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#### The aff may only defend the consequences of the hypothetical enactment of the plan by the United States Federal Government.

#### Resolved before a colon indicates a legislative forum

Army Officer School ’4 (5-12, “# 12, Punctuation – The Colon and Semicolon”, http://usawocc.army.mil/IMI/wg12.htm)

The colon introduces the following: a. A list, but only after "as follows," "the following," or a noun for which the list is an appositive: Each scout will carry the following: (colon) meals for three days, a survival knife, and his sleeping bag. The company had four new officers: (colon) Bill Smith, Frank Tucker, Peter Fillmore, and Oliver Lewis. b. A long quotation (one or more paragraphs): In The Killer Angels Michael Shaara wrote: (colon) You may find it a different story from the one you learned in school. There have been many versions of that battle [Gettysburg] and that war [the Civil War]. (The quote continues for two more paragraphs.) c. A formal quotation or question: The President declared: (colon) "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The question is: (colon) what can we do about it? d. A second independent clause which explains the first: Potter's motive is clear: (colon) he wants the assignment. e. After the introduction of a business letter: Dear Sirs: (colon) Dear Madam: (colon) f. The details following an announcement For sale: (colon) large lakeside cabin with dock g. A formal resolution, after the word "resolved:" Resolved: (colon) That this council petition the mayor.

#### “USFG should” means the debate is solely about a policy established by the government

Ericson ’3 Jon M. Ericson, Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, 2003, p. 4

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow should in the should-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase free trade, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the affirmative side in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### They don’t meet—they defend a genealogy instead of topical action

#### First net benefit is agonism

#### Competitive activities must test participants across stable axes of achievement, like the resolution. Cheating’s bad—it’s indicative of a desire to win at all costs, which diminishes the agonistic potential of debate and reverts into an ascetic desire for weakness and suffering.

Acampora ‘2 Christa Davis Acampora, professor of philosophy at Hunter College of CUNY, “Of Dangerous Games and Dastardly Deeds,” International Studies in Philosophy, vol. 34, no. 3, Fall 2002

The agonistic game is organized around the test of a specific quality the persons involved possess. When two runners compete, the quality tested is typically speed or endurance; when artists compete, it is creativity; craftsmen test their skills, etc.. The contest has a specific set of rules and criteria for determining (i.e., measuring) which person has excelled above the others in the relevant way. What is tested is a quality the individual competitors themselves possess; and external assistance is not permitted. (This is not to say that agonistic games occur only between individuals and that there can be no cooperative aspects of agonistic engagement. Clearly individuals can assert themselves and strive against other individuals within the context of a team competition, but groups can also work collectively to engage other groups agonistically. In those cases what is tested is the collective might, creativity, endurance, or organizational ability of the participating groups.) Ideally, agonistic endeavors draw out of the competitors the best performance of which they are capable. Although agonistic competition is sometimes viewed as a "zero-sum game," in which the winner takes all, in the cases that Nietzsche highlights as particularly productive agonistic institutions, all who participate are enhanced by their competition. Winning must be a significant goal of participation in agonistic contests, but it would seem that winning might be only one, and not necessarily the most important one, among many reasons to participate in such a competition. In his later writings, Nietzsche appears to be interested in thinking about how the structures of contests or struggles can facilitate different possibilities for competing well within them. In other words, he questions whether the structure of the game might limit the way in which one might be able to compete. His study of slavish morality illuminates well that concern. II. Dastardly Deeds The so-called "Good Eris," described in "Homer's Contest," supposedly allowed the unavoidable urge to strive for preeminence to find expression in perpetual competition in ancient Greek culture. In On the Genealogy of Morals, Nietzsche seeks to critique Christianity for advocating a kind of altruism, or selflessness, that is essentially self-destructive, and for perverting the urge to struggle by transforming it into a desire for annihilation. Read in light of "Homer's Contest," Nietzsche's Genealogy enables us to better grasp his conception of the value of contest as a possible arena for the revaluation of values, and it advances an understanding of the distinctions Nietzsche draws between creative and destructive forms of contest and modes of competing within them. Nietzsche's On the Genealogy of Morals, a Streitschrift—a polemic, a writing that aims to provoke a certain kind of fighting—portrays a battle between "the two opposing values 'good and bad,' 'good and evil'." Nietzsche depicts slavish morality as that which condemns as evil what perpetuates the agon—namely, self-interest, jealousy, and the desire to legislate values— but rather than killing off the desire to struggle, slavish morality manipulates and redirects it. Prevention of struggle is considered by Nietzsche to be hostile to life: an "order thought of as sovereign and universal, not as a means in the struggle between power-complexes but as a means of preventing all struggle in general—... would be a principle hostile to life, an agent of the dissolution and destruction of man, an attempt to assassinate the future of man, a sign of weariness, a secret path to nothingness" (GM II:11). "The 'evolution' of a thing, a custom, an organ is [...] a succession of [...] more or less mutually independent processes of subduing, plus the resistances they encounter, the attempts at transformation for the purpose of defense and reaction, and the results of successful counteractions"(GM II:12). For Nietzsche, human beings, like nations, acquire their identity in their histories of struggles, accomplishments, and moments of resistance. The complete cessation of strife, for Nietzsche, robs a being of its activity, of its life. In the second essay of the Genealogy, Nietzsche identifies the notion of conscience, which demands a kind of self-mortification, as an example of the kind of contest slavish morality seeks: "Hostility, cruelty, joy in persecuting, in attacking, in change, in destruction—all this turned against the possessors of such instinct: that is the origin of the 'bad conscience'" (GM II:16). Denied all enemies and resistances, finding nothing and no one with whom to struggle except himself, the man of bad conscience: impatiently lacerated, persecuted, gnawed at, assaulted, and maltreated himself; this animal that rubbed itself raw against the bars of its cage as one tried to 'tame' it; this deprived creature... had to turn himself into an adventure, a torture chamber, an uncertain and dangerous wilderness — this fool, this yearning and desperate prisoner became the inventor of the 'bad conscience.' But thus began the gravest and uncanniest illness... a declaration of war against the old instincts upon which his strength, joy, and terribleness had reached hitherto (GM II:16). Bad conscience functions in slavish morality as a means of self-flagellation, as a way to vent the desire to hurt others once external expressions of opposition are inhibited and forbidden. "Guilt before God: this thought becomes an instrument of torture to him" (GM II:22). In that case, self-worth depends upon the ability to injure and harm oneself, to apply the payment of selfmaltreatment to one's irreconcilable account with God. It is the effort expended in one's attempt to make the impossible repayment that determines one's worth. xi The genuine struggle, that which truly determines value for the ascetic ideal is one in which one destructively opposes oneself—one's value increases as one succeeds in annihilating oneself. Slavish morality is still driven by contest, but the mode of this contest is destructive. It mistakes self-inflicted suffering as a sign of strength. The ascetic ideal celebrates cruelty and torture—it revels in and sanctifies its own pain. It is a discord that wants to be discordant, that enjoys itself in this suffering and even grows more self-confident and triumphant the more its own presupposition, its physiological capacity for life decreases. 'Triumph in the ultimate agony': the ascetic ideal has always fought under this hyperbolic sign; in this enigma of seduction, in this image of torment and delight, it recognized its brightest light, its salvation, its ultimate victory (GM III:28). Slavish morality, particularly in the form of Pauline Christianity, redirects the competitive drive and whips into submission all outward expressions of strife by cultivating the desire to be "good" xii in which case being good amounts abandoning, as Nietzsche portrays it, both the structure of the contests he admired in "Homer's Contest" and the productive ways of competing within them. It does not merely redirect the goal of the contest (e.g., struggling for the glory of Christ rather than competing for the glory of Athens), rather how one competes well is also transformed (e.g., the "good fight" is conceived as tapping divine power to destroy worldly strongholds xiii rather than excelling them). In other words, the ethos of contest, the ethos of the agon is transformed in slavish morality. Xiv III. Dangerous Games Moralities effect contests in two ways: 1) they articulate a structure through which the meaning of human being (e.g., excellence, goodness, etc.) can be created and meted out, and 2) they simultaneously cultivate a commitment to a certain way of competing within those structures. By cultivating not only a desire to win but a desire to compete well (which includes respect for one's competitor and the institutions that sets forth the terms of the engagement), xv we can establish a culture capable of deriving our standards of excellence internally and of renewing and revaluing those standards according to changes in needs and interests of our communities. This is the legacy that Nietzsche strives to articulate in his "Homer's Contest," one that he intends his so-called "new nobility" to claim. If the life of slavish morality is characterized by actions of annihilation and cruelty, Nietzsche's alternative form of valuation is marked by its activity of surmounting what opposes, of overcoming opposition by rising above (erheben) what resists, of striving continually to rise above the form of life it has lived. As a form of spiritualized striving, self-overcoming, must, like Christian agony, be self-directed; its aim is primarily resistance to and within oneself, but the agony—that is, the structure of that kind of painful struggle—differs both in how it orients its opposition and in how it pursues its goals. Self-overcoming does not aim at self-destruction but rather at self-exhaustion and self-surpassing. It strives not for annihilation but for transformation, and the method of doing so is the one most productive in the external contests of the ancient Greeks: the act of rising above. Self-overcoming asks us to seek hostility and enmity as effective means for summoning our powers of development. Others who pose as resistances, who challenge and test our strength, are to be earnestly sought and revered. That kind of reverence, Nietzsche claims, is what makes possible genuine relationships that enhance our lives. Such admiration and cultivation of opposition serve as "a bridge to love" (GM I:10) because they present a person with the opportunity to actively distinguish himself, to experience the joy and satisfaction that comes with what Nietzsche describes as "becoming what one is." xvi This, Nietzsche suggests, is what makes life worth living—it is what permits us to realize a certain human freedom to be active participants in shaping our own lives. xvii Agonists, in the sense that Nietzsche has in mind, do not strive to win at all costs. Were that their chief or even highly prominent goal we would expect to see even the best contestants hiding from their serious challengers to their superiority or much more frequently resorting to cheating in order to win. Rather, agonists strive to claim maximal meaning for their actions. (That's the good of winning.) They want to perform in a superior manner, one that they certainly hope will excel that of their opponent. In other words, the best contestants have a foremost commitment to excellence, a disposition that includes being mindful of the structure through which their action might have any meaning at all—the rules of the contest or game.xviii

#### Avoiding your burden of rejoinder to meet the neg halfway turns your advocacy—debate becomes a series of ideological speeches, not an intersubjective dialogue, which is essential to inclusion and spillover.

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

Conceiving debate as a dialogue exposes a means of bridging the divide between the policy community and the kritik community. Here I will distinguish between formal argument and dialogue. While formal argument centers on the demands of informal and formal logic as a mechanism of mediation, dialogue tends to focus on the relational aspects of an interaction. As such, it emphasizes the give-and-take process of negotiation. Consequently, dialogue emphasizes outcomes related to agreement or consensus rather than propositional correctness (Mendelson & Lindeman, 2000). As dialogue, the affirmative case constitutes a discursive act that anticipates a discursive response. The consequent interplay does not seek to establish a propositional truth, but seeks to initiate an in-depth dialogue between the debate participants. Such an approach would have little use for rigid rules of logic or argument, such as stock issues or fallacy theory, except to the point where the participants agreed that these were functional approaches. Instead, a dialogic approach encourages evaluations of affirmative cases relative to their performative benefits, or whether or not the case is a valuable speech act. The move away from formal logic structure toward a dialogical conversation model allows for a broader perspective regarding the ontological status of debate. At the same time, a dialogical approach challenges the ways that many teams argue speech act and performance theory in debates. Because there are a range of ways that performative oriented teams argue their cases, there is little consensus regarding the status of topicality. While some take topicality as a central challenge to creating performance-based debates, many argue that topicality is wholly irrelevant to the debate, contending that the requirement that a critical affirmative be topical silences creativity and oppositional approaches. However, if we move beyond viewing debate as an ontologically independent monologue—but as an invitation to dialogue, our attention must move from the ontology of the affirmative case to a consideration of the case in light of exigent opposition (Farrell, 1985). Thus, the initial speech act of the affirmative team sets the stage for an emergent response. While most responses deal directly with the affirmative case, Farrell notes that they may also deal with metacommunication regarding the process of negotiation. In this way, we may conceptualize the affirmative’s goal in creating a “germ of a response” (Bakhtin, 1990) whose completeness bears on the possibility of all subsequent utterances. Conceived as a dialogue, the affirmative speech act anticipates the negative response. A failure to adequately encourage, or anticipate a response deprives the negative speech act and the emergent dialogue of the capacity for a complete inquiry. Such violations short circuit the dialogue and undermine the potential for an emerging dialogue to gain significance (either within the debate community or as translated to forums outside of the activity). Here, the dialogical model performs as a fairness model, contending that the affirmative speech act, be it policy oriented, critical, or performative in nature, must adhere to normative restrictions to achieve its maximum competitive and ontological potential.

#### Second net benefit is pedagogy

#### Role playing as the state is essential to teaching responsible political practice

Esberg and Sagan ’12 Jane Esberg, special assistant to the director at NYU’s Center on International Cooperation, and Scott Sagan, professor of political science and director of Stanford’s Center for International Security and Cooperation, “NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy,” The Nonproliferation Review, vol. 19, issue 1, 2012, pp. 95-108, taylor & francis

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by students in educational simulations. Government participants learn about the importance of understanding foreign perspectives, the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War, political scientist Robert Mandel noted how crisis exercises and war games forced government officials to overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia,’’ moving beyond their normal organizational roles and thinking more creatively about how others might react in a crisis or conflict.6 The skills of imagination and the subsequent ability to predict foreign interests and reactions remain critical for real-world foreign policy makers. For example, simulations of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials and regional experts\*highlighted the dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’ preferences and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7 By university age, students often have a pre-defined view of international affairs, and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises force students to challenge their assumptions about how other governments behave and how their own government works.8 Since simulations became more common as a teaching tool in the late 1950s, educational literature has expounded on their benefits, from encouraging engagement by breaking from the typical lecture format, to improving communication skills, to promoting teamwork.9 More broadly, simulations can deepen understanding by asking students to link fact and theory, providing a context for facts while bringing theory into the realm of practice.10 These exercises are particularly valuable in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy makers: they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.’’11 Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12 Role-playing exercises certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\* but they learn them in a more active style. Rather than sitting in a classroom and merely receiving knowledge, students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others.13 Facts can change quickly; simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14

#### This is particularly true of this year’s topic

Connolly ’12 William E. Connolly, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, “Steps toward an Ecology of Late Capitalism,” Theory & Event, Vol. 15, Issue 1, 2012, Muse

3. Today, perhaps the initial target should be on reconstituting established patterns of consumption by a combination of direct citizen actions in consumption choices, publicity of such actions, and social movements to reconstitute the state/market supported infrastructure of consumption. By the infrastructure of consumption I mean state support for market subsystems such as a national highway system, a system of airports, medical care through private insurance, etc., etc., that enable some modes of consumption in the zones of travel, education, diet, retirement, medical care, energy use, health, and education and render others more difficult or expensive to procure.21 To shift several of these in the correct direction would already reduce extant inequalities. To change the infrastructure is also to affect the types of work and investment available. Social movements that work upon the infrastructure and ethos in tandem can make a real difference directly, encourage more people to extend their critical perspectives, and thereby open more people to a militant politics if and as a new disruptive event emerges. Perhaps a cross-state citizen goal should be to construct a pluralist assemblage by moving back and forth between shifts in role performance, revisions in political ideology, and adjustments in political sensibility, doing so to generate enough collective energy to launch a general strike simultaneously in several countries in the near future. Its aim would be to reduce inequality and to reverse the deadly future created by established patterns of climate change by fomenting significant shifts in patterns of consumption, corporate policies, state law and the priorities of interstate organizations. Again, the dilemma of today is that the fragility of things demands shifting and slowing down intrusions into several aspects of nature as we speed up shifts in identity, role performance, cultural ethos, market regulation, and citizen activism.

### Capitalism K

#### Their politics commodifies social identity—emphasis on social legitimation ensures that identity production only confirms underlying labor structures

Katz 2k Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.” Pg.163.

In that case, far from being the ground of border-crossing politics and pedagogy, voice, identity, and so forth are actually pretexts for the produc­tion of an independent realm in which revaluation takes place. Thus, what is at stake in postmodernist politics is the seizure of the (modern) means of authorization, of the means of producing social authority (i.e., subjectivities) that have been released as a result of the hegemonic crisis of post-1960s capitalism and that are presumed to hold the key to a redis­tribution of power and hence more democracy. As long as the indepen­dence of these means from the direct control of the main contending classes (that is, the relative autonomy of the petite bourgeoisie) is as­sured, then a high degree of pluralism will be legitimate, as with any rela­tively secure regime of private property. The privileging of heterogeneity represents the minimum level of agreement necessary for this system of class practices because it guarantees the independence of the discursive terrain of revaluation from the oppressed class and therefore its corporate possession by the border-crossing petite bourgeoisie. Within the framework of this agreement, various forms of postmod­ernism, with marginally different political commitments, are possible. A Left postmodernism supports this notion of pluralism and democracy by refusing to establish or theorize a hierarchy of struggles (which requires an inquiry into the material conditions of social transformation), thereby ensuring that politics will not go beyond the arena of the exchanges of discourses and identities and that it will continue to require the diplo­matic practices of postmodern pedagogues. The identities organized by a Left postmodernism, then, would best be characterized as neoidentities, since they are posited as identities that are in principle exchangeable within the system of circulation established by the counterpublics them­selves. And it is the border crossers, who can participate in many counter­publics, who will have access to the means of exchange. That is, just as the availability in principle of private property to any individual in fact se­cures its possession by the capitalist class, so the liberation of the means of authorization in fact guarantees its possession by the class whose posi­tion within the social division of labor provides it with privileged access to those means.

#### The particulars of their historical inquiry are irrelevant without totalizing theory—the aff makes universal what is particular to capitalism—methodology is a prior question

Lukács ’67 György Lukács, History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics, trans. Rodney Livingstone, MIT Press: Cambridge, 1967, p. 7-10

Thus we perceive that there is something highly problematic in the fact that capitalist society is predisposed to harmonise with scientific method, to constitute indeed the social premises of its exactness. If the internal structure of the 'facts' of their interconnections is essentially historical, if, that is to say, they are caught up in a process of continuous transformation, then we may indeed question when the greater scientific inaccuracy occurs. It is when I conceive of the 'facts' as existing in a form and as subject to laws concerning which I have a methodological certainty (or at least probability) that they no longer apply to these facts? Or is it when I consciously take this situation into account, cast a critical eye at the 'exactitude' attainable by such a method and concentrate instead on those points where this historical aspect, this decisive fact of change really manifests itself? The historical character of the 'facts' which science seems to have grasped with such 'purity' makes itself felt in an even more devastating manner. As the products of historical evolution they are involved in continuous change. But in addition they are also precisely in their objective structure the products of a definite historical epoch, namely capitalism. Thus when 'science' maintains that the manner in which data immediately present themselves is an adequate foundation of scientific conceptualisation and that the actual form of these data is the appropriate starting point for the formation of scientific concepts, it thereby takes its stand simply and dogmatically on the basis of capitalist society. It uncritically accepts the nature of the object as it is given and the laws of that society as the unalterable foundation of 'science'. In order to progress from these 'facts' to facts in the true meaning of the word it is necessary to perceive their historical conditioning as such and to abandon the point of view that would see them as immediately given: they must themselves be subjected to a historical and dialectical examination. For as Marx says:8 "The finished pattern of economic relations as seen on the surface in their real existence and consequently in the ideas with which the agents and bearers of these relations seek to understand them, is very different from, and indeed quite the reverse of and antagonistic to their inner, essential but concealed core and the concepts corresponding to it." If the facts are to be understood, this distinction between their real existence and their inner core must be grasped clearly and precisely. This distinction is the first premise of a truly scientific study which in Marx's words, "would be superfluous if the outward appearance of things coincided with their essence" .10 Thus we must detach the phenomena from the form in which they are immediately given and discover the intervening links which connect them to their core, their essence. In so doing, we shall arrive at an understanding of their apparent form and see it as the form in which the inner core necessarily appears. It is necessary because of the historical character of the facts, because they have grown in the soil of capitalist society. This twofold character, the simultaneous recognition and transcendence of immediate appearances is precisely the dialectical nexus. In this respect, superficial readers imprisoned in the modes of thought created by capitalism, experienced the gravest difficulties in comprehending the structure of thought in Capital. For on the one hand, Marx's account pushes the capitalist nature of all economic forms to their furthest limits, he creates an intellectual milieu where they can exist in their purest form by positing a society 'corresponding to the theory', i.e. capitalist through and through, consisting of none but capitalists and proletarians. But conversely, no sooner does this strategy produce results, no sooner does this world of phenomena seem to be on the point of crystallising out into theory than it dissolves into a mere illusion, a distorted situation appears as in a distorting mirror which is, however, "only the conscious expression of an imaginary movement". Only in this context which sees the isolated facts of social life as aspects of the historical process and integrates them in a totality, can knowledge of the facts hope to become knowledge of reality. This knowledge starts from the simple (and to the capitalist world), pure, immediate, natural determinants described above. It progresses from them to the knowledge of the concrete totality, i.e. to the conceptual reproduction of reality. This concrete totality is by no means an unmediated datum for thought. "The concrete is concrete," Marx says,11 "because it is a synthesis of many particular determinants, i.e. a unity of diverse elements." Idealism succumbs here to the delusion of confusing the intellectual reproduction of reality with the actual structure of reality itself. For "in thought, reality appears as the process of synthesis, not as starting-point, but as outcome, although it is the real starting-point and hence the starting-point for perception and ideas." Conversely, the vulgar materialists, even in the modem guise donned by Bernstein and others, do not go beyond the reproduction of the immediate, simple determinants of social life. They imagine that they are being quite extraordinarily 'exact' when they simply take over these determinants without either analysing them further or welding them into a concrete totality. They take the facts in abstract isolation, explaining them only in terms of abstract laws unrelated to the concrete totality. As Marx observes: "Crudeness and conceptual nullity consist in the tendency to forge arbitrary unmediated connections between things that belong together in an organic union." 12 The crudeness and conceptual nullity of such thought lies primarily in the fact that it obscures the historical, transitory nature of capitalist society. Its determinants take on the appearance of timeless, eternal categories valid for all social formations. This could be seen at its crassest in the vulgar bourgeois economists, but the vulgar Marxists soon followed in their footsteps. The dialectical method was overthrown and with it the methodological supremacy of the totality over the individual aspects; the parts were prevented from finding their definition within the whole and, instead, the whole was dismissed as unscientific or else it degenerated into the mere 'idea' or 'sum' of the parts. With the totality out of the way, the fetishistic relations of the isolated parts appeared as a timeless law valid for every human society. Marx's dictum: "The relations of production of every society form a whole" 13 is the methodological point of departure and the key to the historical understanding of social relations. All the isolated partial categories can be thought of and treated-in isolation-as something that is always present in every society. (If it cannot be found in a given society this is put down to 'chance as the exception that proves the rule.) But the changes to which these individual aspects are subject give no clear and unambiguous picture of the real differences in the various stages of the evolution of society. These can really only be discerned in the context of the total historical process of their relation to society as a whole.

#### 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.

#### Evaluate the debate as a dialectical materialist—you are a historian inquiring into the determinant factors behind the 1AC—Marx’s labor theory of value is the best possible description

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.

### Anthropocentrism K

#### Racial and gendered violence is rooted in a presupposition of human superiority—extermination of the other becomes possible only in a society which deems the ‘nonhuman’ exterminable with impunity

Deckha ’10 Maneesha Deckha, “It’s time to abandon the idea of ‘human’ rights,” The Scavenger, 12/13/2010, http://www.thescavenger.net/animals/its-time-to-abandon-the-idea-of-human-rights-77234-536.html

While the intersection of race and gender is often acknowledged in understanding the etiology of justificatory narratives for war, the presence of species distinctions and the importance of the subhuman are less appreciated. Yet, the race (and gender) thinking that animates Razack’s argument in normalizing violence for detainees (and others) is also centrally sustained by the subhuman figure. As Charles Patterson notes with respect to multiple forms of exploitation: Throughout the history of our ascent to dominance as the master species, our victimization of animals has served as the model and foundation for our victimization of each other. The study of human history reveals the pattern: first, humans exploit and slaughter animals; then, they treat other people like animas and do the same to them. Patterson emphasizes how the human/animal hierarchy and our ideas about animals and animality are foundational for intra-human hierarchies and the violence they promote. The routine violence against beings designated subhuman serves as both a justification and blueprint for violence against humans. For example, in discussing the specific dynamics of the Nazi camps, Patterson further notes how techniques to make the killing of detainees resemble the slaughter of animals were deliberately implemented in order to make the killing seem more palatable and benign. That the detainees were made naked and kept crowded in the gas chambers facilitated their animalization and, in turn, their death at the hands of other humans who were already culturally familiar and comfortable with killing animals in this way. Returning to Razack’s exposition of race thinking in contemporary camps, one can see how subhuman thinking is foundational to race thinking. One of her primary arguments is that race thinking, which she defines as “the denial of a common bond of humanity between people of European descent and those who are not”, is “a defining feature of the world order” today as in the past. In other words, it is the “species thinking” that helps to create the racial demarcation. As Razack notes with respect to the specific logic infusing the camps, they “are not simply contemporary excesses born of the west’s current quest for security, but instead represent a more ominous, permanent arrangement of who is and is not a part of the human community”. Once placed outside the “human” zone by race thinking, the detainees may be handled lawlessly and thus with violence that is legitimated at all times. Racialization is not enough and does not complete their Othering experience. Rather, they must be dehumanized for the larger public to accept the violence against them and the increasing “culture of exception” which sustains these human bodily exclusions. Although nonhumans are not the focus of Razack’s work, the centrality of the subhuman to the logic of the camps and racial and sexual violence contained therein is also clearly illustrated in her specific examples. In the course of her analysis, to determine the import of race thinking in enabling violence, Razack quotes a newspaper story that describes the background mentality of Private Lynndie England, the white female soldier made notorious by images of her holding onto imprisoned and naked Iraqi men with a leash around their necks. The story itself quotes a resident from England’s hometown who says the following about the sensibilities of individuals from their town: To the country boys here, if you’re a different nationality, a different race, you’re sub-human. That’s the way that girls like Lynndie England are raised. Tormenting Iraqis, in her mind, would be no different from shooting a turkey. Every season here you’re hunting something. Over there they’re hunting Iraqis. Razack extracts this quote to illustrate how “race overdetermined what went on”, but it may also be observed that species “overdetermined what went on”. Race has a formative function, to be sure, but it works in conjunction with species difference to enable the violence at Abu Ghraib and other camps. Dehumanization promotes racialization, which further entrenches both identities. It is an intertwined logic of race, sex, culture and species that lays the foundation for the violence.

#### Speciesism makes unspeakable violence banal and invisible

Kochi and Ordan ‘8 Tarik Kochi & Noam Ordan, “An Argument for the Global Suicide of Humanity,” borderlands, vol. 7 no. 3, 2008, http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol7no3\_2008/kochiordan\_argument.pdf

Within the picture many paint of humanity, events such as the Holocaust are considered as an exception, an aberration. The Holocaust is often portrayed as an example of ‘evil’, a moment of hatred, madness and cruelty (cf. the differing accounts of ‘evil’ given in Neiman, 2004). The event is also treated as one through which humanity might comprehend its own weakness and draw strength, via the resolve that such actions will never happen again. However, if we take seriously the differing ways in which the Holocaust was ‘evil’, then one must surely include along side it the almost uncountable numbers of genocides that have occurred throughout human history. Hence, if we are to think of the content of the ‘human heritage’, then this must include the annihilation of indigenous peoples and their cultures across the globe and the manner in which their beliefs, behaviours and social practices have been erased from what the people of the ‘West’ generally consider to be the content of a human heritage. Again the history of colonialism is telling here. It reminds us exactly how normal, regular and mundane acts of annihilation of different forms of human life and culture have been throughout human history. Indeed the history of colonialism, in its various guises, points to the fact that so many of our legal institutions and forms of ethical life (i.e. nation-states which pride themselves on protecting human rights through the rule of law) have been founded upon colonial violence, war and the appropriation of other peoples’ land (Schmitt, 2003; Benjamin, 1986). Further, the history of colonialism highlights the central function of ‘race war’ that often underlies human social organisation and many of its legal and ethical systems of thought (Foucault, 2003). This history of modern colonialism thus presents a key to understanding that events such as the Holocaust are not an aberration and exception but are closer to the norm, and sadly, lie at the heart of any heritage of humanity. After all, all too often the European colonisation of the globe was justified by arguments that indigenous inhabitants were racially ‘inferior’ and in some instances that they were closer to ‘apes’ than to humans (Diamond, 2006). Such violence justified by an erroneous view of ‘race’ is in many ways merely an extension of an underlying attitude of speciesism involving a long history of killing and enslavement of non-human species by humans. Such a connection between the two histories of inter-human violence (via the mythical notion of differing human ‘races’) and interspecies violence, is well expressed in Isaac Bashevis Singer’s comment that whereas humans consider themselves “the crown of creation”, for animals “all people are Nazis” and animal life is “an eternal Treblinka” (Singer, 1968, p.750). Certainly many organisms use ‘force’ to survive and thrive at the expense of their others. Humans are not special in this regard. However humans, due a particular form of self-awareness and ability to plan for the future, have the capacity to carry out highly organised forms of violence and destruction (i.e. the Holocaust; the massacre and enslavement of indigenous peoples by Europeans) and the capacity to develop forms of social organisation and communal life in which harm and violence are organised and regulated. It is perhaps this capacity for reflection upon the merits of harm and violence (the moral reflection upon the good and bad of violence) which gives humans a ‘special’ place within the food chain. Nonetheless, with these capacities come responsibility and our proposal of global suicide is directed at bringing into full view the issue of human moral responsibility. When taking a wider view of history, one which focuses on the relationship of humans towards other species, it becomes clear that the human heritage – and the propagation of itself as a thing of value – has occurred on the back of seemingly endless acts of violence, destruction, killing and genocide. While this cannot be verified, perhaps ‘human’ history and progress begins with the genocide of the Neanderthals and never loses a step thereafter. It only takes a short glimpse at the list of all the sufferings caused by humanity for one to begin to question whether this species deserves to continue into the future. The list of human-made disasters is ever-growing after all: suffering caused to animals in the name of science or human health, not to mention the cosmetic, food and textile industries; damage to the environment by polluting the earth and its stratosphere; deforesting and overuse of natural resources; and of course, inflicting suffering on fellow human beings all over the globe, from killing to economic exploitation to abusing minorities, individually and collectively. In light of such a list it becomes difficult to hold onto any assumption that the human species possesses any special or higher value over other species. Indeed, if humans at any point did possess such a value, because of higher cognitive powers, or even because of a special status granted by God, then humanity has surely devalued itself through its actions and has forfeited its claim to any special place within the cosmos. In our development from higher predator to semi-conscious destroyer we have perhaps undermined all that is good in ourselves and have left behind a heritage best exemplified by the images of the gas chamber and the incinerator. We draw attention to this darker and pessimistic view of the human heritage not for dramatic reasons but to throw into question the stability of a modern humanism which sees itself as inherently ‘good’ and which presents the action of cosmic colonisation as a solution to environmental catastrophe. Rather than presenting a solution it would seem that an ideology of modern humanism is itself a greater part of the problem, and as part of the problem it cannot overcome itself purely with itself. If this is so, what perhaps needs to occur is the attempt to let go of any one-sided and privileged value of the ‘human’ as it relates to moral activity. That is, perhaps it is modern humanism itself that must be negated and supplemented by a utopian anti-humanism and moral action re-conceived through this relational or dialectical standpoint in thought.

#### Vote negative to imagine the death of the human. This allows more responsible ways of coexisting with other critters to emerge.

Kochi and Ordan ‘8 Tarik Kochi & Noam Ordan, “An Argument for the Global Suicide of Humanity,” borderlands, vol. 7 no. 3, 2008, http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol7no3\_2008/kochiordan\_argument.pdf

How might such a standpoint of dialectical, utopian anti-humanism reconfigure a notion of action which does not simply repeat in another way the modern humanist infliction of violence, as exemplified by the plan of Hawking, or fall prey to institutional and systemic complicity in speciesist violence? While this question goes beyond what it is possible to outline in this paper, we contend that the thought experiment of global suicide helps to locate this question – the question of modern action itself – as residing at the heart of the modern environmental problem. In a sense perhaps the only way to understand what is at stake in ethical action which responds to the natural environment is to come to terms with the logical consequences of ethical action itself. The point operates then not as the end, but as the starting point of a standpoint which attempts to reconfigure our notions of action, life-value, and harm. For some, guided by the pressure of moral conscience or by a practice of harm minimisation, the appropriate response to historical and contemporary environmental destruction is that of action guided by abstention. For example, one way of reacting to mundane, everyday complicity is the attempt to abstain or opt-out of certain aspects of modern, industrial society: to not eat non-human animals, to invest ethically, to buy organic produce, to not use cars and buses, to live in an environmentally conscious commune. Ranging from small personal decisions to the establishment of parallel economies (think of organic and fair trade products as an attempt to set up a quasi-parallel economy), a typical modern form of action is that of a refusal to be complicit in human practices that are violent and destructive. Again, however, at a practical level, to what extent are such acts of nonparticipation rendered banal by their complicity in other actions? In a grand register of violence and harm the individual who abstains from eating non-human animals but still uses the bus or an airplane or electricity has only opted out of some harm causing practices and remains fully complicit with others. One response, however, which bypasses the problem of complicity and the banality of action is to take the non-participation solution to its most extreme level. In this instance, the only way to truly be non-complicit in the violence of the human heritage would be to opt-out altogether. Here, then, the modern discourse of reflection, responsibility and action runs to its logical conclusion – the global suicide of humanity – as a free-willed and ‘final solution’. While we are not interested in the discussion of the ‘method’ of the global suicide of humanity per se, one method that would be the least violent is that of humans choosing to no longer reproduce. [10] The case at point here is that the global suicide of humanity would be a moral act; it would take humanity out of the equation of life on this earth and remake the calculation for the benefit of everything nonhuman. While suicide in certain forms of religious thinking is normally condemned as something which is selfish and inflicts harm upon loved ones, the global suicide of humanity would be the highest act of altruism. That is, global suicide would involve the taking of responsibility for the destructive actions of the human species. By eradicating ourselves we end the long process of inflicting harm upon other species and offer a human-free world. If there is a form of divine intelligence then surely the human act of global suicide will be seen for what it is: a profound moral gesture aimed at redeeming humanity. Such an act is an offer of sacrifice to pay for past wrongs that would usher in a new future. Through the death of our species we will give the gift of life to others. It should be noted nonetheless that our proposal for the global suicide of humanity is based upon the notion that such a radical action needs to be voluntary and not forced. In this sense, and given the likelihood of such an action not being agreed upon, it operates as a thought experiment which may help humans to radically rethink what it means to participate in modern, moral life within the natural world. In other words, whether or not the act of global suicide takes place might well be irrelevant. What is more important is the form of critical reflection that an individual needs to go through before coming to the conclusion that the global suicide of humanity is an action that would be worthwhile. The point then of a thought experiment that considers the argument for the global suicide of humanity is the attempt to outline an anti-humanist, or non-human-centric ethics. Such an ethics attempts to take into account both sides of the human heritage: the capacity to carry out violence and inflict harm and the capacity to use moral reflection and creative social organisation to minimise violence and harm. Through the idea of global suicide such an ethics reintroduces a central question to the heart of moral reflection: To what extent is the value of the continuation of human life worth the total harm inflicted upon the life of all others? Regardless of whether an individual finds the idea of global suicide abhorrent or ridiculous, this question remains valid and relevant and will not go away, no matter how hard we try to forget, suppress or repress it. Finally, it is important to note that such a standpoint need not fall into a version of green or eco-fascism that considers other forms of life more important than the lives of humans. Such a position merely replicates in reverse the speciesism of modern humanist thought. Any choice between the eco-fascist and the humanist, colonial-speciesist is thus a forced choice and is, in reality, a non-choice that should be rejected. The point of proposing the idea of the global suicide of humanity is rather to help identify the way in which we differentially value different forms of life and guide our moral actions by rigidly adhered to standards of life-value. Hence the idea of global suicide, through its radicalism, challenges an ideological or culturally dominant idea of life-value. Further, through confronting humanist ethics with its own violence against the non-human, the idea of global suicide opens up a space for dialectical reflection in which the utopian ideals of both modern humanist and anti-humanist ethics may be comprehended in relation to each other. One possibility of this conflict is the production of a differing standpoint from which to understand the subject and the scope of moral action. From the outset, global suicide throws into question the linkage between life-value and the subject of moral action. It proposes a moral question, the first moral question, which must accompany every human action: Is my life, and its perpetuation, worth the denial of life to others?

### Case

#### State power is inevitable—innovative engagement can redirect power for emancipation

Martin and Pierce ’13 Deborah G. Martin, Joseph Pierce, “Reconceptualizing Resistance: Residuals of the State and Democratic Radical Pluralism,” Antipode, Vol. 45, Issue 1, pp. 61-79, January 2013, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2012.00980.x

The state offers a complex set of power structures against and with which resistance struggles (Holloway 2005; Scott 1988; Tormey 2004). Indeed, Holloway (2005) sees the state as so entrenched in power relations such that any resistance in or through the state is irrevocably bound up in its power logic. We acknowledge state power as always present, but not necessarily as monolithic.2 Despite—or perhaps because of— the power relations inherent in state frameworks, it is in part through laws and state regulations that activists can achieve reworked economic relations such as worker ownership, community banks, or cooperative housing (DeFilippis 2004). Hackworth explicitly acknowledges the possibility of a “neo-Keynesian” resistance which seeks to maintain relatively left-leaning state functions. Ultimately, though, he dismisses the resistive potential of such “neo-Keynesian” efforts, arguing that they have yielded “highly limited” successes (2007:191). We argue, however, that focusing on a state's ordering functions [the “police” component of states; as in Rancière (2004)] may provide a lens for examining how resistance through the state might destabilize or subvert neoliberal hegemony. We articulate the notion of residuals, or mechanisms of the state that can, or have historically, been wielded to mitigate inequalities of capitalism. In order to explore this arena as potentially productive for resistance, we first consider radical democracy as an already-articulated conceptualization of neoliberal resistance (Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Purcell 2008). Radical democracy does not seek to enroll the state in resistance to capital, per se, but recognizes the simultaneous co-presence of a hegemonic (but always changing) state, and anti-hegemonic resistances. Radical Democracy: Responding to Hegemony? The concept of radical democracy provides a framework for articulating where residual state apparatuses stand amidst the myriad layers of state functions, power, and hegemony (cf Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Rancière 2004). We imagine a politics in which the state –whether capitalist or not— is always hegemonic, and thus always produces an outside or excluded that is resistant to the hegemonic order. Radical democracy as initially described by Laclau and Mouffe (1985) offered a theory of resistance—although they did not use that term—to capitalist hegemonies.3 Their goal was to identify a leftist, anti-hegemonic political project that did not rely on unitary categories such as class, in response to the identity politics of the 1970s to 1990s and post-structural theorizing of the absence of any common (structural or cultural) basis for political transformation. The theory of radical democracy posits that any order is an hegemonic order; the post-Marxist socialist project of Laclau and Mouffe seeks to destabilize the hegemonies of capitalism and work towards more democratic articulations that marginalize capital, even as forms of inequality may persist (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). Nonetheless, they can seek more articulations, more opportunities for social protest and struggle over multiple inequalities. Each struggle will produce—or seek to produce—new orders, or hegemonies, but these will be unseated by other struggles; this process describes a democracy not defined solely by a capitalist hegemony. As scholars have increasingly taken neoliberalism as the distinct form of contemporary capitalism in response to which resistance is engaged, they have explored the ways that its intense market logic constricts possibilities for traditional political activism to engage the state: the state is responsive primarily to the logic of facilitating the work of private capital (Brenner and Theodore 2002; Harvey 2005; Mitchell 2003; Peck and Tickell 2002; Purcell 2008). At the same time, however, neoliberalism opens possibilities for resistance because of its internal contradictions (like all hegemonic orders); it simultaneously engages the state to facilitate capital expansion, yet rhetorically rejects the state as an active player in market logics (Leitner, Peck and Sheppard 2007; Peck and Tickell 2002; Purcell 2008). In doing so, the door is opened for alternative projects and resistances. Purcell (2008) takes up the ideals of radical democracy to focus on how it might provide specific means for resistance to neoliberalism. He wants to take the insights of Laclau and Mouffe and apply them to a particular, empirically informed framework for engaged activism that actually interrupts, if not challenges (and mostly not, in his examples), neoliberalism. As a result, Purcell engages specifically with the idea of “chains of equivalence”, which he defines as “entities [which] must simultaneously be both different and the same” (2008:74). Political coalitions and actors with shared or complimentary challenges to neoliberalism—but distinct in character, goals, and identities—form networks of equivalence [Purcell (2008), drawing from Hardt and Negri (2004) as well as Laclau and Mouffe (1985)]. Simply put, networks of equivalence conceptually allow for multiple groups with different specific interests and identities to band together to challenge the hegemony of neoliberal capitalism. The crucial point for Purcell, however, and the key radical pluralist component is that those groups can work together without having to resolve their internal differences; they need only share a common questioning of the neoliberal prioritizing of private capital. They share a struggle, then, for a different hegemony (Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Purcell 2008). In the battle against global finance, for example, activists with different specific interests (agriculture or trade policy or environmental protections) confront the state in the form of police in the streets of Seattle or Cancun (Wainwright 2007); their objections are to the state policies and agreements which support and create frameworks for world trade. In Purcell's (2008) networks of equivalence in Seattle, a similar, yet more spatially circumscribed network of neighborhood community activists, environmental activists, and a Native American tribe work together to challenge the terms of the environmental clean-up of toxins in and around the Duwamish River. Their target is the corporate interests being held responsible for actually funding the clean-up. The agent helping to hold the corporate interests accountable is the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Seattle area environmental activists have been able to form a “chain of equivalence” with the EPA in the Duwamish clean-up in part by inserting themselves into an EPA framework that seeks stakeholder input through a participatory planning structure. The shared interests of the EPA and environmental activists are not obvious or easy to negotiate; the EPA, as a bureaucracy with many actors situated within the US federal system, is positioned as a complex institutional agent. But its particular mandate with regard to environmental protection offers a difficult relation to capital, one sometimes allied with non-state actors seeking limits to capital. Purcell's (2008) account of this case is insightful and engaging. We are highly sympathetic to his project of conceptualizing resistance and, by connection, a better, more complete democracy. But we differ over some of the details—essential details—of how best to enact successful resistances. In his case study of the Duwamish River clean up in Seattle, Purcell (2008) cites government policies as the factor enabling community resistance and involvement. His account is historically detailed—and necessarily so, for the complexities of the state have everything to do with the sedimented and sometimes inherently contradictory nature of its policies and procedures. In brief, he points to the EPA, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) (also known as “Superfund”), and associated environmental laws as a sort of “environmental Keynesianism” that the federal government enacted in the decade of the 1970s (through 1980) (Purcell 2008:137). For Purcell, the neoliberalisation of these laws is evident in the increasing local devolution of governance authority over particular Superfund sites, including his case of the Duwamish River, resulting in “a proliferation of ad hoc and special purpose entities [that] increasingly carries out the everyday decision-making in Superfund cleanups” (2008:137). At the same time, however, Purcell (2008:138) acknowledges “that such ‘flexibilization’ … tends to create political opportunities that social movements can exploit”. We want to engage the idea that such flexible—or Keynesian—tools of the state are levers that can force the state to act in ways that might be counter to capital and in the service of greater democracy. In particular, we hope for a more complex, and, we expect, more practically productive conceptualization of resistance in relation to the state. While Purcell (2008:38, 183, note 2,2) acknowledges resistive possibilities from engagement with the state, he also notes that “the state is fully imbricated in the project of neoliberalization” (a point also made elsewhere; cf Harvey 2005; Holloway 2005; Mitchell 2003; Smith 1996; Wainwright 2007). We do not disagree with the basic contention that the state regulates and administers a hegemonic political economic order of and for capital. But the state is complex; following the persuasive arguments of Laclau and Mouffe (1985) and the example of the EPA in Purcell (2008), the state ought to be conceptualized like any actor: as multifaceted, with many possible subjectivities in relation to any particular conflict. This complexity offers the possibility that the state can be a tool for resistance, one we explore further in the rest of this paper.

#### We should employ state sovereignty when the particulars of a situation demands it

Derrida ‘4 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.

#### Fear of the state is a paranoid delusion that obscures real oppression and makes you complicit with dumb neocons

Dean citing Foucault ‘9 Jodi Dean, professor of political theory at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, citing Michel Foucault, “The Birth of Biopolitics (4.1): State-phobia redux,” I Cite, 8 January 2009, http://jdeanicite.typepad.com/i\_cite/2009/01/the-birth-of-biopolitics-4-statephobia-and-us-neoliberalism.html

c. The third inflationary mechanism is 'the elision of actuality.' What is striking in Foucault's discussion here is both his psychoanalytic language and the hints that he might have in mind a direct critique of Deleuze (and Guattari, I think from 1000 Plateaus? It was originally published the following year, 1980, so presumably the arguments were in the air). The third factor, the third inflationary mechanism, which seems to me to be characteristic of this type of analysis, is that it enables one to avoid paying the price of reality and actuality inasmuch as, in the name of this dynamism of the state, something like a kinship or danger, something like the great fantasy of the paranoiac and devouring state can always be found. To this extent, ultimately it hardly matters what one's grasp of reality is or what profile of actuality reality presents. It is enough, through suspicion and, as Francois Ewald would say, 'denunciation,' to find something like the fantastical profile of the state and there is no longer and need to analyze actuality. [a few pages later] what I think we should not do is imagine we are describing a real, actual process concerning ourselves when we denounce the growth of state control, or the state becoming fascist, or the establishment of state violence, and so on. All those who share in the great state phobia should know that they are following the direction of the wind and that in fact, for years and years, an effective reduction of the state has been on the way . . .I am saying that we should not delude ourselves by attributing to the state itself a process of becoming fascist which is actually exogenous and due much more to the state's reduction and dislocation. Differently put, Foucault is accusing the state-phobics of indulging in paranoid delusions. A fantasy of the state as a devouring (mother) Thing stands in for an actual analysis of the mechanisms, flows, movements, and effects that are the state. The state is not expanding--other governmentalities are expanding, spreading, intensifying. d. State-phobics avoid considering the 'real source of this kind of anti-state suspicion.' It's not new in the 60s and 70s. It was already in play in . The 'real source' is neoliberalism-ordoliberalism and its internal debates and efforts to establish itself: You find this critique of the polymorphous, omnipresent, and all-powerful state in these years when, liberalism or neoliberalism, or even more precisely, ordoliberalism was engaged in distinguishing itself from the Keynesian critique and at the same time undertaking the critique of the New Deal and Popular Front policies of state control and intervention...or, in a word, of socialism generally.

#### Empirical policy focus is good

- Specific predictions are most productive—solve complexity

- Policy relevance is key to reclaim the political

- Ivory tower abstraction is politically marginalizing

Walt ’12 Stephen M. Walt, professor of international affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, “Theory and Policy in International Relations: Some Personal Reflections,” Yale Journal of International Affairs, September 2012, http://yalejournal.org/2012/09/theory-and-policy-in-international-relations-some-personal-reflections-by-stephen-m-walt/

Most social scientists would like to think that their work helps solve important problems. For scholars of international relations, there is certainly no shortage of issues to address: ethnic and religious conflict, managing a fragile world economy, global terrorism, climate change, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, the Euro crisis, etc.—the list is endless. In this increasingly complex and still-contentious global order, one might think that scholarly expertise about international affairs would be a highly valued commodity. One might expect to see academic theorists working overtime to devise practical solutions to various real-world problems and playing prominent roles in public debates about foreign policy. Yet this does not seem to be the case for most of them. Former policy makers complain that academic scholarship is “either irrelevant or inaccessible. . . locked within the circle of esoteric scholarly discussion,” and one academic recently charged that “scholars are focusing more on themselves, less on the real world. . . Inquiry is becoming obscurantist and in-grown.”1 This situation is not what I anticipated when I decided to pursue a PhD in political science in the spring of 1976, while studying at Stanford University’s overseas program in Berlin, Germany. My undergraduate major was International Relations, and I was torn between graduate study in political science or the more well-trodden and risk-averse path to law school. A lecture on Weimar-era intellectuals by historian Gordon Craig tipped the balance: Craig argued that many German intellectuals had withdrawn from public life during this period—deeming politics too corrupt and sordid for their enlightened participation—and their abdication had helped open the door to Nazism.2 Young and idealistic (some would say naïve), I decided to get a PhD and try to bring scholarship to bear on important public policy issues.3 It has been nearly thirty years since I received my PhD. At that time, I was convinced that systematic scholarly research could uncover and verify timeless truths about international politics and foreign policy, and that once those discoveries had been made, a grateful policy community would quickly absorb them and adopt the right prescriptions. With the passage of time, I’ve gained both a greater respect for the limits of what social science can accomplish and a greater appreciation for the imperviousness of the policy community to reasoned discourse, especially in the United States. Even if scholars were able to produce more convincing analyses—itself a debatable proposition—overcoming the entrenched interests that shape what policy makers choose to do is not easy. This theme can be traced through my own work, although it did not shape my scholarly path in any conscious way. My initial work on alliance formation (e.g., The Origins of Alliances, 1987) was intended to resolve some theoretical puzzles that lay at the heart of recurring policy debates about the use of force in US foreign policy.4 I argued that the claim that states were inclined to bandwagon (i.e., ally with strong and/or threatening powers) was often used to justify the use of force, largely to maintain US credibility and prevent allies from defecting toward the Soviet bloc. By contrast, if states were inclined to balance against threats, then US credibility was not as important and fighting costly wars in the periphery was not necessary. US intervention was also justified by the perceived need to prevent left-wing governments from gaining power, based on the belief that such regimes were ideologically disposed to ally with Moscow. My research showed that balancing was much more common than bandwagoning, and my primary policy conclusion was that because the United States enjoyed enormous geopolitical advantages over the Soviet Union, it did not need to intervene in the developing world for credibility reasons and could generally take a much more relaxed view of its security requirements. The book was well-received in the academic world and attracted some modest attention within policy circles, but it is hard to discern any direct effect on US foreign policy. A subsequent work (Revolution and War, 1996) applied balance-of-threat theory to explain why domestic revolutions led to increased security competition and a heightened risk of war.5 Once again, it began with a policy puzzle: why were US policy makers so alarmed by most domestic revolutions, and why did Washington have such poor relations with revolutionary Russia, China, Cuba, Iran, and several others? I found that revolutions made calculating the balance of power more difficult, unleashed mutual misperceptions that made the use of force seem both necessary and attractive, and usually led to heightened levels of security competition and an increased risk of war. I argued that strategies of “benevolent neglect” were likely to dampen these effects and enable the United States (and others) to contain the effects of revolutionary upheavals at less cost and risk. Whatever the merits of these arguments, evidence of policy impact was slim to non-existent. In Taming American Power: The Global Response to US Primacy (2005), I sought to explain how friends and foes were responding to the unusual position of dominance that the United States enjoyed following the demise of the Soviet Union.6 Why were even long-time US allies alarmed by US primacy, and what strategies did allies and adversaries employ to deflect US power or to exploit it for their own ends? Although not limited to purely realist concepts, this work nonetheless reflected a basically realist sensibility: even if US foreign policy were motivated by noble aims, other states could not take US benevolence for granted. To reduce opposition to US primacy and ensure that key US allies bore their fair share of collective security burdens, I argued for a grand strategy of “offshore balancing” that would reduce the global military footprint of the United States and avoid long and costly wars in areas of marginal strategic importance. The case for this prescription is even stronger in the wake of the 2007 financial crisis and the failed campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan, but it is these events that are pushing the United States toward a smarter grand strategy and not my earlier eloquence. Finally, my work with John Mearsheimer on the impact of the Israel lobby was both a departure from purely realist analysis and one that nonetheless reflects our shared realist roots.7 In our view, the “special relationship” between the United States and Israel is not in either state’s long-term strategic interest and is thus inconsistent with basic realist principles.8 For realists, therefore, the lavish and unconditional support that the United States provides to Israel is an anomaly that needs to be explained. We argued that it is accounted for primarily by the influence of particularly powerful set of interest groups in the United States. The book was a best seller and helped open up a long-overdue debate on this issue, but both the lobby’s influence and the special relationship itself appear largely unaffected thus far.9 What have these and other experiences taught me about the relationship between theory and policy? The first (and somewhat depressing) lesson is that academic theory—including my own work—has had relatively little direct or indirect impact on actual state behavior. Scholars may tell themselves they are “speaking truth to power,” but most of the time the powerful don’t listen. To note an obvious example with which I was personally associated, the effort by two prominent groups of security scholars to oppose the decision to invade Iraq in 2003 had no discernible impact on the Bush administration’s march toward war, or on the many Democrats who eagerly supported Bush’s action.10 Why is academic writing on foreign affairs of such limited relevance? To answer that question, let us first consider what theory might be able to contribute, and then consider why its impact is relatively modest. II. THE ROLE OF THEORY IN THE POLICY PROCESS.11 We live in a world of dizzying complexity. Each day, policy makers must try to figure out which events most merit attention and which items can be deferred, and they must select longer-term objectives and choose policy instruments they believe will advance them. To do this, they depend on purely factual knowledge (e.g., What is the current balance of payments? How much enriched uranium does Iran have?) but also on simple typologies (e.g., “revisionist” versus “status quo” powers), on “rules of thumb” derived from experience, or on well-established empirical laws (e.g., “Democracies don’t fight each other”). And whether they are aware of it or not, policy makers invariably use explicit or implicit theories that purport to identify causal relations between two or more variables of interest. Because contemporary IR theories are relatively weak and definitive empirical tests are elusive, policy debates often hinge on competing theoretical claims. In the 1990s, for example, disagreements over how to respond to the Balkan wars rested in part on competing theories about the causes of ethnic strife.12 Today, competing prescriptions over how to deal with China’s rise rest in part on rival theories of world politics, with realists favoring preventive actions designed to contain Chinese ambitions, liberals advocating policies of engagement designed to foster ties of interdependence, and social constructivists seeking to “socialize” China within existing norms and institutions.13 These debates are important because relying on bogus theories can get states into deep trouble. Prior to World War I, German admiral Alfred von Tirpitz’s “risk theory” argued that naval expansion would put the Royal Navy at risk and deter Great Britain from opposing German ambitions. Instead, this policy led the British to align more closely with Germany’s enemies. The infamous “domino theory” helped justify America’s costly involvement in Indochina and its ill-advised interventions in Central America, just as the neo-conservatives’ naïve beliefs about the ease with which democracy could be spread via military force paved the way toward disaster in Iraq. The converse is also true, of course: good theories often produce beneficial policy results. The Ricardian theory of free trade helped increase global economic growth, and the theory of nuclear deterrence developed in the 1950s informed many aspects of US defense policy and almost certainly reduced the danger of nuclear war. From a policy maker’s point of view, what is a good theory? A good theory should be logically consistent and empirically valid (i.e., it should fit the available evidence), it should also help policy makers comprehend phenomena that would otherwise be incomprehensible. (This is what we mean by a theory’s “explanatory power.”)14 Theories are more useful to policy makers when they deal with important phenomena, and when they contain variables over which policy makers have some leverage.15 Finally, theories are most useful when they are stated clearly. Ceteris paribus, a theory that is hard to understand takes more time for potential users to grasp and is usually harder to verify and test. How does theory help policy makers do their jobs more effectively? First, theory can help them diagnose new situations as they arise. When seeking to address either a recurring issue or a specific new event, policy makers must figure out exactly what sort of phenomenon they are confronting. Is a stalemated negotiation due to lack of trust or are the protagonists simply too far apart to strike a bargain? Is an adversary seeking to alter the status quo because it is greedy, over-confident, or ideologically inspired, or because it is insecure and trying to enhance a weak position? By expanding the set of possible interpretations, theories provide policy makers with a broader set of diagnoses, and can help them avoid premature closure or dangerous forms of stereotyping. Second, by identifying the central forces at work in the international system—what Kenneth Waltz called a “picture of a realm”—theory helps policy makers anticipate future developments.16 This capacity is especially valuable when circumstances are changing rapidly and when straight-line projections from the past are unreliable. To take an obvious example, it would be foolish to try to forecast China’s future conduct by looking solely at its past actions, or even its recent behavior, because Chinese leaders are likely to revise their preferences as their relative power increases. A good theory, however, could tell us how shifts in the balance of power will affect Chinese behavior and help leaders craft policies designed to forestall dangerous future developments. Third, theory is essential to formulating policy prescriptions because all policy actions depend on at least some crude notion of causality. In other words, policy makers select measures A, B, or C because they believe they will produce the desired result. Theory helps policy makers select objectives, guides the selection of policy instruments, and identifies the conditions that must be met for these instruments to work.17 Fourth, theory is also critical to effective policy evaluation. In order to determine if a specific policy is working, policy makers must identify benchmarks measuring progress toward the stated goal(s). The selection of these benchmarks should be theoretically informed, based on what we think we know about the causal relationships involved in producing the desired outcome. Grand strategies based on realist theory tend to emphasize benchmarks that measure shifts in relative power, for example, while a strategy derived from liberal principles looks for increases in economic intercourse, levels of democratic participation, or the broadening and deepening of global institutions. Finally, general theories of international politics can help us guard against various forms of chauvinistic stereotyping. In particular, realist theories highlight the importance of security in a world that lacks a central sovereign authority, and they highlight how structural forces will “shape and shove” even very different states in similar directions. Because they recognize that all states must rely on their own resources to defend themselves, realists are less prone to demonizing adversaries and less likely to see an opponent’s military preparations as evidence of aggressive intentions. Realists are also less surprised when the United States acts in ways that are at odds with its liberal values or its alleged commitment to advancing human rights because the theory depicts international politics as a competitive realm where even powerful states must sometimes compromise ideals in order to improve their security. The Limited Impact of Theory Although it is impossible to formulate policy without at least a crude theory (i.e., some notion of what causes what), even well specified theories of international relations do not seem to have much impact on policy formation. For starters, most theories of international relations seek to explain broad tendencies across time and space, omitting other variables that may be relevant for the specific case(s) that policy makers are grappling with at a particular point in time. None of our existing stock of theories has enormous explanatory power and the specific actions that states take are usually the product of many different factors (relative power, regime-type, individual leadership traits, etc.). Unfortunately, we lack a clear method for combining these various theories or deciding which one will exert the greatest impact in a particular case. This problem is compounded by the broader context in which foreign policy is made. Social science works best when problems can be defined precisely and analyzed systematically; i.e., when actors’ preferences are known and fixed, when there is abundant data with which to test conjectures, and when the impact of alternative choices can be estimated precisely. This is rarely the case in the conduct of foreign policy, however: actors’ preferences are often obscure, they usually have multiple strategies available, and the payoffs from different choices are often unknown. Non-linear relationships and endogeneity effects abound, and preferences and perceptions may change without warning. Even careful efforts to examine the impact of specific policy instruments, such as aid programs, economic sanctions or “foreign-imposed regime changes,” are rife with selection effects that make it difficult to estimate their causal impact. To make matters worse, policy makers and theorists have very different agendas. Academic theorists pursue general explanations of recurring behavior, but policy makers are more interested in solving the specific problem(s) they face today. Although understanding tendencies can help policy makers understand whether their objectives will be easy or difficult, what happens “most of the time” is not as pertinent as knowing what is most likely to happen in the particular case at hand. Moreover, policy makers are often less interested in explaining trends than in figuring out how to overcome them. As a result, notes Arthur Stein, “in-depth experiential knowledge dominates general theorizing and statistical generalizations in the formation of policy.”18 Last but not least, the impact of academic theory is limited even more by the professionalization of the international relations sub-field and the growing gap between the Ivory Tower and the policy world. Although academics still migrate to policy jobs on occasion, their scholarly credentials do not win them much respect in official circles and may even be seen as a liability.19 They may also learn that politicians usually value loyalty and bureaucratic effectiveness far more than they prize academic distinction or theoretical novelty. Moreover, like most political science, contemporary IR scholarship is written to appeal to other members of the profession and not intended for wider consumption, which is one reason why it is increasingly impenetrable and often preoccupied with narrow and trivial topics. Younger scholars understand that theoretical novelty and methodological sophistication are valued much more than in-depth knowledge of a policy area; indeed, there is a clear bias against the latter within contemporary political science. Those without tenure are routinely cautioned not to waste their time writing for policy audiences for fear of being deemed “unscholarly.” Because work that might be useful to policy makers brings few rewards, it is hardly surprising that university-based scholars rarely try to produce it.20 Instead, the gap between theory and policy has been filled by the growing array of think tanks, consultants, and other quasi-academic groups that now dominate intellectual life in major world capitals, and especially in Washington, DC. Policy makers no longer need to consult university-based scholars for advice on pressing global problems, as there is no shortage of people inside the Beltway who are happy to weigh in and are being paid to do just that. These organizations can provide useful guidance, but there are obvious downsides to their growing prominence. Most Washington-based think tanks have an ideological agenda—usually shaped by their financial supporters—and their research output is subject to far less rigorous standards. They also lack the elaborate vetting procedures, including peer review, that universities rely upon to make personnel decisions. Policy makers can get outside advice that addresses immediate concerns but it is neither disinterested nor authoritative. This is not to say that academic scholars have no impact at all. IR theorists occasionally provide the policy community and the wider world with a vocabulary that shapes discourse and may exert subtle effects on policy formation. Concepts such as “interdependence,” “clash of civilizations,” “bipolarity,” “compellence,” “soft power,” etc., form part of the language of policy debate, influencing decisions in indirect ways. Scholars can also exploit the protections of tenure to tackle especially controversial or taboo subjects, and may succeed in opening up debate on previously neglected subjects. Yet in the United States at least, IR theorists rarely challenge taboos and rarely have much impact on policy unless they leave academic life and work directly in government themselves. Our collective impotence as a field should not surprise us: the United States is a very powerful country and its foreign policy bureaucracy is large, well-entrenched, and permeated by powerful interest groups and other stakeholders. It also has a system of divided government with many veto points, which makes policy innovation exceedingly difficult. Under these conditions, it would be fatuous to believe that a scholarly book or article—or even a whole series of them—could steer the ship of state in a new direction all by itself. To have a significant impact on policy requires either direct involvement or sustained political engagement, activities that many academics are neither interested in nor well equipped to pursue. Back in the 1950s, for example, Albert Wohlstetter and his colleagues gave dozens of briefings presenting the results of the RAND Corporation’s famous “basing studies” in an ultimately successful effort to convince the military establishment to adopt their recommendations.21 Similarly, the neoconservatives’ protracted campaign for war with Iraq—which we now know was built on factual errors, biased analysis, and bogus theories—began in earnest in 1998, but did not bear fruit until five years later. Persistence, not perspicacity, is the real taproot of policy influence. This situation has to be discomfiting to those of us who are both devoted to the “life of the mind” yet interested in using knowledge to build a better world. We can still hope to advance that goal through our teaching, and as previously noted, some scholars will have a direct impact through their own government service. There will be occasional moments when a scholar provides a new perspective or analytic approach that seizes the imagination of those in power, usually because it addresses the perceived needs of the moment. But for most members of the discipline, the goal of “speaking truth to power” will be an increasingly distant one.

## 2NC

### Anthropocentrism

#### Biopolitics calls upon “life” in contradistinction to “non-life” or “death” to shore up the productive domain of sovereignty

Agamben ‘4 Giorgio Agamben, The Open: Man and Animal, Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA, 2004, p. 13-16

For anyone undertaking a genealogical study of the concept of “life” in our culture, one of the first and most instructive observations to be made is that the concept never gets defined as such. And yet, this thing that remains indeterminate gets articulated and divided time and again through a series of caesurae and oppositions that invest it with a decisive strategic function in domains as apparently distant as philosophy, theology, politics, and—only later—medicine and biology. That is to say, everything happens as if, in our culture, life were what cannot be defined, yet, precisely for this reason, must be ceaselessly articulated and divided. In the history of Western philosophy, this strategic articulation of the concept of life has a foundational moment. It is the moment in De anima when, from among the various senses of the term “to live,” Aristotle isolates the most general and separable one. It is through life that what has soul in it {l’animale } differs from what has not {l’inanimato}.1 Now this term “to live” has more than one sense, and provided any one alone of these is found in a thing we say that the thing is living—viz. thinking, sensation, local movement and rest, or movement in the sense of nutrition, decay and growth. Hence we think of all species of plants also as living, for they are observed to possess in themselves a principle and potentiality through which they grow and decay in opposite directions. . . . This principle can be separated from the others, but not they from it—in mortal beings at least. The fact is obvious in plants; for it is the only psychic potentiality {potenza dell’anima} they possess. Thus, it is through this principle that life belongs to living things. . . . By nutritive power [threptikon] we mean that part of the soul which is common also to plants.2 It is important to observe that Aristotle in no way defines what life is: he limits himself to breaking it down, by isolating the nutritive function, in order then to rearticulate it in a series of distinct and correlated faculties or potentialities (nutrition, sensation, thought). Here we see at work that principle of foundation which constitutes the strategic device par excellence of Aristotle’s thought. It consists in reformulating every question concerning “what something is” as a question concerning “through what [dia ti] something belongs to another thing.” To ask why a certain being is called living means to seek out the foundation by which living belongs to this being. That is to say, among the various senses of the term “to live,” one must be separated from the others and settle to the bottom, becoming the principle by which life can be attributed to a certain being. In other words, what has been separated and divided (in this case nutritive life) is precisely what—in a sort of divide et impera—allows the construction of the unity of life as the hierarchical articulation of a series of functional faculties and oppositions. The isolation of nutritive life (which the ancient commentators will already call vegetative) constitutes in every sense a fundamental event for Western science. When Bichat, many centuries later, in his Recherches physiologiques sur la vie et la mort, distinguishes between “animal life,” which is defined by its relation to an external world, and “organic life,” which is nothing other than a “habitual succession of assimilation and excretion,”3 it is again Aristotle’s nutritive life that marks out the obscure background from which the life of the higher animals gets separated. According to Bichat, it is as if two “animals” lived together in every higher organism: l’animal existant au-dedans—whose life, which Bichat defines as “organic,” is merely the repetition of, so to speak, blind and unconscious functions (the circulation of blood, respiration, assimilation, excretion, etc.)—and l’animal existant au-dehors—whose life, for Bichat the only one that merits the name of “animal,” is defined through its relation to the external world. In man, these two animals live together, but they do not coincide; the internal animal’s {animale-di-dentro} organic life begins in the fetus before animal life does, and in aging and in the final death throes it survives the death of the external animal {animale- di-fuori }. It is hardly necessary to mention the strategic importance that the identification of this split between the functions of vegetative life and the functions of relational life has had in the history of modern medicine. The successes of modern surgery and anesthesia are founded upon, among other things, just this possibility of dividing and, at the same time, articulating Bichat’s two animals. And as Foucault has shown, when the modern State, starting in the seventeenth § Marked 09:03 § century, began to include the care of the population’s life as one of its essential tasks, thus transforming its politics into biopolitics, it was primarily by means of a progressive generalization and redefinition of the concept of vegetative life (now coinciding with the biological heritage of the nation) that the State would carry out its new vocation. And still today, in discussions about the definition ex lege of the criteria for clinical death, it is a further identification of this bare life—detached from any brain activity and, so to speak, from any subject—which decides whether a certain body can be considered alive or must be abandoned to the extreme vicissitude of transplantation. The division of life into vegetal and relational, organic and animal, animal and human, therefore passes first of all as a mobile border within living man, and without this intimate caesura the very decision of what is human and what is not would probably not be possible. It is possible to oppose man to other living things, and at the same time to organize the complex—and not always edifying—economy of relations between men and animals, only because something like an animal life has been separated within man, only because his distance and proximity to the animal have been measured and recognized first of all in the closest and most intimate place. But if this is true, if the caesura between the human and the animal passes first of all within man, then it is the very question of man—and of “humanism”—that must be posed in a new way. In our culture, man has always been thought of as the articulation and conjunction of a body and a soul, of a living thing and a logos, of a natural (or animal) element and a supernatural or social or divine element. We must learn instead to think of man as what results from the incongruity of these two elements, and investigate not the metaphysical mystery of conjunction, but rather the practical and political mystery of separation. What is man, if he is always the place—and, at the same time, the result—of ceaseless divisions and caesurae? It is more urgent to work on these divisions, to ask in what way—within man—has man been separated from non-man, and the animal from the human, than it is to take positions on the great issues, on so-called human rights and values. And perhaps even the most luminous sphere of our relations with the divine depends, in some way, on that darker one which separates us from the animal.

### Capitalism

#### If communism appears dead, we should rescesitate it in an affirmation of universality—orthodox critique decimates the structural support for capitalism

Žižek ‘9 Slavoj Žižek, First as Tragedy, Then as Farce, Verso: London, 2009, p. p. 6-7

What the book offers is not a neutral analysis but an engaged and extremely "partial" one-for truth is partial, accessible only when one takes sides, and is no less universal for this reason. The side taken here is, of course, that of communism. Adorno begins his Three Studies on Hegel with a rebuttal of the traditional question about Hegel exemplified by the title of Benedetto Croce's book What Is Living and What Is Dead in the Philosophy of Hegel? Such a question presupposes, on the part of the author, the adoption of an arrogant position as judge of the past; but when we are dealing with a truly great philosopher the real question to be raised concerns not what this philosopher may still tell us, what he may still mean to us, but rather the opposite, namely, what we are, what our contemporary situation might be, in his eyes, how our epoch would appear to his thought. And the same should apply to communism-instead of asking the obvious question "Is the idea of communism still pertinent today, can it still be used as a tool of analysis and political practise? " one should ask the opposite question: "How does our predicament today look from the perspective of the communist idea?" Therein resides the dialectic of the Old and the New: it is those who propose the constant creation of new terms ("postmodern society:' "risk society:' "informational society:' "postindustrial society:' etc. ) in order to grasp what is going on today who miss the contours of what is actually New. The only way to grasp the true novelty of the New is to analyze the world through the lenses of what was "eternal" in the Old. If communism really is an "eternal" Idea, then it works as a Hegelian "concrete universality": it is eternal not in the sense of a series of abstract-universal features that may be applied everywhere, but in the sense that it has to be re-invented in each new historical situation. In the good old days of Really Existing Socialism, a joke popular among dissidents was used to illustrate the futility of their protests. In the fifteenth century, when Russia was occupied by Mongols, a peasant and his wife were walking along a dusty country road; a Mongol warrior on a horse stopped at their side and told the peasant he would now proceed to rape his wife; he then added: "But since there is a lot of dust on the ground, you must hold my testicles while I rape your wife, so that they will not get dirty!" Once the Mongol had done the deed and ridden away, the peasant started laughing and jumping with joy. His surprised wife asked: "How can you be jumping with joy when I was just brutally raped in your presence?" The farmer answered: "But I got him! His balls are covered with dust!" This sad joke reveals the predicament of the dissidents: they thought they were dealing serious blows to the party nomenklatura, but al they were doing was slightly soiling the nomenklatura's testicles, while the ruling elite carried on raping the people . .. Is today's critical Left not in a similar position? (Among the contemporary names for ever-so-slightly smearing those in power, we could list "deconstruction;' or the "protection of individual freedoms:') In a famous confrontation at the university of Salamanca in 1936, Miguel de Unamuno quipped at the Francoists: "Vencereis, pero no convencereis" ("You will win, but you will not convince")-is this all that today's Left can say to triumphant global capitalism? Is the Left predestined to continue to play the role of those who, on the contrary, convince but nevertheless still lose (and are especially convincing in retroactively explaining the reasons for their own failure)? Our task is to discover how to go a step further. Our Thesis 11 should be: in our societies, critical Leftists have hitherto only succeeded in soiling those in power, whereas the real point is to castrate them .. . But how can we do this? We should learn here from the failures of twentieth century Leftist politics. The task is not to conduct the castration in a direct climactic confrontation, but to undermine those in power with patient ideologico-critical work, so that although they are still in power, one all of a sudden notices that the powers-that-be are afflicted with unnaturally high-pitched voices. Back in the 1960s, Lacan named the irregular short-lived periodical of his school Scilicet-the message was not the word's predominant meaning today ("namely; "to wit;' "that is to say"), but literally "it is permitted to know.' (To know what?-what the Freudian School of Paris thinks about the unconscious . . .) Today, our message should be the same: it is permitted to know and to fully engage in communism, to again act in full fidelity to the communist Idea. Liberal permissiveness is of the order of videlicet-it is permitted to see, but the very fascination with the obscenity we are allowed to observe prevents us from knowing what it is that we see.

#### Ideological apologia for particular elements naturalize the system as a whole—social life shouldn’t have to survive by illusion

Cotter ’12 Jennifer Cotter, Assistant Professor of English at William Jewell College, “Bio-politics, Transspecies Love and/as Class Commons-Sense,” Red Critique, Winter/Spring 2012, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/biopoliticstransspeciesismandclasscommonssense.htm

I argue that biopolitics and transspecies posthumanism, in displacing "class" with "life," "production" with "reproduction," "labor" with "love," are affective and ultimately spiritualist understandings of material contradictions that articulate what Marx calls an "inverted world-consciousness." In "A Contribution to a Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right: Introduction," Marx critiques religion for the way in which it articulates an inverted world consciousness because, on the one hand, it is "an expression of and protest against real suffering" and, on the other hand, it provides an "illusory happiness" for "real suffering." By "illusory happiness" Marx means that religion provides an illusory resolution of the material contradictions of exploitation in capitalism that cause the "real suffering" to which religion is both an effect and a response. In this way, rather than providing a material solution to problems of social alienation whose origin are in material relations of production, religion ends up providing a "spiritual aroma" for capitalism that helps to ideologically blur material relations of class and culturally adjust exploited workers to ruling class interests. It is on this basis that Marx argues that "The call [to workers] to abandon illusions about their condition is the call to abandon a condition which requires illusions" (131). Biopolitics and transspecies posthumanism articulate the "spiritual aroma"—the cultural imaginary—of transnational capital now. They do so by putting forward a "common share" in the "immaterial" of a new "global" culture under capitalism in place of transformation of the material relations of production in capitalism and freedom from exploitation. In doing so they serve to naturalize the material relations of exploitation and culturally adjust the contemporary workforces to the needs of capitalism now. In this respect, bio-political and transspecies posthumanist theories of love are a continuation—in a new historical form—of updating the working class into a new morality. George Sampson, in his 1921 book on British national education, English for the English, provides a telling historical example of this practice in his comments on the role of teaching "English" literature and culture to the working-class: "Deny to working-class children any common share in the immaterial, and presently they will grow into the men who demand with menaces a communism of the material" (as qtd in Eagleton 21). To put this another way, the "common share" in the "immaterial" of "culture" for all, was proposed by representatives of ruling class interests, such as Sampson, in order to ideologically smooth over severe material contradictions which were leading British workers to increasingly call into question the basis of ruling class wealth in their own exploitation. More generally, moreover, these comments are symptomatic of the fact that it is in the material interests of capital to provide "immaterial" and "spiritual" resolutions to deflect attention away from the economic and at the same time maintain the cultural cohesion of social bonds that are necessitated by social relations of production founded on exploitation.

#### 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.

#### Securing identities—the aff becomes an a-political goose chase that causes infighting and withdrawal

Katz 2k Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.” Pg. 39-40.

Both the economic and the cultural-ideological aspects of social domi­nation are recognized here but in a way that separates them in an ab­solute manner and makes it impossible to theorize the relations between them. The two possible courses of action posited by this passage are ei­ther to reflect an already existing collective will that is to be found in the economy or to fashion a new collective will. The very notion of the econ­omy as something that one could “get a hold of” presupposes the eco­nomic reductionism that Hall is presumably contesting: That is, it accepts the notion of the economic as something self-contained and independent. In this case, as soon as the contending classes step outside of the econ­omy, they are no longer classes in any meaningful sense but rather posi­tions struggling for power in relation to political, moral, intellectual, cul­tural, ideological, and sexual questions. This rigid antinomy is reproduced in the choice between reflecting an already formed collective will and fashioning a new one. The possibility of constructing a new collective will out of the contradictions situated in the economic structure, contradic­tions that are articulated in relation to other cultural structures where the elements of such a will are emerging as a result of differentiated arenas of struggle, is excluded here. Instead, the collective will can be fashioned through a synthesis of positions immanent in these specific struggles themselves. This becomes more evident in Hall’s concluding chapters to The Hard Road to Renewal. There, he argues that electoral politics—in fact, every kind of politics—depends on political identi­ties and identifications. People make identifications symbolically: through so­cial imagery, in their political imaginations. They “see themselves” as one sort of person or another. They “imagine their future” within this scenario or that. They don’t just think about voting in terms of how much they have, their so-called “material interests.” Material interests matter profoundly. But they are always ideologically defined (1988, 261). Once again, there is a reference to the importance of material, ultimately class interests, and Hall also mentions that people have conflicting inter­ests as well as conflicting identities. However, the claim that both the economic and the ideological are im­portant—by itself, a commonplace observation—can lead in one of two fundamentally opposed directions. One possibility is to theorize the mate­rial interests of social classes and engage in an ideological struggle to clar­ify the contradictions that structure the ideologies and identities of op­pressed groups, thereby making the production of oppositional class consciousness possible. The other possibility is to construct images and identities that are immediately accessible and intelligible within the framework of those contradictions, thereby resecuring subordinated sub­jects’ consent for the social order that produces them. This latter possibil­ity becomes the unavoidable consequence if politics is defined as “a strug­gle for popular identities” (Hall 1988, 282). In addition, this possibility is inevitable given Hall’s reductive understanding of material interests as lit­tle more than income levels (“how much they have”), rather than in terms of the reproduction of all of the social and institutional conditions of the production of effective subjects.

#### Race is a consequence of labor division—Non-Marxist theories of it ideologically serve capital

Young ‘6 Robert Young, internet guru, Red Critique, “Putting Materialism Back into Race Theory,” Winter/Spring, 2006 <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm>

This essay advances a materialist theory of race. In my view, race oppression dialectically intersects with the exploitative logic of advanced capitalism, a regime which deploys race in the interest of surplus accumulation. Thus, race operates at the (economic) base and therefore produces cultural and ideological effects at the superstructure; in turn, these effects—in very historically specific way—interact with and ideologically justify the operations at the economic base [[1]](http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/printversions/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm#_edn1). In a sense then, race encodes the totality of contemporary capitalist social relations, which is why race cuts across a range of seemingly disparate social sites in contemporary US society. For instance, one can mark race difference and its discriminatory effects in such diverse sites as health care, housing/real estate, education, law, job market, and many other social sites. However, unlike many commentators who engage race matters, I do not isolate these social sites and view race as a local problem, which would lead to reformist measures along the lines of either legal reform or a cultural-ideological battle to win the hearts and minds of people and thus keep the existing socio-economic arrangements intact; instead, I foreground the relationality of these sites within the exchange mechanism of multinational capitalism. Consequently, I believe, the eradication of race oppression also requires a totalizing political project: the transformation of existing capitalism—a system which produces difference (the racial/gender division of labor) and accompanying ideological narratives that justify the resulting social inequality. Hence, my project articulates a transformative theory of race—a theory that reclaims revolutionary class politics in the interests of contributing toward a post-racist society. In other words, the transformation from actually existing capitalism into socialism constitutes the condition of possibility for a post-racist society—a society free from racial and all other forms of oppression. By freedom, I do not simply mean a legal or cultural articulation of individual rights as proposed by bourgeois race theorists. Instead, I theorize freedom as a material effect of emancipated economic forms. I foreground my (materialist) understanding of race as a way to contest contemporary accounts of race, which erase any determinate connection to economics. For instance, humanism and poststructuralism represent two dominant views on race in the contemporary academy. Even though they articulate very different theoretical positions, they produce similar ideological effects: the suppression of economics. They collude in redirecting attention away from the logic of capitalist exploitation and point us to the cultural questions of sameness (humanism) or difference (poststructuralism). In developing my project, I critique the ideological assumptions of some exemplary instances of humanist and poststructuralist accounts of race, especially those accounts that also attempt to displace Marxism, and, in doing so, I foreground the historically determinate link between race and exploitation. It is this link that forms the core of what I am calling a transformative theory of race. The transformation of race from a sign of exploitation to one of democratic multiculturalism, ultimately, requires the transformation of capitalism.

# Rd 3 vs Wayne State JS

### T—Reduce

#### A. “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. Vio: Moratoria on future reductions isn’t a decrease in number of current restrictions.

#### C. Vote neg:

#### Predictable limits – reducing future restrictions unlimits the topic by including actions not included in the status quo. That justifies future fiat, which uniquely jacks the neg

#### Ground – future action makes it impossible to garner core DA links that are based off immediate action, like politics and perception DAs.

#### Extra T—last plank of plan isn’t a reduction—independently unpredictable and delimits stable ground division

### Debt Ceiling DA

#### Debt ceiling agreement now—Obama leverage key

Dorning 1-3 Mike Dorning, “Obama Fights Republicans on Debt as Investors Seek Growth,” Bloomberg, 1/3/2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-03/obama-fights-republicans-on-debt-as-investors-seek-growth.html

The next chapter in the skirmishing over the nation’s finances plays out during a phase of the political calendar that gives Obama unusual access to the power of the presidential bully pulpit, with his inauguration for a second term and State of the Union address in the coming weeks. The administration is considering how to make the best use of the opportunities, the White House official said. Obama is likely to repeat tactics he used to mobilize public opinion in the fight over tax rates, including a social media campaign and campaign-style appearances outside Washington, the official said. Patrick Griffin, who was White House congressional lobbying chief for Democratic President Bill Clinton, said the debt limit “is not the leverage that Republicans think it will be.” Obama “is completely in a different position” than during the 2011 debt talks, Griffin said. Fresh Mandate The president has a fresh political mandate from his re- election. And corporate leaders anxious to avert the economic disruption of a debt default have taken a more prominent role in pressing for compromise, Griffin said. Obama also has gained more public credibility on the deficit, in part because he has spent more time speaking out about wanting to bring down government debt, Griffin said. A Bloomberg National Poll conducted Dec. 7-10 found 40 percent public approval of Obama’s handling of the deficit versus 32 percent in June 2011, at the start of the last debt-limit talks. Congressional Republicans have now twice backed off threats to stand fast in the face of a financial crisis, agreeing to the debt-limit increase in August 2011 and reaching a deal to avert the tax increase on Jan. 1. “Republicans conceded they did not want to create a crisis on the fiscal cliff,” Griffin said. “Why would they want to turn around and create an even bigger crisis on the debt limit?”

#### Plan disrupts Obama’s balancing strategy—ostracizes key parts of the base

Schnur ‘12 Dan Schnur, director of the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at the University of Southern California, served as the national communications director of Senator John McCain’s presidential campaign in 2000, “The President, Gas Prices and the Pipeline,” New York Times, 4/9/2012, http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/09/the-president-gas-prices-and-the-keystone-pipeline/

Like every president seeking re-election, Barack Obama walks the fine line every day between the discordant goals of motivating his party’s strongest loyalists and reaching out to swing voters for their support. A few weeks ago, that pathway took him to a tiny town in Oklahoma, where, caught between the anti-drilling demands of the environmental community and the thirst for more affordable gasoline from unions, business owners and drivers, the president announced his support for building half of an oil pipeline. The economic impact of rising energy prices in itself is considerable, but the psychological toll on voters is just as significant, as tens of millions of motorists are reminded by large signs on almost every street corner of the financial pain of filling their gas tanks. Obama and his political lieutenants are acutely aware that this growing frustration has the potential to complicate an election year that otherwise seems to be shifting in the incumbent’s favor. As a result, Obama has been hitting the energy issue hard in recent weeks, at least as hard as a candidate can hit when forced to navigate between two almost mutually exclusive political priorities. The result is a president who talks forcefully of the benefits of wind and solar power while also boasting about the amount of oil the nation produces under his leadership. There are times when this gets slightly uncomfortable. Obama recently called for increased exploration along the Atlantic Coast but stopped short of calling for expanded drilling in that region. This is the energy policy equivalent of admitting to an experiment with marijuana but not inhaling. Where the issue becomes more tangible and therefore trickier for Obama is when the multiple choices become binary. The debate over the proposed XL Keystone Pipeline that would transport Canadian oil through the nation’s heartland to the Gulf of Mexico crystallizes the choices involved and forces a shades-of-gray conversation into starker hues of black and white. Obama recognizes that the devoted environmentalists who represent a critical portion of the Democratic party base need some motivation to turn out for him in the fall. But he also understands that centrist voters who support him on a range of other domestic and foreign policy matters could be lured away by a Republican opponent who either promises relief at the gas pump or who can lay blame at the White House doorstep for those higher prices. Even more complicated is the role of organized labor, which has poured immense amounts of support into Obama’s re-election but also prioritizes the job-creation potential of the pipeline. The result of these competing political and policy pressures brought Obama to Ripley, Okla., where he tried to satisfy the needs of these various audiences without alienating any of them. First, the president endorsed the southern portion of the Keystone project in order to relieve the glut of domestically drilled oil that is now unable to make it to refineries near the Gulf of Mexico in a timely manner. This had the effect of irritating his environmental allies but failed to mollify the project’s advocates, who pointed out that the review process that the president called for was already underway. He then reiterated the administration’s antipathy toward the northern section of the pipeline, which would allow Canadian-drilled oil to be transported into this country. This provided some comfort to drilling opponents, but infuriated both the pro-oil forces and the Canadian government. The most likely outcome is that Canada will still build a pipeline, but rather one that goes westward to the Pacific Ocean north of the United States border and then ships Canadian oil to China instead of into this country.

#### Default causes global economic collapse—on brink now

Goldfarb 1/1 (Zach, WaPost, “‘Fiscal cliff’ deal does little to tame threats from debt ceiling, high unemployment rates http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/fiscal-cliff/fiscal-cliff-deal-does-little-to-tame-threats-from-debt-ceiling-high-unemployment-rates/2013/01/01/8e4c14aa-5393-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f\_print.html)

The deal fell somewhere in between. But by gaining the support of both sides, it did not achieve what many economists believe is necessary for the short- and long-term success of the U.S. economy.¶ Leaving the fate of the debt ceiling up in the air will cause anxiety among businesses and individuals, potentially crimping hiring, investing and consumer spending.¶ In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation’s bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy.¶ And while a default would be all but certain to push the economy into recession, growth is likely to be slow — and job-market improvement slight — even without such a cataclysmic event. The unemployment rate, which stands at 7.7 percent, is not expected to fall below 7.4 percent by the end of this year, and not below 6 percent until at least 2016 or later.¶ In the midst of the recession, the government stepped in with spending programs and deep tax cuts to lift growth and reduce unemployment. A majority of economists say those efforts worked.¶ But federal stimulus has been winding down. And the spending cuts and tax hikes set for 2013 are expected to be a drag on the economy — with government policy offsetting much of the robust recovery being experienced in the private sector.

#### Economic collapse causes global wars that’s Royal

#### Economic decline kills heg

Pape ‘9professor of political science at the University of Chicago [Robert A. Pape, Realities and Obama's diplomacy, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2009-03-08/news/0903070435_1_power-assets-foreign-policy-smart-power>]

For nearly two decades, the U.S. has been viewed as a global hegemon -- vastly more powerful than any major country in the world. Since 2000, however, our global dominance has fallen dramatically. During the Bush administration, the self-inflicted wounds of the Iraq war, growing government debt, increasingly negative current account balances and other internal economic weaknesses cost the U.S. real power in a world of rapidly spreading knowledge and technology. Simply put, the main legacy of the Bush years has been to leave the U.S. as a declining power. From Rome to the United States today, the rise and fall of great nations have been driven primarily by economic strength. At any given moment, a state's power depends on the size and quality of its military forces and other power assets. Over time, however, power is a result of economic strength -- the prerequisite for building and modernizing military forces. And so the size of the economy relative to potential rivals ultimately determines the limits of power in international politics. The power position of the U.S. is crucial to the foreign policy aims that it can achieve. Since the Cold War, America has maintained a vast array of overseas commitments, seeking to ensure peace and stability not just in its own neighborhood, the Western hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia and the oil-rich Persian Gulf. Maintaining these commitments requires enormous resources, but American leaders in recent years chose to pursue far more ambitious goals than merely maintaining the status quo.

#### Heg averts global nuclear conflict

Barnett ’11 Thomas P. M. Barnett, Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” World Politics Review, 3/7/2011, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding. As a result, the vector of structure-building connectivity shifted from trans-Atlantic to trans-Pacific. But if the connectivity push of the past several decades has been from West to East, with little connectivity extended to the South outside of the narrow trade of energy and raw materials, the current connectivity dynamic is dramatically different. Now, the dominant trends are: first, the East cross-connecting back to the West via financial and investment flows as well as Asian companies "going global"; and second, the East creating vast new connectivity networks with the South through South-South trade and investment. The challenge here is how to adjust great-power politics to these profound forces of structural change. Because of the West's connectivity to the East, we are by extension becoming more deeply connected to the unstable South, with China as the primary conduit. Meanwhile, America's self-exhausting post-Sept. 11 unilateralist bender triggered the illusion -- all the rage these days -- of a G-Zero, post-American world. The result, predictably enough for manic-depressive America, is that we've sworn off any overall responsibility for the South, even as we retain the right to go anywhere and kill any individuals -- preferably with flying robots -- that we deem immediately threatening to our narrowly defined national security interests. The problem with this approach is that China has neither the intention nor the ability to step up and play anything resembling a responsible Leviathan over the restive South, where globalization's advance -- again, with a Chinese face -- produces a lot of near-term instability even as it builds the basis for longer-term stability. Libya is a perfect example of where the world is now stuck: America is very reticent to get involved militarily, while China, for the first time in its history, engages in long-range military operations to evacuate its workforce there. Meanwhile, the expanding civil war rages on, to everyone's moral and economic distress. The point is not that America must invade Libya pronto to keep the world as we know it from coming to an end. But if the United States and the West sit by while the Rest, risers that they are, manage nothing more than pious warnings about needlessly butting in, then we all run the risk of collectively making the post-American, G-Zero, do-nothing storyline a self-fulfilling prophecy. While that alone won't stop the world from spinning, if it persists as a pattern, globalization will slide down another path: one of regionalism, spheres of influence and neocolonial burdens that are intuitively hoarded by great powers grown increasingly suspicious of one another. And if you know your history, that should make you nervous.

### Eco-Sovereignty K

#### Eco-exceptionalism: environmental crisis discourse freezes politics in an ever present climate of total danger, mediating political discussions through an episteme which protects elite interests and legitimizes environmental exploitation

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 126-127

In a technologically enframed (and politically diminished) condition, crises of all kinds are manufactured in the dual sense that they are produced, deliberately or as side effects of socioeconomic processes that constantly transform reality, and employed, as Benjamin argues, as fictions (Agamben 2005, 3) to justify political repression. Discussion of whether the ecological reality of any particular situation merits the suspension of politics and ethics is, to some extent, beside the radical ecological political point (such a suspension must always be resisted), although the question of the extent of sovereign power’s involvement in manufacturing a crisis situation, including an ecological crisis like global warming, is clearly not. The real concern is that sovereign power (and, remember, Agamben is thinking primarily of state power) has, as part of its self-definition as "sovereign," accrued the sole right to decide this question. There is thus a real and devastatingly ironic possibility that the idea of an ecological crisis, so long and so vehemently denied by every state, will now find itself recuperated by the very powers responsible for bringing that crisis about, as the latest and most comprehensive justification for apolitical state of emergency, a condition that serves to insulate those powers against all political and ethical critique. We may find that the global war on terror will segue seamlessly into the crisis of global warming, a condition produced by previous technological interventions in the natural world, interventions of a kind that were initially deemed politically unchallengeable by everyone except radical ecologists. The growing (political and ecological) danger is that this emergency is used to legitimate further technocratic interventions, to further extend the state and corporate management of biological life, including the continuing reduction of humanity to bare life. We should be clear what is at stake here: nothing less than the eco- logical future of the natural world and the ethicopolitical future of humanity. The dry bed of the Aral Sea, the burning forests of Southeast Asia, the devastated landscape wrought by the exploitation of the Athabasca oil tar sands, the industrial-scale slaughter of seal pups on Canada’s east coast, and a million other examples all reveal the likely destiny of the natural world without ethicopolitical intervention. As for the reduction of humanity to bare life, this is, as Agamben claims, already well underway. Here too we find states moving toward the biopolitical management of populations; here too the procedures are justified by “exceptional" circumstances that become the new rule(s). A more spatially and temporally localized (and hence more intense) example might be found in the state of emergency declared in New Orleans after hurricane Katrina. What was portrayed as a failure to predict or manage a natural event led to the ethical and political abandonment of a largely African American urban population and the simultaneous imposition of martial law on that same population. The concern, if Agamben is right, is that the disastrous consequences of such instances increase the likelihood of further technological in- terventions and the call for more rigorous bureaucratic control and police powers on ever-increasing scales. That environmentalists now frequently find themselves labeled as ecoterrorists, as the new enemy within the state, only supports this contention (Vanderheiden 2005; Miller, Rivera, and Yelin 2008).

#### Biopolitical terror: exceptional politics reduce the other to bare life to permit its extermination while deploying threats of apocalypse as tools of normalization

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. xiv-xv

Despite their political differences, Schmitt, Benjamin, and Agamben all agree that this definition of sovereignty holds no matter how demo- cratic the modern state’s political constitution may claim to be, al- though Schmitt, of course, infamously defended the legality of the state of emergency declared following Hitler’s accession to power. This dec- laration took the form of the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State, which used emergency provisions in the Weimar consti- tution (Article 48) to suspend the personal liberties supposedly guaran- teed by the Weimar constitution (Agamben 2005, 14-15). And since, as Agamben (1998, 28) remarks, “The decree was never repealed… from a juridical standpoint the entire Third Reich can be considered a state of emergency that lasted twelve years.” Sovereignty inevitably harbors such dangers because, although the justification for declaring a state of emergency is always the defense of the people and the state, sovereign power, by definition, takes it upon itself to decide what constitutes a danger, the state, and the people (and here again, in this last instance, the anthropological machine can play a devastating role, as it did in Nazi Germany, in deciding who does and does not count as properly human). Only politics as such can contest such decisions, but politics is precisely what is suspended as a consequence of this antipolitical decision. The sovereign decision deprives particular people within a particular territory of their right to engage in politics. Here, people’s “political life” (bios politikos), their capacity to express themselves individually and in community with Others through their public words and deeds (and this is Arendt’s [195 8] definition of politics) is (politically) stripped from them. Their political existence is denied by a decision that reduces them to the condition Agamben refers to as “bare life” (naked existence). Bare life is not a return to a prepolitical state of nature, not a condition prior to or ex- ceeding political authority, but a condition in which those included within the polity (subject to sovereign political authority) are nonethe- less excluded from the polity (in terms of political participation and the protection supposedly afforded by its now suspended laws). They experience the worst of both worlds, being subject to a power under which they have no legitimate standing. The prisoners in Guantanamo Bay and the residents of New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina both found themselves in this indeterminate (excluded/included) condition (Butler 2004; Gregory 2006), and Agamben contentiously argues that the most extreme example of such a zone of indeterminacy was the concentration camp. But as Benjamin (2006, 392) remarked, the “tradition of the oppressed teaches us that the ‘state of emergency’ in which we live is not the exception but the rule." In other words, the state of emergency is not confined to such extreme times and places but also becomes normalized in more dif- fuse ways. To put this in Agamben’s terms, which draws on Foucault’s (2004; 2008) earlier analyses, we are now in a situation in which politics is everywhere being replaced by biopolitics, the governmental manage- ment and control of the biological life (and death) of populations. Even in the most democratic of countries, we find ourselves increasingly re- duced for the purposes of governance to so much biological information, to the collection and manipulation of statistics (state information) concerning every aspect of our lives; from our birth date and height to our DNA profile, the unique patterns of our iris and fingerprints, the information in our biometric passports, and so on. The consequences of this more subtle but pervasive biopolitical way of reducing people to bare life are only beginning to be recognized because, as Esposito (2008, 44) argues, "The category of biopolitics seems to demand a new horizon of meaning, a different interpretative key."

#### Text: Vote negative to jam the anthropological machine.

#### Refusing the principle of sovereign domination by contesting the humanist dogma of the 1AC is critical to establishing more responsible and respectful approaches to the ‘natural world’

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 118-121

Agamben’s position, on the other hand, claims to offer a life of absolute political emancipation, of human freedom but entirely without an ecological (or sociohistorical) context, one wherein ecology is somehow implausibly left behind, abandoned to its own unknowable purposes. Here politics risks losing any meaningful connection with the natural world because this supposedly radical position lacks any ecological articulation of politics whatsoever. In Calarco’s (2007, l64—65) words: “Where one might expect a radically post—humanist thinker such as Agamben to challenge the oppositional and reductionistic determinations of animal life characteristic of Western metaphysics, he has . . . remained largely content to occupy the human side of the human/animal binary in order to complicate and rethink the political consequences of essentialist definitions of the human.” What then actually happens to the natural world in Agamben’s "coming community”? He speaks of this future prospect in terms of a "natural life that is unsavable and that has been abandoned by every spiritual element—and yet because of the ‘great ignorance’ [animals' unawareness of the very possibility of desiring anything other than their natural possibilities, that is, their environmental captivation] is nonetheless perfectly blessed.” Human and animal are each released into “their own truer nature,” nature apparently being left serene in its “non-knowledge."' The animal will be "let be outside of being,” outside, that is, of the human phenomenal world (Agamben 2004, 90-91).10 On one level this sounds, as might befit Agamben’s spiritual hyperhumanism, suspiciously like the rapture preached by Christian fundamentalists, which also envisages the leaving behind (abandonment) of the natural world to save the truly human soul. Agamben, however, is not envisaging this in terms of humanity leaving the world at all but of humanity leaving behind its political concerns with its own nature in order to inhabit a world of possibilities that are not governed by the workings of the anthropological machine. This, he thinks, necessarily involves both the letting be of nature as such and the recognition that there is more to life than the (natural) world as it appears to human concerns. “How the world is—this is outside the world" (2000, 105). How might this inform radical ecology’s interest in saving the (natu- ral) world? A clue emerges in the way Agamben (2004, 82) speaks of this abandonment in terms of Benjamin’s notion of the “saved night," that is, the “nature that has been given back to itself," to its own transient appearances and rhythms. This giving back to itself first involves the recognition that there is so much more to nature, to the operations of those concealed rhythms, to life, than how it appears to us-- especially in the very limited mode of appearance forced on nature in its technological enframement. It also recognizes that we have to abandon the attempt to represent nature fully or fix it in its relation to us as having a certain identity. In Heidegger’s terminology, the natural world in itself is neither ready-to—hand nor present-at-hand: it cannot be fully captured instrumentally or conceptually such as it is. But we can only come to think this possibility through our ecological suspension. In one sense, and despite Agamben’s anthropocentric intentions, this offers possibilities for truly ethical recognition of the importance of letting nature be, not just, as Evernden suggests, in terms of saving those aspects of a world that have meaning for us, but going beyond this, of recognizing in Murdoch’s and Levinas’s sense a relation of infinity rather than totality (see chapter 2). We cannot save the world by bewailing the loss of just those elements that have meaning for us (as Evernden sometimes seems to suggest); we must recognize that how the world is, is also outside the human world. As naive ontologists, we had always felt something of this world that is “alive to us” but had not yet been able to conceive of its implications in ethical terms. So while Agamben lacks an ecological ethics or any explicit concern for the natural world, while he seems to think it possible that we can inhabit a world where ecology has no political meaning whatsoever, he still points a way to understanding how human and animal, politics and nature, history and natural history might eventually be reconciled. This reconciliation does not entail, as critics of radical ecology (and fundamentalist primitivists) claim, an impossible return to a mythic state of nature or any reversion to animality. It requires that we reject the claims of sovereignty in all its forms, natural and political. It requires the political mastery of politics as an ethically informed practice by all the world’s people rather than the (bio)political mastery of the world, the ethical recognition of the necessary openness of politics and nature. This means that those capable of doing so accept responsibility for the (pure) means of political "production" in such a way that they let nature be, free from any claims to sovereign power over it. Agamben’s position is not as Hegelian as it initially seemed because he, like Bataille, concerns himself with what exceeds and resists the claims of any purportedly universal or totalizing dialectic: What does this "mastery of the relation between nature and humanity" mean? That neither must man master nature nor nature man. Nor must both be surpassed by a third term that would represent their synthesis. Rather, according to the Benjaminian model of a “dialectic at a standstill,” what is decisive here is only the “between,” the interval or, we might say, the play between the two terms, their immediate constellation in a non- coincidence. The anthropological machine no longer articulates nature and man in order to produce the human through the [political] suspension and capture of the inhuman. The machine is, so to speak, stopped; it is "at a standstill." And, in the reciprocal suspension of the two terms, something for which we perhaps have no name and which is neither animal nor man settles in between nature and humanity and holds itself in the mastered relation, in the saved night. (2004, 83) Perhaps we might find a name for this "reciprocal suspension," the ecological suspension that enables ethics and politics and the political suspension that frees nature into the creative exuberance of the saved night. We might refer to this reconciliation too as a form of “suspended animation," not in the sense of bare life nor of a cryogenic stopping of life’s rhythms or even of leaving nature hanging over the abyss of ecologi-cal destruction, but as an image of the ethical and political holding open of life’s possibilities for both human and more-than-human worlds, as the ethicopolitical suspension of that originary ecological suspension-- those events that initially open the world from its captivation. In this way we might still, naively, attempt to save the (natural) world.

### Russia Oil DA

#### Oil high now and about to go higher—Russia has dominance and middle east crisis means oil prices will double; Plan deflates the oil prices with new supply.

Kompaneyets 12/29 (Andrey, Staff, Voice of Russia, <http://english.ruvr.ru/2012_12_29/Will-oil-price-soar-in-2013/)CJQ>

Next year’s oil price will be about $100 on average but if the situation in the Middle East explodes oil could hit the level of $200, experts say. For the whole of 2012 oil prices remained within a comfortable range for the global economy, without any serious ups or downs. Experts point out that moderate fluctuations satisfy everyone. Analyst Vitaly Krukov from IFD Kapital Group expects the average oil price to remain on the level of 2012. “The oil price is expected to remain at the level of $100. I don’t believe that price fluctuations will be considerable because geopolitical factors have had a marked influence in recent months and next year is unlikely to bring any change in this respect.” However, this scenario will not work if the situation in the Middle East gets out of hand. Expert Denis Borisov from Nomos Bank is convinced that in this case the oil price could hit all records. “The US election is over and now the Iranian issue could top the agenda again. If the worst comes to the worst the rates could become unpredictable and the price could skyrocket to $200.” Experts traditionally name the geopolitical situation as the determining non-economic factor for the oil price. Another significant issue will be the investment activity in the field of oil and gas production in various regions of the world. First of all, we mean the growth of production in the US, IFD Kapital Group expert Vitaly Krukov says. “It is mainly projects in extracting shale oil, they will have a strong effect on a long-term basis. At present I don’t expects them to have any noticeable effect on the oil price in 2013. The current trend is that the US is lowering oil imports and increasing domestic production. At the same time, this trend will be offset by irregular oil deliveries from hot spots.” Shale projects in Europe looked less attractive from the very outset due to difficult land relations. In addition, the population density in Europe is high and shale oil extraction requires a lot of wells. ExxonMobil’s cancellation of projects in Poland became a convincing signal that shale projects would have no mass character in Europe.” Meanwhile, Russian companies are increasing their influence on the global oil and gas market. In particular, Rosneft, which will close up the deal on buying TNK-BP assets in 2013, will become the world-largest company in volumes of proven reserves and daily production. Analysts believe that the company will further consolidate its position when it begins work on the shelf, which is only an issue of a very short time, experts say, because Rosneft is holding all trump cards.

#### Increasing supply of natty drastically pushes down prices

Deutch ’11 (John, Institute Prof. @ Mass. Inst. Tech, Fmr. Dept. Sec. Defense, "The Good News About Gas: The Natural Gas Revolution and Its Consequences," Pp. 92-93, Foreign Affairs 90:1, Jan/Feb 2011) CJQ

In addition to affecting natural gas markets, the increased supply of natural gas will dramatically change the outlook for oil markets. As natural gas edges out oil in the power, transportation, and chemical sectors, oil prices will fall and the price disparity between oil and gas will close. The major oil-producing countries, of course, will need to readjust their expectations. Most of them operate through national oil companies that serve their government’s political and economic interests. The newfound natural gas reserves, dispersed around the world, will reduce the market power these companies have enjoyed. There will be difficult negotiations between natural gas suppliers and consumers over new contract terms. Accordingly, past concerns that the Gas Exporting Countries Forum, an opec-like cartel formed by major natural gas producers, could control supplies and prices of gas the way oil producers have with oil appear far less serious. International oil companies caught with major investments in the exploration and production of natural gas in the Arctic and deep offshore are quickly shifting their exploration and production activities to shale and other forms of unconventional gas that are cheaper to produce. Nobody knows how significant this prospective shift from oil to natural gas might become. But two points deserve emphasis. First, although the explosion of shale gas production will lead to gas substituting for oil and erode the market and political power of today’s major oil- and gas-exporting countries, this market penetration will not be so large that the security concerns of the United States and other oil importers about dependence on foreign oil will disappear.

#### Sudden oil price drop collapses the Russian economy

Rapoza 12 (Kenneth, Forbes Contributor, 4/3/12, [http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2012/04/03 /oil-a-problem-for-russian-economy-official-says/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2012/04/03%20/oil-a-problem-for-russian-economy-official-says/)) CJQ

Russia, awash in oil and natural gas.  It’s the reason why the economy has a budget surplus, and for some it is the reason why Vladimir Putin and United Russia are still in power. Follow the rising price of oil over the last seven years and you will see the rising GDP of the Russian economy right along with it.  Its national icon, Gazprom, is a multi-billion dollar, football sponsoring natural gas behemoth. The biggest in the world. And companies like it, from Rosneft to the privately held Lukoil oil are bad news for the Russians in the not-so-distant future.  Combined they and others in the oil and gas biz account for 75% of Russia’s exports. “Economic growth will promptly fall to two or three percent a year in case of further dominance of the raw materials and fuel sector in the economy as it is now,” Russian Development Minister Elvira Nabiullina told a forum in Moscow on Tuesday. The country’s economic development may get stuck at the level of Japan she warned, something no decent developing nation would wish on their worst enemy. Japan is lucky if it grows 1% a year on average over the course of a five year stretch. Russia’s economy grew 4.3% last year, and is forecast by the government to grow at 3.7% if Urals oil price averages are $100 per barrel. She warned that a fall in GDP growth rates by 0.7-1.7% will cause “a rapid loss of (Russia’s) share of the global market and, what is most important, will reduce opportunities for increasing incomes and living standards.” As an investment story, Russia is known as an oil and gas play. Like the country or not, where oil goes, Russia’s economy will go right along with it. That’s great when Brent crude and its accompanying cheaper oil, Urals, is well over $80 a barrel.  High oil prices is helping finance the new skyline of Moscow. Across from the Moscow River, near where Stalin built his great architectural works in honor of the Russian peoples’ success in World War II, are shiny silver and gold skyscrapers with Sberbank and VTB Capital logos on them. Moscow wants to be a mini-Frankfurt. Better yet, bigger than Frankfurt. It wants to be one of the biggest financial markets in the emerging world. Brazil and China have it beat. Russia’s one trick pony economy is why. Last October, Alexei Kudrin, then Finance Minister of Russia, said that the economy would be okay if Urals priced at $60. Below that and you get budget deficits and credit contraction. That’s no way to build for the future, especially in Moscow, which at first glance is aching to modernize and doing so as fast as Russia can.

#### Nuclear war

Steven David, Prof. of political science at Johns Hopkins, 1999, Foreign Affairs

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

### Warming Adv

#### Reduced consumption lowers prices—that’s offset with increased exports to China

Plumer ’12 Brad Plumer, “How the U.S. could influence China’s coal habits—with exports,” Washington Post, 5/1/2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/can-the-united-states-influence-chinas-coal-habits/2012/05/01/gIQAgqUpuT\_blog.html

Still, as a recent and fascinating report (pdf) from the Carnegie Endowment explains, Chinese coal imports are likely to grow enormously in the coming years. For one, Chinese coal use has been growing at a rate of nearly 6 percent each year. And China’s domestic production can’t keep pace, thanks to railroad and shipping bottlenecks from mining centers in Shanxi, Shaanxi and Inner Mongolia provinces. What’s more, the Carnegie report notes, the Chinese government is becoming increasingly sensitive to the ecological damage wrought by domestic coal mining — as well as to the growing number of protests over unsafe mining conditions. According to official statistics, 6,027 Chinese miners died in 2004, though the real number is probably higher. There are real costs to ramping up production in China. As a result, China will likely try to import a growing share of its coal in the coming years. Much of that will likely come from Indonesia and Australia, since China’s import infrastructure is geared toward those two regions. But many analysts expect the United States to play an increasingly crucial role in coming years. (To date, the U.S. has been supplying China with just small amounts of coking coal, which is used for iron and steel production and which is less readily available in China.) And if American coal starts pouring into China, that will help keep prices down. If that happens, Chinese power plants and factories will burn even more coal and use the stuff less efficiently than they otherwise would. Grist’s David Roberts points to a recent paper (pdf) by Thomas M. Power, a former economics professor at the University of Montana, finding that Chinese coal habits are highly sensitive to prices: Opening the Asian import market to dramatic increases in U.S. coal will drive down coal prices in that market. Several empirical studies of energy in China have demonstrated that coal consumption is highly sensitive to cost. One recent study found that a 10 percent reduction in coal cost would result in a 12 percent increase in coal consumption. Another found that over half of the gain in China’s “energy intensity” improvement during the 1990s was a response to prices. In other words, coal exports will mean cheaper coal in Asia, and cheaper coal means more coal will be burned than would otherwise be the case.

#### Natural gas will inevitably kill coal – not resilient

Miller 12 (RL, attorney and environment blogger with Climate Hawks, "The Rage Of A Dying Dinosaur: Coal’s Decline In The U.S.," Jun 23, [http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/06/23/504331/the-rage-of-a-dying-dinosaur-coals-decline-in-the-us/], jam)

A dinosaur backed into a corner by a pack of smaller dinosaurs may be mortally wounded, but it’s big and angry enough to do some serious damage in its death throes. The coal industry, long accustomed to being the Tyrannosaurus Rex of American politics, is on the ropes, battered by forces outside its control, but angry enough to damage people while it searches for an escape route. Long term use of coal in the US is declining: “The share of U.S. electricity that comes from coal is forecast to fall below 40% for the year, its lowest level since World War II. Four years ago, it was 50%. By the end of this decade, it is likely to be near 30%.” Coal’s decline is widely attributed to three reasons, which I’ve cleverly named EPA — Environmental Protection Agency, Price, Activists. One is far less important than the other two. Congressional Republicans blame the EPA, but every time I’ve looked at “EPA regulations force this coal plant shutdown” cries, I’ve found a decrepit old plant shut down most months because maintenance costs are too high. EPA regulations are a relatively minor factor in coal plant shutdowns. Most business analysts attribute coal’s fall to price. Coal’s price in the United States has stayed fairly stable, but prices of alternatives have plummeted. Natgas is at $2.50/MBTU – it was $9-10 during Bush years. Utilities are actively planning to replace older coal fired plants to natural gas. Things are so bad for Old King Coal that it’s fighting with two of its usual strong allies. The electric utilities, formerly joined at the hip with coal, are now bailing on coal: many now recognize that expending the political capital to fight for plants built in the middle of last century is not worth it — especially when they can construct combined cycle natural gas facilities with relative regulatory ease while releasing roughly half of the emissions in the meantime. A perfect storm is pulling the coal sector under: For example, “American Electric Power, meanwhile, has been one of the most vocal critics of EPA regs. But at the same time, it has admitted — according to Tierney’s paper — that its coal plants are running much less than intended because it is cheaper to operate the natural gas facilities.” While coal is flatlining or declining everywhere else, it's exploding in China Today, Arch Coal announces layoffs of 750 employees, blaming “current market pressures and a challenging regulatory environment.” To top off matters, electric utilities and the coal barons are picking a fight with the railroads, normally the third member of their power-hungry pack, demanding that anti-trust exemptions be removed from railroads. This will not end well for the tyrannosaurus, one hopes. The business analysts don’t like to acknowledge the third reason why coal in the United States is decreasing: the activists. The Sierra Club’s Beyond Coal program takes credit for shutting down 169 coal plants in the United States since Dick Cheney announced a need to build 200 more plants. It’s important to not let up the pressure to shut down coal plants wherever they may be proposed. Coal’s market-force-led decline may change if the market for natural gas picks up and renewables haven’t yet reached grid parity. The tyrannosaurus may be down, but it’s already planning its next move – a bolt overseas, one that is being aided by Obama’s massive expansion of the Powder River Basin and the six Pacific Northwest terminals on the drawing boards. Act locally to fight coal. Some examples: \* in Asheville, North Carolina, tell Progress Energy to move beyond coal \* in Austin, Texas, attend a volunteer orientation June 30 \* if you care about clean air in the national parks, tell the EPA you want strong haze protection. And while fighting coal, remember the alternative: the sun and wind, both of which have been around longer than the dinosaurs.

#### Climate securitization produces a feedback loop which extends the cold calculus of utility to reproduce catastrophe

Yusoff ’10 Kathryn Yusoff, “Biopolitical Economies and the Political Aesthetics of Climate Change,” Theory Culture Society 27: 73, 2010, Sage

One crucial sphere in the politics of climate change is that of the decisions around what is ‘protected’, ‘saved’ or simply allowed to be in the world, and that which is laid to waste, as an unthought, unrepresented, expenditure of anthropogenic-induced climate change. In the context of nature conservation, Steve Hinchliffe has argued that, in theory, nature conservation is concerned with revealing presence and rendering that presence eternal as an archetypal category. In practice, however, the spaces and times of conservation are less clear, and presence is a precarious form of practice and something that has ‘to be made and re-made’ (Hinchliffe, 2008: 88). This approach of looking into practices does not assume in advance what is and is not political in ecologies, but looks at how politics is conﬁgured through different ﬁgures (or ﬁgurations) of the same species. This re-categorizing of aesthetics as a practice rather than representative of some other socio-political ‘thing’ considers aesthetics in terms of what it does in the world rather than what other experiences or thoughts it might give space or time to. Both approaches (aesthetics as practice, aesthetics as constituting the forms of political representation) offer an idea of aesthetics as a future-oriented practice that is implicitly political but do not conceive of this within the utopian/dystopian mode which strives to offer new images of the world, but, in turn, does not attend to the form through which things become visible (that have previously been invisible) and, crucially, through which we derive new thoughts of the possible. It is the question of visibility that Rancière speciﬁcally takes up to suggest that ‘artistic practices are ways of “doing and making” that intervene in the general distribution of ways of “doing and making”, as well as in the relationships they maintain to modes of being and forms of visibility’ (2004: 13). What is key here is that: aesthetics refers to a speciﬁc regime for identifying and reﬂecting on the arts: a mode of articulation between ways of doing and making, their corresponding forms of visibility, and possible ways of thinking about their relationships (which presupposes a certain idea of thought’s effectivity). (2004: 10) This attention to modes of articulation between forms, ways of doing and making and their in/visibility offers a politics that ‘revolves around what is seen and what can be said about it’, where what can be seen and experienced is already predetermined by the common forms of aesthetic practice – ‘a parcelling out of the visible and invisible’ (2004: 19). Thus, these ways of ‘making and doing’ are forms of arrangement and distribution in perception that constitute the social and its possible spheres of social action and forms that inscribe a sense of community. So, aesthetics can be thought of as ‘a mode of articulation between forms of action, production, perception and thought’ (2004: 82). In other words, as Ben Higham suggests, in reference to Rancière: ‘aesthetics is the condition of possibility of politics and society’ (2005: 456). Rancière’s model of aesthetics is ontologically social (as aesthetics is about senses), so it does not suggest how the experience and politics of climate change can be made fuller with regards to multispecies living. But if we push this sensibility further to include other encounters with the world that are in excess of the common modes of perception and the social, into the realm of experience that Bataille calls nonknowledge 6 and those practices that do not have humans at their centre, 7 Rancière’s thinking becomes useful in articulating the ways in which aesthetics circumscribes the space of politics (Rancière, 2006). Reconstituting the social with any number of non-human things is one way to let some other things into our consideration of the political aesthetics of climate change; another is to follow Bataille into a more energetic engagement (inspired by Nietzsche’s ‘play of the world’) that searches for the experiences and things that bring us into contact with the depth and complexity of the world (i.e. to think about what constitutes the experience of change that climate shifts instigate; see Bataille, 1988, 1989). But, while we might add to the multiplicity of things, it also becomes increasingly difﬁcult to account for what is taken away in climate-induced biodiversity loss and the mass extinction events that characterize climate change. This difﬁcultly arises because some of what is lost is never so still or so present as to enter a space of representation, and because absences in the ‘play of the world’ are always hidden in the overwhelming presence of things (in both the fullness of representation and experience). Aesthetics, then, can be seen as a form of ethical discourse on the play of things in the world, the politics of which demand that we notice both multiplicity and subtraction.

#### Even radical emissions reductions are too little, too late

Dye 10-26 Lee Dye, “It May Be Too Late to Stop Global Warming,” ABC News, 10/26/2012, http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/late-stop-global-warming/story?id=17557814&singlePage=true#.UI58icXR5DA

Here's a dark secret about the earth's changing climate that many scientists believe, but few seem eager to discuss: It's too late to stop global warming. Greenhouse gasses pumped into the planet's atmosphere will continue to grow even if the industrialized nations cut their emissions down to the bone. Furthermore, the severe measures that would have to be taken to make those reductions stand about the same chance as that proverbial snowball in hell. Two scientists who believe we are on the wrong track argue in the current issue of the journal Nature Climate Change that global warming is inevitable and it's time to switch our focus from trying to stop it to figuring out how we are going to deal with its consequences. "At present, governments' attempts to limit greenhouse-gas emissions through carbon cap-and-trade schemes and to promote renewable and sustainable energy sources are probably too late to arrest the inevitable trend of global warming," Jasper Knight of Wits University in Johannesburg, South Africa, and Stephan Harrison of the University of Exeter in England argue in their study. Those efforts, they continue, "have little relationship to the real world." What is clear, they contend, is a profound lack of understanding about how we are going to deal with the loss of huge land areas, including some entire island nations, and massive migrations as humans flee areas no longer suitable for sustaining life, the inundation of coastal properties around the world, and so on ... and on ... and on. That doesn't mean nations should stop trying to reduce their carbon emissions, because any reduction could lessen the consequences. But the cold fact is no matter what Europe and the United States and other "developed" nations do, it's not going to curb global climate change, according to one scientist who was once highly skeptical of the entire issue of global warming. "Call me a converted skeptic," physicist Richard A. Muller says in an op-ed piece published in the New York Times last July. Muller's latest book, "Energy for Future Presidents," attempts to poke holes in nearly everything we've been told about energy and climate change, except the fact that "humans are almost entirely the cause" of global warming. Those of us who live in the "developed" world initiated it. Those who live in the "developing" world will sustain it as they strive for a standard of living equal to ours. "As far as global warming is concerned, the developed world is becoming irrelevant," Muller insists in his book. We could set an example by curbing our emissions, and thus claim in the future that "it wasn't our fault," but about the only thing that could stop it would be a complete economic collapse in China and the rest of the world's developing countries. As they race forward, their industrial growth -- and their greenhouse gas emissions -- will outpace any efforts by the West to reduce their carbon footprints, Muller contends. "China has been installing a new gigawatt of coal power each week," he says in his Times piece, and each plant pumps an additional ton of gases into the atmosphere "every second." "By the time you read this, China's yearly greenhouse gas emissions will be double those of the United States, perhaps higher," he contends. And that's not likely to change. "China is fighting poverty, malnutrition, hunger, poor health, inadequate education and limited opportunity. If you were the president of China, would you endanger progress to avoid a few degrees of temperature change?" he asks.

#### Natty’s a dirty bridge—crushes renewable production and investment and methane leaks spike warming

Peter Schwartz, Wired Magazine, “Abundant natural gas and oil are putting the kibosh on clean energy” 8/17/12 <http://www.wired.com/business/2012/08/mf_naturalgas/all/>

Flipping the supply-demand relationship is having some unexpected consequences. Chief among them is that, as fossil fuels become more abundant—and we consume less of them—the incentives to develop clean, renewable energy drop dramatically. As a result, we may no longer be looking at an age of increasing solar, wind, and nuclear power. Instead we are likely moving into a new hydrocarbon era. And that’s very bad news for climate change. One of the main features of America’s changing energy landscape is the new abundance of natural gas. Only a few years ago we were desperate to bring in foreign gas. Domestic gas supplies were running out, demand was rising, and prices were skyrocketing. We were struggling to build enough gas import terminals. Fast-forward to today, and we’re trying to figure out how to convert those just-finished import terminals into export facilities. What made tens of billions of dollars’ worth of brand-new infrastructure almost worthless, seemingly overnight? Shale gas. The US is endowed with enormous deposits of shale—soft but brittle rock that is dense with hydrocarbons. Sometimes the hydrocarbons take the form of oil, but mostly they exist as natural gas. Over the past 30 years, the technology needed to break up those rocks and get at this gas has steadily advanced. Less than five years ago only specialty gas companies were working on accessing shale gas through hydraulic fracturing, or fracking—using pressurized liquid to break up the rock and release the gas. But as the technique matured and the price of gas rose, major energy companies moved aggressively to exploit these new fields. The result has been an explosion in natural gas production, which has led to a 70 percent fall in gas prices since 2008 and a near collapse of the natural gas import business. Cheap domestic gas will ultimately have three effects. First it will delay or kill most new competing sources of electricity production—be they coal, nuclear, solar, or anything else. Gas is now incredibly cheap and easy to acquire, while other energy sources remain expensive or hard to get (or both). Not surprisingly, gas is already winning: Coal is being pushed out, nuclear has stalled, and wind and solar projects are being canceled. Second, natural gas has become so cheap that it will win over some transportation markets. Trucks, buses, delivery vans, and a variety of commercial and fleet vehicles can all be converted to natural gas. UPS already runs a system of trucks powered by liquefied natural gas and has partnered with other companies to create a refueling infrastructure that runs from Los Angeles to Las Vegas and on to Salt Lake City. The third impact will be on greenhouse gas emissions. Most new power plants will run on natural gas. While methane is cleaner than coal, it is obviously dirtier than nuclear, wind, and solar. And although some aging coal plants will be replaced, decreasing overall CO2 output, far more nuclear, solar, and wind plants will be deferred or canceled in favor of gas operations. All told, moving to a gas-based power grid will almost certainly result in more greenhouse gas emissions over time. This is especially true when you factor in the inevitable gas that leaks in the production, shipping, and distribution process. As an agent of global warming, methane is 25 times more potent than C02 so even a little leakage can have a large impact.

#### No warming impact—lack of evidence, no harm in CO2, their authors are biased

Allegre et al. ’12 Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, “No Need to Panic About Global Warming,” Wall Street Journal, 1/27/2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html#articleTabs%3Darticle

Perhaps the most inconvenient fact is the lack of global warming for well over 10 years now. This is known to the warming establishment, as one can see from the 2009 "Climategate" email of climate scientist Kevin Trenberth: "The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't." But the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO2. The lack of warming for more than a decade—indeed, the smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) began issuing projections—suggests that computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming additional CO2 can cause. Faced with this embarrassment, those promoting alarm have shifted their drumbeat from warming to weather extremes, to enable anything unusual that happens in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO2. The fact is that CO2 is not a pollutant. CO2 is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle. Plants do so much better with more CO2 that greenhouse operators often increase the CO2 concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO2 concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO2 in the atmosphere. Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists is growing, many young scientists furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they are afraid to speak up for fear of not being promoted—or worse. They have good reason to worry. In 2003, Dr. Chris de Freitas, the editor of the journal Climate Research, dared to publish a peer-reviewed article with the politically incorrect (but factually correct) conclusion that the recent warming is not unusual in the context of climate changes over the past thousand years. The international warming establishment quickly mounted a determined campaign to have Dr. de Freitas removed from his editorial job and fired from his university position. Fortunately, Dr. de Freitas was able to keep his university job. This is not the way science is supposed to work, but we have seen it before—for example, in the frightening period when Trofim Lysenko hijacked biology in the Soviet Union. Soviet biologists who revealed that they believed in genes, which Lysenko maintained were a bourgeois fiction, were fired from their jobs. Many were sent to the gulag and some were condemned to death. Why is there so much passion about global warming, and why has the issue become so vexing that the American Physical Society, from which Dr. Giaever resigned a few months ago, refused the seemingly reasonable request by many of its members to remove the word "incontrovertible" from its description of a scientific issue? There are several reasons, but a good place to start is the old question "cui bono?" Or the modern update, "Follow the money." Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucracies to grow. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet. Lysenko and his team lived very well, and they fiercely defended their dogma and the privileges it brought them.

#### 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.

### Economy Adv

#### No net jobs increase

Levi ’12 Michael Levi, David M. Rubenstein senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change, “Think again: the American energy boom.” Foreign Policy July/August 2012 http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think\_again\_the\_american\_energy\_boom

It's much harder, though, to extrapolate into the future. In a deeply depressed economy, new development can put people to work without reducing employment elsewhere. That's why boom states have benefited massively in recent years. The same is not true, though, in a more normal economy. Unemployment rates are typically determined by fundamental factors such as the ease of hiring and firing and the match between skills that employers need and that workers have. The oil and gas boom won't change these much. That's why we should be skeptical about rosy projections of millions of new jobs. Wood MacKenzie, for example, claims that the energy boom could deliver as many as 1.1 million jobs by 2020, while Citigroup forecasts a whopping 3.6 million. Unless the U.S. economy remains deep in the doldrums for another decade, these will mostly come at the expense of jobs elsewhere.

#### Implicating economic decline in terms of absolute destruction postpones analysis of the emptiness and unsustainability of modern economy—this permits environmental destruction and classist abuse

Cohen ’12 Tom Cohen, “Introduction,” Telemorphosis, ed. Tom Cohen, Open Humanities Press, 2012, p. 13-15

Warnings regarding the planet earth’s imminent depletion of reserves or “life as we know it” arrive today more as routine tweets than events that might give us pause, particularly as the current wars over global “sovereign debt” and economic “crises” swamp attention. The intensifying specter of megadebt—at a time of “peak everything” (peak water, peak oil, peak humans)—dumped into a future despoiled of reserves and earning capacity has a specific relation to this white-out—the “economical” and “ecological” tandem shifts all attention to the first term (or first “eco”). In a post-global present consolidating what is routinely remarked as a neo-feudal order, the titanic shift of hyperwealth to the corporatist few (the so-called 1%) sets the stage for a shift to control societies anticipating social disruption and the implications of “Occupy” style eruptions— concerning which the U.S. congress hastily passed new unconstitutional rules to apprehend citizens or take down websites. The Ponzi scheme logics of twenty-first century earthscapes portray an array of time-bubbles, catastrophic deferrals, telecratic capture, and a voracious present that seems to practice a sort of tempophagy on itself corresponding with its structural premise of hyper-consumption and perpetual “growth. The supposed urgencies of threatened economic and monetary “collapse” occlude and defer any attention to the imperatives of the biosphere, but this apparent pause or deferral of attention covers over an irreversible mutation. A new phase of unsustainability appears in which a faux status quo ante appears to will to sustain itself as long as possible and at whatever cost; the event of the twenty-first century is that there will be no event, that no crisis will disturb the expansion of consumption beyond all supposed limits or peaks. In such an environment other materialities emerge, reference systems default, and the legacies of anthropo-narcissm go into overdrive in mechanical ways. Supposedly advanced or post-theory theory is no exception— claiming on the one hand ever more verdant comings together of redemptive communities, and discretely restoring many phenomenological tropes that 20th century thought had displaced. This has been characterized as an unfolding eco-eco disaster—a complex at once economic and ecological.1 The logics of the double oikos appear, today, caught in a self-feeding default. The present volume, in diverse ways, reclaims a certain violence that has seemed occluded or anaesthetized (it is a “present,” after all, palpably beyond “tipping points” yet shy of their fully arrived implications— hence the pop proliferation of “zombie” metaphors: zombie banks, zombie politics, zombie “theory”). It departs from a problem inherent in the “eco” as a metaphoric complex, that of the home (oikos), and the suicidal fashion in which this supposed proper ground recuperates itself from a nonexistent position. The figure of an ecology that is ours and that must be saved precludes us from confronting the displacement and dispossession which conditions all production, including the production of homelands. Memory regimes have insistently, silently and anonymously prolonged and defended the construct of “homeland security” (both in its political sense, and in the epistemological sense of being secure in our modes of cognition), but these systems of security have in fact accelerated the vortices of ecocatastrophic imaginaries. If a double logic of eco-eco disaster overlaps with the epoch in deep time geologists now refer to as the “anthropocene,” what critical re-orientations, today, contest what has been characterized as a collective blind or psychotic foreclosure? Nor can one place the blame at the feet alone of an accidental and evil ‘1%’ of corporate culture alone, since an old style revolutionary model does not emerge from this exitless network of systems. More interesting is the way that ‘theory’, with its nostalgic agendas for a properly political world of genuine praxis or feeling has been complicit in its fashion. How might one read the implicit, unseen collaboration that critical agendas coming out of twentieth century master-texts unwittingly maintained with the accelerated trajectories in question? The mesmerizing fixation with cultural histories, the ethics of “others,” the enhancement of subjectivities, “human rights” and institutions of power not only partook of this occlusion but ‘we theorists’ have deferred addressing biospheric collapse, mass extinction events, or the implications of resource wars and “population” culling. It is our sense of justified propriety— our defense of cultures, affects, bodies and others—that allows us to remain secure in our homeland, unaware of all the ruses that maintain that spurious home.

#### Shale is a bubble

Bloomberg, “US shale bubble inflates after near-record prices for untested fields” 1/9/12 <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-01-09/shale-bubble-inflates-on-near-record-prices-for-untested-fields.html>

Surging prices for oil and natural- gas shales, in at least one case rising 10-fold in five weeks, are raising concern of a bubble as valuations of drilling acreage approach the peak set before the collapse of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. Chinese, French and Japanese energy explorers committed more than $8 billion in the past two weeks to shale-rock formations from Pennsylvania to Texas after 2011 set records for international average crude prices and U.S. gas demand. As competition among buyers intensifies, overseas investors are paying top dollar for fields where too few wells have been drilled to assess potential production, said Sven Del Pozzo, a senior equity analyst at IHS Inc. (IHS) Marubeni Corp. (8002), the Japanese commodity trader, last week agreed to pay as much as $25,000 an acre for a stake in Hunt Oil Co.’s Eagle Ford shale property in Texas. The price, which includes future drilling costs, exceeds the $21,000 an acre Marathon Oil Corp. (MRO) paid last year for nearby prospects owned by KKR & Co. (KKR)’s Hilcorp Resources Holdings LP. In the Utica shale of Ohio and Pennsylvania, deal prices jumped 10-fold in five weeks to almost $15,000 an acre, according to IHS figures. “I don’t feel confident that the prices being paid now are justified,” Del Pozzo said in a telephone interview from Norwalk, Connecticut. “I’m wary.”

#### Gas has marginal impact on manufacturing

Michael Levi, David M. Rubenstein senior fellow for energy and the environment at the Council on Foreign Relations and director of its Program on Energy Security and Climate Change, “Oil and gas euphoria is getting out of hand” 5/7/12 <http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2012/05/07/oil-and-gas-euphoria-is-getting-out-of-hand/>

Once again, these sorts of claims have become increasingly common. Indeed the quantitative assertions are perfectly plausible. But the big picture implications don’t make sense. As of 2010, total sales of U.S. manufactured goods were about five trillion dollars. At the same time, the sector spent about 100 billion dollars on energy. That’s a mere two percent of total sales. You could slash energy costs to zero, and it would barely move the needle for most U.S. manufacturers. There are, of course, exceptions, like some iron, steel, cement, and paper makers. But even these industries care about much more than their electricity prices. Will lower energy costs move things at the margin? Of course they will, and that’s good news. But they are nowhere close to what’s needed for U.S. manufacturing to broadly thrive.

#### Domestic production doesn’t solve price spikes or instability

Goldwyn 11-12 David L. Goldwyn, Nonresident Senior Fellow @ Brookings, Foreign Policy, Energy Security Initiative, “Making an Energy Boom Work for the U.S.,” Brookings, 11/12/2012, http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/11/12-energy-us-goldwyn

The reduced U.S. dependence on crude imports does not mean an end to history. The issues of price volatility, diversity of supply and helping U.S. friends and allies to be free from monopolistic pricing or coercive supply arrangements will remain as vital 20 years from now as they are today. Reduced oil imports would not provide immunity from supply disruptions. Indeed, as has been seen since the advent of the Arab Spring political upheaval, the effects of useful increases in U.S. production can be overwhelmed by disruptions in producing countries. Prices are set globally. In 2011 the Libyan uprising caused a swift disruption in supply. The lack of much excess capacity to make up for more outages led to prices that further restrained already weak economic growth in the United States and Europe. Saudi Arabia ramped up production, and the International Energy Agency, based in Paris, and the United States agreed on an emergency release of strategic reserves. This year, Iran’s oil exports have declined by almost one million barrels a day, the result of surprisingly effective financial sanctions and the effects of an impending European Union embargo. But unprecedented — and essential — political cohesion to counter the threat posed by Iran’s nuclear program came at a price. Reduced Iranian exports and other outages pushed Brent crude prices to around $120 a barrel and U.S. gasoline prices close to $4 a gallon. To help countries, mostly in Asia, that had been large customers for Iranian oil, Saudi Arabia both increased production and reportedly provided discounts on oil sales. Iraq and Libya revived their production. Washington hinted at another release of S.P.R. crude to discourage speculation in the markets. The fact that U.S. production rose 3.1 percent in 2011 from a year earlier, with an expected increase this year of 10.7 percent, was immaterial to managing these disruptions.

#### Alt cause: Volcker Rule

Reuters, “Volcker rule could raise energy prices, study says,” 3/28/12 <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/28/us-financial-regulation-volcker-idUSBRE82R04I20120328>

The proposed Volcker rule crackdown on trading and investing by banks could cause gasoline, electricity and natural gas prices to rise, according to a new report. The report, released on Wednesday by business information provider IHS Inc (IHS.N), seeks to gauge the rule's impact on energy companies and markets, including oil refineries, natural gas producers and electricity providers. The study was commissioned by investment bank Morgan Stanley (MS.N), which stands to be a big loser under the trading crackdown, but IHS researchers said they maintained complete control over the study and its conclusions. The report's authors said large banks play a key role in helping a variety of energy companies hedge risk and engage in timely trades on commodity exchanges. Any reduction in the banks' ability to play this role because of the Volcker rule will cause the cost of doing business to rise, according to the report, and that will lead to higher energy prices for consumers. "You are going to eliminate the flywheel that makes the system work," IHS CERA Chairman Daniel Yergin, one of the report's authors, said in an interview. The rule is a controversial part of the 2010 Dodd-Frank financial oversight law and it prevents banks from trading with their own capital and greatly restricts their investments in hedge and private equity funds. The Volcker rule, an initial proposal of which was released by regulators in October, exempts trades done on behalf of clients or to hedge portfolio risk, but critics are concerned such exceptions may not work in practice. Among the report's specific findings are that under the Volcker rule there could be 200,000 fewer energy sector jobs than projected between 2012 and 2016, gasoline prices on the East Coast could rise by 4 cents a gallon and investment in natural gas development could decrease.

#### Alt cause: global supply shift

Henry Jacoby, Professor Emeritus of Management and Professor of Applied Economics in the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research at MIT, Francis O’Sullivan, Executive Director of the Energy Sustainability Challenge Program at the MIT Energy Initiative, and Sergey Palstev, Assistant Director for Economic Research at the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change. “The influence of shale gas on US energy and environmental policy.” Economics of Energy and Environmental Policy 1:1, 2012

Moreover, these changes in international markets may be magniﬁed by the future development of shale resources outside the U.S., which were not included in our analysis. Though gas shale deposits are known to exist in many area of the world (Kuuskraa et al., 2011) their economic potential outside the U.S. is yet very poorly understood. If, however, preliminary resource estimates prove correct and supplies follow a path like that in the U.S., there will be dramatic implications for global gas use, trade and price, as well as for the geopolitics of energy (Medlock et al., 2011).

## 2NC

### Warming Adv

#### We’re already locked in for their terminal impacts

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.

#### Net increases warming—methane’s terrible

Bill Chameides, Dean of Duke’s School of the Environment, “Natural gas: A bridge to a low-carbon future or not?” Huffington Post 7/20/12 <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bill-chameides/-natural-gas-a-bridge-to_b_1690857.html>

Interestingly enough, with the advent of fracking for shale gas and the consequent jump in estimates of natural gas resources (see here and here), the use of natural gas as a transition fuel actually seems to be feasible. Good news for the climate, one might conclude. Not really, scientists like Bob Howarth of Cornell University, protested. Why? Before answering that, you need to know a couple of background facts. First, methane, the major component of natural gas, is itself a very potent greenhouse gas -- some 21 times more effective a warmer than CO2 on a 100-year basis. And second, when we use natural gas, there are inevitably fugitive emissions, leaks during mining, transport, and consumption that allow methane to escape into the atmosphere where it can do its global warming thing. What Howarth argued in a much-debated paper published last year is that the leakage rates are so high that, contrary to conventional wisdom, transitioning from coal to natural gas would actually lead to more global warming than just sticking with coal, even though coal is the most carbon-intensive of the fossil fuels.

#### Best studies are on our side

Tom Wigley, senior scientist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research and climate scientist at the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, “Coal to gas: the influence of methane leakage” Climatic Change Letters August 26, 2011

In summary, our results show that the substitution of gas for coal as an energy source results in increased rather than decreased global warming for many decades — out to the mid 22nd century for the 10% leakage case. This is in accord with Hayhoe et al. (2002) and with the less well established claims of Howarth et al. (2011) who base their analysis on Global Warming Potentials rather than direct modeling of the climate. Our results are critically sensitive to the assumed leakage rate. In our analysis, the warming results from two effects: the reduction in SO2 emissions that occurs due to reduced coal combustion; and the potentially greater leakage of methane that accompanies new gas production relative to coal. The first effect is in accord with Hayhoe et al. In Hayhoe et al., however, the methane effect is in the opposite direction to our result (albeit very small). This is because our analyses use more recent information on gas leakage from coal mines and gas production, with greater leakage from the latter. The effect of methane leakage from gas production in our analyses is, nevertheless, small and less than implied by Howarth et al. Our coal-to-gas scenario assumes a linear decrease in coal use from zero in 2010 to 50% reduction in 2050, continuing at 50% after that. Hayhoe et al. consider linear decreases from zero in 2000 to 10, 25 and 50% reductions in 2025. If these authors assumed constant reduction percentages after 2025, then their high scenario is very similar to our scenario. In our analyses, the temperature differences between the baseline and coal-to-gas scenarios are small (less than 0.1°C) out to at least 2100. The most important result, however, in accord with the above authors, is that, unless leakage rates for new methane can be kept below 2%, substituting gas for coal is not an effective means for reducing the magnitude of future climate change. This is contrary to claims such as that by Ridley (2011) who states (p. 5), with regard to the exploitation of shale gas, that it will “accelerate the decarbonisation of the world economy”. The key point here is that it is not decarbonisation per se that is the goal, but the attendant reduction of climate change. Indeed, the shorter-term effects are in the opposite direction. Given the small climate differences between the baseline and the coal-to-gas scenarios, decisions regarding further exploitation of gas reserves should be based on resource availability (both gas and water), the economics of extraction, and environmental impacts unrelated to climate change.

### K

#### Any mobilization from their doomsaying would be shortsighted and ineffective

Broda-Bahm 99 (Kenneth T, Assistant Professor in the Mass Communication and Communication Studies Department at Towson University, “Finding Protection in Definitions: The Quest for Environmental Security” Argumentation & Advocacy, 10511431, Spring99, Vol. 35, Issue 4)

Another motive for speaking of environmental degradation as a threat to national security is rhetorical: to make people respond to environmental threats with a sense of urgency. But before harnessing the old horse of national security to pull the heavy new environmental wagon, one must examine its temperament... If the emotional appeals of national security can somehow be connected to environmental issues, then it is also possible that other, less benign associations may be transferred. Yet the national security mentality engenders an enviable sense of urgency, and a corresponding willingness to accept great personal sacrifice. Unfortunately, these emotions may be difficult to sustain. Crises call for resolution, and the patience of a mobilized populace is rarely long. A cycle of arousal and somnolence is unlikely to establish permanent patterns of environmentally sound behavior, and `crash' solutions are often bad ones. (pp. 24-25)

#### Focus on singular, imminent disasters obscures broader criticism that’s key to actually solve environmental issues

Barnett ‘1 Jon Barnett, Fellow in the School of Social and Environmental Enquiry at University of Melbourne, and a New Zealand Sci and Tech Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Canterbury and serves on the editorial boards of several scholarly journals, May 4, The Meaning of Environmental Security: Ecological Politics and Policy in the New Security Era

Another failing of the threat discourse is that it focuses attention on issues 'only when crises are imminent, by which time it is often too late for effective interventions and corrective measures' (Dabelko and Simmons 1997: 142). This is another example of what Prins calls the environmental Catch-22: by the time environmental problems are unambiguously overt it is too late to rectify them; on the other hand, unless the problems at immediately pressing there is insufficient motivation to result in action by mainstream political institutions (Prins 1990). Thus the particular state- and military-centred interpretation of environmental security by the US policy community ignores a telling implication of environmental problems for politics: that long-term and fundamental reforms are required to address the underlying structural causes of environ­mental degradation.This presentation of environmental problems as threats rests on a recurrent conflation of threat with risk. Environmental security in this sense represents the state's particular highly politicised assessment of risk rather than any scientific account of the actual risks. There is little corre­lation between the two; most often the way states respond to environ­mental problems is conditioned by political factors more than informed risk assessments. Certainly the US government's assessment of risks is fat less a matter of credible scientific assessment and far more a Matter of the', politics of identity and Otherness. The challenge, according to Hay, is to continue to provide informed risk assessments, and 'to expose the distor­tions imposed by the state's own consequence-risk calculus' (Hay 1994: 226). This chapter has sought to expose such distortions in US policy.

#### Public discourse surrounding fracking is warped by incentives for lax oversight and environmental and social exploitation

Szeman ’13 Imre Szeman, “What the frack? Combustible water and other late capitalist novelties,” Radical Philosophy 177, January/February 2013, http://www.radicalphilosophy.com/commentary/what-the-frack

But there are problems with fracking that belie the positive image of a new world of natural gas – a world in which gas (again, according to official nar­ratives) will become a dominant source of energy, allowing us to bridge the gap between the end of oil and whatever comes next without having to change much, if anything, about the way we live our lives and conduct busi­ness. There is a primary set of categories used to define natural resources, terms whose quotidian employment has stripped away some of the power of their blunt assertion as to where we now stand in relation to energy. The website of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, an industry group that has been especially forceful in defend­ing the actions of oil and gas companies in Canada, defines theses clearly and without ambiguity: Natural gas comes from both ‘conventional’ (easier to produce) and ‘unconventional’ (more difficult to produce) geological formations. The key difference between ‘conventional’ and ‘unconventional’ natural gas is the manner, ease and cost associated with extracting the resource.4 More and more, we are becoming reliant on unconventional forms of energy. Shale gas is one such form, and not only because of the unusual processes required to access it, but also because of the costs involved – costs above and beyond the mere dollar figures of setting up and manning a drill site. Fracking requires enormous amounts of water - between 5 and 11 million litres for each well drilled (to give some reference point, an Olympic-sized swimming pool contains 2.5 million litres of water). There are now close to half a million active gas wells in the USA alone that have been created through the use of fracking. Much of the water that goes down into the wells comes back up, but a great deal of it also disappears underground. As a result, the chemicals that are put into the mix to help shatter the shale rock pollute both the water that returns and that which does not. The image most commonly associated with fracking is a shocking one: water from taps being set alight by a match. In the 2010 documentary Gasland, director Josh Fox travels to the western USA to gain insight into the consequences of fracking in order to help him decide whether he should accept an offer to lease his family’s land on the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania to a natural gas company. What he finds startles him: reports of contaminated water and of chronic health problems that lessees connect to the start of gas exploration on their land or on nearby properties. The image of tap water being set on fire, which Fox witnesses in Weld County, Colorado, also shows up in another recent documentary – Cameron Esler and Tadzio Richard’s Burning Water (2010) – which probes the outcome of EnCana’s use of fracking to extract coal bed methane in southern Alberta. As in the US documentary, those living in and around the extraction sites report all manner of health problems after EnCana set to work, including skin burns from their showers, where they previously had experienced no problems from their water supplies. Water can do many things, including break rock apart. What it should never do is catch fire; when and if it does, it a certain sign that something is happening that should not be. There are numerous ways in which fracking might produce water that burns. The gas released from shale might get mixed into the water aquifers through which companies have to drill to reach the resource, either through cracks in the rock or via poorly sealed drill holes. Even more worrisome than the gas itself are the chemicals mixed into the fracking fluid, which include toxins and known carcinogens. Fracking fluid will almost certainly include methanol; other common substances include ethylene glycol (a substance found in antifreeze) and isopropyl alcohol (a solvent used in a wide range of industrial liquids, including cleaning solutions). Of the 750 chemicals that made up various mixes of fracking fluids, a report by the Minority Staff of the US House of Representatives found that twenty-nine of these were known carcinogens (including benzene and lead) regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) and the Clean Air Act.5 As this was a minority report, no legal action followed. At present, under the terms of the 2005 Energy Policy Act engineered by then vice president Dick Cheney, the solutions used in fracking remain exempt from the SDWA. (The fact that Halliburton, the company that Cheney once led as CEO, is one of the planet’s major well services companies and a major supplier of fracking fluids, almost need not be mentioned.) The fear of serious and perhaps irresolvable water pollution has led some governments, including France, the Czech Republic, and in the USA the state of Vermont, to ban fracking. One of the first acts of the province of Quebec’s new Parti Quebecois government (elected in September 2012) was to impose a moratorium on the exploration for and extraction of shale gas. The Utica Shale structure, which stretches between Montreal and Quebec City, could host as many as 18,000 wells and hold as much as 163,000 billion cubic feet of gas. Even so, Martine Ouellet, the province’s new Natural Resource Minister, has said that she ‘cannot see the day when the extraction of natural gas by the fracking method can be done in a safe way’.6 The anxieties in Quebec extend from the possibility of water pollution in a densely populated area dependent on the same aquifers that would be used for fracking, to fears over the possibilities that fracking might lead to earthquakes of the kind produced near Blackpool, in the UK, in spring 2011. (Quebec experienced a small earthquake on 11 October 2012, the most recent of several such minor quakes.) In general, however, fracking is backed by governments around the world, despite the potential dangers to the environment and to individuals living near or in conjunction with natural gas wells. Yet there are numerous examples of problems with the current system of regulation and inspection. In his extensive examination of the wave of drill­ing that has taken place in Pennsylvania since 2006, journalist Tom Wilber points out that the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) inspectors have identified ‘a pattern of operators routinely disregarding regulations’. In the first six months of 2010, ‘DEP staff made 1,700 inspections of Marcellus Shale sites and found more than 530 violations.’7 However, inspectors have more often than not avoided or minimized such investigations and the findings they might bring. They rely heavily on industry reports, which when closely examined are found to contain errors or to be incomplete. What is being played out in Pennsylvania is being repeated elsewhere. Neoliberal policies rear their head once again in a chain of connections that draws ever tighter with each passing year. Too few inspectors with too few resources devoted to the inspection of well sites accords with the desire of the politicians’ buddies in the oil and gas industry, who want to get on with profit-making and sidestep responsibility for any social and ecological crises they might generate along the way. Though it is the name of an industrial process, fracking should also be taken as an index of the political crises with which we now have to contend. Coming at a time when the West is preoccupied with thoughts of sustainability and the organic, the impact of fracking on water supplies cannot help but make the locals restless and angry. Oil and gas might well constitute the second nature of capitalism, but when it comes to water, we are today more likely to agree with Thales: that water is a fundamental sub­stance that gives being to the world as such. This tension portends political possibilities; maybe something in the water, put there by unconventional resources, might prompt an unconventional politics, too. But what might such a politics look like?

#### The perm’s exceptionalism is exactly the sovereign logic that we critique—that’s an Auschwitz DA to the aff. Humanist rule over nonhuman alterity is unforgivable—ecological praxis requires unflinching rejection.

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 121-125

But even though the timeless mythic principles on which state authority is constituted are supposed (de facto) to command universal assent, everyone actually knows they are neither timeless nor universal. As Pateman (1985, 168) argues: “Liberal democratic theorists treat the state as if it were a natural feature of the world," but without the hypothetical voluntarism assumed by the original (mythic) social contract, "the emperor is indeed naked.’“3 The state form has a relatively recent history. There never was a state of nature or a social contract. State boundaries are inventions. The right of humans to rule the natural world is as politically arbitrary as the feudal notion of the diving right of kings. Of course, it still takes a certain kind of political naivety to state the obvious. But radical ecology constitutes a fundamental po- litical challenge precisely because it refuses to accept the reality of any aspect of this myth of state sovereignty, whether in terms of sovereignty over human political possibilities or natality of the natural world or na- tional territories. Instead it advocates ethical, nonauthoritarian, non- territorially delimited relations to the more-than-human world, that is, to adapt Levinas’s term, it envisages ecological ethics as anarchic “first philosophy"—a philosophy that can persuasively inform (rather than compel assent to) diverse forms of ecological politics. Here, once again, Agamben’s work offers important insights not only in terms of his critique of the anthropological machine and of the biopolitical reduction of human individuals to bare life but also in terms of the ecological potential of his critique of sovereignty—a potential that exists despite Agamben’s understanding politics entirely in terms of community with other humans (see chapter 3) and never considers the possibility of a “coming ecological community” (Agamben 2001). Still, as already indicated, Agamben’s work constitutes a fundamental ethicopolitical critique of the very idea of sovereignty, one now finding echoes well beyond Italian radical circles (Virno and Hardt 1996) through writers like Judith Butler (2004) and Slavoj Zizek (2002), albeit one that is absent from environmental discussions of state sovereignty (for example, Litiin 1998; Eckersely 2004; Barry and Eckersley 2005). This absence is not unrelated to the radical nature of Agamben’s critique, which would certainly undermine any attempt to recuperate a role for state sovereignty for ecological purposes (see chapter 7). In several books, most especially Homo sacer (1998) and its sequel State of Exception (2005), Agamben combines his critical appropriation of Foucault‘s concept of biopolitics with Schmitt’s (1985) account of sovereignty. In this way, he seeks to show how contemporary claims of state sovereignty are complicit in the biopolitical reduction of the sphere of human politics to the technical administration and manage- ment of populations. And while Agamben’s appropriation of Foucault’s notion of biopower is certainly contentious (as several recent essays indicate; see Calarco and DeCaroli 2007),14 his interpretation of Schmitt plays the key role in his political analysis. Schmitt’s Political Theology (2005, 5) opens with his famous defini- tion: "Sovereign is he who decides on the exception”; that is to say, it is the ultimate mark of sovereign power to be able to suspend the normal rule of law and the political order by declaring a state of emergency (exception). Further, since such a suspension is paradigmatically only envisaged under exceptional circumstances (at times of political cri- sis), the precise conditions of its imposition cannot be predetermined (and hence codified in law or a procedural politics) but depend on an extralegal/procedural decision made by the very power that thereby awards itself a monopoly on political power/action. The rule (of law) as an expression of sovereign power declares a state of emergency where "suspending itself, gives rise to the exception and [simultaneously] maintains itself in relation to the exception” (Agamben 1998, 18). Agamben, like Schmitt, emphasizes how the possibility of this ultimately arbitrary decisionistic assumption of absolute territorial authority underlies all claims of state sovereignty, no matter what kind of political constitution such states espouse. Paradoxically, then, the (state of) exception is precisely that situation that (ap)proves the sovereign power’s rule. “What the ‘ark’ of power contains at its center is the state of exception—but this is essentially an empty space” (Agamben 2005, 86). The declaration of a state of emergency is both the ultimate political act and simultaneously the abrogation of politics per se. Here, participation in the political realm, which from Arendt’s (1958, 198) and Agamben’s perspectives “rises directly out of acting together, the ‘sharing of words and deeds,"’ is denied by a political decision to some or all of the population of a sovereign territory, thereby reducing them to a condition of bare life. Agamben thus reaffirms the Aristotelian description of humans as bios politikos, as the kind of beings whose form of life is such as to en- able (but not compel) them to participate in a political community (and, as Arendt argues, to appear before others as particular persons through that involvement). This possibility is denied in the reduction of human beings to the inhuman(e) condition of bare life, the most appalling example of which, Agamben claims, is found in the concentration camp. Here, the political exception took on a literal and localizable form as a real space containing those whom sovereign power had decided to exclude from the political community (those reduced to bare life) under the auspices of a state of emergency. “lnasmuch as its inhabitants have been stripped of every political status and reduced completely to naked life [bare life], the camp is also the most biopolitical space that has ever been realized" (Agamben 2000, 40). All political and ethical norms were suspended, with the most horrific consequences, since once the camp’s inmates were legalistically defined as nonpersons, stripped of their citizenship and any ethicopolitical standing in the eyes of the state, "no act committed against them could appear any longer as a crime" (Agamben 1998, 171).15 Since Agamben’s analysis is intended to apply to the notion of sovereignty as such, and not just the singular state of emergency in Nazi Germany, this also means that despite its extremity, the camp is far from being an isolated instance. Agamben (1998, 166) regards “the camp as the nomos of the modern,” an exemplary form in the negative sense that it was “merely the place in which the most absolute condi- tio inhumana that has ever existed on earth was realized" (166). The specter of the camp reappears wherever sovereign power institutes a state of exception that reduces people to bare life and especially when this state of exception is given a fixed spatial arrangement. Agamben (2005, 3—4) argues that Guantanamo Bay, for example, could only really be understood as a camp (see also Ek 2006; Gregory 2006), an exceptional space for containing detainees denied any recourse to normal legal or political process. Here again, sovereign power is demonstrated (made monstrously obvious) through an “inclusive exclusion," that is, their exclusion (being held in suspension) from the political commu- nity is the very mark of their subjection to that sovereign power. (As always, Agamben’s political purpose here is not to compare the rela- tive degrees of suffering such circumstances cause, since this varies radically from case to case, but to expose their underlying unity of form in terms of their relation to the exceptional and absolute claims of sovereign power.) The new global (and unending) war against terror used to justify Guantanamo is also indicative of the ways in which what is initially justified as a state of exception, an emergency measure, can easily become the (a)political norm. As Walter Benjamin (2006, 392) remarked, the “tradition of the oppressed teaches us that the ‘state of emergency’ in which we live is not the exception but the rule." And this occurs precisely where the "political system of the modern nation state . . . Enters into a lasting crisis, and the state decides to assume directly the care of the nation’s biological life as one of its proper tasks" (Agamben 1998, 174-75). As the state of emergency (declared on the basis of a per- ceived threat to the state’s continued existence) becomes permanent, so the defense of sovereign power in the name of survival becomes its own justification. The political relations (bios politikas) on which the State’s existence, as a supposedly “natural" expression of a political community, were premised are suppressed. Instead, the state deploys its (extra) constitutional sovereign powers to control all serious counter- vailing political expression. It reconstitutes itself on the basis of the biopolitical management of populations where the diffuse (largely non- localized) treatment of the nation’s populace as bare life—for example, as so much biometric and genetic information—becomes normalized, In Zizek’s (2002, 100) words, we come to inhabit a new world order where the “very democratic public space is a mask concealing the fact that, ultimately, we are all Homo sacer,” that is, a world dominated by a hegemonic “postpolitics,” the fundamental feature of which “is the reduction of politics to ‘biopolitics’ in the precise sense of adminis- tering and regulating ‘mere life."’ This shift only emphasizes that for Agamben, sovereign power is never a creative (constituting) political power (as Schmitt portrays it) but only a (constituted/constitutional) power based ultimately in the ability to suspend, to place in abeyance, ethics and politics as such.

#### Little steps are insufficient—we need radical systemic critique—anything less is a surveillance strategy which makes flagrant adventurism inevitable

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 90-91

This talk of the complicity between absolute innocence and system- atic guilt may seem a little abstract. But think, for example, of the ways in which we are frequently told by authority that the ecological crisis is everyone’s and/or no one’s fault and that it is in all of our own (selfish) interests to do our bit to ensure the world’s future. Think too of the tokenistic apolitical “solutions" this perspective engenders——let’s all drive a few miles less, all use energy-efficient light-bulbs, and so on. These actions may offer ways of further absolving an already systematically dispersed guilt, but they hardly touch the systemic nature of the problem, and they certainly do not identify those who profit most from this situation. This pattern is repeated in almost every aspect of modern existence. Think of modern cityscapes or of the shopping mall as expressions of modern civilization’s social, economic, and (im)moral orders. These are far from being places of free association. They are constantly and continuously monitored by technology’s eyes in the ser- vice of states and corporations (Lyons 2001). Of course, those who po- lice the populace argue that the innocent have nothing to fear from even the most intrusive forms of public surveillance, that it is only the guilty who should be concerned. But this is simply not true, nor, as Foucault (1991) argued in a different context, is this the rationale behind such panopticism. Everyone is captured on closed-circuit television, and it is precisely any semblance of innocence that is lost through this incessant observation of the quotidian. All are deemed (potentially) guilty and expected to internalize the moral norms such surveillance imposes, to police themselves to ensure security for private property, the circulation of capital, and fictitious (anti)social contracts——“NO LOITERING ALLOVVED,” “FREE PARKING FOR CUSTOMERS ONLY], This egalitarian dispersal of guilt contaminates everyone, placing them on interminable trial, since no one can ever be proven innocent by observations that will proceed into an indefinite future.2° Thus, as Camus (1984, 12) marked, it is indeed innocence that is called upon to justify itself, to justify why it should (but will not) be allowed to survive in any aspect of everyday lives. This surveillance is also (and by no means accidentally), as Agamben argues, a key aspect of the biopolitical reduction of politics to the policing of disciplined subjects, redefined not as individuals but as “bare life." Again, this refers to people stripped of their political and ethical possibilities and now primarily identified in terms of their bodily in- scription of transferable information. People are not quite reduced to animality, to just their biology, but their biological being is made increasingly subject to observation, management, and control as the key mode of operation of contemporary authority. Video cameras; facial, gait, and voice pattern recognition technologies, fingerprints; retinal scans; DNA analysis; electronic tagging; the collection of consumer information; data mining and tracking; global positioning systems; communications intelligence; and so on, concern themselves with every aspect of people’s lives hut are in no sense concerned for the individuals (in their singularity). Rather, they measure and evaluate that person’s every move as a potential risk to the security of property, the security of capital(ism), the security of the moral order, and the security of the state. The entire populace comes to occupy an increasingly pervasive state of exception, a “zone of anomie" (Agamben 2005, 50) that is certainly not a state of nature but a technologically mediated political (and ethical) void. And again, if this authoritarian monitoring and control is questioned, the answer is that it is everyone’s fault and nobody’s, that it is actually our desires and our ultimate personal security (the se- curity of people and state) that determined that the relevant authorities had no choice but to take this path, that it is a small cost to pay for the protection of civilization, that, in effect, we are all guilty of our own impending technologically mediated reduction to bare life.

#### Refuse the reformist frenzy for policy resolution. The only way out of ethical failure and anthropocentric extermination is a move to overcome sovereign power.

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 219-221

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK is to open possibilities for rethinking and constituting ecological ethics and politics—so should one need to apologize for a lack of specific environmental policies? Should the book declaim on the necessity of using low-energy light bulbs or of increasing the price of gasoline? Alternatively, should one point out that such limited measures are an apology (a poor substitute) for the absence of any real ecological ethics and politics? Is it possible to read this book and still think that I believe the problem is one of the incompleteness of the current policy agenda and that the solution to our environmental ills is an ever-more complex and complete legislative program to represent and regulate the world? It may be possible, but I hope not. For this desire for legislative completeness, this institutional lack (in a Lacanian sense), the desire for policy after policy, is clearly the regulative counterpart to the global metastasis of those free-market approaches that effectively reduce the world’s diversity to a common currency, a universal, abstract, monetary exchange value. They are, almost literally, two sides of the same coin, the currency of modernism and capitalism, and their presence is a tangible indicator of the spread of biopolitics. Meanwhile, the restricted economy of debates around policy priorities and cost-benefit analyses almost always excludes more profound questions and concerns about the singular denizens of a more-than-human world. The purpose of this book is to provide philosophical grounds on which such questions and concerns can be raised, to challenge the myths and meta- physics that would regard them as inconsequential. In this, no doubt, it is already overambitious. In any case, unlike the majority of people writing on the environment, I do not have a recipe for saving the natural world, a set of rules to follow, a list of guiding principles, or a favorite ideology or institutional form to promote as a solution For before all this, we need to ask what “saving the natural world" might mean. And this requires, as I have argued, sustaining ethics, and politics, and ecology over and against sovereign power—the exercise of which reduces people to bare life and the more-than-human world to standing reserve. This is not a politically or ethically neutral position in the way that liberalism, for example, would like to present itself; it reenvisages ecological communities in very different ways. Of course, I have opinions on what is to be done, although not in any Leninist fashion. My sympathies might find some expression in, for example, ecologically revisioning Kropotkin‘s mutual aid and Proudhon’s mutualism. But expanding on these ideas here would just provide an excuse for many not to take the broader argument about sovereignty seriously. What we need are plural ways to imagine a world without sovereign power, without human dominion. And so, instead of an apology or an apologia for the lack of policy recommendations (and who exactly would implement them), I offer an apologue, a “moral fable, esp. one having animals or inanimate things as its characters" (New Shorter Oxford Dictiormry).\* I have in mind a recent image that momentarily broke through the self-referential shells that accrete around so many of us, cutting us off from the world as it really is. Not an ancient painting on a rock wall, but a still photograph of a living polar bear standing, apparently stranded, on a small iceberg—a remainder of the ice Hoes melting under the onslaught of global warming. Now only a wishful thinker (or a bureaucrat) would contend that such bears will be saved by more stringent hunting permits (deeply as I abhor sport hunting), by a policy to increase ecotourism, or by a captive breeding program in a zoo. These measures are clearly inadequate for the task. Despite conforming to a policy model and taking account of realpolitik, they are far from being realistic. For the bear, in its essence, is ecologically inseparable from the ice-clad north; it lives and breathes as an inhabitant, a denizen, of such apparently inhospitable places. It is an opening on an ursine world that we can only actually imagine, but its image still flashes before us relating “what-has-been to the now” (Benjamin 1999, 462). This image is one of many that, through affecting us, have the potential to inspire new ethical and political constellations like those of radical ecology. For a radical ecologist, the bear is not a resource (not even an ecotourist sight) but a being of ethical concern, albeit it in so many respects alien, pointless, independent from us—and, for the most part, indifferent to us. It can become close to our hearts (which is not to expect to hug it but to say that it elicits an ethical response that inspires a politics). And this politics argues that only a hypocrite could claim that the solution to the plight of such polar bears lies in the resolution of questions of arctic sovereignty, in an agreement to take account of the rightful territorial claims of states over these portions of the earth. Once defined as sovereign territories, there can be no doubt that the minerals and oil beneath the arctic ocean will be exploited in the "name of the people and the state” and to make money for capitalists. And this will add immeasurably to the same atmospheric carbon dioxide that already causes the melting ice. After all, there is no other purpose in declaring sovereignty except to be able to make such decisions. And once this power of decision is ceded, all the nature reserves in the world will not save the bears or the ecology they inhabit. They will (in Nancy’s and Agamben’s terms) have been "abandoned," “sacrificed,” for nothing and by nothing. So what could be done? When those seeking a policy solution to the Arctic’s melting ice ask this question, they are not looking to institute policies that would abandon or radically transform capitalism, abolish big oil, or even close down the Athabasca tar sands. They expect to legislate for a mode of gradual amelioration that in no way threatens the current economic and political forms they (wrongly) assume to be ultimate realities. In short, they want a solution that maintains the claims of ecological sovereignty.

#### Sovereign managerialism is tautological and dangerous—rethinking how we relate to the environment is a prior question

Smith no date Mick Smith, Professor and Queen’s National Scholar in the Departments of Environmental Studies and Philosophy at Queen’s University, Canada, “Editorial Profile,” Environmental Humanities, no date given, http://environmentalhumanities.org/about/profiles/ep-smith

The “Anthropocene” has become something of a buzzword in its migration from geology to philosophy and beyond. Do you find it to be a productive concept? What can the humanities contribute to its articulation and critique? Coining a new term, the Anthropocene, to describe humanity’s transformative effects on the Earth’s climate and ecology opens some intriguing possibilities. There are certainly reasonable scientific grounds for accepting the term since recent human impacts will leave their marks (most notably in terms of mass extinctions, but also radioactive traces, chemical pollution, a kind of fossilised archaeology, and so on) in the geological record. Politically, the term also works to bring to mind the immense global and temporal extent of the destructive effects of current economic and industrial activities. It may, therefore, have some affect as an ecological wake-up call. Having said this, the term seems anthropocentric in another (presumably unintended) way that may suggest its use is less justifiable, since in terms of geological time scales these impacts will probably appear as an almost instantaneous event not so very different from the impact of the meteor that wiped out the dinosaurs, rather than as an “age”. That is to say, the Anthropocene (if we understand this as the period where humans are the dominant driving force on the planet) will almost certainly turn out to be a far shorter period even than the Holocene, which itself covers just the 12,000 years since the last ice age. There is, after all, no way that the current scale of impacts can be sustained for very long and no way that humans can escape the negative ecological impacts that will result if such changes continue. Either we will succeed (via science and ethics and politics) in reducing these impacts (and therefore stop being the dominant planetary driving force) or we will face ecological and social collapse on a scale humans have never before witnessed. Some think there are other (technological) alternatives but this actually illustrates a possible danger of uncritically accepting the term Anthropocene, for some may come to regard it as a badge of honour that (en)titles a new epoch of human technical mastery over the planet. There are, for example, those who refer to themselves as “geo-engineers”, neo-Promethean fantasists who have learnt little or nothing from the failures of past attempts to provide technical fixes to ecologically and socially complex problems. For them, the idea of the Anthropocene may merely offer new opportunities to acquire funding for their own pet schemes for planetary engineering, such as flooding the oceans with iron filings to deliberately (rather than “accidentally”) encourage algal blooms. Disastrous past interventions are simply adduced as reasons for larger and even more far reaching interventions in the future. These science fiction schemes pose a very real danger to both planet and politics, but they may well be taken seriously precisely because they seem to offer a model of business as usual for those profiting from the ecologically destructive economic system whose advent, for reasons that are far from coincidental, closely matches the date proposed for the beginning of the Anthropocene (that is, some 200 years ago). Perhaps, then, the term Anthropocene may actually serve to hide the social, historical, and economic developments underlying these destructive interventions, for it is not humans per se that are responsible for the scale of this climatic and ecological impact but certain ways of organizing human societies that have become both divorced from ecological considerations and global in extent. The current economic system, which recognises only a single imperative – financial profit – is what needs questioning, re-engineering and to be radically changed. In this sense capitalism might be thought of as the ecologically obscene (hidden, offensive, unmentionably appalling) aspect of scientific discussions about the Anthropocene. Perhaps the roles of the humanities in providing a critical edge to these discussions might, rather ironically, include puncturing the inflated self-understandings of a hubristic humanism that celebrates technical mastery, bringing the “coincidences” between ecology and economy to light, reminding us about (environmental) history, sustaining and developing forms of (ecological) ethics to counter anthropocentric forms of dominance, and offering political (and never just technical) analyses and alternatives.

#### Magnitude—biopolitics is the root cause of nuclear omnicide

Foucault ’78 Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction, trans. Robert Hurley, 1978, p. 136-137

Since the classical age the West has undergone a very profound transformation of these mechanisms of power. "Deduction" has tended to be no longer the major form of power but merely one element among others, working to incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimize, and organize the forces under it: a power bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them. There has been a parallel shift in the right of death, or at least a tendency to align itself with the exigencies of a life-administering power and to define itself accordingly. This death that was based on the right of the sovereign is now manifested as simply the reverse of the right of the social body to ensure, maintain, or develop its life. Yet wars were never as bloody as they have been since the nineteenth century, and all things being equal, never before did regimes visit such holocausts on their own populations. But this formidable power of death -and this is perhaps what accounts for part of its force and the cynicism with which it has so greatly expanded its limits -now presents itself as the counterpart of a power that exerts a positive influence on life, that endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations. Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital. It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many men to be killed. And through a turn that closes the circle, as the technology of wars has caused them to tend increasingly toward all-out destruction, the decision that initiates them and the one that terminates them are in fact increasingly informed by the naked question of survival. The atomic situation is now at the end point of this process: the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee an individual's continued existence. The principle underlying the tactics of battle that one has to be capable of killing in order to go on living-has become the principle that defines the strategy of states. But the existence in question is no longer the juridical existence of sovereignty; at stake is the biological existence of a population. If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers, this is not because of a recent return of the ancient right to kill; it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population.

#### Prior rejection of anthropocentric approaches is essential for crafting more responsible approaches to energy and environmental politics. Their economic rationality is a delusion which generates only short-sighted and ethically insufficient responses.

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 113-117

To recall: Radical ecology is an ethically motivated (that is, non- instrumental) political concern with saving the (natural) world. This saving might be understood as releasing nature from political claims of human sovereignty into the flows of natural (evolutionary and eco- logical) history, though it does not thereby set humanity apart from nature or decry involvement in nature. After all, humans ek-sist (stand out) in(to) the natural world as beings-in-the-world. Our involvement should, however, be one guided by the ethics of a worldly phronesis, not socioeconomic realpolitik. To accomplish this saving, radical ecol- ogy must recognize the relative autonomy of ethics and politics and struggle to save these too from their reduction to a biopolitics that is ultimately based in the technological enframing of the (natural) world, that is, the reduction of every aspect of life, human and nonhuman, to standing reserve. The consequences of this Gestell, and of biopolitics, for humanity is the stripping of ethical and political possibilities, our reduction to what Agamben calls bare life, a human state of political exception. What we must recognize in our current ecological crisis is that saving nature also depends on generating the possibilities for concerned involvement in the world, which only ethics and politics can offer. Ironically, then, there would be no ethical concern for the natural world, nor any political possibility of saving the world, if humans were not natural aliens, if we were not, at least in one sense, “ecologically suspended? In The Open: Man and Animal (2004), Agamben describes how this suspension might be understood from an admittedly anthro— pocentric, Heideggerian perspective. Heidegger claims that humans have a capacity to “suspend” themselves from what he terms the dis- inhibiting ring (Enthemrnungsring), the enfolding aspects of the world that operate as evolutionarily determined "carriers of significance" for particular nonhuman creatures. These carriers of significance—for ex- ample, the right mammalian body temperature that, once sensed by the tick, sets in motion its blood-sucking activities—captivate the animal by engaging its specific capabilities. It is in this sense that Heidegger claims that animals are “world poor," unable to free themselves from their spellbound, instinctual attachments to specific aspects of their environments. "Being ceaselessly driven the animal finds itself sus- pended, as it were, between itself and its environment, even though neither the one nor the other is experienced as a being" (Heidegger in Agamben 2004, 54), Evernden (1999, 168n25) would, quite rightly, be skeptical of Hei- degger‘s use of the term instinctual to cover a multitude of potential relations that are by no means automatic or mechanical responses, And one of the reasons to be suspicious of this move is precisely its anthropological intent, its suggestion that (wild) nature has no crea- tivity, no natality, no possibility of initiating something new, or behav- ing different(ial)ly. However, it is still the loss of this situation, of this suspension of animal being within ecology, rather than the suspen- sion of human being from ecology, if Heidegger is right, this close, inescapable, involvement within the natural world, that Evernden, like many radical ecologists, regards as a matter of regret. This eco- logical suspension (originary alienation) may indeed be something to regret insofar as nonhuman life seems to experience a “wealth of being-open, of which human life may know nothing at all” (Heidegger in Agamben 2004, 60), that is, a kind of passionate, naive, unmediated involvement denied to us—though, here again, the question of whether the loss of our potential for ecological involvement is actually final or complete is very doubtful (see, for example, Abram 1996). Yet, Heidegger argues, it is this same self-suspension that allows us to see other beings as beings and thus to potentially “bring the living thing into the free in such a Way as to let the thing which excites ‘be’” (Heidegger in Agamben 2004, 58). In other words, the possibility of seeing other beings as things in themselves, beings that might resist their appropriation as mere means for our engaged capabilities, “beings which refuse themselves in their totality” (67), that is, that language too cannot fully capture, depends on this suspension. This same ecological suspension from the environment’s disinhibiting ring also marks the self-realization of our own existence as one offering human possibilities and responsibilities. Ethics and politics, the possibility of recognizing (though never fully comprehending) another being as such and our po- tential to free ourselves from captivation by our phenomenal world, to act in word and deed (as Arendt puts it), in ways that are ethically and politically world forming require this kind of suspension, this holding open, these particular avenues of negativity with no use. Heidegger usually treats this suspension as marking an absolute dis- tinction between human and animal, as in most respects does Agamben, which seems strange, since the point of The Open is to critique the an- thropological machine. It is true that in his commentary on Heidegger, Agamben (2004, 70) recognizes that under “certain circumstances . . . the animal can suspend its immediate relationship with its environ- ment, without, however, either ceasing to be an animal or becoming human," but this suspension is not one that opens up ethicopolitical possibilities for animals. “The animal is,"’ says Agamben, “constituted in such a way that something like a pure possibility can never become manifest within it" (68). Agamben elsewhere defines being-human as “the simple fact of one’s own existence as possibility or potentiality (Agamben 2001, 42). The separation between human and animal, between politics and ecology, is a political necessity for Agamben. This separation must be realized politically if we want to avoid the various forms of biopolities that constantly threaten to reappear as and when the anthropological machine is redeployed by sovereign power to define a state of excep- tion, to reduce some portion of humanity, and perhaps eventually all humanity, to bare life. What is at stake in the workings of the anthro- pological machine is the question of “the production and definition of this [human] nature” (Agamben 2004, 22). But what Agamben seeks is a politics that has overcome any need to ground itself in human nature precisely because any such politics always founds its claims to sovereign power in the decision (the divide and rule) of who is properly human. We need to be clear where Agamben’s argument leads. He is not, as we might initially think, critical of humanism because it constantly tries (and fails) to distinguish the human and the political from ani- mality. On the contrary, what he thinks needs to be overcome is a view of humanity that still conceives of itself and of politics as involving relations that are dependent on our animality in any kind of terms at all. What he appreciates in Heidegger is that Heidegger points the way toward a successful philosophical and political overcoming of our ani- mality. From Agamben’s perspective, we need to rethink the uniquely human political form of life (bios jwlitikos) as something that opens pure possibilities of which zoé (animality) knows nothing at all. It is tempting, given the Hegelian and eschatological motifs at the beginning and end of The Open—his account of the theriomorphous figures (those human bodies with animal heads) pictured at the end of days (history) in certain ancient religious manuscripts—to view Agamben’s own theory in terms of a quasi—Hegelian teleology whereby human spirit (anirnux) is envisaged as the motor of the sociohistorical movement of an anthropological machine that eventually overcomes and transcends (aufheben) its own origins, a movement ending in a self—understanding of its political possibilities as an inspired realm no longer dependent on animal nature. In this sense, he would present us with a hyperhumanist (animated/enspirited) materialism that is sup- posed to inform our political self—understanding. Whether this success- fully overcomes the anthropological machine or is just its latest and one of its most extreme iterations, a kind of postmodern political gnosti- cism, remains a moot point. Why should we not regard Agamben him- self as just propounding yet another version of the anthropological ma- chine, one based in the existential possibilities, the openness, of human politics set over and against the animal’s instinctive environmental captivation? Many radical ecologists might think that Agamben does not provide a sufficiently coherent answer to this question. This, fortu- nately, is not quite the whole story.
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### Debt Ceiling DA

#### Budget fights cripple energy policy

Colman 1/6 (Zack, The Hill, Dems dig in against spending cuts to clean-energy programs Read more: http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/275731-democrats-dig-in-against-cuts-to-clean-energy-programs#ixzz2HJrbyupm)

GOP lawmakers also would likely seek to zero out, or sharply reduce, federal stimulus-style research spending that helped firms commercialize technology. Republicans would prefer to prioritize basic research funding to help generate technological breakthroughs.¶ Nick Loris, a policy analyst with the conservative Heritage Foundation, said killing EERE would save $2.3 billion.¶ “It’s a huge amount to spend on technologies where we already have viable companies,” Loris said.¶ But Dorothy Coleman, vice president of tax and domestic economic policy with the National Association of Manufacturers, warned against cuts to federal research and development programs.¶ “You can’t just turn the switch back on,” Coleman said of letting research spending lapse. “You’re going to lose a lot of institutional knowledge and continuity. … There’s a real downside in the long term on innovation and R&D.”¶ Rob Mosher, legislative director with the Alliance to Save Energy, said he thinks DOE’s research budget could be vulnerable in the spending talks to come.¶ Mosher said research funding, as well as EERE programs such as building energy codes, federal energy management and the weatherization assistance program, are likely to be targets.¶ “These programs have demonstrated significant value over many years and we would like to see investment to these programs maintained. But we recognize, with the ongoing push for austerity measures, it will be a challenge,” Mosher told The Hill.

#### Econ decline turns china war

Glaser ’12 Bonnie S. Glaser, senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “China Is Reacting to Our Weak Economy,” New York Times, 5/2/2012, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/05/02/are-we-headed-for-a-cold-war-with-china/china-is-reacting-to-our-weak-economy

To maintain peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and secure American interests, the United States must sustain its leadership and bolster regional confidence in its staying power. The key to those goals is reinvigorating the U.S. economy. Historically, the Chinese have taken advantage of perceived American weakness and shifts in the global balance of power. In 1974 China seized the Paracel Islands from Saigon just after the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam signed the Paris Peace Treaty, which signaled the U.S. withdrawal from the region. When the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met one of Deng Xiaoping’s “three obstacles” requirements for better ties and withdrew from Can Ranh Bay, Vietnam, in 1988, China snatched seven of the Spratly Islands from Hanoi. Two decades later, as the United States-Philippines base agreement was terminated, China grabbed Mischief Reef from Manila. Beijing must not be allowed to conclude that an economic downturn means our ability to guarantee regional stability has weakened. The Chinese assertive behaviors against its neighbors in recent years in the East China Sea, the South China Sea and the Yellow Sea were in part a consequence of China’s assessment that the global financial crisis signaled the beginning of U.S. decline and a shift in the balance of power in China’s favor. The Obama administration’s “rebalancing” or “pivot” to Asia will help prevent Chinese miscalculation and increase the confidence of U.S. partners in U.S. reliability as the ballast for peace and stability in the region. But failure to follow through with actions and resources would spark uncertainty and lead smaller countries to accommodate Chinese interests in the region. Most important, the United States must revive its economy. China will inevitably overtake the United States as the largest economy in the world in the coming decade or two. The United States must not let Beijing conclude that a relative decline in U.S. power means a weakened United States unable to guarantee regional peace and stability. The Chinese see the United States as mired in financial disorder, with an alarming budget deficit, high unemployment and slow economic growth — which, they predict, will lead to America's demise as the sole global superpower. To avoid Chinese miscalculation and greater United States-China strategic competition, the United States needs to restore financial solvency and growth through bipartisan action.

#### Negotiations will be nasty—rife w/ disagreement—puts final deal at risk

Brown 1-2 Abram Brown, “Fiscal Cliff: Two Monster Problems Loom Ahead. Here's What Happens Next,” Forbes, 1/2/2013, http://www.forbes.com/sites/abrambrown/2013/01/02/u-s-faces-uphill-climb-after-fiscal-cliff-deal-heres-what-happes-next/

The sequester. D.C. decided to push off any decisions about the $110 billion in spending cuts included in the fiscal cliff. Half needed to come from defense and half from other portions of the government’s budget. The lack of any spending cuts in the compromise deal almost stalled the bill’s progress when House Republicans almost balked. The GOP believes it can wrestle some concessions from Democrats over this matter because conservatives relented some on raising taxes on wealthy Americans. (And they hold that aforementioned bargaining chip.) “Now it’s time to get serious about reducing Washington’s out-of-control spending. That’s a debate the American people want. It’s the debate we’ll have next. And it’s a debate Republicans are ready for,” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (Kentucky) said last night. Democrats have said they would only consider legislation that contained a mix of tax increases and spending cuts. We’re in for a struggle. “Given the cantankerous nature of the negotiations over the past …days it is no very possible that we will see another stand-off,” says Paul Ashworth, chief U.S. economist at Capital Economics. “Out of the frying pan, into the fire.” The latest advocate for an expedited solution: the International Monetary Fund. That body called on D.C. today to remove the remaining uncertainty and allow the economic recovery to gain speed.

#### Debt ceiling thumps gun control

Flaherty 1/6 (Anne, AP,Debt Ceiling Debate: Lawmakers Dig In Heels <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/06/debt-ceiling-debate_n_2421517.html>

Lawmakers said debt talks will consume Congress in the coming weeks, likely delaying any consideration of an expected White House proposal on gun restrictions in the wake of the Connecticut school shooting.

#### Obama’s focus is on fiscal issues – thumps gun control and immigration

Whitesides 1/4 (John, Reuters, "Budget battles threaten to limit Obama's second-term agenda," 2013, [www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/04/us-usa-obama-agenda-idUSBRE9030RA20130104])

Administration officials promise to move quickly in January in pursuit of new legislation on gun control and immigration. The gun control effort will be led by Vice President Joe Biden, who was appointed to develop a response to the deadly Connecticut school shootings in December. But what seemed to be fresh momentum for new measures such as a ban on assault rifles after the mass killing in Connecticut could be stalled by a protracted focus on the seemingly never-ending budget showdowns. Obama also plans to introduce comprehensive immigration legislation this month. Republicans will have fresh incentive on the issue after Hispanics soundly rejected Republican presidential contender Mitt Romney in the November election, giving Obama more than 70 percent of their vote. But a Senate Republican leadership aide said economic issues would be the prime concern of Congress for months, pushing back consideration of gun control and immigration. The aide blamed Obama.

#### Debt ceiling fights will only be in the House – Obama doesn’t need PC in the Senate

Star Ledger 1/6 (Debt ceiling and hostage taking: Editorial, http://blog.nj.com/njv\_editorial\_page/2013/01/post\_75.html)

Within a month or two, Congress will have another chance to impose a self-inflicted wound on our wobbly economy by refusing to raise the debt ceiling.¶ If that scares you, it should. A standoff would trigger a default that would spook investors, causing interest rates to skyrocket. That would slow the economy and kill jobs. And it would sharply increase the cost of interest payments, which amounted to a staggering $220 billion last year — more than Washington spends on education and housing combined.¶ With no ability to borrow more money, the federal government would have to abruptly cut spending by about one-quarter. That would cause massive layoffs, and could even force a halt in military paychecks. Every mutual fund that holds federal Treasurys would be destabilized as well.¶ Republicans are threatening to pull this trigger unless President Obama agrees to deep spending cuts. That tactic is so reckless it should be criminal. But it worked in 2011 when Obama folded under the pressure and agreed to more than $1 trillion in discretionary spending cuts.¶ This time, Obama promises to fight. He vows he will not negotiate with a gun to his head and allow a minority party to dictate terms.¶ “I want to send a very clear message,” he said a few weeks ago. “We are not going to play that game next year ... because we’ve got to break that habit.”¶ This is a game of chicken. Republicans are threatening to shoot the hostage unless they get their way, and Obama is daring them to pull the trigger.¶ It’s scary to watch, but Obama has good reason to take this tough line. Republicans cannot be allowed to use their narrow control of the House as a lever to dictate terms to the Senate and the White House every year as the debt grows.¶ Republicans are threatening to shoot the hostage, and Obama is daring them to pull the trigger.¶ Would House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) really pull the trigger? Most Americans understand that the intransigence of House Republicans is the main impediment to a balanced debt deal. If they drive the economy into a ditch, they could lose their control of the chamber in 2014.

#### No coin – it’s a bluff that would wreck the dollar

Salmon 1/7 (Felix, Reuters, “Why we wont mint a platinum coin” <http://blogs.reuters.com/felix-salmon/2013/01/07/why-we-wont-mint-a-platinum-coin/>)

Let’s be clear about this: no one’s going to mint a trillion-dollar platinum coin. Nor is anybody going to mint a million million-dollar platinum coins. But it would probably be stupid for anybody in the government to say that they’re not going to do it.¶ The trillion-dollar coin is the fiscal equivalent of the Flying Spaghetti Monster: a logical reductio ad absurdum designed to emphasize the silliness of an opposing position. For instance, if you don’t believe that churches should be tax-exempt, then you just claim that your entire family are Pastafarian priests, and that therefore all your investment income should be tax-exempt. Or rather you claim that you could claim that, but doing so would obviously be absurd; the logical implication is that failing to tax the investment income of, say, the Catholic church is equally absurd.¶ In this case, the absurdity to be pointed out is the debt ceiling. Everybody who’s ever been in charge of any country’s finances knows that the concept of a debt ceiling is profoundly stupid, self-defeating, and generally idiotic. And we discovered in 2011 that it can do very real harm. Back then, I hated the idea of the platinum coin:¶ Tools like the 14th Amendment or even crazier loopholes like coin seignorage would be signs of the utter failure of the US political system and civil society. And that alone could mean the loss of America’s status as a safe haven and a reserve currency. The present value of such a loss? Much bigger than $2 trillion.¶ This is the real problem with the main argument for minting a coin, which is that “yes, it’s a stupid gimmick, but so is the debt ceiling, and the debt ceiling is a lot more harmful than a coin would be”. That’s true, but it’s important to recognize just how damaging the platinum-coin move would be, all the same. It would effectively mark the demise of the three-branch system of government, by allowing the executive branch to simply steamroller the rights and privileges of the legislative branch. Yes, the legislature is behaving like a bunch of utter morons if they think that driving the US government into default is a good idea. But it’s their right to behave like a bunch of utter morons. If the executive branch failed to respect that right, it would effectively be defying the exact same authority by which the president himself governs. The result would be a governance crisis which would make the last debt-ceiling fiasco look positively benign in comparison.¶ There’s a reason why the proponents of the platinum-coin approach are generally economists, or at least economically-minded. The idea makes gloriously elegant economic sense, and attempts to shoot it down on economic grounds generally fail miserably. You can try a legal tack instead, but that doesn’t work much better: the coin is as logically robust as it is Constitutionally stupid.¶ No one in the executive branch has any real desire to mint a trillion-dollar coin — you can be sure of that. But the coin-minting advocates are OK with that: they just want to use the threat of the coin to persuade Congress that it should just go ahead and allow Treasury to pay for all the spending that Congress has, after all, already mandated. As a result, while no one intends to actually mint a coin, any statement to that effect would constitute unilateral disarmament in the war between the executive and the legislature.

### Warming Adv

#### No CCP collapse—the government represses instability

Pei 9 (Minxin, Senior Associate in the China Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3/12. “Will the Chinese Communist Party Survive the Crisis?” Foreign Affairs. http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64862/minxin-pei/will-the-chinese-communist-party-survive-the-crisis)

It might seem reasonable to expect that challenges from the disaffected urban middle class, frustrated college graduates, and unemployed migrants will constitute the principal threat to the party's rule. If those groups were in fact to band together in a powerful coalition, then the world's longest-ruling party would indeed be in deep trouble. But that is not going to happen. Such a revolutionary scenario overlooks two critical forces blocking political change in China and similar authoritarian political systems: the regime's capacity for repression and the unity among the elite. Economic crisis and social unrest may make it tougher for the CCP to govern, but they will not loosen the party's hold on power. A glance at countries such as Zimbabwe, North Korea, Cuba, and Burma shows that a relatively unified elite in control of the military and police can cling to power through brutal force, even in the face of abysmal economic failure. Disunity within the ruling elite, on the other hand, weakens the regime's repressive capacity and usually spells the rulers' doom. The CCP has already demonstrated its remarkable ability to contain and suppress chronic social protest and small-scale dissident movements. The regime maintains the People's Armed Police, a well-trained and well-equipped anti-riot force of 250,000. In addition, China's secret police are among the most capable in the world and are augmented by a vast network of informers. And although the Internet may have made control of information more difficult, Chinese censors can still react quickly and thoroughly to end the dissemination of dangerous news. Since the Tiananmen crackdown, the Chinese government has greatly refined its repressive capabilities. Responding to tens of thousands of riots each year has made Chinese law enforcement the most experienced in the world at crowd control and dispersion. Chinese state security services have applied the tactic of "political decapitation" to great effect, quickly arresting protest leaders and leaving their followers disorganized, demoralized, and impotent. If worsening economic conditions lead to a potentially explosive political situation, the party will stick to these tried-and-true practices to ward off any organized movement against the regime.
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#### GOP’s nuts—they’d go over the brink

Thai 1-3 Xuan Thai, “GOP willing to shut down government over debt ceiling?” MSNBC, 1/3/2013, http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/01/03/gop-willing-to-shut-down-government-over-debt-ceiling/

Republican Sen. Bob Corker, R-Tenn., ducked a question about shutting down the government over the upcoming debt ceiling debate on The Daily Rundown but at least one of his fellow Republicans was singing a different tune Thursday. “Unfortunately, the next line of the sand is the debt ceiling,” Corker said on The Daily Rundown Wednesday. “I think if the White House could show us [their proposed spending cuts]… this debate could move along so much more quickly and we could look like adults here instead of having to use leverage points.” However, less than 48 hours after passing a deal to avert the so-called fiscal cliff, Sen. Pat Toomey, R-Penn., said on Morning Joe Wednesday that Republicans can’t rule out a shut down in the negotiations. “We Republicans need to be willing to tolerate a temporary, partial government shutdown,” Toomey said Wednesday. “We absolutely have to have this fight over the debt limit.” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell also weighed in on the looming debt ceiling debate, writing in an op-ed for Yahoo, “The president may not want to have a fight about government spending over the next few months, but it’s the fight he is going to have, because it’s a debate the country needs.”

#### This fight is unique—republicans could see defaulting as rational

West 1-3 Sean West, head of the United States practice at Eurasia Group, a global political risk advisory firm, “Debt Ceiling Fight Could Be Train Wreck,” Bloomberg, 1/3/2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-03/debt-ceiling-fight-could-be-train-wreck.html

So we’re left looking forward to a debt ceiling, sequestration, and continuing resolution fight that may be nastier than the fiscal cliff imbroglio. At least in the case of the cliff, both sides had aligned incentives in that neither actually wanted across-the-board tax increases or spending cuts to take hold. But the incentives are now much different. Obama wants to break the Republican desire to extract dollar-for-dollar spending cuts for debt ceiling increases by refusing to negotiate on the issue. And unless Obama gives House Republicans significant spending cuts -- or at least a credible illusion of them -- they are going to hold out until the bitter end on increasing the debt limit.
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### T—Financial Incentives

#### Financial incentives consist of direct cash payments or loans—tax incentives are distinct

Lewis and Wiser ‘7 Joanna I. Lewis and Ryan H. Wiser in 2007, Fostering a renewable energy technology industry: An international comparison of wind industry policy support mechanisms, Energy Policy 35 (2007) 1844–1857, Cited by Malgor [exceptional dancer] in his wording paper “RE Incentives wording paper”

Financial incentives of various forms, whether based on electrical production or capital investment and whether paid as a direct cash incentive or as a favorable loan program, can also be used to encourage renewable energy development. Without a long-term power purchase agreement, however, this policy mechanism has been found to generally play a supplemental role to other policies in encouraging stable and sizable growth in renewable energy markets. Virtually all of the countries included in this survey have used ﬁnancial incentives of various types to encourage wind development. Many governments also provide a variety of tax-related incentives to promote investment in or production of renewable power generation. These incentives can come in the form of capital- or production-based income tax deductions or credits, accelerated depreciation, property tax incentives, sales or excise tax reductions, and VAT reductions. One of the most successful tax incentives in terms of contributing to installed capacity is the US’s PTC. Though the PTC has certainly been effective at promoting wind installations, its on-again, off-again nature has resulted in a very unstable market for wind farm investment, as was illustrated in Fig. 2. In the 1990s, India’s market was also driven in large part by various tax incentives, including 100 percent depreciation of wind equipment in the ﬁrst year of project installation, as well as a 5-year tax holiday (Rajsekhar et al., 1999). China has VAT reductions and income tax exemptions on electricity from wind, and a number of other countries have also used or continue to use a variety of tax-based incentives. As with ﬁnancial incentives, tax-based incentives are generally found to play a supplemental role to other policies, and countries that have relied heavily on tax-based strategies (e.g., US and India) have often been left with unstable markets for wind power.

#### Voting issue

#### Limits—key to check already huge mechanism and energy ground—that ensures core, focused topic education and checks collapse into backfile rehashes

#### Ground—positive incentives are key to spending links for politics and fiscal disciplines—those are key generics that the neg is SOL without—key to fairness
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#### Debt ceiling agreement now—Obama capital key

Dorning 1-3 Mike Dorning, “Obama Fights Republicans on Debt as Investors Seek Growth,” Bloomberg, 1/3/2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-03/obama-fights-republicans-on-debt-as-investors-seek-growth.html

The next chapter in the skirmishing over the nation’s finances plays out during a phase of the political calendar that gives Obama unusual access to the power of the presidential bully pulpit, with his inauguration for a second term and State of the Union address in the coming weeks. The administration is considering how to make the best use of the opportunities, the White House official said. Obama is likely to repeat tactics he used to mobilize public opinion in the fight over tax rates, including a social media campaign and campaign-style appearances outside Washington, the official said. Patrick Griffin, who was White House congressional lobbying chief for Democratic President Bill Clinton, said the debt limit “is not the leverage that Republicans think it will be.” Obama “is completely in a different position” than during the 2011 debt talks, Griffin said. Fresh Mandate The president has a fresh political mandate from his re- election. And corporate leaders anxious to avert the economic disruption of a debt default have taken a more prominent role in pressing for compromise, Griffin said. Obama also has gained more public credibility on the deficit, in part because he has spent more time speaking out about wanting to bring down government debt, Griffin said. A Bloomberg National Poll conducted Dec. 7-10 found 40 percent public approval of Obama’s handling of the deficit versus 32 percent in June 2011, at the start of the last debt-limit talks. Congressional Republicans have now twice backed off threats to stand fast in the face of a financial crisis, agreeing to the debt-limit increase in August 2011 and reaching a deal to avert the tax increase on Jan. 1. “Republicans conceded they did not want to create a crisis on the fiscal cliff,” Griffin said. “Why would they want to turn around and create an even bigger crisis on the debt limit?”

#### SMRs generally create congressional conflicts—fiscal discipline, waste, safety

Hopf 11 Jim is a blogger at NuclearCafe.org, 10/25/2011, “Roadblock in Congress for SMR Development” <http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2011/10/25/congress-smr/>

As discussed in my [June 20 post](http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2011/06/20/small-modular-reactors-and-current-policy-initiatives/), small modular reactors (SMRs) have many potential advantages, and could very well represent nuclear’s best prospect for the future. The industry has run into trouble, however, in getting government support for getting SMRs off the ground. The Obama administration has made a multi-year, $450 million [request](http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2011/07/14/8) for SMR development, including $67 million this year to support SMR licensing. The U.S. House of Representatives has included the $67 million in its 2012 [budget](http://www.politico.com/morningenergy/1011/morningenergy354.html) bill. That funding got removed from the U.S. Senate budget bill, however, by the Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, due primarily to opposition from Chairwoman Dianne Feinstein (D., Cal.). Feinstein cited the fact that SMRs would create additional nuclear [waste](http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2011/07/14/8), for which there is still no permanent disposal site, as a reason for her opposition. She also said that federal nuclear R&D money should be spent on [safety](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-09-06/senate-panel-led-by-democrats-cuts-obama-s-clean-energy-programs.html), as opposed to new reactor development, in light of the Fukushima disaster.

#### Default causes global economic collapse—on brink now

Goldfarb 1/1 (Zach, WaPost, “‘Fiscal cliff’ deal does little to tame threats from debt ceiling, high unemployment rates http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/fiscal-cliff/fiscal-cliff-deal-does-little-to-tame-threats-from-debt-ceiling-high-unemployment-rates/2013/01/01/8e4c14aa-5393-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f\_print.html)

The deal fell somewhere in between. But by gaining the support of both sides, it did not achieve what many economists believe is necessary for the short- and long-term success of the U.S. economy.¶ Leaving the fate of the debt ceiling up in the air will cause anxiety among businesses and individuals, potentially crimping hiring, investing and consumer spending.¶ In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation’s bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy.¶ And while a default would be all but certain to push the economy into recession, growth is likely to be slow — and job-market improvement slight — even without such a cataclysmic event. The unemployment rate, which stands at 7.7 percent, is not expected to fall below 7.4 percent by the end of this year, and not below 6 percent until at least 2016 or later.¶ In the midst of the recession, the government stepped in with spending programs and deep tax cuts to lift growth and reduce unemployment. A majority of economists say those efforts worked.¶ But federal stimulus has been winding down. And the spending cuts and tax hikes set for 2013 are expected to be a drag on the economy — with government policy offsetting much of the robust recovery being experienced in the private sector.

#### Economic collapse causes global wars

Royal ‘10 director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense (Jedediah, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal, and Political Perspectives, pg 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent stales. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level. Pollins (20081 advances Modclski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 19SJ) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fcaron. 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately. Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level. Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Mom berg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write. The linkage, between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict lends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other (Hlomhen? & Hess. 2(102. p. X9> Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blombcrg. Hess. & Wee ra pan a, 2004). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DcRoucn (1995), and Blombcrg. Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force arc at least indirecti) correlated. Gelpi (1997). Miller (1999). and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that Ihe tendency towards diversionary tactics arc greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked lo an increase in the use of force. In summary, rcccni economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict al systemic, dyadic and national levels.' This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### LFTRs CP

#### The United States Federal Government should provide production tax credits and a 20% investment tax credit to GE-Hitachi Nuclear Energy and all subsequent developers for production of a demonstration Small Modular Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor and for all subsequent reactors following that design for energy production in the United States.

#### Two net benefits –

#### First, politics — unique support for thorium

Tindale 11 (Stephen, associate fellow at the Centre for European Reform, June 2011, "Thorium: How to save Europe's nuclear revival," [www.cer.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2011/pb\_thorium\_june11-153.pdf], jam)

In the US, political interest in thorium molten salt reactors is cross-party, having been led by Democratic Senator Harry Reid and Republican Senator Orrin Hatch. Reid and Hatch have introduced three bills to Congress, all of which identified thorium fuel cycle technology as a means to expand nuclear power without increasing waste or nuclear proliferation. When he entered office, President Barack Obama set up a Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s nuclear future, which is considering nuclear fuel cycles and nuclear waste against criteria of “cost, safety, resource utilisation and sustainability, and the promotion of nuclear non-proliferation and counter-terrorism goals”.11 The Commission will publish a draft report in July 2011 and a final report in January 2012. US Energy Secretary Steven Chu has already indicated that he thinks thorium and molten salt reactors are the way forward for nuclear energy: “We cannot continue to improve the condition of people throughout the world without use of nuclear power. None of the renewable energy solutions can be scaled quickly enough to meet current and future energy needs. Safer, proliferation resistant, nuclear power without the long term high level waste storage problems is needed to power a growing world economy and to allow all nations to provide for and feed their growing populations in peace. These goals are available by changing the nuclear fuel cycle to a U233/Thorium fuel cycle.”12 Large US energy companies have not yet shown serious interest in molten salt reactors. However, Microsoft’s Bill Gates has set up a company called TerraPower with the aim of developing a nuclear energy system which reduces the weapons proliferation risk and allows the re-use of spent nuclear fuel. TerraPower has identified thorium molten salt reactors as a promising means of achieving these objectives. Other US companies are part of a consortium, with Japanese and Russian companies, to develop a molten salt reactor. Japanese companies involved include Toyota, Toshiba and Hitachi.

#### Second, the case arguments - LFTRs provide safe and effective reprocessing—avoids the turns

Hall 10 (Vincent, M.S. Chemical Engineering at University of Tennessee-Knoxville, Process Engineer at Burns & McDonnell, "A REVIEW OF THE BENEFITS AND APPLICATIONS OF THE THORIUM FUEL CYCLE," Sep 21, jam)

What appears to be the most promising reactor design for the thorium fuel cycle is the one for which it originally was intended, that is the Molten Salt Reactor (MSR) or Liquid Fluoride Thermal Reactor (LFTR). Current reactor designs, typified by solid fuel elements, necessitate that the power plant be modeled as a mechanical operation, the primary objective being the simplification of heat transfer equipment. However this is paid for by complicated fuel reprocessing. Solid fuel elements remain in the same position during their service time, accumulating fission and activation products until the fuel is so heavily poisoned that the nuclear reaction can no longer take place. The accumulation of poisons such as xenon requires the presence of more fuel than otherwise necessary, resulting in additional generation of waste. Eventually, the operation must be shutdown so that the fuel can undergo maintenance or replacement (Hron 222-223). At the least, the fuel bundles must be routinely shuffled in the core to avoid build up of neutron poisons, but this still requires downtime. Also, reprocessing is generally not economical as the solid fuel must be first converted to a liquid/gas for separations and then back to solid form for geological disposal. One alternative to this approach is a reactor with the fuel dissolved in a liquid core, modeling the facility morel like a chemical plant. Such a design seeks to maximize the ease of reprocessing and recovery (Briant and Weinberg 797). The Molten Salt Reactor Experiment (MSRE) performed at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) from the 1950’s to 1970’s was extremely successful and demonstrated the feasibility of the technology. The continuous and flowing nature of the process provided simple fission product removal and reprocessing. Inherent safety and proliferation resistance features were also key elements of the design. A drawback to reprocessing with a MSR is that a reprocessing plant must be collocated with each plant site, which is an added cost. However, on site reprocessing reduces proliferation threats as it decreases the need for transportation. The MSRE was based upon the idea of dissolving the fertile and fissile materials as fluorides in a molten carrier salt, typically LiF and BeF2. It was designed as a seed- and blanket type reactor and was able to operate 233 U, 235 U, and 239 Pu as fissile fuels. The 232 Th233 U cycle is most applicable to a MSR, as it allows for much higher conversion in the thermal neutron spectrum, which is where the reactor operates, while the 238 U239 Pu cycle needs to take place in the fast spectrum to obtain complete conversion. In the original design of the MSRE, an inner spherical core contains the dissolved 233 UF4 in the fuel salt, where the nuclear reaction takes place. This is surrounded by a second vessel containing 232 ThF4 dissolved in a blanket salt. Neutron flux from the inner core passes into the blanket salt to transmute the thorium to fissile uranium. The blanket salt is continuously sent to a chemical processing plant where the thorium is returned to the blanket while the uranium is sent to the inner core fuel salt. Similarly, the fuel salt is also sent through a chemical separations procedure to remove fission products from the fuel. The rationale behind this design is due to the fact that thorium and the formed fission products are chemically similar, thus isolating the two species greatly simplifies the reprocessing procedure. The problem with this design was that the allowable critical diameter of the inner core was only 1 meter, too small to obtain sufficient power output on an industrial scale. The design was then altered so that the fluids were interlaced by an integrated plumbing scheme to provide sufficient neutron flux between the salts, while still keeping thorium separated from the fission products. However, the graphite present in the core would shrink and swell under the presence of the high irradiation, yielding a complicated and sensitive “plumbing problem”. A subsequent design was adopted that contained all the dissolved species in a single salt mixture. This design was eventually constructed and ran successfully for five years. The simplification of the reactor though, was compensated for by the difficulty in reprocessing the waste. ORNL used a Liquid Bismuth Reductive Extraction (LBRE) process to separate the fission products from thorium, but it was a very costly, complex, and delicate process (LeBlanc “Liquid Fluoride Reactors”). Now, with the current revival of interest in nuclear power, reinvestigations of ORNL’s “plumbing problem” in the two fluid design or optimization of the difficult LBRE process with current pyrochemical methods may provide an effective and economical way of closing the nuclear fuel cycle. Construction of a two fluid MSR capable of handling the flexing problem associated with the plumbing will greatly reduce the challenge of reprocessing. For the blanket salt, bubbling F2 gas through causes dissolved 233 UF4 to form gaseous 233 UF6, which can be easily removed, converted back to 233 UF4 by reacting with H2 and sent to the fuel salt. Likewise, for the removal of fission products from the inner core, uranium and gaseous fission products are first removed separately from the fuel salt based upon fluoride volatility. The salt is then placed in a still to undergo vacuum distillation. The decay heat of the fission products facilitates the evaporation of the salt which is recombined with the uranium, while leaving solid fission products behind for disposal. In addition, the two-fluid design solves the thorium fuel cycle’s protactinium problem. The risk of 233 Pa absorbing neutrons to form transuranic wastes is lessened because the neutron flux in the blanket salt where the protactinium is formed is much lower. Thus, 233 Pa can be allowed to simply remain in the salt and decay to 233 U (LeBlanc “Liquid Fluoride Reactors”). Efficiency, safety, and proliferation resistance features make the MSR a viable technology. The chemical and physical stability of the salt allow the reactor to reach much higher temperatures than traditional solid fuel reactors. The MSRE, a 1000 MWe design, demonstrated an operating temperature of 700°C, significantly higher than that of a typical LWR (~315°C). For any power cycle, higher temperatures result in higher efficiencies. A MSR could potentially allow power plants to replace steam driven turbines with the more efficient gas driven turbines (LeBlanc “Liquid Fluoride Reactors”). Today, a current 1 GW capacity nuclear plant requires up to 800,000 tons mined uranium ore to undergo milling and fuel fabrication, of which results to roughly 35-40 tons of spent fuel per year. A 1GWyr MSR however, only requires around 200 tons of thorium ore and results in about 1 ton of fission products and little to no transuranic waste due to the use of thorium as fuel. The absence of transuranics means that only 300-500 years is needed for the entirety of the fission product waste to decay to a stable and safe state. In addition, in the thermal spectrum, the best way demonstrated of obtaining complete fuel consumption is by use of a MSR run on the thorium fuel cycle. If all of the fuel from the uranium cycle is desired to be burned, the neutronic speeds must be switched to the fast, and arguably less safe, spectrum. With such efficiencies, it is possible that a thorium fueled MSR is capable of producing enough energy so that only 100 grams of pure thorium would represent the average U.S citizen’s lifetime energy consumption. In comparison 3.5kg of Lightly Enriched Uranium (LEU) would represent the same amount of energy (Sorensen “Energy from Thorium) as would 54 tons of coal (ENS “Fuel Comparison”). The design of a MSR is also inherently safe. As the fuel salt heats up inside the core, it expands and flows out of the high neutron flux zone. This loss of fissile material in the core limits the extent of reaction and cools down the system. The process works in reverse as well when the reactor is performing below the desired output temperature, the more dense salt allows more fissile material to flow in and increase the neutron economy. Unlike traditional pressurized water cooled designs, the liquid salt in the MSR serves as its own coolant and its high boiling point allows it to operate at low pressure. This eliminates the risk of a high pressure rupture in the system, so that no expensive containment vessels or piping and equipment designed for high pressure applications are needed. If there were however, a breach in the system, the high melting point of the salt would simply cause it to solidify upon contact with the air and possibly even seal the break. In the event of a loss of power to the system, ORNL developed a simple and effective method for cooling the reactor. Under normal operation, a fan system was used to cool and solidify a section of piping containing the salt, known as the “freeze plug”. If was power was lost, the freeze plug would simply melt and the molten salt would then flow to a passively cooled containment vessel. This is much simpler than current reactor designs were emergency coolant has to be brought to the reactor and override normal operation procedures (Sorensen “Energy from Thorium”). As a guard against weapons proliferation, the simple fact that the fuel exists as a molten liquid form with a temperature of at least 500°C makes it a difficult material to misappropriate. In addition, the use thorium fuel cycle yields 232 U as a side product of the burn-up chain, regardless of the reactor design, which also enhances proliferation resistance as its daughter products are strong gamma emitters that make direct handling and weapons usage difficult (IAEA 66). Furthermore, in the event of the security of the facility being compromised, 238 UF4 can be quickly dumped into the reactor, denaturing it to a form unsuitable for proliferation (LeBlanc “Liquid Fluoride Reactors”). The THOREX process is the most developed method for reprocessing. However, this process which utilizes a liquid-liquid extraction technique for the removal of uranium, thorium, and/or plutonium from the fission products has yet to reach the efficiency and practicality of its equivalent PUREX process (IAEA 65). The first step of reprocessing solid fuel elements from a LWR is the removal of its protective cladding, commonly referred to as the head-end process. This consists of either a series of mechanical de-cladding operations or a chemical de-cladding procedure. For most Zircaloy or stainless steel clad fuel elements the mechanical option is usually implemented, and consists of cutting, grinding, shearing, and crushing away the casing. The chemical option consists of either a dry-fluorination procedure, a SULFEX solution (5 M HNO3 + 2 M HCl and 5 M H2SO4) for SS removal or a ZIRFLEX solution (6 M NH4F + 0.5 M NH4NO3) for Zircaloy removal (IAEA 71). After the head-end process, the fuel is dissolved in the nitric acid based THOREX solution. This solution undergoes a varying degree of feed preparation, extraction, partitioning, and stripping stages depending on whether uranium, uranium and thorium, or uranium, thorium, and if present plutonium are desired to be recovered. Tributyl phosphate (TBP) dissolved in dodecane is generally used as the extractant. Control of the concentration of TBP and acidity of the scrubbing and stripping solutions permits selectivity of what actinides will be recovered (IAEA 72). In the 1980’s, Zimmer and Merz performed much work fine tuning the THOREX process developed by ORNL in the 1950’s by adjusting and optimizing acid and TBP concentrations throughout the extraction process in order to maximize decontamination factors and minimize precipitant crud formation. They also proposed the use of pulse columns for reprocessing thorium fuel. Compared to mixer-settlers, pulse columns provide less contact time between fission products and the organic phase, which leads to less decomposition of TBP into unwanted DBP. Also, any crud precipitation formed in the process is less likely to cause clogging than in mixer-settlers due to the increased flow velocity as well as a decrease in the occurrence of any unwanted third phase complexes associated with thorium and TBP. However, the issue of criticality should be acknowledged with pulse columns, as it was observed that the concentration of uranium in the upper part of the column in the partitioning stage is one order of magnitude higher than in the feed solution (Merz and Zimmer 338-339). The most common method of THOREX reprocessing is the sole retrieval of uranium leaving thorium discarded in the raffinate, known as the INTERIM 23 process. 1.5% to 5% TBP is used in the extraction stage, followed by a series of scrubbing stages with 1-2 M HNO3, and ending with a dilute nitric acid stripping stage to remove the 233 U from the organic solvent. If further purity is desired, an anionic exchange method in HCl solution may be used. This however, presents problems as corrosion control is arduous to maintain and the resulting corrosion products lead to poor decontamination factors (IAEA 72). When the retrieval of both uranium and thorium is desired a 30% to 43% TBP solution is capable of extracting both actinides. An acid strip greater than 0.3M HNO3 used in the partitioning stage removes the majority of the thorium, while a very dilute acid strip removes the uranium from the organic. A problem associated with this procedure is the aforementioned formation of a third phase due to poor solubility of the complexes formed by thorium and TBP in the dodecane diluent. Replacements for dodecane capable of sufficient loading without formation of a third phase are currently being considered such as amides and aromatic diluents (IAEA 73). Little investigation has been undertaken in the development of a three stream process for recovering plutonium if Th-Pu MOX fuel is used. This process would theoretically combine aspects of the PUREX and THOREX processes. A 5% TBP extraction / scrubbing / stripping process will yield a U-Pu nitrate solution that can then undergo traditional PUREX processing for eventual formation of separate oxide powders. The leftover thorium contained in the raffinate will then be removed from the fission products with at 30% TBP extraction / scrubbing / stripping process followed by precipitation and calcination to form an oxide powder. A problem presented in this scheme is the formation of nitrous gases that stabilize plutonium ions, limiting their solubility in the initial 5% TBP extractant. Considerable research is needed concerning the process chemistry of this scheme before its application can be realized (IAEA 74). If the intermediate 233 Pa, in the transmutation of 232 Th to 233 U, is desired for recovery and eventual conversion to 233 U, then considerable technological development must be undertaken. In the current THOREX process, protactinium passes through with the fission products in the raffinate waste. Not only is this a loss of the potentially re-usable 233 Pa as a transitional to 233 U, but it also means that any 231 Pa formed in the burn-up chain of 232 U will be carried with the remaining waste for permanent disposal. 231 Pa is an alpha emitting isotope with a long term radiological impact constituting a half-life of 3 x 10 4 years that is a concern regarding geological disposal. The recovery of both of these isotopes of protactinium would limit the amount and severity of the waste product and reduce fuel consumption as both can be converted to 233 U in the reactor (IAEA 65-66). An alternative to recovering 233 Pa from the spent fuel is to simply allow it to decay to 233 U before reprocessing. However, as stated early, this requires storage time of one year that can be expensive. Oddly enough, it appears that the most viable solution to solving the protactinium problem may have been already solved by ORNL in the 1960s. They were able to successfully absorb 98% of the protactinium dissolved in THOREX solution on pulverized unfired Vycor glass. This was done by introducing agitated contact between the protactinium containing solution and the Vycor glass for 24 hours. The difference in the gross gamma count of the glass and aqueous raffinate was then used to measure the amount of adsorbed protactinium. In order to determine if this technique is transferable to an industrial process, ORNL suggested that a hot-cell experiment involving THOREX solution from spent fuel pins be performed to determine the effects of fission product concentrations on the adsorption of protactinium under normal process conditions (Moore 1-2). It should be noted however, that the attainment of 233 U from 233 Pa from reprocessing poses a significant weapons proliferation problem. Any 233 U obtained from 233 Pa, will be considered Highly Enriched Uranium. This 233 U will have little of the proliferation limiting 232 U that it is normally associated with in the thorium burn-up chain. Thus, the Vycor adsorption process would limit the protactinium problem, so long as the protactinium recovered was sent back to the service end of the fuel cycle before conversion to 233 U. In addition, the THOREX process faces another challenge concerning the role of 232 U. On the one hand, the 232 U formed by (n, 2n) reactions of 232 Th, 233 Pa, and 233 U in the thorium decay chain provides a natural proliferation barrier as its decay products, such as 212 Bi and 208 Tl, yield strong gamma emissions of 0.78MeV and 2.6MeV, respectively. These emissions are capable of compromising the electronic triggering components of a military weapon attempting to utilize reprocessed 233 U, potentially rendering such a bomb unstable or useless. The presence of such radiation will also greatly aid in the exposure of concealed nuclear weaponry due to the growing science and technology of nuclear detection systems (IAEA 9). On the other hand, the presence of 232 U complicates spent fuel reprocessing. It has a half-life of roughly 72 years and the radioactivity of its daughter products necessitates remote, shielded, and preferably automated reprocessing. While this may be beneficial in deterring the proliferation of the spent fuel, it is costly and complicated. This is due to the fact that both 232 U and its alpha decay product 228 Th are chemically inseparable from their respective isotopes of 233 U and 232 Th (IAEA 66). Isotopic separation of the thorium should be easily achievable with current centrifugal effect technology due to the relatively large difference in atomic mass between the isotopes. However, the very slight mass difference between the uranium isotopes may prove to be a challenge. Emerging separation technologies involving mass spectrometry or atomic laser vapor isotope separation (AVLIS) may prove applicable to this process once further developed. If desired, the amount of 232 U can be minimized by controlling the neutron flux spectrum of the reactor. Higher 232 U concentrations are associated with fast neutron spectrums than with thermal. For a fast LWR, for example, the 232 U present is roughly on the order of 2000-3000 ppm. In a thermalized PHWR, 232 U concentration is expected at 500-1000 ppm. However, it has been demonstrated by the BN-350 sodium cooled fast reactor in Kazakhstan, that by introducing a 15-20 cm spacing between the thorium blanket and central core, 232 U can be all but eliminated. The 232 U obtained from this design was only 2-11 ppm, proving that minimization of 232 U can be achieved, but this returns us to the proliferation problem of reprocessing pure 233 U (IAEA 66). Unlike UO2 and PuO2, ThO2 exists in only one oxidation state, making it more stable under most storage and process conditions. While UO2 is easily dissolved in nitric acid, mixed fuels containing over 80% ThO2 cannot be dissolved in pure HNO3. A small amount of HF is needed to aid in the dissolution. The addition of HF, however, introduces a corrosion problem for stainless steel piping and equipment. These effects can be mitigated with the addition of aluminum nitrate, which complexes with excess free fluoride ions that would otherwise instigate corrosion. In the 1950’s ORNL developed a process using the following dissolved acid: 13M HNO3+0.05 M HF+0.1M Al (NO3)3 which is now the accepted THOREX solution formula and has served as the best medium for dissolving ThO2 to date. ThO2 is dissolved in THOREX solution at ~120°C and ambient pressure, while coupled with agitation. Increasing the temperature and pressure to ~200°C and 9 atm greatly increases the dissolution rate, but of course increases safety risk as well. It has been also demonstrated that irradiated fuel dissolves more readily in solution than fresh fuel. This is most likely attributed to disturbances formed in the crystal structure of the spent fuel during the service period. Recent experiments performed with un-irradiated fuel have also shown that the addition of roughly 1.5% MgO during the pellet fabrication stage and replacement of HF with NaF in the THOREX solution lead to increased dissolution rates (IAEA 66). Disposal The direct disposal of spent thorium fuels would be anticipated to be very similar to that of uranium. Currently, different countries have adopted different methodologies for disposing of nuclear waste. In the U.S, civilian waste remains on-site in large cooling ponds. These large concrete structures serve to provide radiation protection and remove heat generated from radioactive decay. It is intended that after sufficient cooling time, the waste from these pools will be encapsulated and transported to a permanent geological repository such as Yucca Mountain in Nevada or the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico (WNA “Waste Management”). In Canada, long term waste management plans involve placement of the waste in corrosion resistant containers enclosed by a clay-based buffer barrier. These containers are then set into a deeply excavated granite vault for permanent disposal (IAEA 76). In Europe, much of the spent fuel is actually reprocessed in either the UK or France. The recovered fuel is returned to the plants, while the waste is vitrified, sealed in stainless containers, and either stored at the reprocessing facility or returned as well. Eventually, the waste will also be sent to permanent geological disposal (WNA “Nuclear Waste Management”). Thus, regardless of when and how the waste gets there, a geological repository is the final step in waste management for all countries. It is here were thorium based fuels hold the advantage over traditional uranium fuels. The high chemical stability of ThO2 and its very low solubility in groundwater aids in its retention of harmful fission products, making it suitable for direct geological disposal. Also, it has bee shown that fission gas release. from defected thorium fuel elements is 1 to 2 orders of magnitude lower than that of uranium and that release of Br, Cs, and Rb from the fuel matrix is much slower as well (IAEA 78). In the event of a rupture of the casing material during permanent disposal, a gas leak containing radioactive material would pose safety and logistics issues, which a thorium fuel cycle would moderate. A dramatic renovation in the operation and protocol of the nuclear power industry must be undertaken in order for the thorium fuel cycle to be utilized. This will be an extremely difficult task, as a whole new nuclear infrastructure will have to be installed and will be in direct competition with very strong and influential enterprises that already have a reliable and profitable system established. Thus, the only way for thorium power to be economically accessible, is for an increased public awareness of the benefits it can provide, so as to feed demand. Thorium is capable of fixing the negative stigma associated with nuclear energy by providing a sustainable, safe, and weapons resistant form of power. When coupled with MSR technology, the thorium fuel cycle will be capable of producing little to no long lived transuranic waste, will have a natural negative void coefficient during service end operation, and will deter weapons proliferation with the presence of 232 U and ease of denaturing. The more minds that are aware of and insist upon the use of thorium power, the sooner it will be economically realizable and available to the public as a very clean form of energy.

### Eco-Sovereignty K

#### Eco-exceptionalism: environmental crisis discourse freezes politics in an ever present climate of total danger, mediating political discussions through an episteme which protects elite interests and legitimizes environmental exploitation

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 126-127

In a technologically enframed (and politically diminished) condition, crises of all kinds are manufactured in the dual sense that they are produced, deliberately or as side effects of socioeconomic processes that constantly transform reality, and employed, as Benjamin argues, as fictions (Agamben 2005, 3) to justify political repression. Discussion of whether the ecological reality of any particular situation merits the suspension of politics and ethics is, to some extent, beside the radical ecological political point (such a suspension must always be resisted), although the question of the extent of sovereign power’s involvement in manufacturing a crisis situation, including an ecological crisis like global warming, is clearly not. The real concern is that sovereign power (and, remember, Agamben is thinking primarily of state power) has, as part of its self-definition as "sovereign," accrued the sole right to decide this question. There is thus a real and devastatingly ironic possibility that the idea of an ecological crisis, so long and so vehemently denied by every state, will now find itself recuperated by the very powers responsible for bringing that crisis about, as the latest and most comprehensive justification for apolitical state of emergency, a condition that serves to insulate those powers against all political and ethical critique. We may find that the global war on terror will segue seamlessly into the crisis of global warming, a condition produced by previous technological interventions in the natural world, interventions of a kind that were initially deemed politically unchallengeable by everyone except radical ecologists. The growing (political and ecological) danger is that this emergency is used to legitimate further technocratic interventions, to further extend the state and corporate management of biological life, including the continuing reduction of humanity to bare life. We should be clear what is at stake here: nothing less than the eco- logical future of the natural world and the ethicopolitical future of humanity. The dry bed of the Aral Sea, the burning forests of Southeast Asia, the devastated landscape wrought by the exploitation of the Athabasca oil tar sands, the industrial-scale slaughter of seal pups on Canada’s east coast, and a million other examples all reveal the likely destiny of the natural world without ethicopolitical intervention. As for the reduction of humanity to bare life, this is, as Agamben claims, already well underway. Here too we find states moving toward the biopolitical management of populations; here too the procedures are justified by “exceptional" circumstances that become the new rule(s). A more spatially and temporally localized (and hence more intense) example might be found in the state of emergency declared in New Orleans after hurricane Katrina. What was portrayed as a failure to predict or manage a natural event led to the ethical and political abandonment of a largely African American urban population and the simultaneous imposition of martial law on that same population. The concern, if Agamben is right, is that the disastrous consequences of such instances increase the likelihood of further technological in- terventions and the call for more rigorous bureaucratic control and police powers on ever-increasing scales. That environmentalists now frequently find themselves labeled as ecoterrorists, as the new enemy within the state, only supports this contention (Vanderheiden 2005; Miller, Rivera, and Yelin 2008).

#### Biopolitical terror: exceptional politics reduce the other to bare life to permit its extermination while deploying threats of apocalypse as tools of normalization

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. xiv-xv

Despite their political differences, Schmitt, Benjamin, and Agamben all agree that this definition of sovereignty holds no matter how demo- cratic the modern state’s political constitution may claim to be, al- though Schmitt, of course, infamously defended the legality of the state of emergency declared following Hitler’s accession to power. This dec- laration took the form of the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State, which used emergency provisions in the Weimar consti- tution (Article 48) to suspend the personal liberties supposedly guaran- teed by the Weimar constitution (Agamben 2005, 14-15). And since, as Agamben (1998, 28) remarks, “The decree was never repealed… from a juridical standpoint the entire Third Reich can be considered a state of emergency that lasted twelve years.” Sovereignty inevitably harbors such dangers because, although the justification for declaring a state of emergency is always the defense of the people and the state, sovereign power, by definition, takes it upon itself to decide what constitutes a danger, the state, and the people (and here again, in this last instance, the anthropological machine can play a devastating role, as it did in Nazi Germany, in deciding who does and does not count as properly human). Only politics as such can contest such decisions, but politics is precisely what is suspended as a consequence of this antipolitical decision. The sovereign decision deprives particular people within a particular territory of their right to engage in politics. Here, people’s “political life” (bios politikos), their capacity to express themselves individually and in community with Others through their public words and deeds (and this is Arendt’s [195 8] definition of politics) is (politically) stripped from them. Their political existence is denied by a decision that reduces them to the condition Agamben refers to as “bare life” (naked existence). Bare life is not a return to a prepolitical state of nature, not a condition prior to or ex- ceeding political authority, but a condition in which those included within the polity (subject to sovereign political authority) are nonethe- less excluded from the polity (in terms of political participation and the protection supposedly afforded by its now suspended laws). They experience the worst of both worlds, being subject to a power under which they have no legitimate standing. The prisoners in Guantanamo Bay and the residents of New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina both found themselves in this indeterminate (excluded/included) condition (Butler 2004; Gregory 2006), and Agamben contentiously argues that the most extreme example of such a zone of indeterminacy was the concentration camp. But as Benjamin (2006, 392) remarked, the “tradition of the oppressed teaches us that the ‘state of emergency’ in which we live is not the exception but the rule." In other words, the state of emergency is not confined to such extreme times and places but also becomes normalized in more dif- fuse ways. To put this in Agamben’s terms, which draws on Foucault’s (2004; 2008) earlier analyses, we are now in a situation in which politics is everywhere being replaced by biopolitics, the governmental manage- ment and control of the biological life (and death) of populations. Even in the most democratic of countries, we find ourselves increasingly re- duced for the purposes of governance to so much biological information, to the collection and manipulation of statistics (state information) concerning every aspect of our lives; from our birth date and height to our DNA profile, the unique patterns of our iris and fingerprints, the information in our biometric passports, and so on. The consequences of this more subtle but pervasive biopolitical way of reducing people to bare life are only beginning to be recognized because, as Esposito (2008, 44) argues, "The category of biopolitics seems to demand a new horizon of meaning, a different interpretative key."

#### Text: Vote negative to jam the anthropological machine.

#### Refusing the principle of sovereign domination by contesting the humanist dogma of the 1AC is critical to establishing more responsible and respectful approaches to the ‘natural world’

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 118-121

Agamben’s position, on the other hand, claims to offer a life of absolute political emancipation, of human freedom but entirely without an ecological (or sociohistorical) context, one wherein ecology is somehow implausibly left behind, abandoned to its own unknowable purposes. Here politics risks losing any meaningful connection with the natural world because this supposedly radical position lacks any ecological articulation of politics whatsoever. In Calarco’s (2007, l64—65) words: “Where one might expect a radically post—humanist thinker such as Agamben to challenge the oppositional and reductionistic determinations of animal life characteristic of Western metaphysics, he has . . . remained largely content to occupy the human side of the human/animal binary in order to complicate and rethink the political consequences of essentialist definitions of the human.” What then actually happens to the natural world in Agamben’s "coming community”? He speaks of this future prospect in terms of a "natural life that is unsavable and that has been abandoned by every spiritual element—and yet because of the ‘great ignorance’ [animals' unawareness of the very possibility of desiring anything other than their natural possibilities, that is, their environmental captivation] is nonetheless perfectly blessed.” Human and animal are each released into “their own truer nature,” nature apparently being left serene in its “non-knowledge."' The animal will be "let be outside of being,” outside, that is, of the human phenomenal world (Agamben 2004, 90-91).10 On one level this sounds, as might befit Agamben’s spiritual hyperhumanism, suspiciously like the rapture preached by Christian fundamentalists, which also envisages the leaving behind (abandonment) of the natural world to save the truly human soul. Agamben, however, is not envisaging this in terms of humanity leaving the world at all but of humanity leaving behind its political concerns with its own nature in order to inhabit a world of possibilities that are not governed by the workings of the anthropological machine. This, he thinks, necessarily involves both the letting be of nature as such and the recognition that there is more to life than the (natural) world as it appears to human concerns. “How the world is—this is outside the world" (2000, 105). How might this inform radical ecology’s interest in saving the (natu- ral) world? A clue emerges in the way Agamben (2004, 82) speaks of this abandonment in terms of Benjamin’s notion of the “saved night," that is, the “nature that has been given back to itself," to its own transient appearances and rhythms. This giving back to itself first involves the recognition that there is so much more to nature, to the operations of those concealed rhythms, to life, than how it appears to us-- especially in the very limited mode of appearance forced on nature in its technological enframement. It also recognizes that we have to abandon the attempt to represent nature fully or fix it in its relation to us as having a certain identity. In Heidegger’s terminology, the natural world in itself is neither ready-to—hand nor present-at-hand: it cannot be fully captured instrumentally or conceptually such as it is. But we can only come to think this possibility through our ecological suspension. In one sense, and despite Agamben’s anthropocentric intentions, this offers possibilities for truly ethical recognition of the importance of letting nature be, not just, as Evernden suggests, in terms of saving those aspects of a world that have meaning for us, but going beyond this, of recognizing in Murdoch’s and Levinas’s sense a relation of infinity rather than totality (see chapter 2). We cannot save the world by bewailing the loss of just those elements that have meaning for us (as Evernden sometimes seems to suggest); we must recognize that how the world is, is also outside the human world. As naive ontologists, we had always felt something of this world that is “alive to us” but had not yet been able to conceive of its implications in ethical terms. So while Agamben lacks an ecological ethics or any explicit concern for the natural world, while he seems to think it possible that we can inhabit a world where ecology has no political meaning whatsoever, he still points a way to understanding how human and animal, politics and nature, history and natural history might eventually be reconciled. This reconciliation does not entail, as critics of radical ecology (and fundamentalist primitivists) claim, an impossible return to a mythic state of nature or any reversion to animality. It requires that we reject the claims of sovereignty in all its forms, natural and political. It requires the political mastery of politics as an ethically informed practice by all the world’s people rather than the (bio)political mastery of the world, the ethical recognition of the necessary openness of politics and nature. This means that those capable of doing so accept responsibility for the (pure) means of political "production" in such a way that they let nature be, free from any claims to sovereign power over it. Agamben’s position is not as Hegelian as it initially seemed because he, like Bataille, concerns himself with what exceeds and resists the claims of any purportedly universal or totalizing dialectic: What does this "mastery of the relation between nature and humanity" mean? That neither must man master nature nor nature man. Nor must both be surpassed by a third term that would represent their synthesis. Rather, according to the Benjaminian model of a “dialectic at a standstill,” what is decisive here is only the “between,” the interval or, we might say, the play between the two terms, their immediate constellation in a non- coincidence. The anthropological machine no longer articulates nature and man in order to produce the human through the [political] suspension and capture of the inhuman. The machine is, so to speak, stopped; it is "at a standstill." And, in the reciprocal suspension of the two terms, something for which we perhaps have no name and which is neither animal nor man settles in between nature and humanity and holds itself in the mastered relation, in the saved night. (2004, 83) Perhaps we might find a name for this "reciprocal suspension," the ecological suspension that enables ethics and politics and the political suspension that frees nature into the creative exuberance of the saved night. We might refer to this reconciliation too as a form of “suspended animation," not in the sense of bare life nor of a cryogenic stopping of life’s rhythms or even of leaving nature hanging over the abyss of ecologi-cal destruction, but as an image of the ethical and political holding open of life’s possibilities for both human and more-than-human worlds, as the ethicopolitical suspension of that originary ecological suspension-- those events that initially open the world from its captivation. In this way we might still, naively, attempt to save the (natural) world.

### Case

#### No nuke rennaisance

Hopf 11-21 Jim Hopf, senior nuclear engineer with more than 20 years of experience in shielding and criticality analysis and design for spent fuel dry storage and transportation systems, “Post-election outlook for nuclear energy,” ANS Nuclear Café, 11/21/2012, http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/11/21/post-election-outlook-for-nuclear/

I have saved the best for last. Most experts agree that the single most important factor that affects nuclear’s future prospects is the price of natural gas. If gas remains at current (very low) prices over the long term, not only will few, if any, new nuclear plants be built (beyond Vogtle and Summer), but even the continued operation of existing plants may be threatened. A perfect example of this is the recently announced closure of the Kewaunee nuclear plant. The plant lies within a “merchant” market, where the price of electricity is determined by the “last” supplier (highest variable cost), which is usually a gas plant. With the low price of natural gas, market prices for power in the region are very low. At current prices, Kewaunee is losing money. (This came as a shock to me, as the whole idea with nuclear is that whereas the initial capital cost is high, the operating cost, once built, is extremely low, low enough to easily compete with anything—or so I thought.)

#### Uranium-fueled SMRs are a huge prolif risk

Makhijani and Boyd 2010 – ARJUN MAKHIJANI [Arjun Makhijani is an electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research] and MICHELE BOYD [Michele Boyd is the former director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility] “Small Modular Reactors No Solution for the Cost, Safety, and Waste Problems of Nuclear Power” Fact sheet completed in September 2010 <http://www.psr.org/nuclear-bailout/resources/small-modular-reactors-no.pdf>

In addition, the use of plutonium fuel or uranium enriched to levels as high as 20 percent—four to five times the typical enrichment level for present commercial light water reactors—presents serious proliferation risks, especially as some SMRs are proposed to be exported to developing countries with small grids and/or installed in remote locations. Security and safety will be more difficult to maintain in countries with no or underdeveloped nuclear regulatory infrastructure and in isolated areas. Burying the reactor underground, as proposed for some designs, would not sufficiently address security because some access from above will still be needed and it could increase the environmental impact to groundwater, for example, in the event of an accident.

#### Prolif risks extinction

Kroenig ’12 Matthew Kroenig, Council on Foreign Relations Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow and Georgetown University assistant professor of government, “The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have A Future?” Nonproliferation Policy Education Center

Should we worry about the spread of nuclear weapons? At first glance, this might appear to be an absurd question. After all, nuclear weapons are the most powerful weapons ever created by man. A single nuclear weapon could vaporize large portions of a major metropolitan area, killing millions of people, and a full-scale nuclear war between superpowers could end life on Earth as we know it. For decades during the Cold War, the public feared nuclear war and post-apocalyptic nuclear war scenarios became a subject of fascination and terror in popular culture. Meanwhile, scholars carefully theorized the dangers of nuclear weapons and policymakers made nuclear nonproliferation a top national priority. To this day, the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries remains a foremost concern of U.S. leaders. Indeed, in his 2012 annual threat assessment to the U.S. Congress, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper argued that nuclear proliferation poses one of the greatest threats to U.S. national security.[1] Recently, however, academics have become more vocal in questioning the threat posed by the spread of nuclear weapons. Students of international politics known as “proliferation optimists” argue that the spread of nuclear weapons might actually be beneficial because it deters great power war and results in greater levels of international instability.[2] Other scholars, whom I label “proliferation anti-obsessionists,” maintain that nuclear proliferation is neither good nor bad, but irrelevant.[3] They claim that nuclear weapons do not have any meaningful effect on international politics and that the past seventy years of world history would have been roughly the same had nuclear weapons never been invented. Some take this line of argument even further and argue that the only real problem is not the nuclear weapons themselves, but great power nonproliferation policy.[4] They argue that the cure that countries like the United States implement in order to prevent other states from acquiring nuclear weapons is much worse than the disease of the spread of nuclear weapons itself. While these arguments remain provocative, they are far from new. The idea that a few nuclear weapons are sufficient to deter a larger adversary and keep the peace has its origins in the early strategic thinking of the 1940s. Moreover, a critical review of this literature demonstrates that many of these arguments are much less sound than they initially appear. Indeed, both proliferation optimism and proliferation anti-obsessionism rest on internal logical contradictions. In this essay, I argue that the spread of nuclear weapons poses a grave threat to international peace and to U.S. national security. Scholars can grab attention by making counterintuitive arguments about nuclear weapons being less threatening than power holders believe them to be, but their provocative claims cannot wish away the very real dangers posed by the spread of nuclear weapons. The more states that possess nuclear weapons, the more likely we are to suffer a number of devastating consequences including: nuclear war, nuclear terrorism, global and regional instability, constrained U.S. freedom of action, weakened alliances, and the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. While it is important not to exaggerate these threats, it would be an even greater sin to underestimate them and, as a result, not take the steps necessary to combat the spread of the world’s most dangerous weapons.

#### New Tech is bad—it breaks current global convergence increasing cost and lowering safety

Lester and Rosner ‘9 -- Richard K. Lester [Professor of Nuclear Engineering and head of the Nuclear Science and Engineering Department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology] and Robert Rosner [Astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago. Director of Argonne National Laboratory from 2005 to 2009] “THE GROWTH OF NUCLEAR POWER: Drivers and Constraints” MIT-IPC-Energy Innovation Working Paper 09-002 July 2009 (forthcoming in Daedalus) http://web.mit.edu/ipc/research/energy/pdf/EIP\_09-002.pdf

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

#### SMRs exponentially multiply all the perils of nuclear power—radiation leaks, meltdown, waste disposal issues each individually pose extinction level risks

Smith ’11 Gar Smith, “Don’t Mini-mize the Dangers of Nuclear Power,” Earth Island Journal, Summer 2011, http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/eij/article/dont\_mini-mize\_the\_dangers\_of\_nuclear\_power

The radiation from Japan’s crippled Fukushima Daiichi reactors poisoned farmlands, contaminated the sea, and sent invisible mists of radiation wafting around the world. The latest – and it’s just the latest – atomic accident has raised new concerns about the risks of nuclear energy. But still the question remains: Are we wise enough to finally understand that nuclear reactors are a fool’s technology? Earth Island Institute founder David Brower initially believed that “atomic energy could be a safe alternative to damming all our rivers for power.” But Dave soon realized – earlier than most – that “the risk presented by these lethal wastes is like no other risk, and we should not be expected to accept it.” Despite the industry’s glib assurances, nuclear power has never been a safe or foolproof technology. For evidence of that fact, let’s review a few of the major nuclear accidents of the Atomic Age. United Kingdom (1957): Windscale reactor fire contaminates 35 workers. Radioactive cloud covers Northern Europe and causes at least 200 cases of cancer. Soviet Union (1957): Radioactive explosion at Mayak reprocessing site forces evacuation of 10,000 people. Radiation contributes to deaths of 200. USA (1975): Alabama’s Browns Ferry plant catches fire and burns for seven hours with two reactors running. Meltdown feared as fire destroys controls. USA (1979): Partial core meltdown at Three Mile Island. Radiation released. Thousands evacuated. USA (1981): California’s San Onofre plant closed for 14 months to repair 6,000 leaking steam tubes. During restart, plant catches fire, knocking out one of two back-up generators. United Kingdom (1983): Beaches near Sellafield (formerly Windscale) nuclear processing plant closed due to radiation contamination. Soviet Union (1986): Chernobyl explosion. World’s worst nuclear accident – so far. Estimates of associated deaths run from 9,000 to nearly one million people. Japan (1997): Chain reaction at Tokaimura reprocessing plant exposes 37 workers and surrounding neighborhoods to radiation. Japan (1999): Two workers killed at Tokaimura during unplanned chain reaction. Japan (2004): Steam explosion kills four at Mihama reactor. Sweden (2006): Short circuit disables emergency power at Forsmark reactor. Catastrophic core meltdown barely averted. France (2008): Tricastin nuclear facility accidentally releases 18,000 liters of irradiated water. And that’s just a partial list. The problem with nuclear power is simple: It’s too complex. When things go wrong – as they inevitably do, because humans are fallible – the consequences can be deadly. The Fukushima disaster has severely hobbled the atomic industry’s hopes for a big-ticket nuclear renaissance. So the American Nuclear Society has proposed a mini-renaissance based on “Small Modular Reactors,” or SMRs. Cheaper, quicker to build, and small enough to fit in a garage, SMRs could power homes, factories, and military bases. South Carolina’s Savannah River National Laboratory hopes to start building SMRs at a New Mexico plant and is taking a lead role in a GE-Hitachi demonstration project. Even as Japanese engineers were working to contain the radiation risks at Fukushima, an international SMR conference in South Carolina in April attracted representatives from Westinghouse, AREVA, GE, the International Atomic Energy Agency, China National Nuclear Corp., Iraq Energy Institute, the US Army, and many US utilities. But SMRs still depend on designs that generate intense heat, employ dangerous materials (highly reactive sodium coolant), and generate nuclear waste. SMRs also retain all the risks associated with supplying, maintaining, safeguarding, and dismantling large nuclear reactors – only now those risks would be multiplied and decentralized. The planet can’t afford nuclear energy – be it mega or mini. As Dave Brower observed 30 years ago: “Is the minor convenience of allowing the present generation the luxury of doubling its energy consumption every 10 years worth the major hazard of exposing the next 20,000 generations to this lethal waste? “We are at the edge of an abyss and we’re close to being irrevocably lost,” Dave warned. “As the Welshman Allen Reese puts it: ‘At the edge of the abyss, the only progressive move you can make is to step back.’”

#### Breeder reactors aren’t workable, reliable, or competitive

PR Newswire ’10 “Report: Unsuccessful 'Fast Breeder' Is No Solution for Long-Term Reactor Waste Disposal Issues,” PR Newswire, 2/17/2010, http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/report--unsuccessful-fast-breeder-is-no-solution-for-long-term-reactor-waste-disposal-issues-84610032.html

Hopes that the "fast breeder"- a plutonium-fueled nuclear reactor designed to produce more fuel than it consumed -- might serve as a major part of the long-term nuclear waste disposal solution are not merited by the dismal track record to date of such sodium-cooled reactors in France, India, Japan, the Soviet Union/Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States, according to a major new study from the International Panel on Fissile Materials (IPFM). Titled "Fast Breeder Reactor Programs: History and Status," the IPFM report concludes: "The problems (with fast breeder reactors) ... make it hard to dispute Admiral Hyman Rickover's summation in 1956, based on his experience with a sodium-cooled reactor developed to power an early U.S. nuclear submarine, that such reactors are 'expensive to build, complex to operate, susceptible to prolonged shutdown as a result of even minor malfunctions, and difficult and time-consuming to repair.'" Plagued by high costs, often multi-year downtime for repairs (including a 15-year reactor restart delay in Japan), multiple safety problems (among them often catastrophic sodium fires triggered simply by contact with oxygen), and unresolved proliferation risks, "fast breeder" reactors already have been the focus of more than $50 billion in development spending, including more than $10 billion each by the U.S., Japan and Russia. As the IPFM report notes: "Yet none of these efforts has produced a reactor that is anywhere near economically competitive with light-water reactors ... After six decades and the expenditure of the equivalent of tens of billions of dollars, the promise of breeder reactors remains largely unfulfilled and efforts to commercialize them have been steadily cut back in most countries." The new IPFM report is a timely and important addition to the understanding about reactor technology. Today, with increased attention being paid both to so-called "Generation IV" reactors, some of which are based on the fast reactor technology, and a new Obama Administration panel focusing on reprocessing and other waste issues, interest in some quarters has shifted back to fast reactors as a possible means by which to bypass concerns about the long-term storage of nuclear waste. Frank von Hippel, Ph.D., co-chair of the International Panel on Fissile Materials, and professor of Public and International Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, said: "The breeder reactor dream is not dead but it has receded far into the future. In the 1970s, breeder advocates were predicting that the world would have thousands of breeder reactors operating by now. Today, they are predicting commercialization by approximately 2050. In the meantime, the world has to deal with the legacy of the dream; approximately 250 tons of separated weapon-usable plutonium and ongoing - although, in most cases struggling - reprocessing programs in France, India, Japan, Russia and the United Kingdom." Mycle Schneider, Paris, international consultant on energy and nuclear policy, said: "France built with Superphenix, the only commercial-size plutonium fueled breeder reactor in nuclear history. After an endless series of very costly technical, legal and safety problems it was shut down in 1998 with one of the worst operating records in nuclear history." Thomas B. Cochran, nuclear physicist and senior scientist in the Nuclear Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said: "Fast reactor development programs failed in the: 1) United States; 2) France; 3) United Kingdom; 4) Germany; 5) Japan; 6) Italy; 7) Soviet Union/Russia 8) U.S. Navy and 9) the Soviet Navy. The program in India is showing no signs of success and the program in China is only at a very early stage of development. Despite the fact that fast breeder development began in 1944, now some 65 year later, of the 438 operational nuclear power reactors worldwide, only one of these, the BN-600 in Russia, is a commercial-size fast reactor and it hardly qualifies as a successful breeder. The Soviet Union/Russia never closed the fuel cycle and has yet to fuel BN-600 with plutonium." M.V. Ramana, Ph.D., visiting research scholar, Woodrow Wilson School and the Program in Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy, Princeton University, said: "Along with Russia, India is one of only two countries that are currently constructing commercial scale breeder reactors. Both the history of the program and the economic and safety features of the reactor suggest, however, that the program will not fulfill the promises with which it was begun and is being pursued. Breeder reactors have always underpinned the DAE's claims about generating large quantities of cheap electricity necessary for development. Today, more than five decades after those plans were announced, that promise is yet to be fulfilled. As elsewhere, breeder reactors are likely to be unsafe and costly, and their contribution to overall electricity generation will be modest at best."

#### Accidents devastates solvency

Bonass et al, 12 (Matt Bonass, Michael Rudd and Richard Lucas are partners in Bird and Bird’s energy and utilities sector group. Mr Bonass and Mr Rudd are co-editors of Renewables: A Practical Handbook. Mr Rudd is head of Bird and Bird’s nuclear practice. Author interviews, Renewable energy: the fallout from Fukushima, http://www.globelawandbusiness.com/Interviews/Detail.aspx?g=910fcfa6-9a2d-4312-b034-9bbcb2dad9e0)

There is no doubt that the events in Fukushima have cast a shadow over the nuclear industry. Previous nuclear disasters, such as those at Three Mile Island in the United States and Chernobyl in the former Soviet Union, have caused significant delays to the development of the nuclear industry. For example, the United States embargoed the building of new nuclear plants for nearly 25 years following the Three Mile Island crisis and many European countries ceased their nuclear development programmes following events at Chernobyl. Our colleagues across our network of European offices are telling us that their clients are approaching them to discuss the implications of the Fukushima events. For example, what will be the effect on the discussions currently taking place in Italy on the referendum to recommence nuclear development activities? What will be the effect of the proposals in Germany to place its plants offline? Will Europe adopt the proposals for a comprehensive risk and safety assessment of nuclear plants (the so-called ‘stress tests’)? Public perception is vital to the nuclear industry. Over the past few years, nuclear has gradually become an accepted part of the low carbon economy, but it may now have become politically unacceptable to many.

#### deployment timeframe is a decade plus

ITA ’11 “The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors,” International Trade Administration, US Dept of Commerce, February 2011, http://trade.gov/mas/ian/build/groups/public/@tg\_ian/@nuclear/documents/webcontent/tg\_ian\_003185.pdf

Although SMRs have significant potential and the market for their deployment is growing, their designs must still go through the technical and regulatory processes necessary to ensure that they can be safely and securely deployed. Lightwater technology–based SMRs may not be ready for deployment in the United States for at least a decade, and advanced designs might be even further off. Light-water SMRs and SMRs that have undergone significant testing are the most likely candidates for near-term deployment, because they are most similar to existing reactors that have certified designs and significant operating histories. NuScale is on track to submit its reactor design to the NRC by 2012, as is Babcock & Wilcox for its mPower design. In addition, GE-Hitachi, which already completed an NRC preapplication review for its PRISM reactor in 1994, plans to submit its PRISM design for certification in 2012.

#### Environmental justice’s nostalgic naturalism disregards Native concerns in favor of a romantic drive for purity that is regulatory and violent in practice

Yamamoto and Lyman ‘1 Eric K. Yamamoto, Professor of Law, University of Hawai'i Law School, and Jen-L W. Lyman, Stirling & Kleintop, JD from University of Hawaii Law School, “ARTICLE: RACIALIZING ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE,” University of Colorado Law Review, Spring 2001, 72 U. Colo. L. Rev. 311, lexis

James Huffman also criticizes the traditional environmental justice framework, but from the perspective of Native American economic development. He identifies three assumptions of modern environmental thought that work against Native [\*339] interests. 164 First, orthodox environmentalism assumes the existence of a scientifically "correct" natural condition and thus tends toward oppressive command and control methods. 165 The second assumption is that regulations must limit development and growth. 166 Finally, in marked contrast to arguments that anthropocentrism in American environmentalism clashes with Native cultural beliefs, Huffman asserts that American environmentalism assumes a "biocentric" approach fundamentally opposed to economic development, even when necessary for Native survival. 167 He criticizes environmental protection as a "luxury good" enjoyed by wealthier societies 168 that promotes the idea that "the poverty and economic depression of the reservations [is] not only inevitable but desired." 169 Huffman's critique is harsh: "Native Americans, more than any other segment of American society, will suffer at the altar of environmentalism worshipped in their name." 170 Commentator Conrad Huygen arrives at a similar conclusion: "We have romanticized indigenous cultures in a manner that threatens to stifle development on reservations and perpetuate the poverty that permeates them." 171 In more measured terms, Tsosie agrees with Huffman's view that "national implementation of centralized policies (whatever their origin and content) often disregards tribal sovereignty and the special interests of indigenous peoples." 172

#### Calculation is inevitable, but we can still calculate for the other. Their attempts to be free of calculation ensures that their ethic is co-opted

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.

#### Scenario planning is essential to responsible policymaking—even if it’s imperfect, testing increases accuracy

Garrett ’12 Banning Garrett, director of the Asia Program and Strategic Foresight Initiative at the Atlantic Council, “In Search of Sand Piles and Butterflies,” Strategic Foresight Initiative Blog, Atlantic Council, 1/23/2012, http://www.acus.org/disruptive\_change/search-sand-piles-and-butterflies

“Disruptive change” that produces “strategic shocks” has become an increasing concern for policymakers, shaken by momentous events of the last couple of decades that were not on their radar screens – from the fall of the Berlin Wall and the 9/11 terrorist attacks to the 2008 financial crisis and the “Arab Spring.” These were all shocks to the international system, predictable perhaps in retrospect but predicted by very few experts or officials on the eve of their occurrence. This “failure” to predict specific strategic shocks does not mean we should abandon efforts to foresee disruptive change or look at all possible shocks as equally plausible. Most strategic shocks do not “come out of the blue.” We can understand and project long-term global trends and foresee at least some of their potential effects, including potential shocks and disruptive change. We can construct alternative futures scenarios to envision potential change, including strategic shocks. Based on trends and scenarios, we can take actions to avert possible undesirable outcomes or limit the damage should they occur. We can also identify potential opportunities or at least more desirable futures that we seek to seize through policy course corrections. We should distinguish “strategic shocks” that are developments that could happen at any time and yet may never occur. This would include such plausible possibilities as use of a nuclear device by terrorists or the emergence of an airborne human-to-human virus that could kill millions. Such possible but not inevitable developments would not necessarily be the result of worsening long-term trends. Like possible terrorist attacks, governments need to try to prepare for such possible catastrophes though they may never happen. But there are other potential disruptive changes, including those that create strategic shocks to the international system, that can result from identifiable trends that make them more likely in the future—for example, growing demand for food, water, energy and other resources with supplies failing to keep pace. We need to look for the “sand piles” that the trends are building and are subject to collapse at some point with an additional but indeterminable additional “grain of sand” and identify the potential for the sudden appearance of “butterflies” that might flap their wings and set off hurricanes. Mohamed Bouazizi, who immolated himself December 17, 2010 in Sidi Bouzid, Tunisia, was the butterfly who flapped his wings and (with the “force multiplier” of social media) set off a hurricane that is still blowing throughout the Middle East. Perhaps the metaphors are mixed, but the butterfly’s delicate flapping destabilized the sand piles (of rising food prices, unemployed students, corrupt government, etc.) that had been building in Tunisia, Egypt, and much of the region. The result was a sudden collapse and disruptive change that has created a strategic shock that is still producing tremors throughout the region. But the collapse was due to cumulative effects of identifiable and converging trends. When and what form change will take may be difficult if not impossible to foresee, but the likelihood of a tipping point being reached—that linear continuation of the present into the future is increasingly unlikely—can be foreseen. Foreseeing the direction of change and the likelihood of discontinuities, both sudden and protracted, is thus not beyond our capabilities. While efforts to understand and project long-term global trends cannot provide accurate predictions, for example, of the GDPs of China, India, and the United States in 2030, looking at economic and GDP growth trends, can provide insights into a wide range of possible outcomes. For example, it is a useful to assess the implications if the GDPs of these three countries each grew at currently projected average rates – even if one understands that there are many factors that can and likely will alter their trajectories. The projected growth trends of the three countries suggest that at some point in the next few decades, perhaps between 2015 and 2030, China’s GDP will surpass that of the United States. And by adding consideration of the economic impact of demographic trends (China’s aging and India’s youth bulge), there is a possibility that India will surpass both China and the US, perhaps by 2040 or 2050, to become the world’s largest economy. These potential shifts of economic power from the United States to China then to India would likely prove strategically disruptive on a global scale. Although slowly developing, such disruptive change would likely have an even greater strategic impact than the Arab Spring. The “rise” of China has already proved strategically disruptive, creating a potential China-United States regional rivalry in Asia two decades after Americans fretted about an emerging US conflict with a then-rising Japan challenging American economic supremacy. Despite uncertainty surrounding projections, foreseeing the possibility (some would say high likelihood) that China and then India will replace the United States as the largest global economy has near-term policy implications for the US and Europe. The potential long-term shift in economic clout and concomitant shift in political power and strategic position away from the US and the West and toward the East has implications for near-term policy choices. Policymakers could conclude, for example, that the West should make greater efforts to bring the emerging (or re-emerging) great powers into close consultation on the “rules of the game” and global governance as the West’s influence in shaping institutions and behavior is likely to significantly diminish over the next few decades. The alternative to finding such a near-term accommodation could be increasing mutual suspicions and hostility rather than trust and growing cooperation between rising and established powers—especially between China and the United States—leading to a fragmented, zero-sum world in which major global challenges like climate change and resource scarcities are not addressed and conflict over dwindling resources and markets intensifies and even bleeds into the military realm among the major actors. Neither of these scenarios may play out, of course. Other global trends suggest that sometime in the next several decades, the world could encounter a “hard ceiling” on resources availability and that climate change could throw the global economy into a tailspin, harming China and India even more than the United States. In this case, perhaps India and China would falter economically leading to internal instability and crises of governance, significantly reducing their rates of economic growth and their ability to project power and play a significant international role than might otherwise have been expected. But this scenario has other implications for policymakers, including dangers posed to Western interests from “failure” of China and/or India, which could produce huge strategic shocks to the global system, including a prolonged economic downturn in the West as well as the East. Thus, looking at relatively slowly developing trends can provide foresight for necessary course corrections now to avert catastrophic disruptive change or prepare to be more resilient if foreseeable but unavoidable shocks occur. Policymakers and the public will press for predictions and criticize government officials and intelligence agencies when momentous events “catch us by surprise.” But unfortunately, as both Yogi Berra and Neils Bohr are credited with saying, “prediction is very hard, especially about the future.” One can predict with great accuracy many natural events such as sunrise and the boiling point of water at sea level. We can rely on the infallible predictability of the laws of physics to build airplanes and automobiles and iPhones. And we can calculate with great precision the destruction footprint of a given nuclear weapon. Yet even physical systems like the weather as they become more complex, become increasingly difficult and even inherently impossible to predict with precision. With human behavior, specific predictions are not just hard, but impossible as uncertainty is inherent in the human universe. As futurist Paul Saffo wrote in the Harvard Business Review in 2007, “prediction is possible only in a world in which events are preordained and no amount of actions in the present can influence the future outcome.” One cannot know for certain what actions he or she will take in the future much less the actions of another person, a group of people or a nation state. This obvious point is made to dismiss any idea of trying to “predict” what will occur in the future with accuracy, especially the outcomes of the interplay of many complex factors, including the interaction of human and natural systems. More broadly, the human future is not predetermined but rather depends on human choices at every turning point, cumulatively leading to different alternative outcomes. This uncertainty about the future also means the future is amenable to human choice and leadership. Trends analyses—including foreseeing trends leading to disruptive change—are thus essential to provide individuals, organizations and political leaders with the strategic foresight to take steps mitigate the dangers ahead and seize the opportunities for shaping the human destiny. Peter Schwartz nearly a decade ago characterized the convergence of trends and disruptive change as “inevitable surprises.” He wrote in Inevitable Surprises that “in the coming decades we face many more inevitable surprises: major discontinuities in the economic, political and social spheres of our world, each one changing the ‘rules of the game’ as its played today. If anything, there will be more, no fewer, surprises in the future, and they will all be interconnected. Together, they will lead us into a world, ten to fifteen years hence, that is fundamentally different from the one we know today. Understanding these inevitable surprises in our future is critical for the decisions we have to make today …. We may not be able to prevent catastrophe (although sometimes we can), but we can certainly increase our ability to respond, and our ability to see opportunities that we would otherwise miss.

#### Environmental justice reflects an overpowering white and elitist influence which naturalizes structural tendencies through the distraction of inequality in siting

Yamamoto and Lyman ‘1 Eric K. Yamamoto, Professor of Law, University of Hawai'i Law School, and Jen-L W. Lyman, Stirling & Kleintop, JD from University of Hawaii Law School, “ARTICLE: RACIALIZING ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE,” University of Colorado Law Review, Spring 2001, 72 U. Colo. L. Rev. 311, lexis

Critical race theory also facilitates interrogation of the often unexamined influences of whiteness on environmental law, policy, and practice. According to Peter Manus, the environmental movement, from which environmental justice springs in part, "is determined by the norms or perceptions of white mainstream America." 210 Manus thus attributes the tension between environmentalism and other social justice movements to environmentalism's "elitist roots, conceived of and implemented primarily from a white, male, and mainstream perspective" and to its resulting "proclivity to immerse itself in pure science, as opposed to human science, and to express itself in command-and-control regulation, as opposed to consensus." 211 To what extent, if at all, is this true? Critical race theory helps us grapple with this question by unpacking whiteness. In law, whiteness is the racial referent - "inequality" means "not equal to white." Whiteness is the norm. 212 Yet whiteness itself, until recently, has been largely unexplored. Critical race theorists and historians are now unraveling the often hidden strands of white influence and privilege and the ways in which whiteness (as a norm and as a racial identity) dramatically, yet quietly, shapes all racial relationships. 213 Joe Feagin observes the following about the influence of Anglo law, religion, and language. [\*348] From the 1700s to the present, ... immigrant assimilation has been seen as one-way, as conformity to the Anglo-Protestant culture: "If there is anything in American life which can be described as an overall American culture ... it can best be described ... as the middle-class cultural patterns of largely white Protestant, Anglo-Saxon origins." 214 White influence is so pervasive that it often goes unnoticed. It is, according to Barbara Flagg, "transparent": In this society, the white person has an everyday option not to think of herself in racial terms at all. In fact, whites appear to pursue that option so habitually that it may be a defining characteristic of whiteness ... . I label the tendency for whiteness to vanish from whites' self-perception the transparency phenomenon. 215 Integral to this transparency is "the very vocabulary we use to talk about discrimination." 216 "Evil racist individuals" discriminate; by implication, all others do not. This vocabulary hides "power systems and the privilege that is their natural companion." 217 Critical race theory thus pushes environmental justice proponents to examine the white racism (and sometimes the racism by other groups) that undergirds the environmental problems affecting Native communities and communities of color. It also challenges proponents to closely interrogate the influence of whiteness in environmental law, policy, and practice, and its effect, in turn, on established approaches to environmental justice controversies.

## 2NC

### Kritik

#### Expertism distorts the risks of nuclear power—knowledge is validated according to political and social assumptions which may vastly understate the potential consequences—politicizing their knowledge production is essential

Kuch ’11 D. Kuch, PhD candidate in school of history and philosophy at University of NSW, “Three objections to nuclear power after Fukushima,” Overflows, 10/13/2011, http://framingoverflows.blogspot.com/2011/03/three-objections-to-nuclear-power.html

1. Expertise in nuclear physics does not equate to expertise in radiation dispersion. At the level of philosophy of science, all the greatest excesses of Western Science are embodied in nuclear physics: true representations of nature, an ignorant and/or irrational public that must be disciplined; in short, epistemology where 'just the facts' must first be known, then people can form a rational opinion about the topic. But nuclear physics is not nuclear engineering and nuclear engineering is not radiation science. Damage at Fukushima may thus far be confined to reactor core and containment structures but they don't exactly have a camera in there, and there are a number of risks that must be honestly dealt with. Many nuclear advocates have bet the proverbial farm on the integrity of containment, and a full meltdown seems unlikely. (for that scenario, see Joe Romm). It's worth noting here that once highly radioactive cesium and iodine elements are released into the environment, entirely separate bodies of knowledge are needed to deal with their movement. Because such releases are relatively rare, knowledge about the movement of radiation through the atmosphere, soils, plants and animals is basically a form of bricolage. Field testing radiation leakage models would hardly pass any Ethic Committee, so risk management of public health radiation is based on extrapolations and models that deserve public scrutiny. We're in the terrain of what Bruno Latour calls 'matters of concern', rather than 'matters of fact' here (see. eg. The Union of Concerned Scientists) This isn't to say science should be suppressed or excluded - it's indispensable to eventually addressing those matters of concern: For example, Ben Sandilands has noted that: This morning there was an elevated radiation level emergency declared at the Onagawa nuclear plant, which comprises three reactors, and is 120 kilometres from the NE outskirts of Tokyo, compared to about 240km for the nearest Fukushima plant. These fluctuations at Onagawa are now attributed to fallout from the Fukushima “releases” which is not comforting to those in Tokyo or elsewhere in Japan but is an inevitably that adds to the far more visible and immediate aftermaths of the tsunami. Yeah, sorry - once this has happened, Barry Brook's credentials are no better than mine.\* [Update: here's his latest update] 2. Nuclear institutions have a poor record of disclosure. One of the reasons earlier incidents were so damaging was that authorities were incredibly secretive about what was happening. Nuclear physics brings with it a completely impoverished sociology of trust: people are assumed to either hold or not hold information about a topic. The only role of science is to fill any perceived void there. This is the 'deficit model' of scientific citizenship. In reality, as much key science studies work has shown, this 'deficit model' is an ideological fiction. Local publics have sophisticated models of trust about science and technology built from many sources - they parse the interests behind official reports of incidents in a rational manner. Brian Wynne's classic study of Cumbrian Sheep farmers after the Chernobyl disaster exemplifies the need to be attentive to local specifics. The main point from that study was that the Sellafield nuclear reprocessing plant was nearby and a bunch of accidents were covered up. As a result, local farmers held little trust of nuclear authorities. When the Chernobyl meltdown occurred, authorities used a set of crude models to determine how long it would take the radioactive elements to decay around local farms. They basically messed this up, using models that assumed a dry soil, rather than wet clay. In the meantime, the stories fed to farmers were revised, information withheld and they were basically screwed around. The bottom line is that regulatory science should (but for obvious institutional reasons rarely does) have a dose of humility. 3. Energy policy is a political matter: Nuclear scientists might dream of a linear process from 'science to society' (energy 'too cheap to meter' from the 'peaceful atom'), but energy policy is not just a logical problem to be solved according to a set of mathematical principles. Planning requires these, but they're not sufficient. Nuclear power carries with it the authority of science, but requires the social legitimacy of democratic institutions. For better or worse, Sweden placed a moratorium on further nuclear power plants following the (US) Three Mile Island incident. Such decisions must be respected if made in a fair way. Nuclear power plants have political consequences insofar as they are part of inflexible technological networks with incredibly long lead times, incorporating mining, reprocessing, disposal and electricity transmission. This is of course a criticism that could be made against other energy technologies. It is only by suppressing the political consequences of nuclear engineering (of which there are many! - this post hasn't even mentioned weapons proliferation) that one can claim an expert 'unbiased'. And that's a recipe for a debilitated public sphere.

#### Nuclear waste management is inseparable from a politics which maintains a myth of perfect utility to justify tentative practices of violence and ecological destruction like dumping and resource extraction as long as their damage to the homeland is minimized

Laes and Schröder ‘9 Erik Laes, Flemish Institute for Technological Research/University of Antwerp, and Jantine Schröder, Belgian Nuclear Research Centre, “’On the Uses and Disadvantages of History’ for Radioactive Waste Management,” paper presented at the “Managing Radioactive Waste Problems and Challenges in a Globalizing World” conference, 15-17 December 2009, found somewhere on google scholar

In Section 3.1, we exposed the view that inherent to ‘solid’ modernity is the association of practices of spatial division (the drawing of borders) with practices of cultural significance (the drawing of boundaries). Take the borders of nation states as an example. Culturally, modern borders were once established as geographical and historical forms of inclusion and exclusion which operate the following correlations: the local with ‘insiders’, ‘presence’, and the ‘known’; the distant with ‘outsiders’, ‘absence’ and the ‘foreign’. Crucially, this was also the case for waste. Waste, by its modern definition, is any material (solid , liquid or gaseous) that has been or will be discarded as being of no further use. This qualification of putting something outside the category of usefulness clearly draws upon the force of virtuality. In a modern culture (at least in the liberal-democrat version) that has the ‘pursuit of the greatest utility for the greatest number of free people’ as one of its key creeds, ‘waste’ represents the inherently chaotic ‘residue category’ of the useless. Paradoxically, drawing this demarcation line so stringently, requires the need to circumscribe and maintain a space specifically for what lies beyond the line of exclusion. Hence again the conjunction of cultural boundaries and spatial borders: the practices of waste displacement are well exposed in the environmental politics literature, where the phenomenon is called ‘distancing’ (e.g. by dilution, dispersion, export of wastes to Third World countries, etc.). A considerable and sustained effort had to go into maintaining and patrolling this ‘ultimate frontier’ (the ‘end’ in a ‘world of means’), fuelled by the (virtual) force of a belief in progress. Perhaps not surprisingly, with the (virtual) force of progress declining or at least changing over the last few decades, the problem of the handling of wastes resurfaces as one of the defining characteristics of the ‘new’ modernity, with some even going as far as to project a future where waste will no longer exist.6 The fate of waste in modernity is played out in an exemplary way in the nuclear fuel cycle. When nuclear energy was introduced, waste was never expected to become the problem is has turned out to be today. Top-level scientists that mastered the fission process would surely come up with a solution for the ‘external by-product’ of this highly advanced technique. With regard to the ‘disutility’ of nuclear power, attention was in the early years focussed on radiation protection and dual use. Thus a history in which nuclear waste was treated as an issue more or less isolated from nuclear applications as such developed. Although research still looks for a ‘real’ solution to discard nuclear waste, it has become clear that considerable amounts of waste are here to stay and this for a very long period in time. For a number of reasons, nuclear waste tends to be more ‘visible’ than other forms of waste. Paradoxically, these reasons have a lot to do with ‘invisibility’: the ‘invisibility’ of its risk (the literal invisibility of radiation, but also the ‘invisibility’ following the timescale of effects), the ‘invisibility’ of the organisations responsible for its management (leading to a well-publicised lack of trust in these organisations), as well as the ‘invisibility’ of the proposed technical solutions.

#### The aff’s “compassionate” relationship to natives masks post-colonial society’s legal and economic domination of native peoples – appeals to the “market” are an essential part of a strategy that seeks to legitimate this as beyond our control

Taiaiake Alfred, Director of the Indigenous Governance Program at the University of Victoria, 1999, Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto, pg xiii

In the past two generations, indigenous people around the world have broken the rusty cage of colonial oppression and exposed the injustices imposed on them. Brave and powerful leaders have challenged the European’s self-proclaimed right to rule and ruin our nations. Our people have achieved a victory of the mind: the attitudes that sustained our subjugation can no longer be defended. Confronted with the moral and intellectual defeat of its empire in Indian Country, the former oppressor has presented a more compassionate face. Newcomer governments claim to be forging historic new relationships with indigenous nations, relationships based on mutual respect, sharing, sovereignty, and our inherent rights. Economic development, modern treaties, self-government, compacts, revenue-sharing, and co-management have become the watchwords of the ‘post-colonial’ age. But beyond the words, is the promise holding? There have been some improvements. But our reserves are still poor, our governments are still divided and powerless, and our people still suffer. The post-colonial promises cannot ease this pain. The state has shown great skill in shedding the most onerous responsibilities of its rule while holding fast to the lands and authorities that are the foundations of its power. Redefining without reforming, it is letting go of the costly and cumbersome minor features of the colonial relationship and further entrenching in law and practice the real bases of its control. It is ensuring continued access to indigenous lands and resources by insidiously promoting a form of neo-colonial self-government in our communities and forcing our integration into the legal mainstream. Real control remains in the hands of white society, because it is still that society’s rules that determine our life—not through obviously racist laws, but through endless references to the ‘market’. ‘fiscal reality’, ‘Aboriginal rights’, and ‘public will.’ And it is still the white society’s needs that are met. In this supposedly post-colonial world, what does it matter if the reserve is run by Indians, so long as they behave like bureaucrats and carry out the same old policies? Redefined and reworded, the ‘new’ relationship still abuses indigenous people, albeit more subtly. In this ‘new’ relationship, indigenous people are still bound to another power’s order. The rusty cage may be broken, but a new chain has been strung around the indigenous neck; it offers more room to move, but it still ties our people to white men pulling on the strong end.

#### Any mobilization from their doomsaying would be shortsighted and ineffective

Broda-Bahm 99 (Kenneth T, Assistant Professor in the Mass Communication and Communication Studies Department at Towson University, “Finding Protection in Definitions: The Quest for Environmental Security” Argumentation & Advocacy, 10511431, Spring99, Vol. 35, Issue 4)

Another motive for speaking of environmental degradation as a threat to national security is rhetorical: to make people respond to environmental threats with a sense of urgency. But before harnessing the old horse of national security to pull the heavy new environmental wagon, one must examine its temperament... If the emotional appeals of national security can somehow be connected to environmental issues, then it is also possible that other, less benign associations may be transferred. Yet the national security mentality engenders an enviable sense of urgency, and a corresponding willingness to accept great personal sacrifice. Unfortunately, these emotions may be difficult to sustain. Crises call for resolution, and the patience of a mobilized populace is rarely long. A cycle of arousal and somnolence is unlikely to establish permanent patterns of environmentally sound behavior, and `crash' solutions are often bad ones. (pp. 24-25)

#### Focus on singular, imminent disasters obscures broader criticism that’s key to actually solve environmental issues

Barnett ‘1 Jon Barnett, Fellow in the School of Social and Environmental Enquiry at University of Melbourne, and a New Zealand Sci and Tech Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Canterbury and serves on the editorial boards of several scholarly journals, May 4, The Meaning of Environmental Security: Ecological Politics and Policy in the New Security Era

Another failing of the threat discourse is that it focuses attention on issues 'only when crises are imminent, by which time it is often too late for effective interventions and corrective measures' (Dabelko and Simmons 1997: 142). This is another example of what Prins calls the environmental Catch-22: by the time environmental problems are unambiguously overt it is too late to rectify them; on the other hand, unless the problems at immediately pressing there is insufficient motivation to result in action by mainstream political institutions (Prins 1990). Thus the particular state- and military-centred interpretation of environmental security by the US policy community ignores a telling implication of environmental problems for politics: that long-term and fundamental reforms are required to address the underlying structural causes of environ­mental degradation.This presentation of environmental problems as threats rests on a recurrent conflation of threat with risk. Environmental security in this sense represents the state's particular highly politicised assessment of risk rather than any scientific account of the actual risks. There is little corre­lation between the two; most often the way states respond to environ­mental problems is conditioned by political factors more than informed risk assessments. Certainly the US government's assessment of risks is fat less a matter of credible scientific assessment and far more a Matter of the', politics of identity and Otherness. The challenge, according to Hay, is to continue to provide informed risk assessments, and 'to expose the distor­tions imposed by the state's own consequence-risk calculus' (Hay 1994: 226). This chapter has sought to expose such distortions in US policy.

#### The perm’s exceptionalism is exactly the sovereign logic that we critique—that’s an Auschwitz DA to the aff. Humanist rule over nonhuman alterity is unforgivable—ecological praxis requires unflinching rejection.

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 121-125

But even though the timeless mythic principles on which state authority is constituted are supposed (de facto) to command universal assent, everyone actually knows they are neither timeless nor universal. As Pateman (1985, 168) argues: “Liberal democratic theorists treat the state as if it were a natural feature of the world," but without the hypothetical voluntarism assumed by the original (mythic) social contract, "the emperor is indeed naked.’“3 The state form has a relatively recent history. There never was a state of nature or a social contract. State boundaries are inventions. The right of humans to rule the natural world is as politically arbitrary as the feudal notion of the diving right of kings. Of course, it still takes a certain kind of political naivety to state the obvious. But radical ecology constitutes a fundamental po- litical challenge precisely because it refuses to accept the reality of any aspect of this myth of state sovereignty, whether in terms of sovereignty over human political possibilities or natality of the natural world or na- tional territories. Instead it advocates ethical, nonauthoritarian, non- territorially delimited relations to the more-than-human world, that is, to adapt Levinas’s term, it envisages ecological ethics as anarchic “first philosophy"—a philosophy that can persuasively inform (rather than compel assent to) diverse forms of ecological politics. Here, once again, Agamben’s work offers important insights not only in terms of his critique of the anthropological machine and of the biopolitical reduction of human individuals to bare life but also in terms of the ecological potential of his critique of sovereignty—a potential that exists despite Agamben’s understanding politics entirely in terms of community with other humans (see chapter 3) and never considers the possibility of a “coming ecological community” (Agamben 2001). Still, as already indicated, Agamben’s work constitutes a fundamental ethicopolitical critique of the very idea of sovereignty, one now finding echoes well beyond Italian radical circles (Virno and Hardt 1996) through writers like Judith Butler (2004) and Slavoj Zizek (2002), albeit one that is absent from environmental discussions of state sovereignty (for example, Litiin 1998; Eckersely 2004; Barry and Eckersley 2005). This absence is not unrelated to the radical nature of Agamben’s critique, which would certainly undermine any attempt to recuperate a role for state sovereignty for ecological purposes (see chapter 7). In several books, most especially Homo sacer (1998) and its sequel State of Exception (2005), Agamben combines his critical appropriation of Foucault‘s concept of biopolitics with Schmitt’s (1985) account of sovereignty. In this way, he seeks to show how contemporary claims of state sovereignty are complicit in the biopolitical reduction of the sphere of human politics to the technical administration and manage- ment of populations. And while Agamben’s appropriation of Foucault’s notion of biopower is certainly contentious (as several recent essays indicate; see Calarco and DeCaroli 2007),14 his interpretation of Schmitt plays the key role in his political analysis. Schmitt’s Political Theology (2005, 5) opens with his famous defini- tion: "Sovereign is he who decides on the exception”; that is to say, it is the ultimate mark of sovereign power to be able to suspend the normal rule of law and the political order by declaring a state of emergency (exception). Further, since such a suspension is paradigmatically only envisaged under exceptional circumstances (at times of political cri- sis), the precise conditions of its imposition cannot be predetermined (and hence codified in law or a procedural politics) but depend on an extralegal/procedural decision made by the very power that thereby awards itself a monopoly on political power/action. The rule (of law) as an expression of sovereign power declares a state of emergency where "suspending itself, gives rise to the exception and [simultaneously] maintains itself in relation to the exception” (Agamben 1998, 18). Agamben, like Schmitt, emphasizes how the possibility of this ultimately arbitrary decisionistic assumption of absolute territorial authority underlies all claims of state sovereignty, no matter what kind of political constitution such states espouse. Paradoxically, then, the (state of) exception is precisely that situation that (ap)proves the sovereign power’s rule. “What the ‘ark’ of power contains at its center is the state of exception—but this is essentially an empty space” (Agamben 2005, 86). The declaration of a state of emergency is both the ultimate political act and simultaneously the abrogation of politics per se. Here, participation in the political realm, which from Arendt’s (1958, 198) and Agamben’s perspectives “rises directly out of acting together, the ‘sharing of words and deeds,"’ is denied by a political decision to some or all of the population of a sovereign territory, thereby reducing them to a condition of bare life. Agamben thus reaffirms the Aristotelian description of humans as bios politikos, as the kind of beings whose form of life is such as to en- able (but not compel) them to participate in a political community (and, as Arendt argues, to appear before others as particular persons through that involvement). This possibility is denied in the reduction of human beings to the inhuman(e) condition of bare life, the most appalling example of which, Agamben claims, is found in the concentration camp. Here, the political exception took on a literal and localizable form as a real space containing those whom sovereign power had decided to exclude from the political community (those reduced to bare life) under the auspices of a state of emergency. “lnasmuch as its inhabitants have been stripped of every political status and reduced completely to naked life [bare life], the camp is also the most biopolitical space that has ever been realized" (Agamben 2000, 40). All political and ethical norms were suspended, with the most horrific consequences, since once the camp’s inmates were legalistically defined as nonpersons, stripped of their citizenship and any ethicopolitical standing in the eyes of the state, "no act committed against them could appear any longer as a crime" (Agamben 1998, 171).15 Since Agamben’s analysis is intended to apply to the notion of sovereignty as such, and not just the singular state of emergency in Nazi Germany, this also means that despite its extremity, the camp is far from being an isolated instance. Agamben (1998, 166) regards “the camp as the nomos of the modern,” an exemplary form in the negative sense that it was “merely the place in which the most absolute condi- tio inhumana that has ever existed on earth was realized" (166). The specter of the camp reappears wherever sovereign power institutes a state of exception that reduces people to bare life and especially when this state of exception is given a fixed spatial arrangement. Agamben (2005, 3—4) argues that Guantanamo Bay, for example, could only really be understood as a camp (see also Ek 2006; Gregory 2006), an exceptional space for containing detainees denied any recourse to normal legal or political process. Here again, sovereign power is demonstrated (made monstrously obvious) through an “inclusive exclusion," that is, their exclusion (being held in suspension) from the political commu- nity is the very mark of their subjection to that sovereign power. (As always, Agamben’s political purpose here is not to compare the rela- tive degrees of suffering such circumstances cause, since this varies radically from case to case, but to expose their underlying unity of form in terms of their relation to the exceptional and absolute claims of sovereign power.) The new global (and unending) war against terror used to justify Guantanamo is also indicative of the ways in which what is initially justified as a state of exception, an emergency measure, can easily become the (a)political norm. As Walter Benjamin (2006, 392) remarked, the “tradition of the oppressed teaches us that the ‘state of emergency’ in which we live is not the exception but the rule." And this occurs precisely where the "political system of the modern nation state . . . Enters into a lasting crisis, and the state decides to assume directly the care of the nation’s biological life as one of its proper tasks" (Agamben 1998, 174-75). As the state of emergency (declared on the basis of a per- ceived threat to the state’s continued existence) becomes permanent, so the defense of sovereign power in the name of survival becomes its own justification. The political relations (bios politikas) on which the State’s existence, as a supposedly “natural" expression of a political community, were premised are suppressed. Instead, the state deploys its (extra) constitutional sovereign powers to control all serious counter- vailing political expression. It reconstitutes itself on the basis of the biopolitical management of populations where the diffuse (largely non- localized) treatment of the nation’s populace as bare life—for example, as so much biometric and genetic information—becomes normalized, In Zizek’s (2002, 100) words, we come to inhabit a new world order where the “very democratic public space is a mask concealing the fact that, ultimately, we are all Homo sacer,” that is, a world dominated by a hegemonic “postpolitics,” the fundamental feature of which “is the reduction of politics to ‘biopolitics’ in the precise sense of adminis- tering and regulating ‘mere life."’ This shift only emphasizes that for Agamben, sovereign power is never a creative (constituting) political power (as Schmitt portrays it) but only a (constituted/constitutional) power based ultimately in the ability to suspend, to place in abeyance, ethics and politics as such.

#### Levinas’s ethics are profoundly anthropocentric—their abstraction in alterity only conceals more subtly a metaphysics constituted through exclusion of the animal other

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 45-47

If this explains why a difference ethics might be important, it also raises the question of the metaphysical limits of Murdoch’s and Levinas’s own humanism, their own indebtedness to the anthropo- logical machine—that is, the degree to which their philosophies fail to 1 consider our relations to nonhuman others and the extent to which this failure is an inherent feature of, and expressed by, their understanding of ethics as such. Levinas (2003) explicitly develops a Humanism of the Other where we become properly (ethically) human, demarcating our- selves from our natural (animal) selfishness, through the call to respon- sibility made immediate in another human “face." This form of hu- manism may be radically different from those based on self-possessive or reflexive individualism—it puts the ethical relation to the Other first, above all else—but only the human Other. It may claim to be pre- cultural and socially transcendent insofar as "the nudity of the face is a stripping with no cultural ornament—an absolution" (Levinas 2003, 32), but it is so, ironically, only because it treats members of the human species “fellow man [sic]” (7) as similarly special, as exemplifying a (uniquely ethically important) difference. The paradox is that the call to responsibility comes into being precisely because “humanity is not a genre like animality” (6), because the transcendent differences of an- other individual human cannot be denied, yet this still treats humans as a genre. And so, although the ethical relation is nonreciprocal in the sense that it does not imply a return—some reciprocal recognition of or benefit to the individual valuer, it nevertheless implies a return in the sense of a metaphysical indebtedness to the community of humans individually and collectively composed by such ethical relations. “We recognize ethics . . . this obsession by the other man" (6). For Levinas, I, We, and the Other are all constituted through an ethical relation that is ironically defined as an obsession with only those differences that lie beyond the phenomenology of properly human beings. Levinas has, of course, been criticized for the anthropocentrism of his metaphysical assumptions. Most famously, this self-imposed limi- tation on his thought, the closure implicitly underlying his otherwise nontotalizing form of humanism, was the subject of commentary by Derrida (1992, 2008). And as David Wood (1999, 32) notes in his dis- cussion of this commentary, the “question of the other animal is , . . an exemplary case because once we have seen through our self-serving, anthropocentric thinking about other animals, we are and should be left wholly disarmed, ill-equipped to calculate our proper response. It is exemplary because the other animal is the Other par excellence, the being who or which exceeds my concepts, my grasp, etc.” And, we might add ecologically, if this is so for animals, then it is even more so for trees or stones.16 The fact that Levinas does not recognize this suggests strongly that there is indeed a mystical (in the strong sense) aspect of his metaphysics where humans are concerned, a special kind of “beyond being" that applies only to humans. The rootedness of his philosophy in Judaic religious traditions with the “fundamental em- phasis it places on inner [human] life” (Wyschogrod 2000, 178) would support this reading. But, for these reasons, any attempt to develop a Levinasian formulation of a nonhuman difference ethics must include a critical (secularizing) appraisal of the metaphysical assumptions that ground his philosophy too. Extending a Levinasian model of the face-to-face encounter to other nonhuman faces—kestrels, for example, or perhaps ecologically even to rock “faces" or landscapes-—is by no means as simple as it might seem. Levinas, as Diehm (2000, 53) notes, is resistant to, or at best ambigu- ous about, such moves. And while Diehm argues that “I do not think that Levinas’s ethical phenomenology of the face precludes other-than- human faces" (56), his attempt to propose such an extension seems plau- sible only because he downplays the metaphysical aspects of Levinas’s ethics. "I want to argue," says Diehm, "that when Levinas says ‘face’ what he really means is ‘body’ and that it is on the basis of this under- standing that we can speak of the face of the other than human” (54). But, as noted previously, Levinas’s understanding of face has an inte- gral, indeed crucially, metaphysical aspect that, from his perspective, might well preclude such a move (see later in this chapter).

#### Refuse the reformist frenzy for policy resolution. The only way out of ethical failure and anthropocentric extermination is a move to overcome sovereign power.

Smith ’11 Mick Smith, Against Ecological Sovereignty, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 2011, p. 219-221

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK is to open possibilities for rethinking and constituting ecological ethics and politics—so should one need to apologize for a lack of specific environmental policies? Should the book declaim on the necessity of using low-energy light bulbs or of increasing the price of gasoline? Alternatively, should one point out that such limited measures are an apology (a poor substitute) for the absence of any real ecological ethics and politics? Is it possible to read this book and still think that I believe the problem is one of the incompleteness of the current policy agenda and that the solution to our environmental ills is an ever-more complex and complete legislative program to represent and regulate the world? It may be possible, but I hope not. For this desire for legislative completeness, this institutional lack (in a Lacanian sense), the desire for policy after policy, is clearly the regulative counterpart to the global metastasis of those free-market approaches that effectively reduce the world’s diversity to a common currency, a universal, abstract, monetary exchange value. They are, almost literally, two sides of the same coin, the currency of modernism and capitalism, and their presence is a tangible indicator of the spread of biopolitics. Meanwhile, the restricted economy of debates around policy priorities and cost-benefit analyses almost always excludes more profound questions and concerns about the singular denizens of a more-than-human world. The purpose of this book is to provide philosophical grounds on which such questions and concerns can be raised, to challenge the myths and meta- physics that would regard them as inconsequential. In this, no doubt, it is already overambitious. In any case, unlike the majority of people writing on the environment, I do not have a recipe for saving the natural world, a set of rules to follow, a list of guiding principles, or a favorite ideology or institutional form to promote as a solution For before all this, we need to ask what “saving the natural world" might mean. And this requires, as I have argued, sustaining ethics, and politics, and ecology over and against sovereign power—the exercise of which reduces people to bare life and the more-than-human world to standing reserve. This is not a politically or ethically neutral position in the way that liberalism, for example, would like to present itself; it reenvisages ecological communities in very different ways. Of course, I have opinions on what is to be done, although not in any Leninist fashion. My sympathies might find some expression in, for example, ecologically revisioning Kropotkin‘s mutual aid and Proudhon’s mutualism. But expanding on these ideas here would just provide an excuse for many not to take the broader argument about sovereignty seriously. What we need are plural ways to imagine a world without sovereign power, without human dominion. And so, instead of an apology or an apologia for the lack of policy recommendations (and who exactly would implement them), I offer an apologue, a “moral fable, esp. one having animals or inanimate things as its characters" (New Shorter Oxford Dictiormry).\* I have in mind a recent image that momentarily broke through the self-referential shells that accrete around so many of us, cutting us off from the world as it really is. Not an ancient painting on a rock wall, but a still photograph of a living polar bear standing, apparently stranded, on a small iceberg—a remainder of the ice Hoes melting under the onslaught of global warming. Now only a wishful thinker (or a bureaucrat) would contend that such bears will be saved by more stringent hunting permits (deeply as I abhor sport hunting), by a policy to increase ecotourism, or by a captive breeding program in a zoo. These measures are clearly inadequate for the task. Despite conforming to a policy model and taking account of realpolitik, they are far from being realistic. For the bear, in its essence, is ecologically inseparable from the ice-clad north; it lives and breathes as an inhabitant, a denizen, of such apparently inhospitable places. It is an opening on an ursine world that we can only actually imagine, but its image still flashes before us relating “what-has-been to the now” (Benjamin 1999, 462). This image is one of many that, through affecting us, have the potential to inspire new ethical and political constellations like those of radical ecology. For a radical ecologist, the bear is not a resource (not even an ecotourist sight) but a being of ethical concern, albeit it in so many respects alien, pointless, independent from us—and, for the most part, indifferent to us. It can become close to our hearts (which is not to expect to hug it but to say that it elicits an ethical response that inspires a politics). And this politics argues that only a hypocrite could claim that the solution to the plight of such polar bears lies in the resolution of questions of arctic sovereignty, in an agreement to take account of the rightful territorial claims of states over these portions of the earth. Once defined as sovereign territories, there can be no doubt that the minerals and oil beneath the arctic ocean will be exploited in the "name of the people and the state” and to make money for capitalists. And this will add immeasurably to the same atmospheric carbon dioxide that already causes the melting ice. After all, there is no other purpose in declaring sovereignty except to be able to make such decisions. And once this power of decision is ceded, all the nature reserves in the world will not save the bears or the ecology they inhabit. They will (in Nancy’s and Agamben’s terms) have been "abandoned," “sacrificed,” for nothing and by nothing. So what could be done? When those seeking a policy solution to the Arctic’s melting ice ask this question, they are not looking to institute policies that would abandon or radically transform capitalism, abolish big oil, or even close down the Athabasca tar sands. They expect to legislate for a mode of gradual amelioration that in no way threatens the current economic and political forms they (wrongly) assume to be ultimate realities. In short, they want a solution that maintains the claims of ecological sovereignty.

#### Ignore their technocratic nukespeak—groupthink and profit culture makes nuclear accidents systemically understated on account of anthropocentric arrogance

Kinsella 12 (William J. Associate Professor of Communication Director of the Interdisciplinary Program in Science, Technology & Society at North Carolina State University. “Environments, Risks, and the Limits of Representation: Examples from Nuclear Energy and Some Implications of Fukushima.” Environmental Communication. Vol. 6, No.2, June 2012, pp. 251-259) shouts out to UTSA for this card

In the field of civilian nuclear energy, Gwin ( 1990) documents the role of institutional and political forces in the development of the US nuclear industry and the creation of an international nuclear energy enterprise via the "Atoms for Peace"¶ program. Gwin argues that economic challenges and safety risks were systematically understated by a "promotional" approach to nuclear development. This study illustrates how "too little and too much resonance" can exist simultaneously¶ (Luhmann, 1989, p. 115ff.). New scientific knowledge was enthusiastically embraced and applied to political ends, driving domestic and international nuclear expansion, while scientific analyses of the full implications of that project were deficient. As a final example directly relevant to Fukushima, Perin (2005) examines nuclear¶ safety and regulatory oversight in the US. She notes that most nuclear industry regulation is self-regulation: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission inspections¶ "customarily cover only approximately 5 percent of all equipment and programs at¶ an 'average' plant and about 10 percent at plants with problematic records" (p. 8). Here, interactions among legal, political, and economic rationalities are dominated by an economic logic: more intrusive regulation is deemed too costly for both the regulatory agency and the regulated industry, and political action by the industry and its allies sustains that arrangement. Perin also examines the micro-practices used to implement nuclear safety, such as checklists to be followed in case of unusual events. Although the value of checklists in high-risk settings such as nuclear power plants, hospital emergency rooms, and air transportation is increasingly being promoted (e.g., Gawande, 2010), it should be recognized that checklists are limited representations of complex and context-sensitive processes and can constrain, as well as enable, crisis responses. Perin (2005) demonstrates how such representations must accommodate the "tradeoff quandary" (p. 9ff.) between safety and production. Emergency decisions to shut down a nuclear plant are costly due to lost revenue, mandatory time off-line until the problem has been investigated and resolved, and follow-up reporting requirements. Thus the "safety culture" promoted in principle competes with the "production bias" (p. 190ff.) coexisting at nuclear plants. Emergency checklists followed by operators manifest both aspects of this risk tradeoff. Fukushima and the Limits of Representation Some have characterized the "beyond design basis" catastrophe at Fukushima as what¶ Taleb (2007) calls a "black swan" event: a highly improbable, and typically unforeseen, event with severe consequences. I first encountered this expression¶ applied to nuclear accidents three months before Fukushima, at a workshop that¶ included a number of influential nuclear professionals. I found the use of the term to be paradoxical: while signaling acknowledgment that such events are possible, it also served as a rhetorical shrug. The prevailing sense seemed to be that such events do occasionally happen, but because they are inherently unpredictable there is little that can be done to prevent them. In the immediate aftermath of Fukushima, some responses from the nuclear energy community took this fatalistic form. A variant on this theme maintains that as with highway or airline accidents, society implicitly or explicitly sets limits on the acceptable level of nuclear risk. This reasoning understates the potential severity and scope of nuclear accidents, a quantitative difference that places them in a qualitatively different category, as well as the fundamental epistemic uncertainties that characterize them. Nuclear accidents are less frequent than other types of accidents to which they are compared, making statistical prediction inherently problematic. Thus, even within the narrow, prevailing paradigm known as probabilistic risk assessment (USNRC, 2003), the reactor failures at Fukushima have radically altered the statistical world picture. As Makhijani (2011) notes, ((One in every hundred¶ commercial light water power reactors, the most common design in the world¶ (including all operating U.S. commercial reactors) has now had a partial or full¶ meltdown before 40 years of operation" (p. 16). With approximately 440 reactors now operating worldwide, approximately 65 under construction, and nations including China and India considering major nuclear expansions (IAEA, 2011), the prospects for future accidents are not negligible. A § Marked 13:48 § common response to this scenario is that Fukushima can provide valuable "lessons learned" for improving nuclear safety, the principle on which the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission established a 90-day "review of insights" (USNRC, 2011). A potentially fatal flaw in this logic is that such a review is a limited representation based on the events that transpired at Fukushima; a future accident might involve drastically different triggering events and failure modes. If taken seriously, lessons from Fukushima may indeed protect nuclear plants against future earthquakes, tsunamis, and other natural disasters. Some improvements may also have broader protective value; as the review noted, previous precautions adopted to protect plants against terrorism have conferred additional benefits. Nevertheless, the essential lesson of Fukushima may be that, despite the best efforts of nuclear designers, regulators, and operators, prevailing representations are inevitably limited. Similarly, rhetorical characterizations of new reactor designs as ((inherently safe" assume that their risks have been fully represented in the design process, an assumption that also prevailed when the current generation of reactors was deployed. When the consequences of failure are so high, the limits of representation assume special significance.
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### LFTRs CP

#### plan --> more waste and prolif – your article

Pearce 12

(Fred Pearce is a freelance author and journalist based in the UK. He serves as environmental consultant for New Scientist magazine and is the author of numerous books, including When The Rivers Run Dry and With Speed and Violence. In previous articles for Yale Environment 360, Pearce has written about the environmental consequences of humankind’s addiction to chemical fertilizers and the possible role that airborne microbes play in our world, from spreading disease to possibly changing the climate. 30 JUL 2012: ANALYSIS, Are Fast-Breeder Reactors A Nuclear Power Panacea?, 7/30/12 <http://e360.yale.edu/feature/are_fast-breeder_reactors_a_nuclear_power_panacea/2557/)//TR>

The technical challenges include the fact that it would require converting the plutonium powder into a metal alloy, with uranium and zirconium. This would be a large-scale industrial activity on its own that would create “a likely large amount of plutonium-contaminated salt waste,” Simper said.

Simper is also concerned that the plutonium metal, once prepared for the reactor, would be even more vulnerable to theft for making bombs than the powdered oxide. This view is shared by the Union of Concerned Scientists in the U.S., which argues that plutonium liberated from spent fuel in preparation for recycling “would be dangerously vulnerable to theft or misuse.”

GEH says Simper is mistaken and that the technology is largely proven. That view seems to be shared by MacKay, who oversees the activities of the decommissioning authority.

The argument about proliferation risk boils down to timescales. In the long term, burning up the plutonium obviously eliminates the risk. But in the short term, there would probably be greater security risks. Another criticism is the more general one that the nuclear industry has a track record of delivering late and wildly over budget — and often not delivering at all.

John Sauven, director of Greenpeace UK, and Paul Dorfman, British nuclear policy analyst at the University of Warwick, England, argued recently that this made all nuclear options a poor alternative to renewables in delivering low-carbon energy. “Even if these latest plans could be made to work, PRISM reactors do nothing to solve the main problems with nuclear: the industry’s repeated failure to build reactors on time and to budget,” they wrote in a letter to the Guardian newspaper. “We are being asked to wait while an industry that has a track record for very costly failures researches yet another much-hyped but still theoretical new technology.”

But this approach has two problems. First, climate change. Besides hydroelectricity, which has its own serious environmental problems, nuclear power is the only source of truly large-scale concentrated low-carbon energy currently available. However good renewables turn out to be, can we really afford to give up on nukes?

#### Liquid metal reactors like the 4S and PRISM are expensive, unreliable, and liable to catch fire or explode

Makhijani and Boyd 2010 – ARJUN MAKHIJANI [Arjun Makhijani is an electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research] and MICHELE BOYD [Michele Boyd is the former director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility] “Small Modular Reactors No Solution for the Cost, Safety, and Waste Problems of Nuclear Power” Fact sheet completed in September 2010 <http://www.psr.org/nuclear-bailout/resources/small-modular-reactors-no.pdf>

LIQUID METAL FAST REACTOR DESIGNS do not use a moderator to slow neutrons down. The coolant is liquid metal, such as sodium or potassium. Fast reactors have never been commercialized anywhere in the world because they are expensive and unreliable and pose serious safety hazards. 8 Both sodium and potassium burn when in contact with air and explode when in contact with water. Two SMR sodium-cooled fast reactor designs under development are: Super-Safe, Small and Simple Reactor (4S) by Toshiba: This reactor would be fueled with either enriched uranium or with plutonium. Two sizes are proposed—10 MW and 50 MW: the 10 MW version would use 24 percent plutonium fuel or 20 percent enriched uranium; the 50 MW version would use 11.5 percent plutonium fuel. The reactor would be sealed in a cylindrical vault underground with turbine-generator housed in an aboveground building. The reactor is supposed to operate for 30 years without refueling. Toshiba has proposed to build a free demonstration reactor in Galena, Alaska. Power Reactor Inherently Safe Module (PRISM) by GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy: The standard facility would consist of nine 155 MWe reactor modules, each with its own below-ground silo connected to a separate generator. 9 The nine reactors would be grouped into three “power blocks” each of which would consist of three reactors. One control center would be used to manage all nine reactors. The total amount of electricity produced per facility would be 1,395 MWe. 10

#### Their study is biased

Rees ’11 Eifion Rees, “Don't believe the spin on thorium being a ‘greener’ nuclear option,” The Ecologist, 6/23/2011, http://www.theecologist.org/News/news\_analysis/952238/dont\_believe\_the\_spin\_on\_thorium\_being\_a\_greener\_nuclear\_option.html

Proponents counter that the NNL paper fails to address the question of MSR technology, evidence of its bias towards an industry wedded to PWRs. Reliant on diverse uranium/plutonium revenue streams – fuel packages and fuel reprocessing, for example – the nuclear energy giants will never give thorium a fair hearing, they say.

#### We access cost-competitiveness

Hargraves and Moir ’10 Robert Hargraves, teaches energy policy at the Institute for Lifelong Education at Dartmouth, PhD in physics from Brown, and Ralph Moir, Sc.D. in nuclear engineering from MIT, published 10 papers on molten-salt reactors during his career at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, “Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors: An old idea in nuclear power gets reexamined,” American Scientist, Vol. 98, No. 4, July-August 2010, http://www.americanscientist.org/issues/feature/liquid-fluoride-thorium-reactors

In terms of cost, the ideal would be to compete successfully against coal without subsidies or market-modifying legislation. It may well be possible. Capital costs are generally higher for conventional nuclear versus fossil-fuel plants, whereas fuel costs are lower. Capital costs are outsized for nuclear plants because the construction, including the containment building, must meet very high standards; the facilities include elaborate, redundant safety systems; and included in capital costs are levies for the cost of decommissioning and removing the plants when they are ultimately taken out of service. The much-consulted MIT study The Future of Nuclear Power, originally published in 2003 and updated in 2009, shows the capital costs of coal plants at $2.30 per watt versus $4 for light-water nuclear. A principal reason why the capital costs of LFTR plants could depart from this ratio is that the LFTR operates at atmospheric pressure and contains no pressurized water. With no water to flash to steam in the event of a pressure breach, a LFTR can use a much more close-fitting containment structure. Other expensive high-pressure coolant-injection systems can also be deleted. One concept for the smaller LFTR containment structure is a hardened concrete facility below ground level, with a robust concrete cap at ground level to resist aircraft impact and any other foreseeable assaults. Other factors contribute to a favorable cost structure, such as simpler fuel handling, smaller components, markedly lower fuel costs and significantly higher energy efficiency. LFTRs are high-temperature reactors, operating at around 800 degrees Celsius, which is thermodynamically favorable for conversion of thermal to electrical energy—a conversion efficiency of 45 percent is likely, versus 33 percent typical of coal and older nuclear plants. The high heat also opens the door for other remunerative uses for the thermal energy, such as hydrogen production, which is greatly facilitated by high temperature, as well as driving other industrial chemical processes with excess process heat. Depending on the siting of a LFTR plant, it could even supply heat for homes and offices. Thorium must also compete economically with energy-efficiency initiatives and renewables. A mature decision process requires that we consider whether renewables and efficiency can realistically answer the rapidly growing energy needs of China, India and the other tiers of the developing world as cheap fossil fuels beckon—at terrible environmental cost. Part of the cost calculation for transitioning to thorium must include its role in the expansion of prosperity in the world, which will be linked inexorably to greater energy demands. We have a pecuniary interest in avoiding the enviromental blowback of a massive upsurge in fossil-fuel consumption in the developing world. The value of providing an alternative to that scenario is hard to monetize, but the consequences of not doing so are impossible to hide from. Perhaps the most compelling idea on the drawing board for pushing thorium-based power into the mainstream is mass production to drive rapid deployment in the U.S. and export elsewhere. Business economists observe that commercialization of any technology leads to lower costs as the number of units increases and the experience curve delivers benefits in work specialization, refined production processes, product standardization and efficient product redesign. Given the diminished scale of LFTRs, it seems reasonable to project that reactors of 100 megawatts can be factory produced for a cost of around $200 million. Boeing, producing one $200 million airplane per day, could be a model for LFTR production. Modular construction is an important trend in current manufacturing of traditional nuclear plants. The market-leading Westinghouse AP1000 advanced pressurized-water reactor can be built in 36 months from the first pouring of concrete, in part because of its modular construction. The largest module of the AP1000 is a 700-metricton unit that arrives at the construction site with rooms completely wired, pipefitted and painted. Quality benefits from modular construction because inspection can consist of a set of protocols executed by specialists operating in a dedicated environment. One potential role for mass-produced LFTR plants could be replacing the power generation components of existing fossil-fuel fired plants, while integrating with the existing electrical-distribution infrastructure already wired to those sites. The savings from adapting existing infrastructure could be very large indeed.

#### Transition takes 30 months

Sorensen 11 (Kirk, studying thorium technology since 2000 and has been a public advocate for its use and development since 2006, masters’ degree in aerospace engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology and is studying nuclear engineering at the University of Tennessee under Dr. Laurence Miller, May 28, [www.financialsense.com/financial-sense-newshour/big-picture/2011/05/28/03/kirk-sorensen/thorium-could-be-our-energy-silver-bullet], jam)

Jim: (32:00) Let me throw another idea, and I've often had this conversation, with the late Matt Simmons, who was a big believer in peak oil, and was kind of looking for that silver bullet. And that is, could it take a crisis? I know in the midst of a crisis, World War II, you know, we discovered nuclear power and also weapon grade uranium in the Manhattan project where we basically produced a bomb in a short period of time. So if we were faced with a severe energy crisis, global warming, or just shortages of fuel, could we turn this into a Manhattan project and turn thorium? In other words, how quickly can we turn the table and really start to get this thing running? Kirk: (32:47) If we were talking Manhattan project, and that’s where you're taking the smartest people out of society. You’re putting them in a place and they work on it six days a week, 18 hours a day, we could probably have one of these reactors up and running within 18 months. And we could be to a production level within a year or so after that. I mean, it would be a lot like World War II. Imagine the factories turning out B-29 bombers, you know, it would be like that. Jim: (33:11) Wow. Kirk: (33:11) Now Manhattan style projects, that’s a severe disruption though, to the flow society. That is a heavy governmental hand reaching and deciding how to allocate resources. And that’s really not what I would hope would happened. What I would hope would happen would be a much more market-driven approach where a fair and clear regulatory environment allows businesses and investors to make wise decisions, with a high certainty that if they fulfill the obligations laid out, and the regulations, they will be able to build and operate the machines they have designed. In that scenario, which I would call more the skunk works approach, having worked at Lockheed when I was younger, I think we could have this ready in four or five years. With abundant private financing and a clear and realistic regulatory environment. That's not really the world we live in right now. Now that may change, but that's not how it is right now. Right now we have a regulatory challenge and we are looking for ways to move the technology forward under situations that have a stronger need for the technology. For instance, the military's need for base islanding, and so, in that scenario that does stretch out the time. But I guess maybe I’m getting past your original question, which was could we do this in a Manhattan style project, and the answer is absolutely yes. And it would go quite quickly.

#### LFTR fuel cycle is cheap

Cannara ’10 Alexander Cannara, received his BSEE degree from Lehigh University, and received MSEE, DEE and MS Statistics degrees from Stanford, returned to Stanford for a PhD in Mathematical Methods in Educational Research and a Master of Science in Statistics, during which time he designed analog and digital instrumentation, applying for a patent on one design, has taught courses in engineering, programming and networking at Stanford, University of San Francisco, International Technological University, Golden Gate and Silicon Valley University, and has worked both for the government and in the corporate arena with such organizations as Ballantine Laboratories, RMC Research, Zilog, Gibbons & Associates, Mitsubishi Semiconductor, AMD, 3Com, Network General, Vitesse, PacketMotion and Xambala, “Cannara’s Rebuke of PSR/IEER,” letter written to the Physicians for Social Responsibility and Nuclear Information and Resource Service calling them out for publishing the Makhijani & Boyd piece, posted 5/13/2010 by Kirk Sorenson on Energy From Thorium, http://energyfromthorium.com/2010/05/13/cannaras-rebuke-of-psrieer/

l) Paragraph 13 makes an oddly unscientific guess that a “thorium fuel cycle is likely to be even more costly” that a Uranium one. As any nuclear engineer or physicist knows, the enrichment process for Uranium fuel is very expensive. Since Thorium is a common byproduct of such mining as for “rare earths” (ignoring our decade stockpile), and 100% of Thorium supplied to an MSR is consumed over its years of operation, then it’s indeed incredulous that anyone would try to say a far less abundant element, whose isotopic concentration must be strenuously altered from its natural state, and which, in solid-fuel form, can only be under 1/10 consumed, is less “costly”. For use in an MSR, Thorium simply needs to be Fluorinated to a salt that gets dumped into a pot of sister molten salts sitting aside a reactor.

#### No fabrication necessary in LFTRs

Sorensen ’11 Kirk F. Sorensen, served as Chief Nuclear Technologist at Teledyne Brown Engineering, worked for ten years at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center spending the last two of those years on assignment to the US Army Space and Missile Defense Command, Masters of Science in Aerospace Engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology, “IEER/PSR Thorium “Fact Sheet” Rebuttal,” response to the 2009 Makhijani and Boyd piece on thorium, posted 3/23/2011 by Kirk Sorenson on Energy From Thorium, http://energyfromthorium.com/ieer-rebuttal/

Previously I mentioned the implications of the presence of uranium-232 contamination within uranium-233 and its anti-proliferative nature with regards to nuclear weapons. U-232 contamination also makes fabrication of solid thorium-oxide fuel containing uranium-233-oxide very difficult. In the liquid-fluoride reactor, fuel fabrication is unnecessary and this difficulty is completely averted.

#### Thorium reactors can’t produce weapons grade waste – stymies proliferation

Donohue 8/17 (Nathan, George Washington University, Elliott School of International Affairs, research intern for the Project on Nuclear Issues, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2012, "Thorium and its Value in Nonproliferation," [csis.org/blog/thorium-and-its-value-nonproliferation], jam)

The Federation of American Scientists (FAS) recently featured an article on their Science Wonk blog entitled “What about thorium?” As the article discussed, thorium is an element, which like uranium, has the ability to be utilized to produce nuclear power. More importantly, thorium fueled reactors are reported to be more proliferation resistant than uranium fueled reactors. However, despite these assertions, thorium has almost universally been ignored in favor of uranium based nuclear power reactors. The purpose of this piece is to conduct a review of thorium and to develop a better understanding of thorium’s nonproliferation benefits as it relates to nuclear power production. As FAS notes, natural thorium is a fertile material, while not itself fissionable, can be converted into a fissile material suitable to sustain a nuclear fission chain reaction. Accordingly, when natural thorium captures neutrons it becomes a new isotope of thorium which then goes through a process of decay where over a period of weeks, the thorium actually turns into uranium in the form of U-233. Unlike natural thorium, this U-233 is a fissile material suitable to sustain a nuclear fission chain reaction. The use of thorium to produce nuclear power is not a new concept. Research into thorium began in the late 1950’s and in 1965, Alvin Weinberg, the head of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and his team built a working thorium reactor using a molten salt bath design. Thorium was used to power one of the first commercial nuclear power plants in the U.S. in Shippingport, Pennsylvania in 1977. Nevertheless, research into thorium never found a foothold in the U.S. nuclear power infrastructure. By 1973, thorium research and development was fading to the uranium based focus of the U.S. nuclear industry, which was in the process of developing 41 new nuclear plants, all of which used uranium. The Shippingport facility was one of the last vestiges of thorium research in the U.S. for decades. Recently there has been a renewed focus on thorium based nuclear power, specifically in regards to the benefits related to spent fuel, including research involving the European Commission, India, Canada, Slovakia, the Russian Federation, China, France and the Republic of Korea. The utilization of thorium is purported to have the ability to reduce spent fuel waste by upwards of 50% while at the same time reducing the amount of plutonium within the fuel. To that end, thorium fuel designs are regarded as a better alternative for power production in terms of the plutonium proliferation risk inherent in spent fuel from uranium-fueled reactors. For example, all 104 reactors in the U.S. use uranium fuel. In these reactors, when the uranium in the form of U-238 captures extra neutrons, it goes through a process of decay whereby plutonium in the form of Pu-239 is produced. The spent fuel can then be reprocessed to isolate and remove this plutonium, which can then be used in the core of a nuclear weapon. Roughly 13 kilograms (kg) of reactor grade plutonium is necessary to power a nuclear weapon. In total, these 104 U.S. reactors accumulate roughly 2,000 tons of spent fuel per year. The 2,000 tons of waste produced annually by these nuclear utilities, contains roughly 25,520 kg of plutonium or enough plutonium to build 1,963 nuclear weapons a year. Globally, the total world generation of reactor-grade plutonium in spent fuel is equal to roughly 70 tons annually; more than two times what the U.S. produces. Conversely, there is the thorium seed and blanket design. This reactor concept is based on a design comprised of inner seed rods of uranium which provide neutrons to an outer blanket of thorium-uranium dioxide rods, creating U-233, which in turn powers the nuclear reactor. The important difference with this design is in the nature of the spent fuel. As advocates of thorium such as the U.S. company Lightbridge purport, this process would realize a significant reduction in the “quantity and quality” of plutonium produced within the spent fuel, achieving upwards of an 80% reduction in plutonium. For example, “a thorium-fueled reactor …would produce a total of 92 kilograms of plutonium per gigawatt-year of electricity generated, whereas a conventional water-cooled reactor would result in 232 kilograms.” In addition to a lower percentage of plutonium in the spent fuel, the composition of the plutonium produced is different as well, featuring a higher content of the plutonium isotopes Pu-238, Pu-240, and Pu-242. Weapons-grade plutonium requires roughly 90% plutonium in the form of Pu-239. Plutonium with higher contents of Pu-238 and Pu-240 is inherently unpredictable, and can spontaneously fission, making it “difficult or impossible to compress a bomb core containing several kilograms of plutonium to supercriticality before the bomb [disassembles] with a greatly reduced yield.” This reduces the reliability of a given nuclear weapon, thus making the thorium process less suitable for the development of plutonium for a nuclear weapon. The International Atomic Energy Agency considers plutonium containing more than 81% Pu-238 “not weapons-usable.” Although thorium offers the ability to reduce the plutonium risk inherent in spent fuel, it does not eliminate the need for enriched uranium. Specifically, Lightbridge’s seed and blanket fuel technology would require uranium enriched to less than 20 % in both the seed and blanket fuel rods. Equally significant, the U-233 that is produced in the seed and blanket design poses its own proliferation concern. A nuclear weapon can be constructed with a significant quantity of U-233, which the IAEA defines as 8 kg of U-233, and both the U.S. and India have detonated nuclear devices which utilized U-233. At the same time though, U-233 produced through this design also contains a small amount of the uranium isotope U-232, which emits a powerful, highly penetrating gamma ray. As noted by Ray Sollychin, the Executive Director of the Neopanora Institute-Network of Energy Technologies, this reportedly makes “U233 weapons significantly more difficult to conceal and much more dangerous to handle.” In addition, reactors which use a thorium based seed and blanket design are engineered so that the U-233 which is produced is simultaneously denatured or blended with U-238, further reducing its suitability for a nuclear weapon. Moreover, the blanket is designed to remain within the reactor for upwards of nine to twelve years. This allows for the U-233 that is produced within the blanket to burn “in situ.” Lastly, any attempt to prematurely remove the blanket and separate the U-233 from the U-238, U-234 and U-236 isotopes will also “remove the fissile U-235 from the resulting enriched steam,” once again making it unsuitable for a nuclear weapon. From this brief review of thorium and its properties, it appears clear that from a proliferation standpoint, that thorium fueled reactors provide for a safer nuclear power production process. In fact, it begs the question why thorium was overlooked in the first place. The simple answer is that the U.S. nuclear infrastructure was originally designed to facilitate mass quantities of plutonium for the production of a nuclear weapons arsenal. According to an article by Richard Martin in Wired magazine, “Locked in a struggle with a nuclear- armed Soviet Union, the U.S. government in the 60’s chose to build uranium-fueled reactors — in part because they produce plutonium that can be refined into weapons-grade material.” During the Cold War, maintaining nuclear parity with the Soviets was an overarching goal. Yet, with the end of the Cold War, the focus has shifted from acquiring nuclear weapons to stymying their development by both state and non-state actors. Therefore, the plutonium byproduct of the global nuclear power infrastructure has now become a liability and a proliferation risk. As the IAEA has noted, “for nuclear power to be accepted as a significant contributor of primary energy in the next century, it should be based on a fuel cycle, which is highly proliferation-resistant.” For this reason, further research and development of thorium needs to be explored, not only in terms of seed and blanket technology but other thorium based designs as well, including thorium-based Pebble Bed Reactor, fast reactors (liquid metal cooled and gas cooled); and advanced designs such as Molten Salt Reactor and Accelerator Driven System.
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