### T

#### First, we meet: [insert]

#### Second, counter-interp: Restriction is a legal barrier

Free Legal Dictionary, accessed 12

[http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/restriction //wyo-tjc]

restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision. In multi-unit real estate developments, condominium and cooperative housing projects, managed by homeowners' associations or similar organizations are usually required by state law to impose restrictions on use. Thus, the restrictions are part of the "covenants, conditions and restrictions," intended to enhance the use of common facilities and property, recorded and incorporated into the title of each owner.

#### Third, we meet: Wind/Solar producers are banned from organizing as MLPs by law- it is a restriction

Holshouser 12

[Paul, Finance Policy Manager at AWEA, “SMU study: Expanded partnership access could unlock $6 billion in wind energy investment”, p. <http://www.awea.org/blog/index.cfm?customel_dataPageID_1699=16735> //wyo-tjc]

An MLP is a publicly-traded limited partnership in which regular investors can purchase shares in the partnership (called MLP units) just like stock shares. These investments have long been utilized by the oil and gas industry, but renewable projects have been excluded by federal tax law from using them. The SMU team shows that $5 billion to $6 billion is currently sidelined by arbitrary restrictions in the tax code, and also details other strengths of an MLP-based policy:

#### Fourth, irrelevant- plan is also an increase in financial incentives:

#### financial incentives include tax-incentives

Clean and Secure Energy Action Report 10

[staff, 2010 update, “Financial Incentives - Loans, Rebates, Taxes, Bonds, Etc.”, p. <http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/1008CLEANENERGYELECTRICITYINCENTIVES.PDF> //wyo-tjc]

Financial incentives can help states address market barriers and leverage private sector resources for greater investment in energy efficiency or renewable energy systems. Types of financial incentives state governments offer include: tax incentives, grants, loans, rebates, industry recruitment/support, bond programs, green building incentives, leasing/lease purchase programs, and production incentives.

#### MLPs are a tax incentive

Bradford 7.30

[Travis, staff writer, New MLP Parity Act Could Give a Boost to Geothermal/Renewable Energy Investors, p. <http://prometheus.org/2012/07/30/new-mlp-parity-act-could-give-a-boost-to-geothermalrenewable-energy-investors/> //wyo-tjc]

WASHINGTON, D.C. — U.S. Senators Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Jerry Moran (R-Kan.) have introduced legislation, S. 3275, or Master Limited Partnerships (MLP) Parity Act, which gives renewable energy projects access to a tax incentive available now only to oil, gas, and coal projects.

The act could “level the energy playing field by giving investors in renewable-energy projects access to a decades-old tax advantage now available only to investors in fossil fuel-based energy projects,” they noted in their press release. ”The Master Limited Partnerships Parity Act is a straightforward, powerful tweak to the federal tax code that could unleash significant private capital by helping additional energy-generation and renewable fuels companies form master limited partnerships, which combine the funding advantages of corporations and the tax advantages of partnerships.”

Senator Coons said: “Despite all the political rhetoric about the need for an all-of-the-above energy strategy, our current tax code clearly picks winners and losers in the energy space.” He told press, “The MLP Parity Act helps level the playing field by giving investors in renewables and non-renewables access to the same highly attractive master limited partnership business structure. Congress should be setting a realistic and stable policy pathway to sustain innovations in domestic energy development, and help the market work to its fullest potential. That starts with leveling the playing field and giving renewable energy the same shot at market success as fossil fuels.”

#### Fifth, prefer our interpretation:

#### The topic says and/or- they have to prove we are neither a restriction NOR an incentive

#### Sufficient ground- it is a restriction grounded in law, requiring congressional action to remove it, ensures sufficient ground.

#### Sixth, we also meet reduce:

#### Reduce is to diminish in size, amount or extent and to consolidate

Merriam Webster, no date

[http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduce]

transitive verb

1 a : to draw together or cause to converge : consolidate <reduce all the questions to one>

b (1) : to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number <reduce taxes> <reduce the likelihood of war> (2) : to decrease the volume and concentrate the flavor of by boiling <add the wine and reduce the sauce for two minutes>

c : to narrow down : restrict <the Indians were reduced to small reservations>

d : to make shorter : abridge

#### The Plan would put an end to a restricted state and consolidate the tax code

Chambers 10

[Letitia Chambers, Coalition of Publicly Traded Partnerships, and Chambers Associates Incorporated, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, Committee on Ways and Means, House Testimony, 6.13, p. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-107hhrg74229/html/CHRG-107hhrg74229.htm> //wyo-tjc]

In practical terms, this means that when existing PTPs [publicly traded partnerships, also referred to as master limited partnerships or MLPs] want to issue equity, or energy businesses want to create new PTPs, in order to finance their plans for acquisition of new assets, broadening their infrastructure, and more efficiently meeting the country's energy needs, they can do so only to the extent that individual investors are willing and able to buy them. As a result, PTP managers wishing to raise a certain amount of capital must do it in several smaller offerings instead of one large one, increasing the cost of capital, or must assume more debt than they would prefer. They must even check to be sure that none of the other PTPs are planning an offering that is near in time to theirs, because the retail market can only absorb so many PTP units at a time. Needless to say, this hampers, delays, and increases the cost of every major project or acquisition that these companies wish to undertake.

Conclusion. There is no reason for PTP managers to be limited in this way when there is such a need for the energy infrastructure that they could be financing. The Publicly Traded Partnership Equity Act (H.R. 1463) would put an end to this restrictive situation and modernize this bit of the tax code by simply adding income derived from PTPs to the qualifying income list in the RIC rules. H.R. 1463, which has been sponsored in past years by Chairman Thomas, has been introduced this year by Rep. Wally Herger and a bipartisan group of cosponsors. It has been approved by Congress already, as part of the Taxpayer Refund and Relief Act of 1999, which was vetoed by President Clinton.

#### Seventh, their interpretation is bad:

#### Over limits- there are no explicit production restrictions for solar or wind outside of transmission and generation- they moot those two fuels from the topic

[insert specific attacks]

#### Eight, Err affirmative—the topic is massively neg-biased because of a lack of fed-key warrants and the states counterplan, and huge backfile generics because of past energy policies

#### Ninth, Competing interpretations is bad—comparisons are just as subjective as reasonability and their frame encourages a race to the bottom. We shouldn’t lose if our aff makes debate harder as long as it is still possible and educational.

### Warming Advantage:

### Economy Advantage

### CP

#### C/P fails to solve both advantages-

#### Ext 1AC Mormann and Reicher- increased investment is key to jumpstart the renewables market- without investment the manufacturing sector would collapse and we won’t make the transition to renewables in time to reverse the causes of CO2- that’s AFP.

#### Getting rid of energy incentives fails- alt energy could never be competitive and the US would never attain diversity of fuel necessary to become energy independent.

Sommers et al NDG

(Paul, Alfred Marcus, and Roland J. Cole, at Battelle Memorial Institute, CATO Institute Letters, “To the Editor:” <http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv4n2/v4n2-1.pdf//wyo-mm>)

In addition, an argument based on historical equity can be made for granting other forms of incen- tives to alternative means of pro- duction and conservation. Lacking such incentives, new forms of en- ergy production may never be able to compete on an equal basis, and the nation will lack the range of fuel sources that it needs. Current- ly, services-such as the financing of demonstration plants-are the second most costly governmental energy incentive. In the absence of subsidies, the development of alter- native energy forms would be se- verely handicapped. In sum, the magnitude of current and past incentive programs im- plies that there are immense eco- nomic costs in a transition to an incentive-free regime. The authors' preferred strategy of price decon- trol deals with only part of existing incentives and would leave synfuels at a disadvantage. To go further and eliminate all energy incentives would greatly disrupt energy pro- duction... .

Perm do both

Perm do plan then counterplan- this is key to jumpstarting the renewable sector and then creating a completely even playing field.

#### Energy incentives key to keep domestic jobs which are necessary for the economy and key to make renewables competitive to solve warming.

Randazzo 12

(Ryan, Reporter, AZ Central, “Debate over continued incentives for energy companies, May 5, 2012, <http://www.azcentral.com/business/articles/2012/05/05/20120505federal-money-supports-most-forms-energy-debate-over-continued-incentives.html//wyo-mm>)

But in reality, it is more complicated, he said. For example, many of the so-called subsidies that oil companies get are tax breaks that encourage them to drill in the United States. If the incentives didn't exist, it wouldn't cause people to drive less and use less gasoline, it would just push that production overseas. "People say that the oil companies are rich and don't need it," Rapier said. "It doesn't matter if they are rich, is it getting them to do something they would not otherwise do?... That tax credit is designed to save us jobs and prevent outsourcing. This is something people don't think about when they say we need to get rid of (oil) subsidies." Alternative energy is unlikely to ever become widely used without subsidies, or a larger policy shift addressing global warming, because technologies like solar and wind are less efficient at generating electricity than fossil fuels that are densely packed with energy, he said. "If we are ever going to move away from (fossil fuels), it is going to require some help," he said. "We just have to make decisions, as citizens, if this is the way we want to go. Even if I invent a new renewable fuel tomorrow (that can compete with oil), there is no infrastructure to get it to market. There are some things we need to be doing to open up the market a little bit."

#### Can’t solve warming without government intervention-experts agree.

Randazzo 12

(Ryan, Reporter, AZ Central, “Debate over continued incentives for energy companies, May 5, 2012, <http://www.azcentral.com/business/articles/2012/05/05/20120505federal-money-supports-most-forms-energy-debate-over-continued-incentives.html//wyo-mm>)

Ben Schreiber, a tax analyst for Friends of the Earth, said his group advocates for alternative-energy subsidies. "Friends of the Earth believes the government has a really important role to play transitioning to a clean-energy economy," he said. "There is no way we are going to deal with climate change without government intervention."

#### C/P fails- 2 warrants:

#### 1. Global warming at the tipping point now and we don’t have time to make the transition away from incentives.

#### 2. Free-market solutions empirically fail and incentives are key to make transition to renewables now.

Lacey 8/29

(Stephen, B.A. in journalism from Franklin Pierce University and writes on clean energy policy, technologies, and finance, Think Progress, “Free Market Hypocrisy: Why Do We Hold Renewables To Different Standards Than Fossil Fuels And Nuclear?” August 29, 2012, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/08/29/766341/free-market-hypocrisy-why-do-we-hold-renewables-to-different-standards-than-fossil-fuels-and-nuclear///wyo-mm)

In order to smooth out this complicated picture, there are some analysts and political leaders who say we should get rid of all subsidies to all technologies and let the free market hash it out. That’s an appealing argument to many. But it completely ignores the embedded impact of a century of support to fossil fuels and 50 years of support to nuclear. It also ignores a more fundamental problem: Our climate is reaching a tipping point and we don’t have time to waste in transitioning away from carbon-based fuels. Period. Most supporters of clean energy agree there will be a time to phase out incentives that are currently helping boost the industry. There are a lot of disagreements about exactly how and when it should be done, but that conversation is well underway as the cost of renewables continues to fall. As we drudge through this political season and listen to the calls from selective free-marketeers on “picking winners and losers,” let’s remember how we got to where we are in the first place.

#### Links to elections. Fossil fuel subsidies popular - lobbyists

Karpinski, President of the League of Conservation Voters, and Kretzmann, Executive Director of Oil Change International, 11 (Gene and Steve, End subsidies to fossil fuel companies, The Hill Blog, 20 October 2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-a-environment/188787-end-subsidies-to-fossil-fuel-companies, da 8-16-12)

Unfortunately what is popular with the public is not always so popular in Washington. The fossil fuel industry employs a virtual army of lobbyists -- in 2011 the oil and gas industry has already spent more than $75 million lobbying on federal policies. This lobbying is backed up by tens of millions in campaign cash to make sure that Members of Congress put the interests of the fossil fuel industry ahead of the American people. This past June the Senate failed to end handouts to the five biggest oil companies. Not surprisingly, those Senators voting against the repeal took five times more in campaign contributions from the oil industry than those who voted to end these handouts.

### DA Politics

Obama’s already seen as pushing wind, DA non unique .

Belsie 10/4

(Laurent, Christian Science Monitor, “Romney zinger: Obama backs 'green' energy losers. Is he right? (+video),” October 4, 2012, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/Energy-Voices/2012/1004/Romney-zinger-Obama-backs-green-energy-losers.-Is-he-right-video//wyo-mm>)

One of the clearest dividing lines in the 2012 presidential campaign is 'green' energy subsidies. President Obama has pushed them in his four years in office. Challenger Mitt Romney wants to eliminate them, under the theory that government should avoid tinkering with the private sector. At Wednesday night's presidential debate, GOP candidate Romney summarized the difference with this zinger: "You put $90 billion — like 50 years worth of tax breaks — into solar and wind, to Solyndra and Fisker and Tesla and Ener1," he told the president. "I had a friend who said: 'You don't just pick the winners and losers; you pick the losers.' " He has a point. In pushing green energy, Mr. Obama has pursued a high-risk strategy of handing out loan guarantees and other federal subsidies to green energy companies, a strategy most of his predecessors have avoided. The results have not always been pretty.

#### Obama will Lose-All Swing States Surging towards Romney

Muja 10/12

[SAHIT MUJA, “New Polls: Romney leads Obama on 10 swing states”, OCTOBER 12, 2012, <http://www.examiner.com/article/new-poll-romney-leads-obama-on-10-swing-state-polls>, \\wyo-bb]

New polls in two presidential battleground states of the American Research Group polls in both states. In Florida, Romney is at 49% and Obama stands at 46%, the poll, released Friday, shows. Romney's advantage in New Hampshire is four points, 50% to 46%. According to Gravis Marketing new poll of 1,594 Ohio voters who indicated that they were registered to vote in the upcoming presidential election finds that the Obama vs. Romney race is very close. Among all of the likely voters, 1,313 of the poll's participants, Romney is leading with 45.9 percent of the people saying that they'd vote for him, compared to the 45.1 percent favoring Obama. The latest Rasmussen Reports telephone survey of Likely North Carolina voters shows Romney attracting 51% of the vote, while Obama earns support from 48% A new Tampa Bay Times/Bay News 9/Miami Herald poll show Mitt Romney leads President Obama 51 percent to 44 percent. President Obama appears to be in serious trouble in Florida, America's biggest battleground state. New polls points show Florida is shifting significantly toward the Republican nominee Mitt Romney. The latest from American Research Group shows another lead for Romney in Florida, this time 3-points 49 to 46 over President Obama. According to new Poll from Rasmussen. "Mitt Romney has crossed the 50% mark for the first time to widen his lead against Obama to four points in Florida". The latest Rasmussen Reports telephone survey of Likely Florida Voters finds Romney with 51% support to President Obama’s 47%. Two percent (2%) remain undecided. A new polls by QStarNews Swing State Poll with 4808 likely voters poll show Romney ahad of President Obama. Poll has a margin of error of 1.41 percent. The states included in this survey are Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. Questions and results as asked by QStarNews Swing State Poll of likely voters in all 11 key swing states: If the election were held today, would you vote for the ticket of Democratic candidates, President Barack Obama and Vice President Joe Biden, or the ticket of Republican candidates, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney and Congressman Paul Ryan or the ticket of Libertarian Candidates, former New Mexico Governor Gary Johnson and former California Judge Jim Gray? Romney/Ryan 50.20,

**Status quo mechanisms shut out investors for renewable energy: empirically proven that MLPs would be attractive by generating consistent cash flows over long periods of time.**

**Danko 12**

(Pete, attended University of California, Berkeley and is currently the Managing Editor at EarthTechling, Earth Techling, “Meet Clean Energy’s Savior, The MLP,” June 8, 2012, <http://www.earthtechling.com/2012/06/meet-clean-energys-savior-the-mlp///wyo-mm>)

Such an arrangement could be especially valuable to **renewable energy developers** because their **long timelines and heavy capital requirements make it difficult to draw in investors**. So as it stands, **the investors that renewable energy relies on tend to be big money interests who can take advantage of tax credits and accelerated depreciation rates**. Plenty of **other investors** – like tax-exempt pension funds and regular citizens looking to put money into a stock – **are** pretty much **shut out**. And meanwhile, the renewable energy developers are paying a hefty premium for investment capital, as much as 30 percent. But **as an MLP, a company doing a solar-power project** in the desert, say with a long-term power-purchase agreement providing a revenue stream, **could peel off an attractive dividend for investors —** 6-8 percent, perhaps — **while in the process bringing down its cost of capital dramatically**. (**That’s why** in the energy field, **so many MLPs have been pipelines that generate a consistent cash flow over a long period of time**.)

#### Obama will strike iran if he perceives them as a threat to national security

Alajazeera, 12

Obama 'in lockstep' with Israel on Iran issue, <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/americas/2012/02/201225222448276649.html>, accessed 2-18-2012,WYO/JF

US President Barack Obama has said he does not think Israel has made a decision on whether to launch a pre-emptive strike on Iran's nuclear installations, a threat that has rattled the region. **Obama, seeking to reassure Americans over the alleged danger posed by Tehran's nuclear programme, said Washington was working "in lockstep" with Israel to bring Iran to heel**. "I don't think Israel has made a decision" to strike Iranian facilities, Obama said in a pre-Super Bowl interview with NBC on Sunday. When asked if Washington would be consulted first should Israel move ahead with those plans, he said he could not go into specifics but added that the two allies had "closer intelligence and military consultations" than ever before. "**My number one priority continues to be the security of the United States. But also, the security of Israel. And we're going to make sure that we work in lockstep, as we proceed to try to solve this - hopefully diplomatically**." 'Feeling the pinch' Obama said the Islamic republic was "feeling the pinch" of ever tougher sanctions imposed by the international community, and dismissed concerns that Tehran could retaliate by striking US soil, saying such a strike was unlikely. **"I've been very clear - we're going to do everything we can to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon and creating a nuclear arms race in a volatile region**," he said. "We have mobilised the international community, in a way that is unprecedented. They are feeling the pinch. They are feeling the pressure," he said. Iran maintains that its nuclear programme is for strictly peaceful purposes. On whether Tehran could possibly strike US targets, Obama said: "We don't see any evidence they have those intentions or capabilities." He added: "Again, our goal is to resolve this diplomatically. That would be preferable. We're not going to take options off the table, though." Last week, a Washington Post opinion column said Leon Panetta, the US defence secretary, believes there is a "strong likelihood" that Israel will strike Iran's nuclear installations this spring. When asked about the newspaper's article by reporters traveling with him to a NATO meeting in Brussels, Panetta brushed it aside. "I'm not going to comment on that. [...] Israel indicated they're considering this [a strike], we've indicated our concerns," he said. Israeli Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman was due in Washington on Monday, and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu will visit the US in early March, though a meeting between Netanyahu and Obama was not yet confirmed. In the interview with NBC, Obama cautioned that "any kind of additional military activity inside the Gulf is disruptive. And has a big effect on us. It can affect oil prices".

### Security Good:

#### The climate models have empirically been proven to produce accurate trends

Kourentzes 11

(Nikolaos Kourentzes is an assistant professor at Lancaster University and a researcher at the Lancaster Centre for Forecasting. He is currently at the department of Management Science at Lancaster University Management School, UK. “Validation and forecasting accuracy in models of climate change” October 2011. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169207011000604//wyoccd)

With so many requirements for model validation and so many possibilities of confusion, why, we might wonder, has the climate change movement gained so much ground, despite entrenched and powerful opposition? From a long-term perspective, there has been a considerable degree of variability in the Earth’s climate, both locally and globally. An examination of the ice-core record of Antarctic temperatures suggests a range of 10 °C over the past 400,000 years, as can be seen in Fig. 2. However, changes of more than 2 °C in a century have only been observed once, five centuries ago in what is admittedly local data. Is the observed (but recent) upward trend shown in Fig. 3 nothing more than an example of the natural variability long observed, as argued by Green, Armstrong, and Soon (2009), or is the projected temperature change in the IPCC report exceptional? For the annual data needed for decadal modelling, there are many time series data sets of aggregate world temperatures, but it is only since 1850 that broadly reliable data have been being collected regularly; the Hadley Centre data series HadCRUT3v is the latest version of a well-established and analysed series used to appraise AOGCMs. More recently, NASA14 produced alternative estimates which have a correlation of 0.984 with the HadCRUT3v annual dataset (data: 1880–2007). Since our focus here is on decadal climate change (up to 20 years), a long data series is needed, and we have therefore used the HadCRUT3v data for model building. In making this choice, we pass over the question of whether this series offers an accurate and unbiased estimate of global temperatures. While the resolution of this uncertainty is of primary importance in establishing the magnitude and direction of temperature change, it has no direct effect on our methodological arguments. Fig. 3 shows a graph of the HadCRUT3v data, together with a 10-year centred moving average. The features of the global temperature time series (the stylised facts) are relatively stable between 1850 and 1920; there is then a rapid increase until 1940, followed by a period of stability until 1970, since which time there has been a consistent upward trend. From the longer-term data series such as the ice-core records, we can see that the bounds of recent movements (in Fig. 3, ±0.6 °C) have often been broken, but the evidence which we invoke here is local rather than global. We can conclude, however, that the temperature time series has seen persistent local trends, with extremes that are both uncomfortably hot and cold (at least for humans). As we argued in Section 2.4 in relation to forecast validation, an important, if not essential, feature of a good explanatory model is its ability to explain such features of the data where other models fail. In particular, global climate models should produce better forecasts than alternative modelling approaches (in the sense that they are more accurate for a variety of error measures).15 Therefore, over the time scales which we are concerned with, a forecasting model should allow the possibility of a local trend if it is to capture this particular feature of the data. Of course, if no trend is found on the time scale under consideration, this should also emerge from the modelling.

#### Helps Marginalized People

#### Securitization is emancipating—giving marginalizes issues like human rights visibility

Jeff Huysmans, Lecturer in politics at the department of government at Open University, Alternatives “Defining Social Constructivism in Security Studies: The Normative Dilemma of Writing Security” Feb 2002 p. 59-60.

There is no solution for the normative dilemma in the social-con­structivist security analyses defined above. The particular under­standing of language makes any security utterance potentially se­curitizing. Consequently, enunciating security is never innocent or neutral. Of course, this does not have to result in a normative dilemma; it does so only if one wants to or has to utter security in a political context while wanting to avoid a securitization of a par­ticular area. Someone may also employ security language with the intention of securitizing an area. This does not necessarily require a conservative interest in keeping the status quo or in establishing law and order. Securitization can also be performed with an emancipatory interest. Given the capacity of security language to priori­tize questions and to mobilize people, one may employ it as a tac­tical device to give human-rights questions a higher visibility, for example. It is also possible to mobilize security questions in nonse­curity areas with the intention to change the conservative bias of the security language. This would require a positive concept of se­curity that defines liberation from oppression as a good that should be secured.

## Alt Bad: Allows Suffering to Continue

#### REJECTING OUR PLAN IN FAVOR OF THE CRITIQUE PRIVILEGES SEMANTICS OVER REAL HUMAN SUFFERING – WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO THREATS TO HUMAN LIFE AND DIGNITY IN THE STATUS QUO WITHOUT WORRYING ABOUT WHETHER WE OVERLY SECURITIZE SUCH THREATS.

Nicholas **Onuf,** Professor, International Relatoins, Florida International University, Symposium on the Norms and Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention, Center for Global Peace and Conflict Studies Working Paper 00-03, May 5, 20**00**, http://hypatia.ss.uci.edu/gpacs/OnufHumanitarian.pdf.

Paradoxically, if an emergency is defined as a situation calling for immediate action, then these situations cease to be emergencies–immediate action remedied nothing. In the meantime, human misery deepens. It is no wonder, then, that suffering becomes secondary, as violations of human rights take priority. At least this is a tendency among progressive liberals for whom the situation has become an inescapable morass, and for whom human rights are the great project of social reform in our time.

Critics of liberalism think little of the human rights movement. They are disposed to see social reform activism, and more generally the development of civil society, as a manifestation of “global liberal governance” or, more scornfully, “liberal peace.” According to Michael Dillon and Julian Reid, “liberal peace finds itself deeply implicated in a terrain of disorder in which some states are powerful, some states are in radical dissolution, traditional societies are collapsing and civil conflict is endemic, where international corporations and criminal cartels are also involved, and where international organizations and nongovernmental organizations are inextricably committed as well.” Dillon and Reid have argued against calling the more striking manifestations of global disorder “complex emergencies” because doing so unduly simplifies their “vexed political character” and masks the degree to which global liberal governance is implicated in making them so vexed. Their alternative description–“emerging political complexes”–implies that the people who want to call these situations “emergencies” are cynically motivated. Perhaps some humanitarian liberals are cynically motivated; others no doubt have complex political motivations–people always do. Yet banishing “emergency” from our vocabulary because people have mixed motives in calling for immediate action has the untoward result of forestalling action that could help the many victims of the liberal peace and its global disorder. Progressive liberals and their critics both end up making suffering secondary to their own programmatic concerns.

#### second, REALISM MUST BE USED STRATEGICALLY – REJECTING IT RISKS WORSE USES

Stefano **Guzzini**, Assistant Professor at Central European Univ., Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy, 1998, p. 212

Therefore, in a third step, this chapter also claims that it is impossible just to heap realism onto the dustbin of history and start anew. This is a non‑option. Although realism as a strictly causal theory has been a disappointment, various realist assumptions are well alive in the minds of many practitioners and observers of international affairs. Although it does not correspond to a theory which helps us to understand a real world with objective laws, it is a world‑view which suggests thoughts about it, and which permeates our daily language for making sense of it. Realism has been a rich, albeit very contestable, reservoir of lessons of the past, of metaphors and historical analogies, which, in the hands of its most gifted representatives, have been proposed, at times imposed, and reproduced as guides to a common understanding of international affairs. Realism is alive in the collective memory and self‑understanding of our (i.e. Western) foreign policy elite and public, whether educated or not. Hence, we cannot but deal with it. For this reason, forgetting realism is also questionable. Of course, academic observers should not bow to the whims of daily politics. But staying at distance, or being critical, does not mean that they should lose the capacity to understand the languages of those who make significant decisions, not only in government, but also in firms, NGOs, and other institutions. To the contrary, this understanding, as increasingly varied as it may be, is a prerequisite for their very profession. More particularly, it is a prerequisite for opposing the more irresponsible claims made in the name, although not always necessarily in the spirit, of realism.

#### Perm do both.

#### third, THE PERM SOLVES BEST… REALISM OPENS UP SPACE FOR ONGOING CRITICISM, MAKING THE ALTERNATIVE POSSIBLE

**Murray**, Professor Politics at the University of Wales, 19**97** (Alastair J.H., Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics, p. 193-6)

For realism man remains, in the final analysis, limited by himself. As such, it emphasizes caution, and focuses not merely upon the achievement of long-term objectives, but also upon the resolution of more- immediate difficulties. Given that, in the absence of a resolution of such difficulties, longer-term objectives are liable to be unachievable, realism would seem to offer a more effective strategy of transition than relativism itself. Whereas, in constructivism, such strategies are divorced from an awareness of the immediate problems which obstruct such efforts, and, in critical theoretical perspectives, they are divorced from the current realities of international politics altogether, realism's emphasis on first addressing the immediate obstacles to development ensures that it at least generates strategies which offer us a tangible path to follow. If these strategies perhaps lack the visionary appeal of reflectivist proposals, emphasizing simply the necessity of a restrained moderate diplomacy in order to ameliorate conflicts between states, to foster a degree of mutual understanding in international relations, and, ultimately, to develop a sense of community which might underlie a more comprehensive international society, they at least seek to take advantage of the possibilities of reform in the current international system without jeopardizing the possibilities of order. Realism's gradualist reformism, the careful tending of what it regards as an essentially organic process, ultimately suggests the basis for a more sustainable strategy for reform than reflectivist perspectives, however dramatic, can offer. For the realist, then, if rationalist theories prove so conservative as to make their adoption problematic, critical theories prove so progressive as to make their adoption unattractive. If the former can justifiably be criticized for seeking to make a far from ideal order work more efficiently, thus perpetuating its existence and

legitimating its errors, reflectivist theory can equally be criticized for searching for a tomorrow which may never exist, thereby endangering the possibility of establishing any form of stable order in the here and now. Realism's distinctive contribution thus lies in its attempt to drive a path between the two, a path which, in the process, suggests the basis on which some form of synthesis between rationalism and relativism might be achieved. Oriented in its genesis towards addressing the shortcomings in an idealist transformatory project, it is centrally motivated by concern to reconcile vision with practicality, to relate utopia and reality. Unifying technical and a practical stance, it combines aspects of the positivist methodology employed by problem-solving theory with the interpretative stance adopted by critical theory, avoiding the monism of perspective which leads to the self-destructive conflict between the two. Ultimately, it can simultaneously acknowledge the possibility of change in the structure of the international system and the need to probe the limits of the possible, and yet also question the proximity of any international transformation, emphasize the persistence of problems after such a transformation, and serve as a reminder of the need to grasp whatever semblance of order can be obtained in the mean time. Indeed, it is possible to say that realism is uniquely suited to serve as such an orientation. Simultaneously to critique contemporary resolutions of the problem of political authority as unsatisfactory and yet to support them as an attainable measure of order in an unstable world involves one in a contradiction which is difficult to accept. Yet, because it grasps the essential ambiguity of the political, and adopts imperfectionism as its dominant motif, realism can relate these two tasks in a way which allows neither to predominate, achieving, if not a reconciliation, then at least a viable synthesis. Perhaps the most famous realist refrain is that all politics are power politics. It is the all that is important here. Realism lays claim to a relevance across systems, and because it relies on a conception of human nature, rather than a historically specific structure of world politics, it can make good on this claim. If its observations about human nature are even remotely accurate, the problems that it addresses will transcend contingent formulations of the problem of political order. Even in a genuine cosmopolis, conflict might become technical, but it would not be eliminated altogether.67 The primary manifestations of power might become more economic or institutional rather than (para)military but, where disagreements occur and power exists, the employment of the one to ensure the satisfactory resolution of the other is inevitable short of a wholesale transformation of human behaviour. Power is ultimately of the essence of politics; it is not something which can be banished, only tamed and restrained. As a result, realism achieves a universal relevance to the problem of political action which allows it to relate the reformist zeal of critical theory, without which advance would be impossible, with the problem-solver's sensible caution that before reform is attempted, whatever measure of security is possible under contemporary conditions must first be ensured