# 2AC

## Solvency

#### First, OSW is unique- water dynamics, lower surface friction and optimal productivity all guarantee intermittency isn’t an issue, which is the Schroeder ev from the grid advantage

#### Intermittency is manageable- predictions and constant patterns

Willey 12

[Lawrence, “Challenges & Rewards for Engineers in Wind”, Mechanical Engineering, August, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

Many opponents of wind energy try to point to the intermittency of wind and the need to provide backup power or storage. Fortunately, with a holistic systems level view of the grid, this argument doesn't stand up. In fact, large and abrupt changes in demand for electricity can and do adversely affect the output of conventional electric generation sources - such as grid operators facing the sudden loss of a large power plant - whereas wind output changes are typically more gradual and predictable. This is easily understood by thinking of the continuous parade of storm fronts day to day, moving generally west to east in many regions, with wind plant after wind plant in the path of these storms taking their turn to spin up and generate electricity.

#### Intermittency doesn’t apply to OSW- unique thermal characteristics of water guarantee consistent wind flow

Street 8

[Thomas, an Attorney Advisor in the Office of the General Counsel of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, “Climate Change, Offshore Wind Power, and the Coastal Zone

Management Act”, September, p. dticmil//wyo-tjc]

While the onshore siting of wind power turbines is still extremely popular, a recent trend, especially in Europe, has been to site new units, in large-scale farms, offshore. Despite being approximately 40% more expensive, offshore wind power projects have at least one benefit over many terrestrial sites: a higher potential peak energy capacity, as compared to many onshore facilities. One of the most vocal criticisms of onshore wind power projects is the intermittent nature of the wind resource—when the wind does not blow, no energy is produced. Offshore wind energy projects can conversely take advantage of the relatively consistent nature of coastal winds, caused by the different specific heat capacities of land and water.

## Warming

#### Those who are aware of ecological destruction are increasingly more likely to take personal action to avoid consequences- Several national surveys prove

Veldman ‘12

[Robin Globus, a doctoral candidate in the Religion and Nature program at the University of Florida. Her research focuses on the interplay between environmental attitudes, religious beliefs, and ethics. A National Science Foundation fellow in the University of Florida’s Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program in Adaptive Management, she is also Assistant Editor of the Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture, “Narrating the Environmental Apocalypse: How Imagining the End Facilitates Moral Reasoning Among Environmental Activists” Ethics & the Environment, Volume 17, Number 1, Spring 2012, pp. 1-23 (Article)//wyo-hdm]

Some of the strongest evidence of a connection between environmental apocalypticism and activism comes from a national survey that examined whether Americans perceived climate change to be dangerous. As part of his analysis, Anthony Leiserowitz identified several “interpretive communities,” which had consistent demographic characteristics but varied in their levels of risk perception. The group who perceived the risk to be the greatest, which he labeled “alarmists,” described climate change using apocalyptic language, such as “Bad…bad…bad…like after nuclear war…no vegetation,” “Heat waves, it’s gonna kill the world,” and “Death of the planet” (2005, 1440). Given such language, this would seem to be a reasonable way to operationalize environmental apocalypticism. If such apocalypticism encouraged fatalism, we would expect alarmists to be less likely to have engaged in environmental behavior compared to groups with moderate or low levels of concern. To the contrary, however, Leiserowitz found that alarmists “were significantly more likely to have taken personal action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” (ibid.) than respondents who perceived climate change to pose less of a threat. § Marked 14:42 § Interestingly, while one might expect such radical views to appeal only to a tiny minority, Leiserowitz found that a respectable eleven percent of Americans fell into this group (ibid). Further supporting Leiserowitz’s findings, in a separate national survey conducted in 2008, Maibach, Roser-Renouf, and Leiserowitz found that a group they labeled “the Alarmed” (again, due to their high levels of concern about climate change) “are the segment most engaged in the issue of global warming. They are very convinced it is happening, humancaused, and a serious and urgent threat. The Alarmed are already making changes in their own lives and support an aggressive national response” (2009, 3, emphasis added). This group was far more likely than people with lower levels of concern over climate change to have engaged in consumer activism (by rewarding companies that support action to reduce global warming with their business, for example) or to have contacted elected officials to express their concern. Additionally, the authors found that “[w]hen asked which reason for action was most important to them personally, the Alarmed were most likely to select preventing the destruction of most life on the planet (31%)” (2009, 31)—a finding suggesting that for many in this group it is specifically the desire to avert catastrophe, rather than some other motivation, that encourages pro-environmental behavior. Taken together, these and other studies (cf. Semenza et al. 2008 and DerKarabetia, Stephenson, and Poggi 1996) provide important evidence that many of those who think environmental problems pose a severe threat practice some form of activism, rather than giving way to fatalistic resignation.

#### Cap sustainable: green tactics solve environmental crisis

Weiss 09

(Marc, CEO of Global Urban Development, and chairman of the Climate Prosperity Project, served as special assistant to the HUD secretary in the Clinton administration, and was a professor of urban development and planning at Columbia University, “Climate Prosperity: Why Marx Was Wrong and Mother Nature Is Right,” Tikkun, Vol. 24, Issue 3, June 2009, Academic Search Premiere//wyo-mm)

Fortunately it is not too late to create an even higher standard of living for every person and community throughout the world, by shifting from resource-wasting capitalism to resource-saving capitalism. In the twenty-first century, the only way to get richer is by becoming greener, and the only way to earn more money is by using fewer resources and reusing more. In other words, the global economy can significantly enhance prosperity and quality of life for people everywhere by treating Mother Nature as our good friend and one of our most precious assets, rather than as our enemy to be exploited and conquered. The main challenge is for each of us to acknowledge the ancient wisdom of two essential values: 1) new is not always better than old; and 2) more is not always better than less.

## Grid

#### Three 1ac warrants for solving grid vulnerability: A) Resiliency and quick-recovery, both which check the INTENSITY and DURATION of blackouts which is specific to all of our impacts, that’s the Wood ev. B)Prices and congestion- OSW provides energy at key black-out times and eliminates transmission problems- that’s Marcacci, C) Wind quality- OSW is uniquely suited to prevent East coast blackouts, that’s Schroeder

#### And two more warrants: a) Alignment between demand and production potential and B) population density solves resources

Dvorak, 12

Michael J. Dvorak, Bethany A. Corcoran, John E. Ten Hoeve, Nicolas G. McIntyre and Mark Z. Jacobson “US East Coast offshore wind energy resources and their relationship to peak-time electricity demand” <http://www.stanford.edu/group/efmh/jacobson/Articles/I/Offshore/12DvorakEastCoastWindEn.pdf>, accessed 10/26/12,WYO/JF

Offshore wind energy (OWE), located near large and dense coastal electricity demand centers, has the potential to provide large amounts of carbon-free power. Because OWE transmission cables are underwater, the burden of building new terrestrial transmission, which has been shown to be a limiting factor for land-based turbines,1 is greatly reduced. In the USA, the majority of the population lives near oceans or the Great Lakes. As of 2003, 53% (153M people) lived in counties adjacent to oceans or the Great Lakes, with 23 of the 25 most densely populated US counties being coastal.2 The 28 states that have coastal boundaries use 78% of the nation’s electricity.3 Of these 28 states, only six states have enough land-based wind resource potential to generate up to 20% of their electricity demand (see Department of Energy,4 p. 48). The 16 states and the District of Columbia from Florida to Maine near the coast (Figure 1) embody 34% of the total US electricity sales (2009),5 35% of the total US CO2 emissions3 and 37% of the US population.6 The population density of the US East Coast (USEC) is both a benefit and a burden for the abatement of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Dense populations allow a new electrical generation to serve a large number of people in a limited spatial area with limited investment in transmission. At the same time, states with high population densities and high demand for new transmission have the highest siting difficulties (specifically Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania; see Vajjhala and Fischbeck,7 pp. 660–661). Congestion has become an expensive problem in the Mid-Atlantic where transmission expansion has lagged demand. For example, congestion costs charged by the regional transmission operator (RTO) PJM were 3–9% of total energy market revenues between 2003 and 2010 (see PJM,8 p. 472). OWE farms could ease transmission congestion in this region by putting large amounts of power generation online adjacent to the USEC.9 The USEC OWE resource has been roughly estimated to harbor hundreds of gigawatts of potential capacity,10 although this resource has not yet been studied in significant temporal or climatological detail. Hart et al.11 clarified the importance of obtaining more temporal and spatial detail in a wind energy resource analysis, particularly for determining the extent to which hourly demand for electricity can be met by renewable supply. It is known that aggregating wind power generation with transmission lines from multiple, geographically dispersed wind farms reduces the number of hours with no output and makes the total wind energy output probability density function more Gaussian than Weibull.12 Kempton et al.13 explored the utility of connecting offshore wind farms along the USEC by using buoy and reanalysis data, finding that wind farms connected \_1000 km apart and aligned with the prevailing frontal movements reduced ramp rates and lowered the number of no or full-power events. A high-voltage, direct current (HVDC) offshore transmission line called the Atlantic Wind Connection has been proposed from offshore New York to Virginia, and an alternative offshore grid location has been proposed, which takes advantage of sea breezes, spanning from Long Island, New York to the Georges Bank.14 In this study, we characterized the annual mean OWE resource and calculated the resource during periods of peak USEC electric demand on the basis of an analysis of electric demand data. The wind resource was modeled at potential locations with the use of a mesoscale weather model for 5 years at high resolution and validated with the use of a total of 32 buoys and offshore towers. This validation of a publicly available weather model provides insight into what the relative errors of forecasting USEC OWE might be if wind farms are built. The most suitable locations for large-scale development of OWE are prescribed on the basis of their wind resource, shallow bathymetry, hurricane risk and peak-power generation potential.

#### Solves congestion and reliability

Jacobson, 12

Dvorak, M. J., E. D. Stoutenburg, C. L. Archer, W. Kempton, and M. Z. Jacobson (2012), “Where is the ideal location for a US East Coast offshore grid?”, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39, L06804, doi:10.1029/ 2011GL050659., accessed 10/26/12,WYO/JF

An offshore grid similar to the one proposed here has several distinct advantages. An offshore grid as an extension of the onshore grid will reduce transmission congestion along the densely populated US East Coast improving reliability and reducing power price differences between regions that the offshore grid connects. All the benefits of an offshore grid help to allocate its costs to more market actors than just the offshore wind farms, which improves the economics of adding renewable energy to the power system.

## Cap K

#### Perm do both: the best way to understand different cultural contexts is through an a more open knowledge production.

Mezzadra 11

(Sandro, Inter-Asia Cultural Studies, “Bringing capital back in: a materialist turn in postcolonial studies?” 2011//wyo-mm)

How can we develop a methodology capable of grasping this hallmark (and more generally the common characteristics of global capitalism) while at the same time allowing us to remain sensitive to the specificity of local contexts and differences that has been so important for the development of cultural studies? This is a question I asked myself listening to Pun Ngai’s (2010) talk at the Crossroads Conference in Hong Kong, and particularly reflecting upon her impressive description of the ‘dormitory labor system regime’ in contemporary China. There is of course a lot of comparative work to be done here: as Pun (2009) herself writes in a recent article, ‘the dormitory use for labor has a long history both in a western or eastern context of industrialization’. Nevertheless I think that comparative analysis, although important, is not enough. There is something else to be done, a strategy of knowledge production that, as far as I am concerned, I learned in an ongoing conversation with my friends of the ‘colectivo situaciones’, 6 based in Buenos Aires. I will call this, for want of a better definition, letting concepts and images ‘resonate’ in contexts different from the ones where they have been forged, without losing the sense of their historical and geographical specificity but remaining open to the (often unforeseen) effects precisely produced by their ‘resonating’ in different situations. At stake in my discussions with the ‘colectivo situaciones’ has been, for instance, the possibility of making the experiences of the Argentinean unemployed movement politically productive in the European discussion on ‘precarity’, and vice versa. But from a more theoretical point of view, my idea of ‘resonating’ is surprisingly close to what Kuan-Hsing Chen calls the method of ‘inter-referencing’ – and to what he has done in his recent book reading Partha Chatterjee’s analysis of ‘political society’ through the lens of mínjian, and once again vice versa.

#### Capitalism is key to space exploration and development

Blundell, 04

John Blundell, director general of the Institute for Economic Affairs, 2004 (“Mission to Mars must go private to succeed,” February 2, http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=news&ID=166)

What we need is capitalists in space. Capitalism needs property rights, enforcement of contracts and the rule of law. The ideological tussle does not cease once we are beyond the ionosphere. With the exception of Arthur C Clarke, none of us imagined the entertainment potential from satellites. Geostationary lumps of electronic gadgetry beam us our BSkyB television pictures. I remain in awe that Rupert Murdoch can place a device in the skies above Brazil that sends a signal to every home in each hemisphere. Who could have foreseen that mobile phones could keep us chattering without any wiring, or that global position techniques could plot where we all are to within a metre? These are business applications. Business is already in space. Markets detect and apply opportunities that are not envisaged by even the most accomplished technicians. I’m not saying Murdoch has special competences. I imagine he is as baffled by digital miracles as I am. The point is that companies define and refine what public bodies cannot achieve. Lift the veil of course and all those satellite firms are an intricate web of experts supplying ideas and services. We have an infant space market. What use will the Moon be? Is there value on Mars other than the TV rights? The answer is nobody can know. We can only make some guesses. The Spanish ships that set off for the US thought they would get to India. The Portuguese knew they’d reach China. The English followed them westwards seeking gold. In fact, they got tobacco. Events always confound expectations. The arguments for putting men on Mars are expressly vague from President Bush. Perhaps he was really bidding for votes. From my reading the best results may be medical. Zero, or low, gravity techniques may allow therapies of which we are ignorant. It seems facetious to suggest tourism may be a big part of space opportunity but as both the North and South poles are over-populated and there is a queue at the top of Mount Everest, a trip to the Sea of Tranquility may prove a magnet for the wealthy. Instead of NASA’s grotesque bureaucracy it may be Thomas Cook will be a greater force for exploration. NASA could be a procurement body. It need not design and run all space ventures. It could sub-contract far more extensively. Without specialised engineering expertise it is not easy to criticise projects such as the shuttle. It seems to be excessively costly and far too fragile. There are private space entrepreneurs already. They are tiddlers up against the mighty NASA. Yet Dan Goldin, the NASA leader, says he favours the privatisation of space: "We can’t afford to do solar system exploration until we turn these activities over to the cutting edge private sector..."Some may say that commercialising portions of NASA’s functions is heresy. Others may think we are taking a path that will ruin the wonders of space. I believe that when NASA can creatively partner, all of humankind will reap the benefits of access to open space". Is it possible the Moon has a more noble future than merely a branch office of NASA? Is it tolerable that Mars could be a subsidiary of the USA? Could it be nominally a further state of the union? These are not silly questions. In time space will be defined by lawyers and accountants as property rights will need to be deliberated. One possibility may be that both environments are so hostile that Mars and the Moon will never be more than token pockets for humanity. On the evidence so far it is the orbiting satellites that have made us see the Earth through new eyes. We can survey and explore the planet better from 200 miles up than stomping on the surface. The emerging commercial body of space law is derived from telecommunications law. It is perplexing and contrary to our immediate senses. How can you own or exchange something as intangible as digital messages bouncing off satellites? Yet we all pay our mobile phone bills. Many of the business results of space exploration are unintended consequences of NASA’s early adventures. Computer development would probably have been slower but for the need for instrumentation for Apollo. Are there prospects for Scottish firms in space? The prizes will not go to only the mega corporations. Perhaps Dobbies, the Edinburgh garden centre group, can create new roses by placing pots beyond gravity. Edinburgh University laboratories, or rather their commercial spin offs, could patent new medicines. Is it possible the genetic magicians at the Bush could hitch a ride into space and extend their discoveries? NASA is a monopolist. All monopolies are bad for business. They only stunt opportunities. They blunt alternatives. By opening space to entrepreneurship we will be starting on what FA Hayek memorably describes as "a discovery procedure". Science is an open system. So is capitalism.

#### Space solves multiple existential threats –key to survival

Pelton 03

(Joseph, Director of the Space and Advanced Communications Research institute at George Washington University and Executive Director of the Arthur C. Clarke Foundation, “COMMENTARY: Why Space? The Top 10 Reasons”, September 23, http://www.space.com/news/commentary\_top10\_030912.html)

Actually the lack of a space program could get us all killed. I dont mean you or me or my wife or children. I mean that Homo sapiens as a species are actually endangered. Surprising to some, a well conceived space program may well be our only hope for long-term survival. The right or wrong decisions about space research and exploration may be key to the futures of our grandchildren or great-grandchildren or those that follow. Arthur C. Clarke, the author and screenplay writer for 2001: A Space Odyssey, put the issue rather starkly some years back when he said: The dinosaurs are not around today because they did not have a space program. He was, of course, referring to the fact that we now know a quite largish meteor crashed into the earth, released poisonous Iridium chemicals into our atmosphere and created a killer cloud above the Earth that blocked out the sun for a prolonged period of time. This could have been foreseen and averted with a sufficiently advanced space program. But this is only one example of how space programs, such as NASAs Spaceguard program, help protect our fragile planet. Without a space program we would not know about the large ozone hole in our atmosphere, the hazards of solar radiation, the path of killer hurricanes or many other environmental dangers. But this is only a fraction of the ways that space programs are crucial to our future. He Continues… Protection against catastrophic planetary accidents: It is easy to assume that an erratic meteor or comet will not bring destruction to the Earth because the probabilities are low. The truth is we are bombarded from space daily. The dangers are greatest not from a cataclysmic collision, but from not knowing enough about solar storms, cosmic radiation and the ozone layer. An enhanced Spaceguard Program is actually a prudent course that could save our species in time.

#### Capitalism sustainable and inevitable: empirically proven to adapt to any conditions

Farndale 12

(Nigel, The Daily Telegraph, “CAPITALISM: We can rebuild it REPORT First we blamed bankers for the financial collapse, and now the system itself is under attack. But do economists have any better ideas?” January 15, 2012, ProQuest//wyo-mm)

Adam Fergusson's book When Money Dies: the Nightmare of the Weimar Hyperinflation, has become a modern classic. I ask for Fergusson's take. "I don't think there are any serious alternatives to capitalism," he says, "not if we hope for growth and recovery, because capitalism represents the competition and enterprise that produces these things. The events of the past three or four years will have taught those who practise capitalism some big lessons." Does his blood run cold at mention of quantitative easing? "Absolutely. It hasn't worked with us. It hasn't worked in America. The danger is of losing control. If it doesn't work you try harder with more, and it if it does work you increase the amount. It's like drug addiction." And anyway, a shortage of money is not the problem. The problem is that the money is in the wrong place. It's in China where people, for reasons that seem enigmatic to us, like to - say it in a whisper - save. What we are witnessing, then, is the "creative destruction" of the heavily indebted Western economies by the emerging economies of the East. Darwinism at its purest. And a very capitalist idea. What, after all, is capitalism about if not competition and survival of the fittest? Capitalism, like the poor, will always be with us, because trade is how society operates. Trade is the human condition. As the philosopher Michel Onfray has said: "Is this the end of capitalism? Absolutely not. Capitalism has been through antiquity, feudalism, the industrial era, it has worn the guise of fascism and now it's wedding itself to the ecology cause. After this latest event, it will take on a new form. It is indestructible and works like the Hydra of Lerne, cut off one head and another grows in its place."

#### A transition away from capitalism requires war and violence between the protesters and the state

Blackledge 10

(Paul, International Socialism, “Marxism and anarchism,” January 5, 2010, http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=616&issue=125''Marxism//wyo-mm)

With respect to the modern capitalist states, Marxists focus on the way they help sustain the capitalist system at the expense of human freedom. This involves an analysis of how states relate to those class struggles and other social movements which create the potential for developing the solidarity and socialist consciousness necessary to overcome capitalist alienation. On this issue it is clear that once these struggles reach a large enough scale, they will be confronted by states which act as the key organisational safeguard of the capitalist system. It is for this reason that any movement from below which becomes powerful enough to challenge capitalism will be forced to confront the state. As Alex Callinicos has written in an exchange with John Holloway, “the trouble is that the state won’t leave us alone”.38 The truth of this statement was brought home recently in Britain by the death of Ian Tomlinson on the G20 demo in London. This incident acted as a lightning rod exposing the regular and systematic violence meted out by the police against not only political demonstrators but also large sections of the broader population. The fact that it occurred in the wake of the recent international state interventions to prop up the banking system, and in the context of those states’ sustained and regular use of military power, serves to remind us of the intrinsic links between capitalism and the state system. Among numerous other functions, capitalist states act as instruments of political legitimisation, social control, economic regulation and military competition: they are “structurally interdependent” with capitalism, which cannot survive without them. And, whatever else the recent wars and economic bailouts have achieved, they should have laid to rest the idea that the forces of globalisation have broken the power of states.39

#### Zizek’s theories are impossible to apply to political theory for three reasons: His discussion of the act is resolutely individualist and cannot be understood for social transformation, His few examples of historical reform are empirically inaccurate, His alternatives incite violence, producing a world that is worse than the status quo.

Robinson & Tormey 05

(Andrew Robinson (PhD in Political Theory) and Simon Tormey (PhD at the University of Wales) work in the School of Politics at the University of Nottingham, “Zizek is not a radical,” Thesis Eleven, N80, February 2005 UWYO KB)

It ‘means that we accept the vicious circle of revolving around the object [the Real] and find jouissance in it, renouncing the myth that jouissance is amassed somewhere else’.84 It also offers those who take part in it a ‘dimension of Otherness, that moment when the absolute appears in all its fragility’, a ‘brief apparition of a future utopian Otherness to which every authentic revolutionary stance should cling’.85 This absolute, however, can only be glimpsed. The leader, Act and Cause must be betrayed so the social order can be refounded. The leader, or ‘mediator’, ‘must erase himself [sic] from the picture’,86 retreating to the horizon of the social to haunt history as spectre or phantasy.87 Every Great Man must be betrayed so he can assume his fame and thereby become compatible with the status quo;88 once one glimpses the sublime Universal, therefore, one must commit suicide - as Zizek claims the Bolshevik Party did, via the Stalinist purges (‘When the Party Commits Suicide’). Furthermore, despite Zizek’s emphasis on politics, his discussion of the Act remains resolutely individualist - as befits its clinical origins. Zizek’s examples of Acts are nearly all isolated actions by individuals, such as Mary Kay Letourneau’s defiance of juridical pressure to end a relationship with a youth,89 a soldier in Full Metal Jacket killing his drill sergeant and himself,90 and the acts of Stalinist bureaucrats who rewrote history knowing they would later be purged.91 This is problematic as a basis for understanding previous social transformations, and even more so as a recommendation for the future. The new subject Zizek envisages is an authoritarian leader, someone capable of the ‘inherently terroristic’ action of ‘redefining the rules of the game’.92 This is a conservative, if not reactionary, position. As Donald Rooum’s cartoon character Wildcat so astutely puts it, ‘I don’t just want freedom from the capitalists. I also want freedom from people fit to take over’.93 Regarding social structures, furthermore, Zizek consistently prefers overconformity to resistance. For him, disidentification with one’s ideologically-defined role is not subversive; rather, ‘an ideological edifice can be undermined by a too-literal identification’.94 Escapism and ideas of an autonomous self are identical with ideology because they make intolerable conditions ‘liveable’;95 even petty resistance is a ‘condition of possibility’ of the system,96 a supplement which sustains it. To be free of the present, one should renounce ‘the transgressive fantasmic supplement that attaches us to it’,97 and attach oneself instead to the public discourse which power officially promotes.98 How does Zizek distinguish his ‘leftist’ politics from ‘rightist’ alternatives which would equally meet the formal criteria of an Act? He introduces the idea of the ‘false Act’ (or ‘rightist suspension of the ethical’) to deal with this problem. False acts, such as the Nazi seizure of power and the bombing of Afghanistan, have the formal structure of an Act, but are false because they involve impotent acting-out against a pseudo-enemy, and therefore do not traverse the actual social fantasy.99 Their function, rather, is to preserve the system through the actingout. 100 One can tell a true Act from a false Act by assessing whether an act is truly negative, i.e. negates all prior standards,101 and by whether it emerges from the actual void in a situation,102 which is always a single ‘touchy nodal point … which decides where one ‘truly stands’.103 This is problematic because Zizek here introduces external criteria while elsewhere stating that the Act must negate all such criteria. Furthermore, if the authenticity of an Act is dependent on an empirical assessment of where the actual social void is, then Zizek’s account of the Act as the assertion of a Truth over and against the facts is undermined. Zizek’s account of the Act provides a general framework for political assessments. Before assessing its validity, however, we need to examine how the concept operates when applied to a concrete political topic. Depleting Lenin: What is not to be done! Zizek is not a political theorist, and much of what passes for ‘politics’ in his work is asserted in passing. Usually, he discusses politics as an afterthought, during analyses of other subjects, such as a particular film or novel. Zizek’s recent work does however address some directly political topics, including the attacks of September 11th, eastern European nationalism, the Holocaust, the concept of totalitarianism and western interventions in armed conflicts. One of his current fascinations is the relevance or ‘meaning’ of Lenin and the Act-Event associated with the Lenin signifier, i.e. the Russian revolution and its aftermath. This interest in Lenin follows logically from Zizek’s love of provocation. Lenin is perhaps the ultimate bogeyman of post-Marxism. Less open to reformist rearticulation than ‘Marx’, and lacking the anathematising extremity of ‘Stalin’ (for, though Zizek claims to be identifying with the worst anathemas, he avoids in practice the most ‘disavowed’), the signifier ‘Lenin’ occupies the nodal point between a committed revolutionary politics and the ‘progressive’ leftism of Zizek’s intellectual opponents. Further, Zizek’s references to Lenin offer a case-study of the political implications of Zizek’s theories and the extent to which they can generate anything beyond intellectual provocation, negative assertion and abstract theorising. Lenin is an obvious reference-point for anyone concerned about radically transforming the world rather than merely reforming the existing system. Though Lenin was, by most criteria including his own, ultimately unsuccessful in achieving his goals, the revolution associated with his name succeeded in overthrowing capitalism and establishing an alternative social system. Further, Lenin had a reputation for determination, intransigence and ruthlessness which Zizek finds attractive. He was not content to be a tragic-romantic failure, to play the liberal-capitalist view that an ‘impossible’ politics is one that starts from personal denial.107 Arguably, he also ‘shot at himself’ by the sacrifices he made for ‘the revolution’, suppressing his own emotions and denying himself a ‘normal’ family life. As Zizek insists, Lenin was prepared to put aside the promise of emancipation when the regime felt threatened by the lack of ‘order’, during the Civil War. And Lenin used all available means to retain power and celebrated the use of force and terror to underpin the new ‘revolutionary’ symbolism. This terror was sufficiently wideranging to meet Zizek’s demand for a Bataillean dimension.108 Zizek’s admiration for Lenin thus stems from the same source as his admiration for other historical figures such as Pope John Paul II, St Paul, Charles de Gaulle and President Chavez of Venezuela, which is to say that it stems less from Lenin’s politics than from the latter’s willingness to traverse the fantasy of a socio-political ‘given’.109 The paradox of this ‘defence’ of Lenin is that it reproduces almost exactly the conservative account of why Lenin should be renounced as a messianic ‘totalitarian’ despot. This is the Lenin of Bertram D. Wolf, Leonard Shapiro and Adam B. Ulam, the Lenin of the Gulag and the Evil Empire, the Lenin whose ‘Bolshevism proved to be less a doctrine than a technique of action for the seizing and holding of power’,110 the big bad wolf so important for Cold War and anti-left propaganda - that is, the very image of Lenin that generations of leftleaning scholars have been trying to qualify, undermine, challenge or rebut.111 Zizek’s endorsement of this ‘Lenin’ illustrates in stark terms why his project should be rejected by those seeking to advance a left agenda. Zizek’s ‘Leninism’ shows the primacy of the category of the Act within his own approach. What he admires in the figure ‘Lenin’ has little to do with Lenin’s motives and objectives, about which he says little; nor does he endorse progressive game or to polemicise ineffectually from the sidelines, but rather, he was determined to be part of a movement which could seize and retain state power. Zizek’s ‘Leninism’ results from similarities between Lenin’s positions and Zizek’s concept of the Act - especially if Lenin himself is interpreted as initiating the entire revolutionary process. Lenin went through an experience Zizek sees as an Act, taking a ‘mad’ revolutionary stance in April 1917 when even his comrades rejected such a position.104 His revolutionary intransigence suspended liberal and Marxist orthodoxies and so conformed with Zizek’s description of the nature of an Act. And it is true that Zizek’s account is supported by some of Lenin’s statements: ‘After its victory’, Lenin insisted, ‘the proletariat has to make the most strenuous efforts, to suffer the pains of martyrdom ... to ‘liberate’ itself from ... pseudorevolutionaries’; 105 it should make sure it ‘is not afraid of itself’ and be ready to use ‘immediate and severe punishment’, ignoring the empty ‘hypocrisy’ of ‘those who show... fear’, who belong to the old society ‘which utters the word ‘justice’ without believing it’.106 Moreover, his break with Kautsky involved going through subjective destitution, providing support for Zizek’s aspects of the Bolshevik ideology or programme, such as radical decentralisation, land reform and workers’ control. What he admires is how Lenin’s ruthlessness supposedly enabled him to traverse the fantasy and accomplish an Act. Thus, the fact that the revolution was ‘betrayed’, that it (or its successors) ate its own children and created a new Master and a new Order through horrific purges in contradiction to its own proposed goals, are not to be regretted, but should for Zizek be celebrated as evidence of the authenticity of the Leninist Act.112 That the regime which eventually emerged was violent and terroristic is not problematic for Zizek: Acts are necessarily terroristic and sweep their initiators up in a truth-event regardless of their will, and the most one can do is claim responsibility for what occurs.113 Further, they are on Zizek’s account supposed to produce a new Order and a new Master. It remains unclear why one should support the ‘Leninist’ Act, if this is the ‘Leninism’ on offer. As a historical account, this reading of Lenin is problematic. Zizek seems to feel he has little need for evidence to back his claims; he cares about the empty usefulness of the ‘Lenin’ signifier, not the historical Lenin - although his account rests on the assumption that he is saying something relevant to this Lenin and to the historical Russian Revolution. To take a few examples of the selectivity of Zizek’s reading, Lenin specifically rejected ‘orgiastic’ releases of energy,114 and tried to restrain the worst excesses of the Cheka.115 Between Lenin’s ‘mad’ position in April and the Revolution in October, there were the July Days and the text Marxism and Insurrection, where Lenin specifically renounced the idea of taking a revolutionary position without mass support. Lenin’s late texts show that he did not take unconditional responsibility for the betrayal/failure of the revolution, but rather regretted and tried to amend many of the developments to which he had contributed.116 These are just a few examples of a problem of empirical inaccuracy which plagues much of Zizek’s work.

#### Perm do both:

#### Perm solves: Capitalism is key to economic, social and political change, we can use the system to reform it.

Gartzke, 05

Eric Gartzke, Future Depends on Capitalizing on Capitalist Peace, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5133>, accessed 1-20-2011, WYO/JF

A more powerful explanation is emerging from newer, and older, empirical research - the "capitalist peace." As predicted by Montesquieu, Adam Smith, Norman Angell and others, nations with high levels of economic freedom not only fight each other less, they go to war less often, period. Economic freedom is a measure of the depth of free market institutions or, put another way, of capitalism. § Marked 14:49 § The "democratic peace" is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom. Democracy and economic freedom typically co-exis t. Thus, if economic freedom causes peace, then statistically democracy will also appear to cause peace. When democracy and economic freedom are both included in a statistical model, the results reveal that economic freedom is considerably more potent in encouraging peace than democracy, 50 times more potent, in fact, according to my own research. Economic freedom is highly statistically significant (at the one-per-cent level). Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels. But, why would free markets cause peace? Capitalism is not only an immense generator of prosperity; it is also a revolutionary source of economic, social and political change. Wealth no longer arises primarily through land or control of natural resources.
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#### Marx was wrong: capitalism can exist in an efficient and beneficial state that focuses on resource efficiency, sustainable development, and democratic principles; paving the way for increase standards of living and poverty reduction. Reason perm solves best

Weiss 09

(Marc, CEO of Global Urban Development, and chairman of the Climate Prosperity Project, served as special assistant to the HUD secretary in the Clinton administration, and was a professor of urban development and planning at Columbia University, “Climate Prosperity: Why Marx Was Wrong and Mother Nature Is Right,” Tikkun, Vol. 24, Issue 3, June 2009, Academic Search Premiere//wyo-mm)

Global Urban Development (the group that I lead) is coordinating the Climate Prosperity Project, whose core belief is that "innovation, efficiency, and conservation in the use and reuse of all natural and human resources is the best way to increase jobs, incomes, productivity, and competitiveness." The projects main purpose is to creatively use business sustainability concepts taken from Paul Hawken, Amory and Hunter Lovins, Peter Senge, Karl-Henrik Robert, William McDonough, Daniel Esty, and the McKinsey Global Institute, as applied by companies such as GE, IBM, Toyota, IKEA, DuPont, Google, Nike, and Apple. This model has three key elements: Green Savings — reducing waste and cutting costs; Green Opportunities — expanding jobs and businesses by raising revenues and increasing market share; Green Talent — investing in fundamental assets including technology, infrastructure, and most importantly, modern entrepreneurial and workforce skills, because people are now the world's most vital economic resource. Through state, regional, and local Climate Prosperity Strategies, places like Silicon Valley and the State of Delaware are now using the three-part business sustainability model to promote economic development that saves money, creates jobs, raises incomes, and keeps us all safe from environmental harm. This spring the International Economic Development Council will publish the Climate Prosperity Guidebook, describing the various strategies and explaining how to develop and implement such approaches most effectively. Currently there is talk of a Climate Prosperity Agreement that will be part of the United Nations Copenhagen Treaty in 2009, with developed countries committing to invest 1 trillion dollars in developing countries over the next decade to build renewable energy and clean technologies, enabling living standards to rise and poverty to be eliminated through sustainable innovation and resource efficiency. These investments will generate substantial economic and employment growth for every nation throughout the world. The bottom line is that Marx and Engels were wrong, because the real three-phase historical dialectic is as follows: Phase 1 Pre-industrial sustainability Phase 2 Resource-wasting industrialization Phase 3 Innovative, efficient, sustainable, inclusive, democratic, resource-saving industrialism Now that we can envision a healthier, more peaceful, and prosperous future in harmony with Mother Nature, let's all thank her for showing us the one and only path that can definitely ensure our grandchildren will thrive.

#### OSW cost drops are inevitable, but the US market is frozen because it lacks clarity- the plan breaks the impasse by lowering risk and creating certainty

Navigant Group 12

[private market consulting group awarded DOE grant for preparing an analysis on OSW manufacturing and supply chains in the US, Dec 12, 2012, accessed from:

<http://www.thebioenergysite.com/articles/1349/us-offshore-wind-manufacturing-and-supply-chain-development> //wyo-tjc]

The supply chain is evolving in a number of areas. Larger rotors allow for increased energy capture and production. Next-generation drivetrains will result in increasing turbine efficiency and reliability. Offshore wind towers in the future may employ concrete, composites, or other alternative materials to help combat corrosion and reduce steel content while simultaneously enabling taller hub heights. Shifting to High-Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) interconnection lines will reduce electrical losses, and higher voltage array cabling and larger turbines will allow for project layouts that minimize array cabling needs. Such advancements will help to reverse the recent trend of increasing offshore wind power prices, which are driven largely by a movement toward deeper-water sites located farther offshore; increased siting complexity; and higher contingency reserves that result from greater uncertainty when working in the offshore environment. As the industry matures and uncertainties are reduced, both capital costs and the levelized cost of electricity (LCOE) from offshore wind facilities are expected to plateau and trend downward. The potential exists for significant domestic supply of a future US offshore wind market. A lack of current US offshore demand means no domestic manufacturing facilities are currently serving the offshore wind market. However, strong domestic supply capacity for the US land-based wind market suggests that potential also exists to supply significant portions of the future offshore market domestically. The magnitude of US-based offshore wind manufacturing capacity will depend on turbine suppliers perceiving stable, long-term policy support and subsequent demand for offshore wind in the US market. Three major barriers combine to have a dampening effect on the development of the US offshore wind supply chain: the high cost of offshore wind energy; infrastructure challenges such as transmission and purpose-built ports and vessels; and regulatory challenges such as new and uncertain leasing and permitting processes. The result is that European and Asian suppliers who are currently supplying offshore wind turbines and components have a competitive advantage over their US counterparts. The US offshore wind industry faces a “chicken-and-egg” problem where plants will not be built unless the cost is reduced, and local factories (which will help bring down the cost) will not be built until there is a proven domestic market. In deciding whether to enter the US offshore wind market, potential suppliers will assess the supply and demand dynamics. Suppliers will assess whether the market will be large enough to warrant dedicating manufacturing capacity to offshore wind-related products. European-based suppliers will use demand forecasts to determine whether it is financially attractive to build manufacturing plants in the US On the supply side, potential suppliers will assess the competitive rivalry, the barriers to entry, and the risk for each component. Market entry will be more attractive with higher fragmentation, lower barriers to entry, and lower overall risk.