities in many parts of the world, because America’s present margin of superiority makes it harder to draw the line against further commitments. As the late Senator Richard Russell once warned, “If America has the capacity to go anywhere and do anything, we will always be going somewhere and doing something.” Consider the past decade. In addition to the various achievements discussed above, the United States tried to broker a final Arab-Israeli peace settlement, re-create a stable multiethnic democracy in Bosnia in the wake of a bloody civil war, and stabilize the entire Balkan region in the aftermath of the war in Kosovo. The United States also provided logistic support for peacekeeping efforts in East Timor, Cambodia, and Sierra Leone; attempted to cement Western influence in the Black Sea and Caspian regions; and tried to get India and Pakistan to refrain from testing nuclear weapons. At the same time, it also committed itself to building a national missile defense system in the face of foreign opposition and enormous technical obstacles. American leaders have also worked to liberalize the world economy, establish a constructive relationship with a rising China, and achieve a workable agreement to combat global warming. Now consider what the campaign against terrorism has added to America’s overloaded foreign policy agenda. To support its military operations in Afghanistan (and possibly elsewhere), the United States has taken on new security obligations in Pakistan and Uzbekistan. To keep the coalition together and rebuild relations with the Arab world, the United States is trying to convince Israel and the Palestinians to make additional concessions after more than a year of bloody violence. To stabilize the Pervez Musharraf government and encourage it to sever its ties to Islamic extremists, Washington is providing economic aid to Pakistan and trying to reduce tensions between Pakistan and India. Having toppled the Taliban, the United States must now take on the challenge of nation building in an impoverished region where it has little background or experience. To ensure that Al-Qaeda does not reemerge somewhere else, the United States is trying to root out terrorist cells in a host of other countries and attempting to cut off the covert financial flows that nurture these networks. To accomplish any one of these goals will be difficult; to achieve the entire agenda will be nearly impossible. Given these ambitions, it is hardly surprising that the United States does not accomplish everything it tries to do. The real lesson, however, is that strong states are invariably tempted to take on extremely ambitious goals—and they often find this temptation impossible to resist. In baseball, a batter who “swings for the fences” may hit more home runs than others but will probably strike out more often, too. Weaker states cannot accomplish as much as strong ones, but they may be better at recognizing the limits of what they can realistically hope to achieve and be less likely to overextend themselves. There is an obvious tension between the first two pitfalls, but not a complete contradiction. On the one hand, the fact that foreign policy simply is not very important to most Americans (because the United States is already in very good shape) reduces public support for ambitious foreign policies. On the other hand, fifty years of international activism and America’s extraordinary capabilities can lead its leaders to believe that they can achieve almost anything at an acceptable cost. The danger, of course, is that Washington will establish commitments and pursue goals for which there is little domestic support, only to be blindsided by public opposition should the costs exceed the low initial expectations.

#### Epistemic bias--Heg impacts are exaggerated for domestic support

Layne ’97 Christopher Layne, Visiting Associate Professor at the Naval Postgraduate School, “From Preponderance to Offshore Balancing,” International Security, Summer 1997

The security/interdependence nexus results in the exaggeration of threats to American strategic interests because it requires the United States to defend its core interests by intervening in the peripheries. There are three reasons for this. First, as Johnson points out, order-maintenance strategies are biased inherently toward threat exaggeration. Threats to order generate an anxiety “that has at its center the fear of the unknown. It is not just security, but the pattern of order upon which the sense of security depends that is threatened.”4’ Second, because the strategy of preponderance requires U.S. intervention in places that concededly have no intrinsic strategic value, U.S. policymakers are compelled to overstate the dangers to American interests to mobilize domestic support for their policies.42 Third, the tendency to exaggerate threats is tightly linked to the strategy of preponderance’s concern with maintaining U.S. credibility. The diplomatic historian Robert J. McMahon has observed that since 1945 U.S. policymakers consistently have asserted that American credibility is “among the most critical of all foreign policy objectives.” As Khalilzad makes clear, they still are obsessed with the need to preserve America’s reputation for honoring its security commitments: “The credibility of U.S. alliances can be undermined if key allies, such as Germany and Japan, believe that the current. arrangements do not deal adequately with threats to their security. It could also be undermined if, over an extended period, the United States is perceived as lacking the will or capability to lead in protecting their interests.” Credibility is believed to be crucial if the extended deterrence guarantees on which the strategy of preponderance rests are to remain robust. Preponderance’s concern with credibility leads to the belief that U.S. commitments are interdependent. As Thomas C. Schelling has put it: “Few parts of the world are intrinsically worth the risk of serious war by themselves. but defending them or running risks to protect them may preserve one’s commitments to action in other parts of the world at later times.”45 If others perceive that the United States has acted irresolutely in a specific crisis, they will conclude that it will not honor its commitments in future crises. Hence, as happened repeatedly in the Cold War, the United States has taken military action in peripheral areas to demonstrate—both to allies and potential adversaries—that it will uphold its security obligations in core areas.

#### Transition to multipolarity solves better

Weber et al ‘7Professor of Political Science and Director of the Institute for International Studies at Berkeley (Steven with Naazneen Barma, Matthew Kroenig, and Ely Ratner, Ph.D. Candidates at the University of California Berkeley and Research Fellows at its New Era Foreign Policy Center, [“How Globalization Went Bad,” Foreign Policy, Issue 158, January/February)

Axiom 1: Above a certain threshold of power, the rate at which new global problems are generated will exceed the rate at which old problems are fixed. Power does two things in international politics: It enhances the capability of a state to do things, but it also increases the number of things that a state must worry about. At a certain point, the latter starts to over take the former. It's the familiar law of diminishing returns. Because powerful states have large spheres of influence and their security and economic interests touch every region of the world, they are threatened by the risk of things going wrong—anywhere. That is particularly true for the United States, which leverages its ability to go anywhere and do anything through massive debt. No one knows exactly when the law of diminishing returns will kick in. But, historically, it starts to happen long before a single great power dominates the entire globe, which is why large empires from Byzantium to Rome have always reached a point of unsustainability. That may already be happening to the United States today, on issues ranging from oil dependency and nuclear proliferation to pandemics and global warming. What Axiom 1 tells you is that more U.S. power is not the answer; it's actually part of the problem. A multipolar world would almost certainly manage the globe's pressing problems more effectively. The larger the number of great powers in the global system, the greater the chance that at least one of them would exercise some control over a given combination of space, other actors, and problems. Such reasoning doesn't rest on hopeful notions that the great powers will work together. They might do so. But even if they don't, the result is distributed governance, where some great power is interested in most every part of the world through productive competition. Axiom 2: In an increasingly networked world, places that fall between the networks are very dangerous places—and there will be more ungoverned zones when there is only one network to join. The second axiom acknowledges that highly connected networks can be efficient, robust, and resilient to shocks. But in a highly connected world, the pieces that fall between the networks are increasingly shut off from the benefits of connectivity. These problems fester in the form of failed states, mutate like pathogenic bacteria, and, in some cases, reconnect in subterranean networks such as al Qaeda. The truly dangerous places are the points where the subterranean networks touch the mainstream of global politics and economics. What made Afghanistan so dangerous under the Taliban was not that it was a failed state. It wasn't. It was a partially failed and partially connected state that worked the interstices of globalization through the drug trade, counterfeiting, and terrorism. Can any single superpower monitor all the seams and back alleys of globalization? Hardly. In fact, a lone hegemon is unlikely to look closely at these problems, because more pressing issues are happening elsewhere, in places where trade and technology are growing. By contrast, a world of several great powers is a more interest-rich environment in which nations must look in less obvious places to find new sources of advantage. In such a system, it's harder for troublemakers to spring up, because the cracks and seams of globalization are held together by stronger ties. Axiom 3: Without a real chance to find useful allies to counter a superpower, opponents will try to neutralize power, by going underground, going nuclear, or going ''bad." Axiom 3 is a story about the preferred strategies of the weak. It's a basic insight of international relations that states try to balance power. They protect themselves by joining groups that can hold a hegemonic threat at bay. But what if there is no viable group to join? In today's unipolar world, every nation from Venezuela to North Korea is looking for a way to constrain American power. But in the unipolar world, it's harder for states to join together to do that. So they turn to other means. They play a different game. Hamas, Iran, Somalia, North Korea, and Venezuela are not going to become allies anytime soon. Each is better off finding other ways to make life more difficult for Washington. Going nuclear is one way. Counterfeiting U.S. currency is another. Raising uncertainty about oil supplies is perhaps the most obvious method of all. Here's the important downside of unipolar globalization. In a world with multiple great powers, many of these threats would be less troublesome. The relatively weak states would have a choice among potential partners with which to ally, enhancing their influence. Without that more attractive choice, facilitating the dark side of globalization becomes the most effective means of constraining American power

#### Decline now—rising challengers and erosion in political, military and economic cred

Layne ’12 Christopher Layne, Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, noted neorealist, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the *Pax Americana*,” International Studies Quarterly (2012) 56, 203-213

Some twenty years after the Cold War’s end, it now is evident that both the 1980s declinists and the unipolar pessimists were right after all. The Unipolar Era has ended and the Unipolar Exit has begun. The Great Recession has underscored the reality of US decline, and only ‘‘denialists’’ can now bury their heads in the sand and maintain otherwise. To be sure, the Great Recession itself is not the cause either of American decline or the shift in global power, both of which are the culmination of decades-long processes driven by the big, impersonal forces of history. However, it is fair to say the Great Recession has both accelerated the causal forces driving these trends and magnified their impact. There are two drivers of American decline, one external and one domestic. The external driver of US decline is the emergence of new great powers in world politics and the unprecedented shift in the center of global economic power from the EuroAtlantic area to Asia. In this respect, the relative decline of the United States and the end of unipolarity are linked inextricably: the rise of new great powers—especially China—is in itself the most tangible evidence of the erosion of the United States’ power. China’s rise signals unipolarity’s end. Domestically, the driver of change is the relative—and in some ways absolute—decline in America’s economic power, the looming fiscal crisis confronting the United States, and increasing doubts about the dollar’s long-term hold on reserve currency status. Unipolarity’s demise marks the end of era of the post-World War II Pax Americana. When World War II ended, the United States, by virtue of its overwhelming military and economic supremacy, was incontestably the most powerful actor in the international system. Indeed, 1945 was the United States’ first unipolar moment. The United States used its commanding, hegemonic position to construct the postwar international order—the Pax Americana— which endured for more than six decades. During the Cold War, the Pax Americana reflected the fact that outside the Soviet sphere, the United States was the preponderant power in the three regions of the world it cared most about: Western Europe, East Asia, and the Persian Gulf. The Pax Americana rested on the foundational pillars of US military dominance and economic leadership and was buttressed by two supporting pillars: America’s ideological appeal (‘‘soft power’’) and the framework of international institutions that the United States built after 1945. Following the Cold War’s end, the United States used its second unipolar moment to consolidate the Pax Americana by expanding both its geopolitical and ideological ambitions. In the Great Recession’s aftermath, however, the economic foundation of the Pax Americana has crumbled, and its ideational and institutional pillars have been weakened. Although the United States remains preeminent militarily, the rise of new great powers like China, coupled with US fiscal and economic constraints, means that over the next decade or two the United States’ military dominance will be challenged. The decline of American power means the end of US dominance in world politics and a transition to a new constellation of world power. Without the ‘‘hard’’ power (military and economic) upon which it was built, the Pax Americana is doomed to wither in the early twenty-first century. Indeed, because of China’s great-power emergence, and the United States’ own domestic economic weaknesses, it already is withering.

## 1NR

### Elections DA

#### Probability—incredibly likely flashpoint for global escalation

Williams, Professor –Social Sciences - Indian Institute of Technology, 10 (Peril Awaits at the Strait of Hormuz, <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/2557996/posts>)

The Gulf-Southwest Asia region has always been a **hyper-**flash point of **global** conflict due to the dual strategic persistence of the Arab-Israel conflict and the geo-strategic and geo-economic rivalries over oil and its supplies across the critical sea gates of Straits of Hormuz and the Bab-el-Mandab straits. This has resulted in the near permanent forward basing of US and allied naval and air forces in the region with dedicated theater commands along with naval air assets with prepositioned amphibious and expeditionary capabilities. In recent years, the stakes of heightened conflict has increased by vast proportions by the intertwining of the conflicts in Iraq, the nuclear and missile proliferation in Iran and the domino effect that has followed by the Arab states. Iran holds the position of a pivotal state in the Gulf Region and has been energized in its quest to seek a great power status leveraging its Shiite ideology over the vast numbers of the Sunni dominated Southwest Asian region. Iran also has a civilization complex of being the Persian civilization and its affirmed superiority over the Arabs in its geo-historical contexts. Controlling the Straits of Hormuz and the sea gates in the region that has the densest energy-laden shipping and leveraging its enormous oil and natural gas assets into a regional geo-economic and geo-strategic grand strategy matrix has been Iran’s ambitions. Contending Iran in its aggressive quest of power expansion in its geo-strategic and religious ideology has been the US-western allied Arab states and the lone free democratic state of Israel. Geo-strategic importance of the Strait: The maritime archipelagic framework of the Gulf-Southwest Asian region is characterized by the Persian Gulf (also known as “Gulf” avoiding the contending Persian and Arab nomenclature claims), Strait of Hormuz and Gulf of Oman constituting a primary jugular of the sea way of the region. The topography of the Strait is complex with the narrowest point the Strait being 21 miles wide. The shipping lanes consist of two-mile wide channels for inbound and outbound tanker traffic, as well as a two-mile wide buffer zone. Iran’s access to the Strait and the pivotal role as a littoral state to control shipping movements with the capability to jeopardize international shipping has been a critical sinew of strength. In terms of its power profile, Iran could marshal its economic, military and demographic power to overwhelm the fragile states of the Arabian Peninsula that includes the regional giant Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States. The geo-strategic significance of the Strait of Hormuz would continue to increase in its criticality owing to Iranian motivations-capabilities of blocking oil shipping in the event of punitive actions against Tehran through very robust asymmetric naval capabilities of the Iranian navy and the sea-based elements of the IRGC (Iranian Revolutionary Guards Council). Adding to these capabilities, would be Iranian ballistic and cruise missiles with nuclear or other WMD payloads that constitutes the critical gravity of threat in the region to the regional states, international shipping and for powers like China and India which have very critical hydrocarbon stakes in the region. The Iranian move to close the strait would have a very steep impact of jeopardizing the oil trade 6 External powers like France and India have increased considerable offshore access and basing presence in the region with naval support facilities for France in the United Arab Emirates where French naval special operation forces have access facilities along with forward deployment of French warships. Similarly, India has access and naval support facilities in Qatar. The Indian commitment includes a substantive naval security guarantee that would secure the offshore assets of Qatar and provides for the joint venture in production of weapons and military equipment. The maritime cooperation agreement provides India with a strategic naval base in the Gulf region. The India-Qatar maritime security initiative provides India and Qatar with a convergence of Indian naval power with Qatari naval forces to combat the variety of maritime asymmetric threats of terrorism, piracy and securing the offshore oil installations. It thus brings India into the Gulf Region with a secure access agreement. Four, the role of the Israeli Navy in the region adds to the interesting complexity and power balance in the naval theatre. Even as the Iranian clandestine nuclear weapons program races ahead, with the possible targeting of Iranian nuclear-industrial estate being contemplated by the US and allied western powers, Israel has an autonomous naval role in the region with several of its Saar-V class warships outfitted with Delilah standoff missiles with high powered microwave warheads and its German Dolphin class submarines armed with its Popeye Cruise missiles (of ranges 1500km) with a nuclear payload of 200kg have been in frequent deployment in the Gulf Region. This deployment brings to fore the increasing critical importance of nuclear tipped land attack cruise missiles in preemptive strikes against hardened Iranian targets in a prospective joint US-led strike against Iranian nuclear installations. Five, In an event of a conflagration in the Strait of Hormuz, there are increasing possibilities of an Iranian asymmetric move to use chemical or even radiation tipped warheads that could completely wreck civilian shipping with enormous primary and collateral loss and the crippling of shipping leading to an intense bottleneck preventing the entry of US-lead western allied intervention forces. The possibilities of such scenarios serve as important operational options for an Iranian leadership that is determined to stall a US-led preemptive strike. These naval operational realities cloud and condition the naval theatre of the Strait of Hormuz that is increasingly vulnerable and prone to assertive asymmetric strikes / counter strikes by Iran. Sources of Iranian Conduct and Responses: Iran’s template of operational conduct and responses is influenced by several political, economic, religious-ideological, regional rivalry and military factors. Iran is being painted as an irrational actor with an overdose obsession on brinkmanship. While the radical religious clerical leadership and the vanguard of the revolution viz: IRGC (Iranian Revolutionary Guards Council) would like to ratchet and escalate the conflicts in the region by the attempt of a WMD strike in the Strait of Hormuz and even daring targeting Israel, the Iranians in their strategic calculus have always been calculated in their responses. The penchant of an Iranian overdrive by an asymmetric operational strategy either by missile strikes or by naval disruptions could be either as an initiative to subdue the militarily weaker but the oil-rich Sunni Gulf Arab states and Saudi Arabia or as an attempt to deflect US-Israeli targeting by inciting the Hezbollah-Hamas terrorist brigades which are in effect the auxiliary units of the IRGC. A second source of Iranian strategic conduct emerges from its maritime aspirations to control the Gulf and Caspian Sea. With both seas being critically important as oil and natural gas rich repositories, Iran would prefer to maintain sea-control and sea-denial capabilities employing an asymmetric operational approach of sea-based strike missiles, submarines and aggressive naval posturing that could dent the effectiveness of any naval interventionist force. The third possible source of Iranian asymmetric conduct could come from its keen interest in developing EMP weapons (Electromagnetic Pulse) that could have perilous consequences both for onshore and offshore assets. In the last eight years, Iran has tested its missiles over the Caspian Sea with a potential EMP effect. With such serious intent, an Iranian attempt either to launch a Shahab-3 missile with an EMP payload off the US coasts from an innocent looking freighter or even using the same in the approaches of the Strait of Hormuz off the Arabian Sea coast could simply paralyze all interventionist forces. Iranian responses to an offensive strike could include the intense barrage of sea-skimming supersonic anti-ship missiles. The Iranian arsenal includes anti-ship missiles like the C-802 and Kowsar (the Chinese Silkworms and the Russian Sunburns) The C-802 anti-ship missiles are missiles that originate from China. Kowsar anti-ship missiles are basically land-based anti-ship missiles (land-to-sea missiles) which can dodge electronic jamming systems. Deploying an aggressive package of supersonic anti-ship cruise missiles and the employ of EMP weapons could be a deadly cocktail that would complicate intervention and set the stage for more escalation of strikes against Iran and counter strikes that would cripple the maritime oil commerce skyrocketing the oil price over US $300 per barrel or even more dealing with a decimation to the global economy.

#### Merely the absence of Obama pressure causes Israeli strikes—triggers our impacts

Hayden 12 Tom is a writer and blogger. “The coming war with Iran Is GOP rhetoric setting the stage for an Israeli attack?” 2/19/12 <http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/coming-war-with-iran/content?oid=5104826>

Standing in the way, according to the article, is President Barack Obama, whom the Israelis suspect “has abandoned any aggressive strategy that would ensure the prevention of a nuclear Iran and is merely playing a game of words to appease them.” The same conclusion has been suggested elsewhere. So the stage is set for nuclear brinksmanship in an American presidential-election year. The role of Republican candidates is to ensure that the second condition is met, that of “tacit support” for an Israeli strike, even if forced by political pressure. The balance of forces is lopsided at present, with most Americans worried about Iran and unprepared to resist a sudden outbreak of war, Congress—dominated by supporters of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee—and the media are not prepared to oppose a strike. A short “successful” war—a highly dubious prospect—would be accepted by American public opinion until serious consequences set in afterward. Any public expression of protest against this war is far better than silence, of course. But the greatest opportunity for protest may be in the arena of the presidential-election drama now playing out. It is fair and accurate to say both Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich are collaborating, for political reasons, to push Obama into war during the presidential election, with Rick Santorum on the bench if needed. The New York Times has also now documented, in a front-page story, the millions spent by casino billionaire Sheldon Adelson and his Israeli wife to save Gingrich’s presidential campaign. Adelson was pleased when Gingrich, seemingly out of nowhere, recently condemned the Palestinians as “an invented people.” Adelson owns a newpaper chain in Israel supportive of the Netanyahu government and is a vocal opponent of a negotiated settlement. No one in the mainstream media so far has written the story of Romney’s past consulting and business partnership with Israel’s Prime Minister Netanyahu at Boston Consulting Group, but his campaign rhetoric echoes Netanyahu’s position, that Obama can’t be trusted to prevent Iran from getting the bomb. The Romney and Gingrich campaigns create an unrelenting pressure on Obama to support an attack on Iran with little countervailing pressure. But neither the Republicans nor the Israeli hawks are comfortable being charged with using political pressure to start a war. Santorum, whose Republican ranking is third, is equal to Romney and Gingrich in his hawkish position toward Iran. Santorum has deep support from right-wing Christian groups who believe that war in the Middle East will hasten the Second Coming. Avoiding war with Iran may be Obama’s best option in policy and politics, if he can navigate the campaign winds. The question is whether any organized force has his back.

#### Obama prevents Israeli first strike

Hayden 12 Tom is a writer and blogger. “The coming war with Iran Is GOP rhetoric setting the stage for an Israeli attack?” 2/19/12 <http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/coming-war-with-iran/content?oid=5104826>

Standing in the way, according to the article, is President Barack Obama, whom the Israelis suspect “has abandoned any aggressive strategy that would ensure the prevention of a nuclear Iran and is merely playing a game of words to appease them.” The same conclusion has been suggested elsewhere. So the stage is set for nuclear brinksmanship in an American presidential-election year. The role of Republican candidates is to ensure that the second condition is met, that of “tacit support” for an Israeli strike, even if forced by political pressure. The balance of forces is lopsided at present, with most Americans worried about Iran and unprepared to resist a sudden outbreak of war, Congress—dominated by supporters of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee—and the media are not prepared to oppose a strike. A short “successful” war—a highly dubious prospect—would be accepted by American public opinion until serious consequences set in afterward. Any public expression of protest against this war is far better than silence, of course. But the greatest opportunity for protest may be in the arena of the presidential-election drama now playing out. It is fair and accurate to say both Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich are collaborating, for political reasons, to push Obama into war during the presidential election, with Rick Santorum on the bench if needed. The New York Times has also now documented, in a front-page story, the millions spent by casino billionaire Sheldon Adelson and his Israeli wife to save Gingrich’s presidential campaign. Adelson was pleased when Gingrich, seemingly out of nowhere, recently condemned the Palestinians as “an invented people.” Adelson owns a newpaper chain in Israel supportive of the Netanyahu government and is a vocal opponent of a negotiated settlement. No one in the mainstream media so far has written the story of Romney’s past consulting and business partnership with Israel’s Prime Minister Netanyahu at Boston Consulting Group, but his campaign rhetoric echoes Netanyahu’s position, that Obama can’t be trusted to prevent Iran from getting the bomb. The Romney and Gingrich campaigns create an unrelenting pressure on Obama to support an attack on Iran with little countervailing pressure. But neither the Republicans nor the Israeli hawks are comfortable being charged with using political pressure to start a war. Santorum, whose Republican ranking is third, is equal to Romney and Gingrich in his hawkish position toward Iran. Santorum has deep support from right-wing Christian groups who believe that war in the Middle East will hasten the Second Coming. Avoiding war with Iran may be Obama’s best option in policy and politics, if he can navigate the campaign winds. The question is whether any organized force has his back.

#### Obama pressure is key to constrain Israel from striking

Feiffer ’12 John Feiffer, co-director of Foreign Policy in Focus, “Bribing Israel,” Huffington Post, 3/13/2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-feffer/bribing-israel\_b\_1342357.html

The bully came to Washington. The American president told him in no uncertain terms that the United States would not support a military attack on Iran at this moment. The bully met with 13,000 of his U.S. supporters in an effort to pressure the White House. It didn't work. The bully went home empty-handed. This is the conventional news analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's recent visit to Washington, his discussion with President Barack Obama, his speech at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), and his consequent loss of face. Many elements of this analysis are true. So, for instance, it's certainly true that the Israeli hawk failed to convince the Obama administration to green-light an attack during the so-called zone of immunity before Iran achieves its putative desire of membership in the nuclear club. It's certainly true that Netanyahu's hard-line speech on Iran quite nearly brought down the house at the AIPAC shindig, where the audience included more than half the members of Congress. And finally, the Obama administration did indeed hold to its position of "diplomacy backed by pressure." For many observers, Obama has gone at least a pawn up in the intricate chess game with Israel. The president "established a position his critics may find hard to assail," concluded The Guardian's Chris McGeal. "He forced those many members of Congress and beyond who have conflated America's interests with Israel's on to the back foot by saying that on Iran there are differences -- and he will serve U.S. interests first." James Fallows in The Atlantic agreed: "The question is whether this tone genuinely buys Obama more time and freedom of action, rather than constraining his next decisions. I am betting we will look back on this as a chessmaster move. I am hoping that, too." But this story of Obama the diplomat standing up to Netanyahu the bully omits some important information. During Netanyahu's visit, the Obama administration reportedly offered Israel a package of advanced military technology, including bunker-busting bombs and long-range refueling planes, as long as it postponed any attacks on Iran until 2013.

 In other words, Obama wasn't only buying time, he was bribing Israel to prevent the kind of October surprise -- or even July surprise -- that might derail his reelection bid. And he was doing so with precisely the weapons that Israel could use to execute an attack on Iran. Bribery is deeply embedded in the U.S.-Israeli relationship. Half of all U.S. overseas military assistance, after all, goes to Israel. That's $3 billion a year. And it will continue to rise every year until 2017, thanks to an agreement worked out under the Bush administration. And military assistance to Israel is unlike assistance to other countries in quality as well as quantity. "Israel's $3 billion is put almost immediately into an interest-bearing account with the Federal Reserve Bank," explains Walter Pincus in the Washington Post. "The interest, collected by Israel on its military aid balance, is used to pay down debt from earlier Israeli non-guaranteed loans from the United States. Another unique aspect of the assistance package is that about 25 percent of it can be used to buy arms from Israeli companies. No other country has that privilege." That Israel has been cutting its military spending -- an otherwise admirable decision -- means that the United States is increasingly picking up the slack. It also means that Israel, in theory, has increased its dependence on the Pentagon, which should translate into more U.S. political leverage over Israel. But with rare exceptions, the United States has not exercised this leverage. Israel, as I have argued elsewhere, is to the United States what North Korea is to China. These client states take everything from their putative benefactors except advice. Indifferent to international law, armed to the teeth, and isolated in their respective regions, Israel and North Korea dance to their own tune, however discordant it might be for everybody else.

#### DA turns the case: Romney cuts renewables, only Obama re-elect solves

Elisa Wood, AOL Energy, “Fossil fuels: more less or the same under Obama or Romney” 9/4/12 <http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/04/fossil-fuels-more-less-or-the-same-under-obama-or-romney/>

Romney's plan focuses heavily on oil and gas and calls for fast-tracked permits and reduced regulation to make it easier to develop energy projects. He would relinquish to the states control over development on federal lands. He proposes a five-year leasing program to "aggressively" pursue offshore energy development, beginning in Virginia and the Carolinas.¶ While Romney also addresses renewable energy, calling for easier siting rules and basic research funding, his focus is clearly on fossil fuels. ¶ Arno Harris, CEO of Recurrent Energy and board chairman of the Solar Energy Industries Association, charges that Romney is pursuing an "archaic" policy of slash and burn. "Slash renewables and focus on things you can burn: coal and gas and oil."**¶** Meanwhile, Obama emphasizes independence from foreign oil and pursuit of clean energy and efficiency. Obama's critics paint him as obstructing fossil fuels.

#### Bombing Iran will lead to worse nationalistic Iran

Keller 12

Bill, NY TIMES, is an Op-Ed columnist for The New York Times. Prior to this role he was the executive editor of The Times, a role he held since 2003. “Bomb-Bomb-Bomb, Bomb-Bomb Iran?” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/23/opinion/keller-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-bomb-iran.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all>

The point of tough sanctions, of course, is to force Iranians to the bargaining table, where we can do a deal that removes the specter of a nuclear-armed Iran. (You can find [some thoughts](http://keller.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/01/22/how-about-not-bombing-iran/) on what such a deal might entail on my blog.) But the mistrust is so deep, and the election-year pressure to act with manly resolve is so intense, that it’s hard to imagine the administration would feel free to accept an overture from Tehran. Anything short of a humiliating, unilateral Iranian climb-down would be portrayed by the armchair warriors as an Obama surrender. Likewise, if Israel does decide to strike out on its own, Bibi Netanyahu knows that candidate Obama will feel immense pressure to go along. That short-term paradox comes wrapped up in a long-term paradox: an attack on Iran is almost certain to unify the Iranian people around the mullahs and provoke the supreme leader to redouble Iran’s nuclear pursuits, only deeper underground this time, and without international inspectors around. Over at the Pentagon, you sometimes hear it put this way: Bombing Iran is the best way to guarantee exactly what we are trying to prevent.

#### Strikes devastate US economic recovery

Hussain 9-12 Murtaza Hussain, Toronto-based writer and analyst focused on issues related to Middle Eastern politics, “Why war with Iran would spell disaster,” Al-Jazeera, 9/12/2012, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/09/201291194236970294.html

The fragile American economic recovery would be completely upended were Iran to target global energy supplies in the event of war, an act which would be both catastrophic and highly likely if US Iran hawks get their way. Not only does the country itself sit atop some of the largest oil and natural gas reserves on the planet, its close proximity to the shipping routes and oil resources of its neighbours means that in the event of war, its first response would likely be to choke off the global supply of crude; a tactic for which its military defences have in fact been specifically designed. The Strait of Hormuz, located in the Persian Gulf is the shipping point for more than 20 per cent of the world's petroleum. Iran is known to have advanced Silkworm missile batteries buried at strategic points around the strait to make it impassable in the event of war, and has developed "swarming" naval tactics to neutralise larger, less mobile ships such as those used by the US Navy. While Iran could never win in straightforward combat, it has developed tactics of asymmetrical warfare that can effectively inflict losses on a far stronger enemy and render the strait effectively closed to naval traffic. The price of oil would immediately skyrocket, by some estimates upwards several hundred dollars a barrel, shattering the already tenuous steps the US and other Western economies are taking towards recovery. Former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has said a war with Iran could drag out years and would have economic consequences "devastating for the average American"; but these facts are conspicuously absent in public discussion of the war.
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### T-Reduce Restrictions

#### A. Interp: “Reduce” means to bring down to a smaller size.

Random House Dictionary, 2009, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reduce

 reduce Use reduce in a Sentence –verb (used with object) 1. to bring down to a smaller extent, size, amount, number, etc.: to reduce one's weight by 10 pounds.

#### B. Violation: Aff doesn’t decrease number of restrictions on nuclear power production, just shifts those restrictions from the NRC to DHS.

Michael Munson, 2011 JD Candidate at the College of William and Mary, “Averting nuclear 9/11: the need to move beyond NEPA and transition to a Homeland-Security-administered infrastructure security statement,” 35 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 335, Fall 2010.

The Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"), created in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, has always had as one of its central missions the protection of so- called "critical infrastructure." n240 The Department defines such critical infrastructure as "the assets, systems, and networks, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that their incapacitation or destruction would have a debilitating effect on security, national economic security, public health or safety, or any combination thereof." n241¶ The Undersecretary of Homeland Security for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection has, among his many duties, the responsibility "[t]o integrate relevant information, analyses, and vulnerability assessments" n242 as well as to "develop a comprehensive national plan for securing the key resources and critical infrastructure of the United States, including power production, generation, and distribution systems." n243¶ [\*365] ¶ Pursuant to its explicit, statutory responsibility for the security of nuclear power plants and spent fuel storage, the DHS has instituted its own independent security assessment program for such facilities called the "Comprehensive Review." n244 Its objective in instituting this policy is to "determine the security and response capabilities of the facilities and their surrounding community." n245 Additionally, the DHS has instituted a "Buffer Zone Plans" program, which seeks to "identify and recommend security measures and local law enforcement coordination for the area surrounding the facility . . . ." n246¶ Given this clear congressional mandate, it seems worth asking why the NRC is involved in nuclear plant security at all. If the chief security threat to nuclear power facilities is a terrorist attack, and if the DHS has been given the ultimate responsibility for protecting those plants against such attacks, why not give the agency that is the expert in counter-terrorism the ability to truly test and implement its recommendations?¶ Moving the DBT and FOF testing program to the DHS would accomplish two things. First, it would remove the appearance and the reality of impropriety that currently permeates relations between the NRC and private sector utility companies. n247 Rather than removing certain scenarios or weapons from the FOF table in response to industry complaints, the DHS could use its knowledge about the actual capabilities and intentions of terrorists to create a realistic testing regime. It could work in concert with the NRC to approve licenses and continue to test facilities in light of new terrorist threat information.

#### C. Standards

#### Predictable limits: explodes aff mechanism ground by allowing for regulation through any number of unpredictable executive agencies. Err neg given huge number of energy ground and mechanisms.

#### Neg ground: shifting restrictions between agencies takes out all disad links because of double regulation. Makes it impossible to be neg and forces bad generics.

#### D. Voter for fairness and education. Evaluate the round in terms of competing interruptions. Prevents judge intervention.

### Deleuze K

#### Their notion of trauma-time makes an affirmative relation to singularity impossible by alienating the subject from a traumatic event, displacing it into the ‘past’ as something which ‘returns.’ Everything is judged against the negativity of the traumatic event—“modern politics is founded in the moment the plane hit the towers, and this is distinct from all the other whale hunts.” This totalization reduces politics to reactivity.

Lorraine ‘5 Tamsin Lorraine, “Ahab and Becoming-Whale: The Nomadic Subject in Smooth Space,” Deleuze and Space, ed. Buchanan and Lambert, 2005, 170-173

Deleuze's conception of individuality suggests that the self as a kind of thing with certain attributes is no more than a state of relative equilibrium comprising a convergence of multiple lines of force of myriad and heterogeneous elements that is always about to move into another state. These lines of force, for language speakers like ourselves, are composed of symbolic as well as physical elements. Just as a physical body can be at rest and a person feel a moment of stability as a self, so can a belief or obsession propel a body into motion. To conceive of the individual in terms of one of its states of equilibrium is to deny its immersion in a world of becoming where it both affects and is affected by other forms of becoming. Normative subjectivity tends to emphasise states of equilibrium and assimilate its space and time to socially recognisable coordinates. A grid-like conception of space suggests fixed coordinates with respect to which any and all movement can be mapped. This allows us to conceive of space as a uniform void inhabited by a shared reality. A chronological conception of time suggests a temporal grid of instants that allows the coordination of different temporal perspectives according to a set of logically compatible happenings. This allows us to conceive of the world in terms of static entities that can be located within a homogeneous container of time in the way that static objects can be located in space conceived as an empty container. Ahab, as a nomadic subject following a line of flight that changes the nature of the whale hunting multiplicity, experiences a deterritorialised space and time. It is the anomalous nature of the space-time block he shares with Moby-Dick that allows him to free himself from the refrains of life marked out with Others. His example demonstrates just how enticing - and how risky - entering deterritorialised space-times can be. Deleuze's (and Guattari's) notion of the virtual challenges conventional understandings of time. The past as a transcendental field of virtual relations includes relations that defy chronology; Ahab's trauma may have happened in the past, but in his obsessive pursuit of Moby- Dick it is as if that past moment and the present are directly linked. For Deleuze, the past is always present - it insists in the present configuration of forces that inform our situation with virtual forces that may unfold in more than one way. Like the processes of a body or the speech patterns of a poem being read aloud, the past is brought into the present through the force of implicit patterns and relations that are never actualised as well as those that are. This past is not the representable past of a collective history, but a non-personal past that exceeds any narrative of a recognisable set of identities. And yet a novel, a painting, a theory can release some of these virtual possibilities by acting as a vector of force entering into a field of forces with unprecedented effects. Deleuze's (and Guattari's) notion of the virtual likewise challenges conventional understandings of space. The transcendental field of the virtual relations of movements include relations that defy the notion of space as a universal grid within which objects can be located. Just as the events of sense have virtual relations that may never be actualised in an embodied thinker, so do spatial haecceities have virtual relations that insist in the experience of embodied perceivers even if they are imperceptible. While the normative subject experiences the perceptible reality of conventional space and time, the nomadic subject resonates with the imperceptible relations implicit in her experience. After Ahab's shift into obsession, he experienced each movement of his ship and cresting of a wave as a haecceity resonant with the force of space as a virtual whole; instead of a void within which he hunted a whale, his space was experienced in terms of haecceities resonant with the unrepresentable force of the virtual reality that condition any given whale hunt. Symbolic vectors converge with the forces of bodies, cities, states and the environment in ways that can consolidate habitual repetitions or set new patterns into motion. Deleuze's (and Guattari's) nomadic subject can orient herself through the establishment of 'refrains' that may creatively differ from established norms (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 310-50). A nomadic style of subjectivity consists in the unfolding of patterns that are not referred to an external plan of organisation or conventional notions of space and time, but rather evolve from the force of patterns immanent to the individual in its specific milieu. Ahab's encounter with Moby-Dick in conjunction with his years in the smooth space of life on sea led to the actualisation of a line of flight that unfolded according to a logic increasingly foreign to those around him - with disastrous results. One lesson one might take from this example is that it is by living in the shared block of homogenised space-time that we are able to coordinate a life we can live together. And yet, despite the · horror of a path of action that destroyed not just Ahab. but his ship and crew, there is something about Ahab that fascinates us. The virtual real is always with us, no maner how regulated our lives become. Unmeasured and unmeasurable spaces beckon us beyond the reassuringly familiar spaces of our shared reality. For Deleuze, mutant spaces are always right here with us, beckoning us to take risks in our thinking as well as our living. It is such experiments in living, despite the risks they entail, that can, if we are careful, help us to evolve creatively with the becoming-other of life. The nomadic subject orients herself not through the already established norms of socially sanctioned thresholds, but rather through the events of sense and haecceities of enfleshed memory. As Rosi Braidotti puts it: This intensive, zig-zagging, cyclical, and messy type of re-membering does not even aim at retrieving information in a linear manner. It simply intuitively endures . . . It destabilizes identity by opening up spaces where virtual possibilities can be actualised. It's a sort of empowerment of all that was not programmed within the dominant memory. (Braidotti 2002: 399) Deleuze's approach entails attending to the imperceptible forces of meaning, of our bodies, and of the world around us in order to respond creatively to our situation in a way that is fully resonant with the present as well as the vinual past insisting in that present. In Difference and Repetition, Deleuze suggestS that chronological time is rooted in the habitual contractions of organic response and he characterises a kind of time, the third synthesis of time, that entails superseding automatic responses in order to draw upon the generative field of the virtual. The subject able to live this third synthesis of time would change with time itself rather than mark out her movements with respect to a measurable chronology. Just as living the temporality of the third synthesis of time fosters a nomadic subject more interested in creative evolution than preserving a normative self, so does living the spatiality of smooth space foster creative attunement to aspects of our spatiality that defy regulation. Where Ahab failed was not in his willingness to open himself to imperceptible forces in defiance of a homogenised space-time lived with others, but rather in his inability to allow his experiments to resonate with the experiments of others in a shared flight that took the enfleshed and symbolic memories of a community into account. He experiences his pursuit of Moby-Dick as something unique, an event stripped of its habitual connections to other whale hunts and instead resonating with unprecedented possibilities. Ahab's revenge is not just any revenge, but a revenge so singular that his own life, as well as the lives of his men, becomes trivial in comparison. The haecceity of harpoon hitting whale includes everything of importance to Ahab; it resonates with all the places and all the moments when he confronted - or did not confront - his deepest longings and deepest fears. In his obsessive quest for revenge, Ahab entered a smooth space constituted in relation to Moby-Dick. Ahab's spatial orientations were thus, in a sense, reduced from the smooth space created in relation to his ship and crew as well as the surrounding environment to those relations of movements concerning his own becoming-whale. Despite Ahab's openness to forces beyond the territorial confines of the established refrains of whale hunting, he is strangely isolated. His obsessive focus on Moby-Dick - a whale with which he is in actual contact for only short periods of time - excludes the force of his daily interactions with the men and environment of his daily life.

#### This fascistic imposition reappropriates lines of flight towards infinitely destructive ends, ending in suicide and total extermination.

Deleuze and Guattari ’87 Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, trans. Brian Massumi, 1987, p.230-231

This brings us back to the paradox of fascism, and the way in which fascism differs from totalitarianism. For totalitarianism is a State affair: it essentially concerns the relation between the State as a localized assemblage and the abstract machine of overcoding it effectuates. Even in the case of a military dictatorship, it is a State army, not a war machine, that takes power and elevates the State to the totalitarian stage. Totalitarianism is quintessentially conservative. Fascism, on the other hand, involves a war machine. When fascism builds itself a totalitarian State, it is not in the sense of a State army taking power, but of a war machine taking over the State. A bizarre remark by Virilio puts us on the trail: in fascism, the State is far less totalitarian than it is suicidal. There is in fascism a realized nihilism. Unlike the totalitarian State, which does its utmost to seal all possible lines of flight, fascism is constructed on an intense line of flight, which it transforms into a line of pure destruction and abolition. It is curious that from the very beginning the Nazis announced to Germany what they were bringing: at once wedding bells and death, including their own death, and the death of the Germans. They thought they would perish but that their undertaking would be resumed, all across Europe, all over the world, throughout the solar system. And the people cheered, not because they did not understand, but because they wanted that death through the death of others. Like a will to wager everything you have every hand, to stake your own death against the death of others, and measure everything by "deleometers." Klaus Mann's novel, Mephisto, gives samplings of entirely ordinary Nazi speeches and conversations: "Heroism was something that was being ruled out of our lives. . . . In reality, we are not marching forward, we are reeling, staggering. Our beloved Fiihrer is dragging us toward the shades of darkness and everlasting nothingness. How can we poets, we who have a special affinity for darkness and lower depths, not admire him? . . . Fires blazing on the horizon; rivers of blood in all the streets; and the frenzied dancing of the survivors, of those who are still spared, around the bodies of the dead!"32 Suicide is presented not as a punishment but as the crowning glory of the death of others. One can always say that it is just a matter of foggy talk and ideology, nothing but ideology. But that is not true. The insufficiency of economic and political definitions of fascism does not simply imply a need to tack on vague, so-called ideological determinations. We prefer to follow Faye's inquiry into the precise formation of Nazi statements, which are just as much in evidence in politics and economics as in the most absurd of conversations. They always contain the "stupid and repugnant" cry, Long live death!, even at the economic level, where the arms expansion replaces growth in consumption and where investment veers from the means of production toward the means of pure destruction. Paul Virilio's analysis strikes us as entirely correct in defining fascism not by the notion of the totalitarian State but by the notion of the suicidal State: so-called total war seems less a State undertaking than an undertaking of a war machine that appropriates the State and channels into it a flow of absolute war whose only possible outcome is the suicide of the State itself. "The triggering of a hitherto unknown material process, one that is limitless and aimless. . . . Once triggered, its mechanism cannot stop at peace, for the indirect strategy effectively places the dominant powers outside the usual categories of space and time. . . . It was in the horror of daily life and its environment that Hitler finally found his surest means of governing, the legitimation of his policies and military strategy; and it lasted right up to the end, for the ruins and horrors and crimes and chaos of total war, far from discharging the repulsive nature of its power, normally only increase its scope. Telegram 71 is the normal outcome: If the war is lost, may the nation perish. Here, Hitler decides to join forces with his enemies in order to complete the destruction of his own people, by obliterating the last remaining resources of its life-support system, civil reserves of every kind (potable water, fuel, provisions, etc.)."33 It was this reversion of the line of flight into a line of destruction that already animated the molecular focuses of fascism, and made them interact in a war machine instead of resonating in a State apparatus. A war machine that no longer had anything but war as its object and would rather annihilate its own servants than stop the destruction. All the dangers of the other lines pale by comparison.

#### Vote negative for an ethic of affirmation.

#### Instead of trying to reintegrate the traumatic event into the symbolic by attaching meaning to it, we should affirm the event in its complete meaningless and rupture to our own subjectivity. This solves the aff and is essential to unleashing the creative joy of life

Braidotti ’11 Rosi Braidotti, “Affirmation versus Vulnerability: On Contemporary Ethical Debates,” Gilles Deleuze – The Intensive Reduction, ed. Constantin Boundas, 2011, p. 151-155

The ethics of affirmation, with its emphasis on moving across the pain and transforming it into activity, may seem counter-intuitive. In our culture people go to great lengths to ease all pain, but especially the pain of uncertainty about identity, origin, and belonging. Great distress follows from not knowing or not being able to articulate the source of one's suffering, or from knowing it all too well, all the time. People who have been confronted by the irreparable, the unbearable, the insurmountable, the traumatic and inhuman event will do anything to find solace, resolution, and also compensation. The yearning for these measures-solace, closure, justice-is all too understandable and worthy of respect. Nowadays, this longing is both supported and commercially exploited by genetics and its application to tracking of racial and territorial origins. The ethical dilemma was already posed by Jean-Francois Lyotard in Le Difefrend and, much earlier, by Primo Levi about the survivors of Nazi concentration camps: the kind of vulnerability human beings experience in the face of events on the scale of high horror is something for which no adequate compensation is even thinkable, let alone applicable. There is an incommensurability of the suffering involved for which no measure of compensation is possible-a hurt or wound beyond repair. This means that the notion of justice in the sense of a logic of rights and reparation is not applicable in a quantifiable manner. For Lyotard, in keeping with the poststructuralist emphasis on the ethical dimension of the problem, ethics consists in accepting the impossibility of adequate compensation, and living with the open wound. On the contrary, contemporary culture has taken the opposite direction: it has favored, encouraged, and rewarded a public morality based on the twin principles of claims and compensation, as if financial settlements could provide the answer to the injury suffered, the pain endured, and the long-lasting effects of the injustice. Cases that exemplify this trend are the compensation for the Shoah in the sense of restitution of stolen property, artworks, and bank deposits. Similar claims have been made by the descendants of slaves forcefully removed from Mrica to North America (Gilroy 2000), and more recently compensation for damages caused by Soviet communism, notably the confiscation of properties across eastern Europe, from Jewish and other former citizens. The ethics of affirmation is about suspending the quest for both claims and compensation, resisting the logic of retribution of rights and taking instead a different road. In order to understand this move it is important to de-psychologize the discussion of affirmation. Affectivity is intrinsically understood as positive: it is the force that aims at fulfilling the subject's capacity for interaction and freedom. It is Spinoza's conatus, or the notion of potentia as the affirmative aspect of power. It is joyful and pleasure-prone, and it is immanent in that it coincides with the terms and modes of its expression. This means concretely that ethical behavior confirms, facilitates, and enhances the subject's potentia, as the capacity to express his/her freedom. The positivity of this desire to express one's innermost and constitutive freedom (conatus, potentia, or becoming) is conducive to ethical behavior, however, only if the subject is capable of making it endure, thus allowing it to sustain its own impetus. Unethical behavior achieves the opposite: it denies, hinders, and diminishes that impetus or is unable to sustain it. Affirmation is therefore not naive optimism or Candide-like unrealism. It is about endurance and transformation. Endurance is self-affirmation. It is also an ethical principle of affirmation of the positivity of the intensive subject-its joyful affirmation as potentia. The subject is a spatio-temporal compound which frames the boundaries of processes of becoming. This works by transforming negative into positive passions through the power of an understanding that is no longer indexed upon a phallogocentric set of standards, but is rather unhinged and therefore affective. This sort of turning of the tide of negativity is the transformative process of achieving freedom of understanding through the awareness of our limits, of our bondage. This results in the freedom to affirm one's essence as joy, through encounters and minglings with other bodies, entities, beings, and forces. Ethics means faithfulness to this potentia, or the desire to become. Deleuze defines the latter with reference to Bergson's concept of 'duration,' thus proposing the notion of the subject as an entity that lasts, that endures sustainable changes and transformation and enacts them around him/herself in a community or collectivity. Affirmative ethics rests on the idea of sustainability as a principle of containment and tolerable development of a subject's resources, understood environmentally, affectively, and cognitively. A subject thus constituted inhabits a time that is the active tense of continuous 'becoming.' Endurance has therefore a temporal dimension: it has to do with lasting in time-hence duration and self-perpetuation. But it also has a spatial side to do with the space of the body as an enfleshed field of actualization of passions or forces. It evolves affectivity and joy, as in the capacity for being affected by these forces, to the point of pain or extreme pleasure, which come to the same; it means putting up with hardship and physical pain. The point, however, is that extreme pleasure or extreme pain-which may score the same on a Spinozist scale of ethology of aff ects-are of course not the same. On the reactive side of the equation, endurance points to the struggle to sustain the pain without being annihilated by it. It also introduces a temporal dimension about duration in time. This is linked to memory: intense pain, a wrong, a betrayal, a wound are hard to forget. The traumatic impact of painful events fixes them in a rigid, eternal present tense out of which it is difficult to emerge. This is the eternal return of that which precisely cannot be endured and returns in the mode of the unwanted, the untimely, the unassimilated or inappropriate/d. They are also, however, paradoxically difficult to remember, insofar as remembering entails retrieval and repetition of the pain itself. Psychoanalysis, of course, has been here before (Laplanche 1976). The notion of the return of the repressed is the key to the logic of unconscious remembrance, but it is a secret and somewhat invisible key which condenses space into the spasm of the symptom and time into a, short-circuit that mines the very thinkability of the present. Kristeva's notion of the abject (1980) expresses clearly the temporality involved in psychoanalysis-by stressing the structural function played by the negative, the incomprehensible, the unthinkable, the other of understandable knowledge. Deleuze calls this alterity 'Chaos' and defines it ontologically as the virtual formation of all possible form. Lacan, on the other hand-and Derrida with him, I would argue-defines Chaos epistemologically as that which precedes form, structure, and language. This makes for two radically divergent conceptions of time and negativity. That which is incomprehensible for Lacan, following Hegel, is the virtual for Deleuze, following Spinoza, Bergson, and Leibnitz. This produces a number of significant shifts: from negative to affirmative; from entropic to generative; from incomprehensible, meaningless, and crazy to virtual waiting to be actualized; from constituting constitutive outsides to a geometry of affects that require mutual synchronization; from a melancholy and split to an open-ended web-like subject; from the epistemological to the ontological turn in poststructuralist philosophy. This introduces a temporal dimension into the discussion that leads to the very conditions of possibility of the future, to futurity as such. For an ethics of sustainability, the expression of positive affects is that which makes the subject last or endure. It is like a source of long-term energy at the affective core of subjectivity (Grosz 2004). Nietzsche has also been here before, of course. The eternal return in Nietzsche is the repetition, yet neither in the compulsive mode of neurosis nor in the negative erasure that marks the traumatic event. It is the eternal return of and as positivity (Ansell-Pearson 1999). This kind of ethics addresses the affective structure of pain and suffering but does not locate the ethical instance within it, be it in the mode of compassionate witnessing (Bauman 1993; 1998) or empathic co-presence. In a nomadic, Deleuzian-Nietzschean perspective, ethics is essentially about transformation of negative into positive passions, that is, about moving beyond the pain. This does not mean denying the pain but rather activating it, working it through. Again, the positivity here is not supposed to indicate a facile optimism or a careless dismissal of human suffering. What is positive in the ethics of affirmation is the belief that negative affects can be transformed. This implies a dynamic view of all affects, even those that freeze us in pain, horror, or mourning. Affirmative nomadic ethics puts the motion back into emotion and the active back into activism, introducing movement, process, and becoming. This shift makes all the difference to the patterns of repetition of negative emotions. What is negative about negative affects is not a value judgment (any more than it is for the positivity of difference), but rather the effect of arrest, blockage, and rigidification that comes as a result of an act of violence, betrayal, a trauma-or which can be self-perpetuated through practices that our culture simultaneously chastises as self-destructive and cultivates as a mode of discipline and punishment: all forms of mild and extreme addictions, differing degrees of abusive practices that mortify and glorify the bodily matter, from binging to bodily modifications. Abusive, addictive, or destructive practices do not merely destroy the self but harm the self's capacity to relate to others, both human and non-human others. Thus they harm the capacity to grow in and through others and become others. Negative passions diminish our capacity to express the high levels of interdependence, the vital reliance on others, whichis the key to a non-unitary and dynamic vision of the subject. What is negated by negative passions is the power of life itself, as the dynamic force, vital flows of connections and becomings. This is why they should not be encouraged, nor should we be rewarded for lingering around them too long. Negative passions are black holes. An ethics of affirmation involves the transformation of negative into positive passions: resentment into affirmation, as Nietzsche put it. The practice of transforming negative into positive passions is the process of reintroducing time, movement, and transformation into a stifling enclosure saturated with unprocessed pain. It is a gesture of affirmation of hope in the sense of affirming the possibility of moving beyond the stultifying effects of the pain, the injury, the injustice. This is a gesture of displacement of the hurt, which fully contradicts the twin logic of claims and compensation. This is achieved through a sort of de-personalization of the event, which is the ultimate ethical challenge. The displacement of the ego-indexed negative passions or affects reveals the fundamental senselessness of the hurt, the injustice, or injury one has suffered. 'Why me?' is the refrain most commonly heard in situations of extreme distress. This expresses rage as well as anguish at one's ill fate. The answer is plain: for no reason at all. Examples of this are the banality of evil in large-scale genocides like the Holocaust (Arendt 1963), and the randomness of surviving them (think of Primo Levi who could/not endure his own survival). There is something intrinsically senseless about the pain or injustice: lives are lost or saved for all and no reason at all. Why did some go to work in the WTC on 9/11 while others missed the train? Why did Frida Kahlo take that tram which crashed so that she was impaled by a metal rod, and not the next one? For no reason at all. Reason has nothing to do with it. That is precisely the point. Contrary to the traditional morality that follows a rationalist and legalistic model of possible interpretation of the wrongs one suffered to a logic of responsibility, claim, and compensation, affirmative ethics rests on the notion of the random access to the phenomena that cause pain (or pleasure). This is not fatalism, and even less resignation, but rather amor fati. This is a crucial difference: we have to be worthy of what happens to us and rework it within an ethics of relation. Of course, repugnant and unbearable events do happen. Ethics consists, however, in reworking these events in the direction of positive relations. This is not carelessness or lack of compassion, but rather a form of lucidity that acknowledges the impossibility of finding an adequate answer to the question about the source, the origin, the cause of the ill fate, the painful event, the violence suffered. Acknowledging the futility of even trying to answer that question is a starting point.

### Bataille K

#### The alternative is to do the plan for no reason.

#### The aff subordinates working-through to the telos of the temporary resolution of the ballot which denies the essential vitality of being. Only acting without regard for return disrupts the stability of individualism in favor of radical generosity.

Stoekl ‘7 Allan Stoekl, Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Penn State University, Bataille’s Peak: Energy, Religion, and Postsustainability, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2007, p. 50-51

Bataille’s model in The Accursed Share ultimately depends on a distinction between types of expenditure and what we might call the modes of being associated with each type. This is significant because much of Bataille’s analysis entails a critique of the confusion between different types of expenditure and economy: the “restrained” and the “general.” Indeed, Bataille would argue that many of our current ills under capitalism derive from the confusion between the two realms; a Bataillean ethics would work to separate them. First, “good” expenditure. Bataille associates it with an uncontrollable “élan”: “riches prolong the burst of the sun and invoke passion”; “it’s the return of the breadth of living to the truth of exuberance” (OC, 7: 78; AS, 76). Here again we have the passions unleashed by a naive intimacy with the sun and the profound workings of the universe. But this intimacy is inseparable from the violence of enthusiasm. Contrary to the world of work, the world of expenditure entails spending without regard for the future, affirmation of ecstasy now, and the refusal of things (les choses) that only serve a purpose and that contribute only to one’s own personal security and satisfaction (profit). Thus Bataille’s theory is not only an economic one but an ethical one that criticizes the affirmation of self. As we have seen, however, this affirmation does not serve to deny what is usually, and perhaps wrongly, associated with the self: pleasure. For this reason Bataille proposes a subject, which, in its habitation of an intimate world, refuses the stable and reasonable order of things in order to enter into a profound communication with others and with the universe. This communication, this intimacy, this generosity, entails a kind of relation that is radically different from the use of a seemingly stable thing to achieve a purpose. In The Accursed Share, Bataille writes: The intimate world is opposed to the real as the measureless is to measure, as madness is to reason, as drunkenness is to lucidity. There is only measure in the object, reason in the identity of the object with itself, lucidity in the direct knowledge of objects. The world of the subject is night: this moving, infinitely suspect night, which, in the sleep of reason, engenders monsters. I propose, concerning the free subject, which is not at all subordinate to the “real” order and which is occupied only in the present, that in principle madness itself can give us only an adulterated idea. (OC, 7: 63; AS, 58; italics Bataille’s) In spite of this emphasis on the subject, it should be stressed that Bataille is attempting to put forward a concept of the instant and of experience— if those words have any meaning at all—which exit from the personal, individual realm; the very notion of a general economy means that individual, isolated interest is in principle left behind, and instead a larger perspective is embraced, one in which the individual’s concerns and worries are no longer paramount. Replacing them are the larger energy flows of the death -bound, erotic subject, of society in the grip of collective frenzy or revolt, and of the universe in the unrecoverable energy of a myriad of stars.

#### 9/11 is traumatic precisely because we wanted the towers to explode. This is the dark underside of a closed economy—excess is accumulated until the entire systems wants nothing more than its own death. Their attempt to exorcise their own historical baggage only flies ten more planes into the registers of meaning at the heart of the 1AC.

Baudrillard ‘1 Jean Baudrillard, “The Spirit of Terrorism,” Le Monde, 11/2/2001, trans. Rachel Bloul, http://www.egs.edu/faculty/jean-baudrillard/articles/the-spirit-of-terrorism/

All the speeches and commentaries betray a gigantic abreaction to the event itself and to the fascination that it exerts. Moral condemnation and the sacred union against terrorism are equal to the prodigious jubilation engendered by witnessing this global superpower being destroyed; better, by seeing it more or less self-destroying, even suiciding spectacularly. Though it is (this superpower) that has, through its unbearable power, engendered all that violence brewing around the world, and therefore this terrorist imagination which -- unknowingly -- inhabits us all. That we have dreamed of this event, that everybody without exception has dreamt of it, because everybody must dream of the destruction of any power hegemonic to that degree, - this is unacceptable for Western moral conscience, but it is still a fact, and one which is justly measured by the pathetic violence of all those discourses which attempt to erase it. It is almost they who did it, but we who wanted it. If one does not take that into account, the event lost all symbolic dimension to become a pure accident, an act purely arbitrary, the murderous fantasy of a few fanatics, who would need only to be suppressed. But we know very well that this is not so. Thus all those delirious, counter-phobic exorcisms: because evil is there, everywhere as an obscure object of desire. Without this deep complicity, the event would not have had such repercussions, and without doubt, terrorists know that in their symbolic strategy they can count on this unavowable complicity. This goes much further than hatred for the dominant global power from the disinherited and the exploited, those who fell on the wrong side of global order. That malignant desire is in the very heart of those who share (this order's) benefits. An allergy to all definitive order, to all definitive power is happily universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center embodied perfectly, in their very double-ness (literally twin-ness), this definitive order. No need for a death wish or desire for self-destruction, not even for perverse effects. It is very logically, and inexorably, that the (literally: "rise to power of power") exacerbates a will to destroy it. And power is complicit with its own destruction. When the two towers collapsed, one could feel that they answered the suicide of the kamikazes by their own suicide. It has been said: "God cannot declare war on Itself". Well, It can. The West, in its God-like position (of divine power, and absolute moral legitimacy) becomes suicidal, and declares war on itself. Numerous disaster movies are witness to this phantasm, which they obviously exorcise through images and submerge under special effects. But the universal attraction these movies exert, as pornography does, shows how (this phantasm's) realization is always close at hand -- the impulse to deny any system being all the stronger if such system is close to perfection or absolute supremacy. It is even probable that the terrorists (like the experts!) did not anticipate the collapse of the Twin Towers, which was, far more than (the attack of) the Pentagon, the deepest symbolic shock. The symbolic collapse of a whole system is due to an unforeseen complicity, as if, by collapsing (themselves), by suiciding, the towers had entered the game to complete the event. In a way, it is the entire system that, by its internal fragility, helps the initial action. The more the system is globally concentrated to constitute ultimately only one network, the more it becomes vulnerable at a single point (already one little Filipino hacker has succeeded, with his laptop, to launch the I love you virus that wrecked entire networks). Here, eighteen (dix-huit in the text) kamikazes, through the absolute arm that is death multiplied by technological efficiency, start a global catastrophic process. When the situation is thus monopolized by global power, when one deals with this formidable condensation of all functions through technocratic machinery and absolute ideological hegemony (pensee unique), what other way is there, than a terrorist reversal of the situation (literally 'transfer of situation': am I too influenced by early translation as 'reversal'?)? It is the system itself that has created the objective conditions for this brutal distortion. By taking all the cards to itself, it forces the Other to change the rules of the game. And the new rules are ferocious, because the stakes are ferocious. To a system whose excess of power creates an unsolvable challenge, terrorists respond by a definitive act that is also unanswerable (in the text: which cannot be part of the exchange circuit). Terrorism is an act that reintroduces an irreducible singularity in a generalized exchange system. Any singularity (whether species, individual or culture), which has paid with its death for the setting up of a global circuit dominated by a single power, is avenged today by this terrorist situational transfer.

### Congress CP

#### Text: The United States Congress should legislate that the Nuclear Regulatory Committee cannot consider terrorism in environmental impact standards.

Courts shield – Obama can’t claim plan as victory

Garrett and Stutz 05 [Robert T., and Terrence, Dallas Morning News Staff “Justices to decide if overhaul needed after bills fail in Legislature,” August 19, 2005, http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/news/texassouthwest/legislature/schoolfinance/stories/082005dntexsession.8bd31b4a.html]

That could foreshadow the court's response to a chief argument by state attorneys – that the court should butt out and leave school finance to the Legislature. A court finding against the state would put the ball back in the hands of lawmakers, who have tended to put off dealing with problems in schools, prisons and mental health facilities until state or federal judges forced them to act. "It's the classic political response to problems they don't want to deal with," said Maurice Dyson, a school finance expert and assistant law professor at Southern Methodist University. "There is no better political cover than to have a court rule that something must be done, which allows politicians to say their hands are tied."

### Elections DA

#### Romney winning a close FL race – polling, state econ

Miami Herald “Buz group FL poll: Romney 50%, Obama 47%” 9/13/12 <http://miamiherald.typepad.com/nakedpolitics/2012/09/biz-group-fl-poll-romney-50-obama-47.html>

The Associated Industries of Florida business group has released snippets of a survey taken by Mclaughlin & Associates, a firm that typically polls for Republicans, which finds Mitt Romney clinging to an inside-the-error-margin lead over President Obama, 50-47%, among likely voters.¶ Th AIF numbers suggest a significant bounce compared to pre-convention surveys from Quinnipiac University and CNN/Time/ORC (Although Public Policy Polling, which typically surveys for Democrats, found Obama up by just 1 before and after the conventions). And the Florida figures show a more comfortable lead for Romney now than he faces nationwide, where most surveys indicate Obama got a post-convention bounce while Romney didn't. Update: Missed this Survey USA Poll released yesterday showing Obama with a 4-point lead (48-44) in Florida.¶ But there's still a good chance that Florida could be breaking the opposite direction from the nation. The state's jobless and home-foreclosure rates are higher than the nation's. The poll says 55 percent to 40 percent of likely voters say they're not better off than four years ago. There's also a good chance that this one poll will be a pro-Romney outlier as other surveys are released.

#### Nuclear swings Florida and Latinos for Obama

Whitman and Avilla 12

Christie is an [American](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States)  [politician](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politician) and [author](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Author) who served as the [50th](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Governors_of_New_Jersey) [Governor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Governor_of_New_Jersey) of [New Jersey](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Jersey) from 1994 to 2001, and was the [Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Administrator_of_the_Environmental_Protection_Agency) also was New Jersey's first, and to date, only [female governor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_female_state_governors_in_the_United_States). Karen is a guest Columnist for the Orlando Sentinel. “Nuclear energy = green jobs, economic growth in Fla., beyond” 6/22/12 <http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621_1_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community>

We all know how critical Florida is to the outcome of this year's election. This week, as Orlando hosts the annual conference of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, all eyes are on the presidential candidates as they speak to Hispanic elected officials — and by extension, to their constituents — about the issues that are top of mind for voters.¶ Notably, the conference addresses two issues also of paramount concern to all Floridians: energy and the economy.¶ From our perspective, these issues are deeply intertwined — and one way that Floridians and the state's thriving Hispanic community can advocate for economic growth through renewed [investment](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621_1_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community) in clean energy is by supporting nuclear energy. We need to let the candidates know that Americans are relying on the next president for clean, sustainable energy policies that benefit us all.¶ As we look toward diversifying America's energy [portfolio](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621_1_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community) and building out the energy generated by renewables, candidates should look to nuclear energy as one proven way to effectively meet growing demand. In doing so, they are registering their support for well-paying jobs, sustained economic growth and clean, affordable energy options.¶ Florida is one of many states exploring opportunities to expand capacity at existing facilities, which would mean the creation of new jobs and added [economic](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621_1_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community) impact. By showing our support for Florida's five nuclear-energy reactors, as well as paving the way for the expansion of the infrastructure that supports them in the state and beyond, we can help create and sustain green jobs and work to reduce unemployment.¶ Florida needs jobs. While overall U.S. unemployment rates stand at 8.2 percent, unemployment in Florida is slightly higher, at 8.6 percent. National unemployment among Hispanics is higher still, at 11 percent.¶ At present, the U.S. nuclear-energy industry supports 100,000 American jobs. Each new nuclear facility creates an average of 1,400 to 1,800 high-paying jobs, often reaching as many as 3,500 jobs during peak construction periods. Once operational, these facilities create 400 to 700 direct and permanent jobs.¶ What does this all mean for minorities, who are so disproportionately impacted by unemployment?¶ Latinos in Florida will be able to take advantage of contract opportunities set aside for minority development programs. And Florida's communities will provide the goods and [services](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621_1_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community) needed to support a growing nuclear-energy industry. Recent trends in entrepreneurship indicate business starts in the Hispanic community will continue at a much higher rate than in other communities. Hispanic communities are therefore readily able to address the growing needs of new nuclear facilities.¶ Educational institutions across the state are also targeting minority populations with training programs designed to produce nuclear work-force-ready candidates. These programs and partnerships are cropping up at minority-serving institutions statewide.¶ Take, for example, [Miami Dade College](http://www.orlandosentinel.com/topic/OREDU0000157196.topic)'s Nuclear-Career Academic Bridge, which leverages a combination of [financial](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621_1_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community) aid, mentorships and focused, skills-oriented training to ready students to enter the nuclear industry upon completion of the program.¶ These kinds of efforts — which expose Hispanic students in greater numbers to critical science,[technology](http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621_1_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community), engineering and mathematics education — not only promote greater diversity in the energy work force, but also put Hispanic students in line to enter well-paying careers in an industry with a bright future.¶ Just as nuclear power creates and sustains jobs, it also promotes healthy economic growth. Each of America's 104 nuclear-power facilities generates, on average, $430 million in economic output annually, as well as an additional $40 million per year in total labor income. Minority-owned suppliers and businesses are among key beneficiaries of this economic infusion.¶ Indeed, all eyes will be on the candidates speaking at the Orlando conference this week. And clearly the candidates will be keenly focused on the Hispanic community. They're looking to the more than 1 million potential voters that Florida's Hispanic population represents for cues on how to shape their policies and platforms.¶

#### Florida is a must-win for Romney – best analysis proves

*The* Nate Silver 9/12 [Nate, 9/12/12, “Florida a True Must-Win for Romney” <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/12/sept-11-florida-a-true-must-win-for-romney/#more-34415>]

Florida has a [well-established reputation](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/08/29/in-florida-tampa-is-essential-to-romney-election-hopes/) as a swing state. But as the election season has worn on, it has come to look even more important. Florida now ranks a clear second on our list of [tipping point states](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/27/arizona-is-probably-not-a-swing-state/), those most likely to provide the decisive votes in the Electoral College, behind only Ohio.¶ Florida is typically just slightly Republican-leaning, and the tipping point calculation is sensitive to even the smallest deviations from the national averages. As I’ve argued before, for instance, North Carolina [isn’t that essential to the electoral math](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/08/07/aug-7-north-carolina-isnt-central-to-electoral-math/), even though the race there is quite close, because other states that would help get a candidate to 270 electoral votes precede it in the pecking order.¶ But as the election has evolved, Mr. Obama’s polling has held up fairly well in Florida, including [another decent poll there](http://www.surveyusa.com/index.php/2012/09/11/in-florida-8-weeks-out-obama-4-points-atop-romney-nelson-11-points-atop-mack-voter-fraud-of-greater-concern-than-voter-suppression/) on Tuesday, which put him four points ahead.¶ Just as important, Mr. Obama’s polling has been choppy lately in a several other states, particularly Virginia (where he got a very poor poll on Monday), Colorado and Iowa, which had initially appeared to be easier wins for him. It is more conceivable now that Mr. Obama could have an easier time winning Florida than those other states, increasing its importance.¶ Nonetheless, Florida is mostly a state where Mr. Obama is playing offense. If he wins it, it will solve almost all of his other problems.¶ If Mr. Obama wins Florida, he could lose each of Virginia, Colorado and Iowa, along with Ohio, Wisconsin, and North Carolina, and either New Hampshire or Nevada, and still win the Electoral College. From Mr. Romney’s point of view, conversely, that might seem to make Florida a must-win state. In fact, it’s possible to put some numbers around this idea.¶ Defining a must-win state in a formal way is a bit tricky. For example, is Georgia a must-win for Mr. Romney? If he loses it, he would almost certainly lose the Electoral College. But that is because Georgia is much more Republican-leaning than the states that we would ordinarily classify as swing states. If things get bad enough for Mr. Romney to lose Georgia, his map will almost certainly be a disaster in a number of other ways.¶ So what we might really think of as must-win states are those that a candidate could not afford to lose even in a *close* election.¶ Imagine that the election is very close: the popular vote is within one percentage point either way. This condition occurred roughly 3,000 times out of the 25,000 simulations that I ran in the forecast model on Monday.¶ For each of the top 12 states on our tipping point list, I looked up the probability of Mr. Romney winning the election conditional upon losing the state in these 3,000 simulations. If Mr. Romney has great difficulty winning the Electoral College without the state in a close election, we can fairly describe it as a must-win.¶ These simulations estimate that Mr. Romney has only a 2 percent chance of winning the election if he loses Florida — even assuming that the election is very close over all. Losing its 29 electoral votes just presents too daunting a challenge for him, given his inability so far to penetrate into states like Pennsylvania that could plausibly substitute for it.¶ The numbers aren’t remotely that overwhelming for any other state. Mr. Romney has a 15 percent chance of winning a close election despite losing Ohio, for instance — not pleasant odds, but also far from impossible. If he lost Virginia, he’d still have a 19 percent chance of winning a close election; Colorado, a 28 percent chance; Wisconsin, a 37 percent chance, and so forth.¶ So, it isn’t a cliché to call Florida a must-win for Mr. Romney; he very badly needs it. What does the same list look like for Mr. Obama? Pennsylvania is the closest analog to Florida for him; he has just a 10 percent chance of winning a close election if he loses the state.¶ However, Mr. Obama is highly likely to win Pennsylvania, according to our forecast, as he has led in every poll of the state since February and as Mr. Romney has not placed all that many resources into the state.¶ Otherwise, Mr. Obama’s electoral strategy is fairly robust. He has about a 28 percent chance of winning a close election if he loses Ohio, for instance, about twice Mr. Romney’s chance of doing the same.

#### Romney win causes Iran strikes—causes escalating conflict

Hussain 9-12 Murtaza Hussain, Toronto-based writer and analyst focused on issues related to Middle Eastern politics, “Why war with Iran would spell disaster,” Al-Jazeera, 9/12/2012, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/09/201291194236970294.html

Leading members of the House and Congress from both parties as well as the closest advisers to Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney have called for attacking Iran, with some high-ranking GOP advisers even suggesting that the time is now for a Congressional resolution formally declaring war on the country. Romney and many other leading Republican figures have called for pre-emptive war against Iran, and have continually upped the ante in terms of threats of military action throughout the election campaign. This alarming and potentially highly consequential rhetoric is occurring in a context where the American people are still recovering from the disastrous war in Iraq and winding down the US occupation of Afghanistan, while at the same time coping with the worst economic drought since the Great Depression. Public statements claiming that the extent of the conflict would be limited to targeted airstrikes on Iranian nuclear facilities are utterly disingenuous, ignoring the escalating cycle of retribution that such "limited" conflicts necessarily breed. As did the war in Libya start off with calls only for a benign "no-fly zone" to protect civilians and seamlessly turned into an all-out aerial campaign to topple Muammar Gaddafi, any crossing of the military threshold with Iran would also likely result in a far bigger conflagration than the public has been prepared for by their leaders. War with Iran would be no quick and clean affair, as many senior political and military figures have pointed out it would make the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, which cost trillions of dollars and the lives of thousands of soldiers and civilians, seem like "a cakewalk". The fact that it is becoming increasingly likely, inevitable in the eyes of many, and that it is high on the agenda of so many leading political figures warrants exploration of what such a conflict would really entail. Conflict on an unprecedented scale Not a war of weeks or months, but a "generations-long war" is how no less a figure than former Mossad chief Efraim Halevy describes the consequences of open conflict with Iran. In comparison with Iraq and Afghanistan, both countries with relatively small populations which were already in a state of relative powerlessness before they were invaded, Iran commands the eighth largest active duty military in the world, as well as highly trained special forces and guerilla organisations which operate in countries throughout the region and beyond. Retired US General John Abizaid has previously described the Iranian military as "the most powerful in the Middle East" (exempting Israel), and its highly sophisticated and battle-hardened proxies in Lebanon and Iraq have twice succeeded in defeating far stronger and better funded Western military forces. Any attack on Iran would assuredly lead to the activation of these proxies in neighbouring countries to attack American interests and would create a situation of borderless war unprecedented in any past US conflicts in the Middle East. None of this is to suggest that the United States would not "win" a war with Iran, but given the incredibly painful costs of Iraq and Afghanistan; wars fought again weak, poorly organised enemies lacking broad influence, politicians campaigning for war with Iran are leading the American people into a battle which will be guaranteed to make the past decade of fighting look tame in comparison. A recent study has shown that an initial US aerial assault on Iran would require hundreds of planes, ships and missiles in order to be completed; a military undertaking itself unprecedented since the first Gulf War and representative of only the first phase of what would likely be a long drawn-out war of attrition. For a country already nursing the wounds from the casualties of far less intense conflicts and still reeling from their economic costs, the sheer battle fatigue inherent in a large-scale war with Iran would stand to greatly exacerbate these issues. Oil shocks and the American economy The fragile American economic recovery would be completely upended were Iran to target global energy supplies in the event of war, an act which would be both catastrophic and highly likely if US Iran hawks get their way. Not only does the country itself sit atop some of the largest oil and natural gas reserves on the planet, its close proximity to the shipping routes and oil resources of its neighbours means that in the event of war, its first response would likely be to choke off the global supply of crude; a tactic for which its military defences have in fact been specifically designed. The Strait of Hormuz, located in the Persian Gulf is the shipping point for more than 20 per cent of the world's petroleum. Iran is known to have advanced Silkworm missile batteries buried at strategic points around the strait to make it impassable in the event of war, and has developed "swarming" naval tactics to neutralise larger, less mobile ships such as those used by the US Navy. While Iran could never win in straightforward combat, it has developed tactics of asymmetrical warfare that can effectively inflict losses on a far stronger enemy and render the strait effectively closed to naval traffic. The price of oil would immediately skyrocket, by some estimates upwards several hundred dollars a barrel, shattering the already tenuous steps the US and other Western economies are taking towards recovery. Former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has said a war with Iran could drag out years and would have economic consequences "devastating for the average American"; but these facts are conspicuously absent in public discussion of the war. Every conflict has blowback, but if US politicians are attempting to maneouver the country into a conflict of such potentially devastating magnitude, potentially sacrificing ordinary Americans' economic well-being for years to come, it would behoove them to speak frankly about these costs and not attempt to obfuscate or downplay them in order to make their case. Conflict across borders Finally, a war with Iran would be not be like conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya where the fighting was constrained to the borders of the country in question. Despite widespread resentment towards the country due to the perception of it as a regionally imperialist power as well sectarian animosity towards it as Shia Muslim theocracy, Iran maintains deep links throughout the Middle East and South Asia and can count on both popular support as well as assistance from its network of armed proxies in various countries. In a report for Haaretz, Ahmed Rashid noted that an attack on Iran would likely inflame anti-American sentiment throughout the region, across both Shia and Sunni Muslim communities. Despite Iran's poor human rights record and bellicose leadership, polls have consistently shown that Iranian and Iranian-backed leaders such as Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hassan Nasrallah remain among the most popular figures throughout the Arab and Muslim world. This popularity comes not necessarily out of respect for Iranian ideology, but from a perception that Iran is the only assertive power in the region and is the target of aggression from the United States and its allies. In Rashid's analysis, both the Middle East and South Asia would become unsafe for American citizens and their interests for years to come; popular anger would reach a level which would render these area effectively off-limits and would cause grave and immediate danger to both American businesses and troops based in the region. Again, this would be a situation quite different from the other wars of the past decade, fought against isolated regimes without the ability to call upon large and often well-funded numbers of regional sympathisers; a fact also rarely mentioned by war advocates. Not a political game Going to war with Iran would be an elective decision for the United States, but it is for too grave and consequential a choice to be left up to the whims of politicians seeking to win the approval of lobby groups and one-up each other to appeal to influential campaign donors who would like to see a war with Iran. Make no mistake, the possibility of war is very real and has become eminently more so in recent months. Many of the same politicians and political advisers responsible for engineering the Iraq War have returned to public life and are at the forefront of pushing a new American conflict with Iran. Mitt Romney's closest foreign policy advisers include leading hawks from the war with Iraq, including John Bolton, Eliot Cohen and Dan Senor. Many of them have enthusiastically and publicly expressed their desire to engineer a US military confrontation with Iran and have already begun to tout the inevitability of this action in a Romney presidency.

### Case

#### Psychoanalytic critique causes passivity and destroys political struggle

Paul Gordon, psychotherapist living and working in London, Race & Class, 2001, v. 42, n. 4, p. 30-1

The postmodernists' problem is that they cannot live with disappointment. All the tragedies of the political project of emancipation -- the evils of Stalinism in particular -- are seen as the inevitable product of men and women trying to create a better society. But, rather than engage in a critical assessment of how, for instance, radical political movements go wrong, they discard the emancipatory project and impulse itself. The postmodernists, as Sivanandan puts it, blame modernity for having failed them: `the intellectuals and academics have fled into discourse and deconstruction and representation -- as though to interpret the world is more important than to change it, as though changing the interpretation is all we could do in a changing world'.58 To justify their flight from a politics holding out the prospect of radical change through self-activity, the disappointed intellectuals find abundant intellectual alibis for themselves in the very work they champion, including, in Cohen's case, psychoanalysis. What Marshall Berman says of Foucault seems true also of psychoanalysis; that it offers `a world-historical alibi' for the passivity and helplessness felt by many in the 1970s, and that it has nothing but contempt for those naive enough to imagine that it might be possible for modern human- kind to be free. At every turn for such theorists, as Berman argues, whether in sexuality, politics, even our imagination, we are nothing but prisoners: there is no freedom in Foucault's world, because his language forms a seamless web, a cage far more airtight than anything Weber ever dreamed of, into which no life can break . . . There is no point in trying to resist the oppressions and injustices of modern life, since even our dreams of freedom only add more links to our chains; however, once we grasp the futility of it all, at least we can relax.59 Cohen's political defeatism and his conviction in the explanatory power of his new faith of psychoanalysis lead him to be contemptuous and dismissive of any attempt at political solidarity or collective action. For him, `communities' are always `imagined', which, in his view, means based on fantasy, while different forms of working-class organisation, from the craft fraternity to the revolutionary group, are dismissed as `fantasies of self-sufficient combination'.60 In this scenario, the idea that people might come together, think together, analyse together and act together as rational beings is impossible. The idea of a genuine community of equals becomes a pure fantasy, a `symbolic retrieval' of something that never existed in the first place: `Community is a magical device for conjuring something apparently solidary out of the thin air of modern times, a mechanism of re-enchantment.' As for history, it is always false, since `We are always dealing with invented traditions.'61 Now, this is not only nonsense, but dangerous nonsense at that. Is history `always false'? Did the Judeocide happen or did it not? And did not some people even try to resist it? Did slavery exist or did it not, and did not people resist that too and, ultimately, bring it to an end? And are communities always `imagined'? Or, as Sivanandan states, are they beaten out on the smithy of a people's collective struggle? Furthermore, all attempts to legislate against ideology are bound to fail because they have to adopt `technologies of surveillance and control identical to those used by the state'. Note here the Foucauldian language to set up the notion that all `surveillance' is bad. But is it? No society can function without surveillance of some kind. The point, surely, is that there should be a public conversation about such moves and that those responsible for implementing them be at all times accountable. To equate, as Cohen does, a council poster about `Stamping out racism' with Orwell's horrendous prophecy in 1984 of a boot stamping on a human face is ludicrous and insulting. (Orwell's image was intensely personal and destructive; the other is about the need to challenge not individuals, but a collective evil.) Cohen reveals himself to be deeply ambivalent about punitive action against racists, as though punishment or other firm action against them (or anyone else transgressing agreed social or legal norms) precluded `understanding' or even help through psychotherapy. It is indeed a strange kind of `anti-racism' that portrays active racists as the `victims', those who are in need of `help'. But this is where Cohen's argument ends up. In their move from politics to the academy and the world of `discourse', the postmodernists may have simply exchanged one grand narrative, historical materialism, for another, psychoanalysis.62 For psychoanalysis is a grand narrative, par excellence. It is a theory that seeks to account for the world and which recognises few limits on its explanatory potential. And the claimed radicalism of psychoanalysis, in the hands of the postmodernists at least, is not a radicalism at all but a prescription for a politics of quietism, fatalism and defeat. Those wanting to change the world, not just to interpret it, need to look elsewhere.

#### Policy analysis should precede discourse – most effective way to challenge power

Taft-Kaufman ’95 Jill Taft-Kaufman, Speech prof @ CMU, 1995, Southern Comm. Journal, Spring, v. 60, Iss. 3, “Other Ways”, p pq

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

#### Value to life inevitable – existence key to maximize it

David Pizer 2001“Argument that life has inherent value”, July 8, <http://www.cryonet.org/cgi-bin/dsp.cgi?msg=16930>

Argument that life has inherent value 1. The concept of value comes from what living beings will pay for something. How much one being is willing to give in order to get something he wants is a way to think of the value of that thing. What a being is willing to pay for something depends on how much he desires that thing. So indirectly, desire is what actually sets the value of something. 2. In order to desire something, the thing doing the desiring must be alive - it must be a living being. So value, the end of desire, is dependent on life. Only living things (living beings) can give value to something else. 3. In order for any first thing to give something to a second thing, the first thing must first have it to give. So if only living things can give value, then living things must have value. 4. Desire can only come from, (and so must be in), living beings. So when living things desire something, that desire must be inherent in the living things. If desire in living things is what gives value to other things, and that desire is inherent in the living thing, then living things, or life, has inherent value in it. Or to say it another way: If an object gives something value, that object must have value in it as a quality to give. Example: For me to love my dog, I must first have love in me. For me to value my dog, I must first have value in me. 5. Put another way, if a living being has some quality, that quality is a part of what makes that being what it is. 6.If life gives value to life, than one of the parts of life is value. Put another way, value cannot exist without life, so value is life and life is value. 7. If value is only relative, then saying life being valuable relative to life is the same as saying life has worth relative to life. Anything that is relative to itself is an unconditional part of itself and therefore has "inherentness". 8.THEREFORE, anyway you look at it, life is value and value is life - and life has inherent value.

#### Cant solve – NJDEP insufficient

Ben Schifman, 2011 Columbia Law JD Candidate, “The limits of NEPA: Consideration of the impacts of terrorism in environmental impact statements for nuclear facilities” Columbia Journal of Environmental Law 35.3 2010

The environmental consequences of a terrorist attack should be ¶ considered in an EIS even under the interpretation of NEPA ¶ advanced by the NJDEP court (relying on Metropolitan Edison and ¶ Public Citizen).¶ 157¶ Though other federal agencies undoubtedly bear ¶ some responsibility for preventing an attack, this does not—and ¶ should not—excuse the NRC from considering such effects as they ¶ are at least partially within the limits of NRC control. Further, the ¶ analogy to tort law advanced by Metropolitan Edison and NJDEP¶ reveals that while a terrorist attack is undoubtedly an intervening ¶ criminal act, it is nonetheless reasonably foreseeable. Indeed, the ¶ NRC has foreseen this act and taken steps to prevent it. Therefore, ¶ the effects of a terrorist attack should be included in any EIS the ¶ NRC prepares for a nuclear facility.

#### Calculation is inevitable - radical rejection is co-opted to sustain present inequalities. Infinite justice necessitates political strategies like the plan.

Campbell '99 David Campbell, professor of international politics at the University of Newcastle, Moral Spaces, 1999, pp. 46-47

That undecidability resides within the decision, Derrida argues, "that justice exceeds law and calculation, that the unpresentable exceeds the determinable cannot and should not serve as alibi for staying out of juridico-political battles, within an institution or a state, or between institutions or states and others."9' Indeed, "incalculable justice requires us to calculate." From where does this insistence come? What is behind, what is animating, these imperatives? It is both the character of infinite justice as a heteronomic relationship to the other, a relationship that because of its undecidability multiplies responsibility, and the fact that "left to itself, the incalculable and giving (donatrice) idea of justice is always very close to the bad, even to the worst, for it can always be reappropriated by the most perverse calculation."92 The necessity of calculating the incalculable thus responds to a duty, a duty that inhabits the instant of madness and compels the decision to avoid "the bad," the "perverse calculation," even "the worst." This is the duty that also dwells with deconstruction and makes it the starting point, the "at least necessary condition," for the organization of resistance to totalitarianism in all its forms. And it is a duty that responds to practical political concerns when we recognize that Derrida names the bad, the perverse, and the worst as those violences "we recognize all too well without yet having thought them through, the crimes of xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism, religious or nationalist fanaticism." Furthermore, the duty within the decision, the obligation that recognizes the necessity of negotiating the possibilities provided by the impossibilities of justice, is not content with simply avoiding, containing, combating, or negating the worst violence-though it could certainly begin with those strategies. Instead, this responsibility, which is the responsibility of responsibility, commissions a "utopian" strategy. Not a strategy that is beyond all bounds of possibility so as to be considered "unrealistic," but one which in respecting the necessity of calculation, takes the possibility summoned by the calculation as far as possible, "must take it as far as possible, beyond the place we find ourselves and beyond the already identifiable zones of morality or politics or law, beyond the distinction between national and international, public and private, and so on."94 As Derrida declares, "The condition of possibility of this thing called responsibility is a certain experience and experiment of the possibility of the impossible: the testing of the aporia from which one may invent the only possible invention, the impossible invention."95 This leads Derrida to enunciate a proposition that many, not the least of whom are his Habermasian critics, could hardly have expected: "Nothing seems to me less outdated than the classical emancipatory ideal. We cannot attempt to disqualify it today, whether crudely or with sophistication, at least not without treating it too lightly and forming the worst complicities." 6

#### We should talk about the specifics of the state when the particulars of a situation demands it

Jacques Derrida, Directeur d’Etudes at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, and Professor of Philosophy, French and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, 2004, For What Tomorrow? A Dialogue With Elisabeth Roudinesco, p. 91-92

J.D.: A moment ago you spoke of regicide as the necessity of an ex­ception, in sum. Well, yes, one can refer provisionally to Carl Schmitt (whatever one may think of him, his arguments are always useful for prob­lematizing the “political” or the “juridical”; I examined this question in Pol­itics of Friendship). He says in effect that a sovereign is defined by his capacity to decide the exception. Sovereign is he who effectively decides the exception. The revolutionaries decided that at that moment that it was nec­essary to suspend justice and—in order to establish the law [droit] and to give the Revolution its rights—to suspend the rule of law [l’Etat de droit]. Schmitt also gives this definition of sovereignty: to have the right to sus­pend the law, or the rule of law, the constitutional state. Without this cate­gory of exception, we cannot understand the concept of sovereignty. Today, the great question is indeed, everywhere, that of sovereignty. Omnipresent in our discourses and in our axioms, under its own name or another, liter­ally or figuratively, this concept has a theological origin: the true sovereign is God. The concept of this authority or of this power was transferred to the monarch, said to have a “divine right.” Sovereignty was then delegated to the people, in the form of democracy, or to the nation, with the same the­ological attributes as those attributed to the king and to God. Today, wher­ever the word “sovereignty” is spoken, this heritage remains undeniable, whatever internal differentiation one may recognize in it. How do we deal with this? Here we return to the question of heritage with which we began. It is necessary to deconstruct the concept of sover­eignty, never to forget its theological filiation and to be ready to call this fil­iation into question wherever we discern its effects. This supposes an in­flexible critique of the logic of the state and of the nation-state. And yet—hence the enormous responsibility of the citizen and of the heir in general, in certain situations—the state, in its actual form, can resist certain forces that I consider the most threatening. What I here call “responsibility” is what dictates the decision to be sometimes for the sovereign state and sometimes against it, for its deconstruction (“theoretical and practical,” as one used to say) according to the singularity of the contexts and the stakes. There is no relativism in this, no renunciation of the injunction to “think” and to deconstruct the heritage. This aporia is in truth the very condition of decision and responsibility—if there is any. I am thinking for example of the incoherent but organized coalition of international capitalist forces that, in the name of neoliberalism or the market,31 are taking hold of the world in conditions such as the “state” form; this is what can still resist the most. For the moment. But it is neces­sary to reinvent the conditions of resistance. Once again, I would say that according to the situations, I am an antisovereignist or a sovereignist—and I vindicate the right to be antisovereignist at certain times and a sovereignist at others. No one can make me respond to this question as though it were a matter of pressing a button on some old-fashioned machine. There are cases in which I would support a logic of the state, but I ask to examine each situation before making any statement. It is also necessary to recognize that by requiring someone to be not unconditionally sovereignist but rather soyvereignist only under certain conditions, one is already calling into question the principle of sovereignty. Deconstruction begins there. It demands a dif­ficult dissociation, almost impossible but indispensable, between uncondi­tionality (justice without power) and sovereignty (right, power, or potency). Deconstruction is on the side of unconditionaliry, even when it seems im­possible, and not sovereignty, even when it seems possible.

#### Disregard root causes—prefer normative geopolitics—most flexible

Moore ‘4 John Moore, chaired law prof, UVA. Frm first Chairman of the Board of the US Institute of Peace and as the Counselor on Int Law to the Dept. of State, “Beyond the Democratic Peace,” 44 Va. J. Int'l L. 341, 2004, lexis

If major interstate war is predominantly a product of a synergy between a potential nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence, what is the role of the many traditional "causes" of war? Past, and many contemporary, theories of war have focused on the role of specific disputes between nations, ethnic and religious differences, arms races, poverty and social injustice, competition for resources, incidents and accidents, greed, fear, perceptions of "honor," and many other factors. Such factors may well play a role in motivating aggression or generating fear and manipulating public opinion. The reality, however, is that while some of these factors may have more potential to contribute to war than others, there may well be an infinite set of motivating factors, or human wants, motivating aggression. It is not the independent existence of such motivating factors for war but rather the circumstances permitting or encouraging high-risk decisions leading to war that is the key to more effectively controlling armed conflict. And the same may also be true of democide. The early focus in the Rwanda slaughter on "ethnic conflict," as though Hutus and Tutsis had begun to slaughter each other through spontaneous combustion, distracted our attention from the reality that a nondemocratic Hutu regime had carefully planned and orchestrated a genocide against Rwandan Tutsis as well as its Hutu opponents. 158 Certainly if we were able to press a button and end poverty, racism, religious intolerance, injustice, and endless disputes, we would want to do so. Indeed, democratic governments must remain committed to policies that will produce a better world by all measures of human progress. The broader achievement of democracy and the rule of law will itself assist in this progress. No one, however, has yet been able to demonstrate the kind of robust correlation with any of these "traditional" causes of war that is reflected in the "democratic peace." Further, given the difficulties in overcoming many of these social problems, an approach to war exclusively dependent on their solution may doom us to war for generations to come. [\*394] A useful framework for thinking about the war puzzle is provided in the Kenneth Waltz classic Man, the State and War, 159 first published in 1954 for the Institute of War and Peace Studies, in which he notes that previous thinkers about the causes of war have tended to assign responsibility at one of the three levels of individual psychology, the nature of the state, or the nature of the international system. This tripartite level of analysis has subsequently been widely copied in the study of international relations. We might summarize my analysis in this classical construct by suggesting that the most critical variables are the second and third levels, or "images," of analysis. Government structures, at the second level, seem to play a central role in levels of aggressiveness in high-risk behavior leading to major war. In this, the "democratic peace" is an essential insight. The third level of analysis, the international system, or totality of external incentives influencing the decision to go to war, is also critical when government structures do not restrain such high-risk behavior on their own. Indeed, nondemocratic systems may not only fail to constrain inappropriate aggressive behavior, they may even massively enable it by placing the resources of the state at the disposal of a ruthless regime elite. It is not that the first level of analysis, the individual, is unimportant - I have already argued that it is important in elite perceptions about the permissibility and feasibility of force and resultant necessary levels of deterrence. It is, instead, that the second level of analysis, government structures, may be a powerful proxy for settings bringing to power those who are disposed to aggressive military adventures and in creating incentive structures predisposed to high-risk behavior. We might also want to keep open the possibility that a war/peace model focused on democracy and deterrence might be further usefully refined by adding psychological profiles of particular leaders as we assess the likelihood of aggression and levels of necessary deterrence. Nondemocracies' leaders can have different perceptions of the necessity or usefulness of force and, as Marcus Aurelius should remind us, not all absolute leaders are Caligulas or Neros. Further, the history of ancient Egypt reminds us that not all Pharaohs were disposed to make war on their neighbors. Despite the importance of individual leaders, however, the key to war avoidance is understanding that major international war is critically an interaction, or synergy, of certain characteristics at levels two and three - specifically an absence of [\*395] democracy and an absence of effective deterrence. Yet another way to conceptualize the importance of democracy and deterrence in war avoidance is to note that each in its own way internalizes the costs to decision elites of engaging in high-risk aggressive behavior. Democracy internalizes these costs in a variety of ways including displeasure of the electorate at having war imposed upon it by its own government. And deterrence either prevents achievement of the objective altogether or imposes punishing costs making the gamble not worth the risk. 160 III. Testing the Hypothesis Hypotheses, or paradigms, are useful if they reflect the real world better than previously held paradigms. In the complex world of foreign affairs and the war puzzle, perfection is unlikely. No general construct will fit all cases even in the restricted category of "major interstate war;" there are simply too many variables. We should insist, however, on testing against the real world and on results that suggest enhanced usefulness over other constructs. In testing the hypothesis, we can test it for consistency with major wars. That is, in looking, for example, at the principal interstate wars in the twentieth century, did they present both a nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence? 161 And although it, by itself, does not prove causation, we might also want to test the hypothesis against settings of potential wars that did not occur. That is, in non-war settings, was there an absence of at least one element of the synergy? We might also ask questions about the effect of changes on the international system in either element of the synergy. That is, what, in general, happens when a totalitarian state makes a transition to stable democracy or vice versa? And what, in general, happens when levels of deterrence are dramatically increased or decreased?

#### Psychoanalysis is a gigantic biopolitical machine that grinds up the unconscious and violently imposes reductive models upon the individual psyche

Gilles Deleuze, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Paris VII, 2004, Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953-1974, p. 274-76

I would like to present five propositions on psychoanalysis. The first is this: psy­choanalysis today presents a political danger all of its own that is different from the implicit dangers of the old psychiatric hospital. The latter constitutes a place of localized captivity; psychoanalysis, on the other hand, works in the open air. The psychoanalyst has in a sense the same position that Marx accorded to the merchant in feudal society: working in the open pores of society, not only in pri­vate offices, but also in schools, institutions, departmentalism, etc. This function puts us in a unique position with respect to the psychoanalytic project. We rec­ognize that psychoanalysis tells us a great deal about the unconscious; but, in a certain way, it does so only to reduce the unconscious, to destroy it, to repulse it, to imagine it as a sort of parasite on consciousness. For psychoanalysis, it is fair to say there are always too many desires. The Freudian conception of the child as polymorphous pervert shows that there are always too many desires. In our view, however, there are never enough desires. We do not, by one method or another, wish to reduce the unconscious: we prefer to produce it: there is no unconscious that is already there; the unconscious must be produced politically, socially, and historically. The question is: in what place, in what circumstances, in the shadow of what events, can the unconscious be produced. Producing the unconscious means very precisely the production of desire in a historical social milieu or the appearance of statements and expressions of a new kind. My second proposition is that psychoanalysis is a complete machine, designed in advance to prevent people from talking, therefore from producing statements that suit them and the groups with which they have certain affinities. As soon as one begins analysis, one has the impression of talking. But one talks in vain; the entire psychoanalytical machine exists to suppress the conditions of a real expression. Whatever one says is taken into a sort of tourniquet, an inter­pretive machine; the patient will never be able to get to what he really has to say. Desire or delirium (which are in a deep sense the same thing), desire-delirium is by its nature a libidinal investment of an entire historical milieu, of an entire social environment. What makes one delirious are classes, peoples, races, masses, mobs. Psychoanalysis, possessed of a pre-existing code, superintends a sort of destruction. This code consists of Oedipus, castration, the family romance; the most secret content of delirium, i.e. this divergence from the social and histori­cal milieu, will be destroyed so that no delirious statement, corresponding to an overflow in the unconscious, will be able to get through the analytical machine. We say that the schizophrenic has to deal not with his family, nor with his par­ents, but with peoples, populations, and tribes. We say that the unconscious is not a matter of generations or family genealogy, but rather of world population, and that the psychoanalytical machine destroys all this. I will cite just two exam­ples: the celebrated example of President Schreber whose delirium is entirely about races, history, and wars. Freud doesn’t realize this and reduces the patient’s delirium exclusively to his relationship with his father. Another example is the Wolfman: when the Wolfman dreams of six or seven wolves, which is by defini­tion a pack, i.e. a certain kind of group, Freud immediately reduces this multiplicity by bringing everything back to a single wolf who is necessarily the father. The entire collective libidinal expression manifested in the delirium of the Wolfman will be unable to make, let alone conceive of the statements that are for him the most meaningful. My third proposition is that psychoanalysis works in this way because of its automatic interpretation machine. This interpretation machine can be described in the following way: whatever you say, you mean something different. We can’t say enough about the damage these machines cause. When someone explains to me that what I say means something other than what I say, a split in the ego as subject is produced. This split is well known: what I say refers to me as the sub­ject of an utterance or statement, what I mean refers to me as an expressing subject. This split is conjured by psychoanalysis as the basis for castration and prevents all production of statements. For example, in certain schools for prob­lem children, dealing with character or even psychopathology, the child, in his work or play activities, is placed in a relationship with his educator, and in this context the child is understood as the subject of an utterance or statement; in his psychotherapy, he is put into a relationship with the analyst or the therapist, and there he is understood as an expressing subject. Whatever he does in the group in terms of his work and his play will be compared to a superior authority, that of the psychotherapist who alone will have the job of interpreting, such that the child himself is split; he cannot win acceptance for any statement about what really matters to him in his relationship or in his group. He will feel like he’s talk­ing, but he will not be able to say a single word about what’s most essential to him. Indeed, what produces statements in each one of us is not ego as subject, it’s something entirely different: multiplicities, masses and mobs, peoples and tribes, collective arrangements; they cross through us, they are within us, and they seem unfamiliar because they are part of our unconscious. The challenge for a real psychoanalysis, an anti-psychoanalytical analysis, is to discover these col­lective arrangements of expression, these collective networks, these peoples who are in us and who make us speak, and who are the source of our statements. This is the sense in which we set a whole field of experimentation, of personal or group experimentation, against the interpretive activities of psychoanalysis. My fourth proposition, to be quick, is that psychoanalysis implies a fairly peculiar power structure. The recent book by Castel, Le Psychanalysme, demon­strates this point very well. The power structure occurs in the contract, a formidable liberal bourgeois institution. It leads to “transference” and culminates in the analyst’s silence. And the analyst’s silence is the greatest and the worst of interpretations. Psychoanalysis uses a small number of collective statements, which are those of capitalism itself regarding castration, loss, and family, and it tries to get this small number of collective statements specific to capitalism to enter into the individual statements of the patients themselves. We claim that one should do just the opposite, that is, start with the real individual statements, give people conditions, including the material conditions, for the production of their individual statements, in order to discover the real collective arrangements that produce them. My last proposition is that, for our part, we prefer not to participate in any effort consistent with a Freudo-Marxist perspective. And this for two reasons. The first is that, in the end, a Freudo-Marxist effort proceeds in general from a return to origins, or more specifically to the sacred texts: the sacred texts of Freud, the sacred texts of Marx. Our point of departure must be completely dif­ferent: we refer not to sacred texts that must be, to a greater or lesser extent, interpreted, but to the situation as is, the situation of the bureaucratic apparatus in psychoanalysis, which is an effort to subvert these apparatuses. Marxism and Psychoanalysis, in two different ways, speak in the name of a kind of memory, of a culture of memory, and also speak in two different ways in the name of the requirements of a development. We believe on the contrary that one must speak in the name of a positive force of forgetting, in the name of what is for each indi­vidual his own underdevelopment, what David Cooper aptly calls our inner third world. Secondly, what separates us from any Freudo-Marxist effort is that such projects seek primarily to reconcile two economies: political economy and libid­inal or desiring economy. In Reich, too, we find the observance of this duality of this effort at reconciliation. Our point of view is on the contrary that there is but one economy and that the problem of a real anti-psychoanalytical analysis is to show how unconscious desire invests the forms of this economy. It is economy itself that is political economy and desiring economy.
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#### The attempt to universal contingent expressions of desire turns their acting-out arguments

Connolly ’2 William Connolly, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, Identity/Difference, revised edition, 2002, pp. 176-178

Finally, then, there is a dimension containing, shall we say, double contingency within it. Some of the contingent elements that enter into your identity are susceptible to reconstitution, and others remain highly resistant to it, even if you desire to transform them and even if there is cultural support for doing so. Let us call the latter branded or entrenched contingencies, to emphasize how they are both contingent formations and resistant to modification once consolidated. A branded contingency is a formation that has become instinctive, even though it may not be reducible to instinct as a biological drive. Indeed, the term "contingency" as used here in no way implies that a contingency is always something that can be changed through will or decision. There are obdurate contingencies, and it is a mistake to assume that the constructed character of a self-identity automatically implies its susceptibility to reconstruction. "Heterosexuality" might be a contingency branded into you. That is, as a result of a history of complex interactions, difficult to trace, by the time you reached your teens in this culture, you were constituted as(say) a male drawn toward sex with women and away from sex with men. In this instance, you identify with the category culturally preselected for you. Things might have turned out differently: your affectional/sexual orientation might have been reversed; or you might have been attracted to both genders; or you might have been drawn to women sexually and resistant to affectional relations with them; or you might have experienced that split in relation to males; or you might have been drawn to modes of erotic/affectional relations that scramble in one of a myriad of possible ways the categories (hetero/homo/bi-male/female) through which such entrenchments are now culturally organized, interiorized, and naturalized.13 Anyway, once things turned out the particular way we have hypothesized, this particular "heterosexuality" became branded into you as part of your second nature. It may be a mistake to try to "explain" individual "cases" too deeply, for to do so is very probably to introject dominant cultural understandings more deeply into standards of individual identity. Through a reflective genealogy you might begin to experience this formation as an entrenched contingency. It is now yours and it corresponds to currently dominant conventions, but it does not necessarily correspond to the nature of things for all that. Your sexual identity may receive its determinacy in part from a contingent aversion that you, as a male, feel toward sex with other males. But this orientation, when understood as a branded contingency (it is irrelevant here whether it contains ambivalence), may now be open to new possibilities of reflection. You are now in a position, first, to question the tendency to ethicize this disposition as if it flowed from a universally proper identity for males ("heterosexuality") and, second, to resist the conviction that you cannot really accept "homosexuality" in others unless you purge the aversion to sex with men in yourself. Without a particular set of entrenched formations you could not have an identity, even though there is more to identity than this. But everything turns upon how these contingent formations are lived and how they relate to different formations in others. The demand to ethicize or universalize the entrenched contingencies on the grounds that they flow from a true identity is a recipe for repression of difference; by treating alternative types of sexuality as immoral, deviant, or sick, it calls upon you to purge any such dispositions lingering in yourself and to support the treatment or punishment of others who manifest them more robustly. This demand grounds your sexual ethic in the self-idealization of a contingent, relational identity that takes itself to be natural and independent. The alternative demand to purge the entrenched contingency in yourself because it is unworthy of ethicization is a recipe for self-repression; it treats another contingent identity as the natural standard everyone must attain. It grounds its ethical idealism in the loathing of a self for what it is. When this track is pursued very far, others will eventually pay a price for the self-loathing you feel… for surely you will want to purge any signs of this tendency in them too. What the demand to ethicize and the demand to purge this branded contingency share is an uncritical imperative of moral purity and an overly developed enthusiasm for normalization: one must either ethicize one's instincts or purge them because they are unworthy of ethicization. Both demands naturalize visceral formations by acting as if they must be either grounded in a universal self-identity or reformed until they are. Both express and engender a certain self-contempt, an inability to accept oneself unless one can either universalize one's contingent dispositions or eliminate them because they are not susceptible to universalization. Both orientations also express a strong disposition to punishment, a demand either to defeat the other in oneself and other selves or to love it until it replicates one's ideal self. Both project the egoism of identity into the idealism of morality. Self-loathing is another contingent disposition that can infiltrate identity; and reflection on the contingency of identity might increase the susceptibility of this contingency to tactics of self-modification.
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Probably didn’t say anything important anyway