### 1st Off

#### The 50 states, Washington D.C., and relevant territories should offer to provide for all costs of the development of wind projects.

#### State financial incentives solve – generate federal and private investment

EPA, “State Planning and Incentive Structure” In EPA’s, Clean Energy-Environment Guide to Action, April 2006.

States are achieving significant energy and cost sav­ ings through well-designed, targeted funding and incentives for clean energy technologies and services. Key types of financial incentives programs states offer include: • Loans • Tax incentives • Grants, buy-downs, and generation incentives • Nitrogen oxide (NOx) set-asides • Energy performance contracting • Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) States have achieved additional savings by coordinat­ ing financial incentives with other state programs and by leveraging utility-based clean energy programs. Over the past three decades, states have diversified their programs from grants or loans into a broader set of programs targeted at specific markets and customer groups. This diversification has led to port­ folios of programs with greater sectoral coverage, a wider array of partnerships with businesses and com­ munity groups, and an overall reduced risk associated with programmatic investments in energy efficiency and clean supply options. Objective State-provided funding and incentives meet the public purpose objectives of supporting technolo­ gies and products that are new to the market and encouraging and stimulating private sector invest­ ment. Funding and incentives can also reduce mar­ ket barriers by subsidizing higher “first costs,” increasing consumer awareness (the programs are often accompanied by education campaigns and the active promotion of products to help achieve a state’s energy efficiency goals), and encourage or “jump-start” private sector investment. Benefits States provide funding and incentives through a combination of sources (i.e., state and federal funds, utility programs, and ratepayers), to support a broad range of cost-effective clean energy tech­ nologies, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, and combined heat and power (CHP). State funding and incentive programs, some of which are self-sustaining (e.g., revolving loan funds), deliver energy and cost savings for governments, business­ es, and consumers. Program results vary depending on the configuration of funding and incentives used by each state. In Texas, the revolving loan fund has resulted in $152 million in savings since 1989 on an investment of $123 million (DOE 2005). In Oregon, more than 12,000 tax credits worth $243 million have been issued since 1980, which save or generate energy worth about $215 million per year (Oregon DOE 2005b). Providing funding and incentives for clean energy can offer the following environmental, energy, and economic benefits: • Reduces energy costs by supporting cost-effective energy efficiency improvements and onsite gener­ ation projects. • Ensures that clean energy is delivered, specifies which technologies are used, and offers incentives to install technologies. Providing funding and incentives also accelerates the adoption of clean energy technologies by improving the project eco­ nomics and offsets market, institutional, or regula­ tory barriers until those barriers can be removed. • Establishes a clean energy technology or project development infrastructure to continue stimulat­ ing the market after the incentives are no longer in effect. • Leverages federal incentives and stimulates private sector investment by further improving the eco­ nomic attractiveness of clean energy. A small investment may lead to broad support and adop­ tion of a clean energy technology or process. • Stimulates clean energy businesses and job cre­ ation within the state. • Supports environmental protection objectives, such as improving air quality.

### 2nd Off

#### Compromise now but Obama’s pc is key

WSJ Jan. 3rd

[Potomac Watch, the Wall Street Journal, January 3rd, 2013, Strassel: The Debt-Ceiling Fight Will Be Dirty, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323374504578218751518184568.html>, uwyo//amp]

Only the GOP can answer these questions, but the point here is that Republicans had better have answered them—and clearly—before they step into the ring. The president has every intention of playing them exactly as he did in the cliff, and in 2011. Mr. Obama will lay out tax-hike demands, give no quarter on spending, not waver and, as the deadline approaches, use his bully pulpit and the media to cow the GOP into the sort of wrangling that led to this week's defeat. If the Republican strategy isn't crystal clear, if the party is again fractured, then Round Two is already Mr. Obama's. So once again: What, exactly, is the GOP prepared to do?

#### Obama’s leverage is key to new fights over debt ceiling and sequestration

Star Ledger, “Obama's legacy trap”, 1/1/2013. http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_legacy\_trap.html

President Barack Obama hopes -- expects, really -- that '13 will be his lucky number, a year to cement his historical legacy and reap the benefits of an economy on the cusp of real revival.¶ That expectation, as much as anything, explains how Obama approached the fiscal cliff and why he opted for compromise over confrontation. The president, eyes fixed on history, always viewed the fight as an obstacle, not a destination, a thing to be gotten past on his way to breaking the historical pattern of weak, scandal-scarred and anticlimactic second-term presidencies.¶ But the endless battle over the budget -- new fights over the debt ceiling and automatic spending cuts loom in a matter of weeks -- could become a legacy trap for Obama, robbing him of precious leverage to redefine his relationship with Republicans on terms more favorable to an ambitious second-term agenda, scholars of the presidency say.¶ "People don't queue up in lines to see the pens for a budget deal under glass, or 'Hey, I just cut this deal with Boehner,'" says presidential historian Douglas Brinkley.¶ "Presidents are remembered for the big things. FDR did Social Security. Truman created the CIA. There's Eisenhower and the highway system. Kennedy and the moon," Brinkley added. "So, it's going to be Obama and what? Obamacare, that's the big one, and killing Bin Laden. There's room for one more big item. What will it be? Immigration? Climate change? It won't be deficits or the fiscal cliff."¶ The White House is casting the potential fiscal deal as a major victory because it forces Republicans to turn their backs on a two-decade policy of opposing all tax increases, even those on the wealthiest Americans, which is a "big win," in the words of one West Wing adviser.¶ For his part, Obama said Monday, "If we're going to be serious about deficit reduction and debt reduction, then it's going to have to be a matter of shared sacrifice -- at least as long as I'm president. And I'm going to be president for the next four years, I think..." he said with a widening smile on Monday.¶ The challenge for a president unusually attuned to his place in history is how to manage fights like the cliff without being diverted by them, and how to suppress the GOP challenge without it becoming a major drain of his time, popular good will and power.¶ "The question is whether he's willing to use the leverage he has to get a better deal. He has a chance to make history here," said Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, reflecting the mixed emotions of many nervous progressives watching the cliff talks from the sidelines. "Standing up to them would not only be a gift to the country, but a big part of his legacy."¶ One staffer for a senior Senate Democrat, summing up the view of several other aides interviewed by POLITICO, called the potential deal a "cave," and warned that Obama's Monday afternoon campaign-style event ahead of the final deal was a "Leon Lett moment" -- a reference to the Dallas Cowboys lineman who fumbled the ball while celebrating a touchdown short of the goal line.¶ But Obama and his staff believe Americans would have blamed him for taking the country over the cliff, and they emphasize his refusal to negotiate over the looming debt ceiling in a couple of months. Nonetheless, even the president concedes that the smaller cliff deal, while possibly postponing bigger battles, prolongs a fight Obama had hoped to move quickly past.¶ Even if he were to become bogged down, Obama's place in history is already assured. He is the nation's first black president, a controversial Beltway neophyte who managed to ram through landmark health reform (the future of which future remains opaque), an incumbent who won a fresh term despite a sour economy, a commander in chief who ended two unwanted wars -- all the while tallying unprecedented national debt and deficits.

#### Wind incentives sap capital – republican opposition, fossil fuel interests, and Solyndra scandal

NYT, New York Times, “End of Clean Energy Subsidies?” May 5, 2012

The federal government has given generously to the clean energy industry over the last few years, funneling billions of dollars in grants, loans and tax breaks to renewable power sources like wind and solar, biofuels and electric vehicles. “Clean tech” has been good in return. ¶ During the recession, it was one of the few sectors to add jobs. Costs of wind turbines and solar cells have fallen over the last five years, electricity from renewables has more than doubled, construction is under way on the country’s first new nuclear power plant in decades. And the United States remains an important player in the global clean energy market. ¶ Yet this productive relationship is in peril, mainly because federal funding is about to drop off a cliff and the Republican wrecking crew in the House remains generally hostile to programs that threaten the hegemony of the oil and gas interests. The clean energy incentives provided by President Obama’s 2009 stimulus bill are coming to an end, while other longer-standing subsidies are expiring. ¶ If nothing changes, clean energy funding will drop from a peak of $44.3 billion in 2009 to $16 billion this year and $11 billion in 2014 — a 75 percent decline. ¶ This alarming news is contained in a new report from experts at the Brookings Institution, the World Resources Institute and the Breakthrough Institute. It is a timely effort to attach real numbers to an increasingly politicized debate over energy subsidies. While Mr. Obama is busily defending subsidies, the Republicans have used the costly market failure of one solar panel company, Solyndra, to indict the entire federal effort to encourage nascent technologies.

#### Sequestration kills aerospace – threat of cuts stifles investment essential to the industry.

Kristen Leigh Painter, Denver Post, “Sequestration deal delayed, leaving Colorado aerospace industry up in air”, 1/4/2013

The budget agreement passed by the U.S. Congress and supported by President Barack Obama to avert the "fiscal cliff" provides tax-rate clarity for individual Americans, yet failed to find a solution to the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration — leaving Colorado's large aerospace industry in limbo.¶ Congress pushed back the deadline to March 1 from the Jan. 1 deadline set in place by the Budget Control Act of 2011. This is neither good news nor bad for an industry facing huge cuts should Congress default on a decision.¶ "The plan did add some certainty to citizens, but nothing to industry," said Fred Doyle, vice president and group leader of defense and intelligence at Ball Aerospace & Technologies in Boulder. "If we had clarity on sequestration, we would be hiring more people to meet the demands of our customers."¶ Aerospace leaders applauded Washington's agreement for coming to some semblance of a tax compromise and for temporarily preventing the sequester from occurring. However, they are now pleading for a comprehensive solution that allows certainty for their industry as well.¶ "Until sequestration is permanently eliminated, there will be an overhang on our industry that stifles investment in plant, equipment, people, and future research and development essential to the future health of our industry," said Lockheed Martin in a statement to The Denver Post.¶ Defense Secretary Leon Panetta released a statement regarding the sequestration delay on Wednesday. He began by thanking Congress and the Obama administration for stalling the cuts, but then turned around to warn those same leaders that they "cannot continue to just kick the can down the road."¶ "Congress has prevented the worst possible outcome by delaying sequestration for two months," Panetta said in a news release. "Unfortunately, the cloud of sequestration remains."¶ That cloud includes hiring freezes or slowdowns, budget-planning uncertainty and stalled growth.¶ "As nimble as companies like to be, it is still difficult for them to plan in a federal environment that is not taking a long-term view," said Patty Silverstein, an economist at Colorado-based Development Research Partners.¶ Vicky Lea, aviation and aerospace industry manager at Denver Metro Economic Development Corp., points out that a lack of long-term planning is especially challenging for aerospace businesses that, by nature, must operate on longer planning cycles to accommodate research and development.¶ "From Colorado's perspective, the impacts of sequestration will be on both Department of Defense and non-Department of Defense, and it will be felt across our three pillars of aerospace — civil, commercial and military space," Lea said.¶ Even without sequestration — which would cut $500 billion from the defense budget over the next 10 years — the department has already been ironing out $487 billion in spending reductions.¶ "This department is doing its part to help the country address its deficit problem," Panetta said. "The specter of sequestration has cast a shadow over our efforts."

#### Aerospace industry is key to space exploration

**Thompson 9** (David, President – American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, 12-10, Lexis)

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth.

#### Next, we have to go to space now – famine, scarcity, wars, and ultimate extinction are inevitable. only moving off the rock while we still have the resources prevents our demise and guarantees a peaceful, sustainable life on earth and across the galaxy

Engdahl 2003

[Sylvia, “Space and Human Survival: My Views on the Importance of Colonizing Space,” November 3, 2003, www.sylviaengdahl.com/space/survival.htm//tjc]

A more urgent cause for concern is the need not to “put all our eggs in one basket,” in case the worst happens and we blow up our own planet, or make it uninhabitable by means of nuclear disaster or perhaps biological warfare. We would all like to believe this won’t happen, yet some people are seriously afraid that it will—it’s hardly an irrational fear. Peace with Russia may have drawn attention from it, yet there are other potential troublemakers, even terrorists; the nuclear peril is not mere history. Furthermore, there is the small but all-too-real possibility that Earth might be struck by an asteroid. We all hope and believe our homes won’t burn down, and yet we buy fire insurance. Does not our species as a whole need an insurance policy?¶ Even Carl Sagan, a long-time opponent of using manned spacecraft where robots can serve, came out in support of space colonization near the end of his life, for this reason; see his book Pale Blue Dot. And in an interview with Britain’s newspaper Daily Telegraph, eminent cosmologist Stephen Hawking said, “I don’t think that the human race will survive the next thousand years unless we spread into space. There are too many accidents that can befall life on a single planet.” Hawking is more worried about the possibility of our creating a virus that destroys us than about nuclear disaster. However, he said, “I’m an optimist. We will reach out to the stars.” (For the full article, see the link section below.)¶ My novel The Far Side of Evil (Atheneum, 1971; updated version Walker, 2003) is based on the concept of a “Critical Stage” during which a species has the technology to expand into space, but hasn’t yet implemented it, and in which that same level of technology enables it to wipe itself out. The premise of the book is that each world will do one or the other, but not both. I have believed this since the early 50s, when there was real danger of nuclear war but no sign of space travel. When the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, my reaction was overwhelming joy and relief, because I thought that at last our energies were going to be turned toward space exploration. I felt that way through the era of Apollo. Since Apollo, as public support of the space program has waned, my fears have grown again; because I don’t believe that a world turned in on itself can remain peaceful. A progressive species like ours has a built-in drive to move forward, and that energy has to go somewhere. Historically, when it was not going into mere survival or into the exploration and settlement of new lands—which is the adaptive reason for such a drive—it has gone into war.¶ This is the price we pay for our innate progressiveness. I know that it is now fashionable to deride the concept of progress, and certainly we cannot say that progress is inevitable. It surely doesn’t characterize all change in all areas of human endeavor. Nevertheless, overall, the human race as a whole advances; if it did not we would still be cavemen. This is what distinguishes our species from all others. And like it or not, this drive is inseparable from the drive toward growth and expansion. Many successful species colonize new ecological niches; this is one of the fundamental features of evolution. When a species can’t find a new niche, and the resources of the old one are no longer sufficient, it dies out. If the resources do remain sufficient, it lives, but is unchanging from era to era. There are no cases in biology of progressive evolution unaccompanied by expansion. ¶ Colonies or Settlements?¶ The question of resources raises an even more crucial reason for expansion into space than the danger of Earth’s destruction. It’s obvious that this planet cannot support an expanding population forever. Most people who recognize this fact advocate population control to the extent of “zero population growth.” I do not; I believe it would be fatal not only for the reason explained above, but because if it could be achieved it would result in stagnation. I do not want a world in which there can be no growth; growth leads to intellectual and artistic progress as well as to material survival. Furthermore, I do not believe it could be achieved. The built-in desire for personal descendants is too strong; that is why our species has survived this long, why it has spread throughout the entire world. Moreover, the biological response to threatened survival is to speed up reproduction, as we can see by the number of starving children in the world. If we tried to suppress population growth completely, we would have either immediate violent upheaval or a period of dictatorship followed by bloody revolution. Ultimately, we ¶ starving children in the world. If we tried to suppress population growth completely, we would have either immediate violent upheaval or a period of dictatorship followed by bloody revolution. Ultimately, we ¶ would reduce the population all right; we would decimate it. That may be “survival” but it’s surely not the future we want.¶ We do not want even the present restriction on resources. Currently, some nations live well while others are deprived, and it’s asserted that even those with the best access to resources should stop using them up—the underdeveloped nations, under this philosophy, are not given the hope of a standard of living commensurate with the level our species has achieved. Will the Third World tolerate such a situation forever? I surely wouldn’t blame them for not wanting to. And neither do I want the rest of the world reduced to a lower level of technology. Even if I had no other objection to such a trend, the plain fact is that a low level of technology cannot support the same size population as a high level; so if you want to cut back on technology, you have to either kill people outright or let them starve. And you certainly can’t do anything toward extending the length of the human lifespan. This is the inevitable result of planning based on a single-planet environment.¶ If there is pessimism in Earthbound science fiction (which its most outstanding characteristic), these truths are the source of it. I have not seen any that denies any of them; pop-culture SF reveals that what people grasp mythopoeically about such a future involves catastrophic war, cut-throat human relationships in overcrowded cities, and a general trend toward dehumanization. Apart from the major films with which my course dealt (e.g. Bladerunner), Soylent Green postulates cannibalism and Logan’s Run is based on the premise that everybody is required to die at the age of 30. The destruction of the world’s ecology is a basic assumption—which is natural, since in a contest between a stable biosphere and personal survival, humans will either prevail or they will die.¶ Myths showing these things are indeed part of the response to a new perception of our environment: the perception that as far as Earth is concerned, it is limited. A basic premise of my course was that all myth is a response of a culture to the environment in which it perceives itself to exist.] But at the rational level, people do not want to face them. They tell themselves that if we do our best to conserve resources and give up a lot of the modern conveniences that enable us to spend time expanding our minds, we can avoid such a fate—as indeed we can, for a while. But not forever. And most significantly, not for long enough to establish space settlements, if we don’t start soon enough. Space humanization is not something that can be achieved overnight.¶ I have called this stage in our evolution the “Critical Stage.” Paul Levinson [the Director of Connected Education] uses different terminology for the same concept. He says that we have only a narrow window to get into space, a relatively short time during which we have the capability, but have not yet run out of the resources to do it. I agree with him completely about this. Expansion into space demands high technology and full utilization of our world’s material resources (although not destructive utilization). It also demands financial resources that we will not have if we deplete the material resources of Earth. And it demands human resources, which we will lose if we are reduced to global war or widespread starvation. Finally, it demands spiritual resources, which we are not likely to retain under the sort of dictatorship that would be necessary to maintain a “sustainable” global civilization.¶ Because the window is narrow, then, we not only have to worry about immediate perils. The ultimate, unavoidable danger for our planet, the transformation of our sun, is distant—but ¶ if we don’t expand into space now, we can never do it. Even if I’m wrong and we survive stagnation, it will be too late to escape from this solar system, much less to explore for the sake of exploring.¶ I realize that what I’ve been saying here doesn’t sound like my usual optimism. But the reason it doesn’t, I think, is that most people don’t understand what’s meant by “space humanization.” Some of you are probably thinking that space travel isn’t going to be a big help with these problems, as indeed, the form of it shown in today’s mythology would not. Almost certainly, you’re thinking that it won’t solve the other problems of Earth, and I fear you may be thinking that the other problems should be solved first.¶ One big reason why they should not is the “narrow window” concept. The other is that they could not. I have explained why I believe the problem of war can’t be solved without expansion. The problem of hunger is, or ultimately will be, the direct result of our planet’s limited resources; though it could be solved for the near-term by political reforms, we are not likely to see such reforms while nations are playing a “ zero-sum game” with what resources Earth still has. Widespread poverty, when not politically based, is caused by insufficient access to high technology and by the fact that there aren’t enough resources to go around (if you doubt this, compare the amount of poverty here with the amount in the Third World, and the amount on the Western frontier with the amount in our modern cities). Non-contagious disease, such as cancer, is at least partially the result of stress; and while expansion won’t eliminate stress, overcrowding certainly increases it. The problem of atmospheric pollution is the result of trying to contain the industry necessary to maintain our technology within the biosphere instead of moving it into orbit where it belongs.¶ In short, all the worldwide problems we want to solve, and feel we should have solved, are related to the fact that we’ve outgrown the ecological niche we presently occupy. I view them not as pathologies, but as natural indicators of our evolutionary stage. I would like to believe that they’ll prove spurs to expansion. If they don’t, we’ll be one of evolution’s failures.

### 3rd Off

#### First the link, BUTLERS OBSTINANT AND INTENTIONAL IGNORANCE OF THE MATERIAL CONDITIONS THAT UNDERPIN THE WAR ON TERROR MEANS THEY DON’T SOLVE AND MAKE THE PROBLEM WORSE

Paul **Smith**, Instructor, Cultural Studies Doctoral Program, George Mason Unversity, “Precarious Politics,” SYMPLOKE 12: 1-2, 20**04**, pp. 254-260, Project Muse.

The nub of all this comes early in the book, when Butler proposes to consider "the conditions under which certain human lives are more vulnerable than others, and thus certain human lives more grievable than others" (30).Thus, she asks why it is that Americans cannot grieve the Muslim dead in the post 9/11 conflicts. The absence of the Muslim dead from the news and the obituaries is immediately aligned with the struggles of "sexual minorities . . . transgendered people . . . intersexed people . . . [the] physically challenged" and racial minorities, all of whom struggle with the social imposition of parameters of the human, with normative values and "culturally viable notions of the human" (35). This sweeping homology is driven home by reference to "the queer lives that vanished on September 11," who went unrecognized in the obituaries and whose relatives were "belatedly and selectively . . . made eligible for benefits" (35). This rather breathtaking alignment has perhaps the opposite effect to that intended. Here and elsewhere Butler is at pains to say that she's not calling for simply some warm and fuzzy inclusion of excluded subjective into the faulty normative schemes that she sees all around her. Instead, she is calling for what she calls "an insurrection at the level of ontology" (33). (If that's to be the new slogan of radicalism, Bush, Ashcroft, Rumsfeld and their ilk probably aren't going to be losing a lot of sleep!) But rather than offering ways to reconceive relational subjectivity, or even simply highlighting the specific struggles of different subjects, Butler in effect produces nothing more than some rough equivalency amongst all those who somehow don't fit neatly into the "culturally [End Page 256]viable notions of the human." To conceive of such an equivalency you have to do a lot of stripping away of materiality and you have to be virtually impervious to levels of specificity. At best, what Butler is pointing to here is a purely discursive or ideological homology, and it turns out to be a very incomplete homology even in its own terms. That is, there's something analytically wrong when Butler's highlighting of the "vanished lives" from the WTC can't include the laborers, janitors, food workers, homeless people and undocumented immigrants who died there, and whose struggles for recognition were not just about their access to "culturally viable notions of humanity" but equally about their economic value. In mostly unpublicized struggles to gain compensation and benefits, the relatives of many of these people, as well as attack survivors themselves, confronted the simple fact that their lives were simply not valued. The struggles of many of these people continue, three years after the attacks. These kinds of people don't appear in Butler's pantheon of victims—and nor do her victims themselves appear as labor, or as subjects whose identity is in any way at all constituted by their relation to capitalism (even though this might well be why they were attacked, as representatives of a predatory capitalist imperium). This elision, executed during Butler's cheerleading for the principles of inculsivity and relationality, is more than simply symptomatic of Butler's approach; it is a reminder of the weakness of any consideration of identity that cannot or will not entertain the historical and material conditions under which such identities are formed. In the end, what divides and differentiates subjects is not some factitious, contingent and unsatisfactory use of the category "human;" rather more it is the continual and relentless depredations of capital. So it's not really "conditions" that Butler investigates in this book; she isn't asking about American imperialism, or media power, or any of the material factors that inflect contemporary ideologies. Rather, she is simply pointing to some of the discursive structures and attitudinal habits that express those conditions.

#### THE DETERMINISM OF CAPITAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTRUMENTALIZATION OF ALL LIFE—IT IS THIS LOGIC THAT MOBILIZES AND ALLOWS FOR THE 1AC’S SCENARIOS IN THE FIRST PLACE

DYER-WITHERFORD (professor of Library and Info. Sciences at the U of Western Ontario) 1999
[Nick. Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism.]

For capitalism, the use of machines as organs of “will over nature” is an imperative. The great insight of the Frankfurt School—an insight subsequently improved and amplified by feminists and ecologists—was that capital’s dual project of dominating both humanity and nature was intimately tied to the cultivation of “instrumental reason” that systematically objectifies, reduces, quantifies and fragments the world for the purposes of technological control. Business’s systemic need to cheapen labor, cut the costs of raw materials, and expand consumer markets gives it an inherent bias toward the piling-up of technological power. This priority—enshrined in phrases such as “progress,” “efficiency,” “productivity,” “modernization,” and “growth”—assumes an automatism that is used to override any objection or alternative, regardless of the environmental and social consequences. Today, we witness global vistas of toxification, deforestation, desertification, dying oceans, disappearing ozone layers, and disintegrating immune systems, all interacting in ways that perhaps threaten the very existence of humanity and are undeniably inflicting social collapse, disease, and immiseration across the planet. The degree to which this project of mastery has backfired is all too obvious.

#### Vote Negative to validate and adopt the method of structural/historical criticism that is the 1NC.

#### THIS IS NOT THE ALTERNATIVE, BUT IN TRUTH THE ONLY OPTION— METHOD IS THE FOREMOST POLITICAL QUESTION BECAUSE ONE MUST UNDERSTAND THE EXISTING SOCIAL TOTALITY BEFORE ONE CAN ACT ON IT—GROUNDING THE SITES OF POLITICAL CONTESTATION OR KNOWLEDGE OUTSIDE OF LABOR AND SURPLUS VALUE MERELY SERVE TO HUMANIZE CAPITAL AND PREVENT A TRANSITION TO A SOCIETY BEYOND OPPRESSION

TUMINO (Prof. English @ Pitt) 2001

[Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online //wyo-tjc]

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.

### 4th Off

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should offer to provide for all costs of the development of community-owned wind projects.

#### The plan is blind to inequalities created in energy production- the offer will be snatched up by large energy corporations to entrench their control

Farrell 11

[John, directs the Energy Self-Reliant States and Communities program at the Institute for Local Self-Reliance, “Democratizing the Electricity System: A Vision for the 21st Century Grid”, June, p. <http://atcscam.homestead.com/democratizing-electricity-system.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

While technology has helped change the economics of electricity production (in favor of renewables and distributed generation), this new dynamic can as easily be controlled by the incumbent utilities as the old paradigm of centralized fossil fuel power generation. The cornerstone of the distributed generation revolution is its potential democratizing influence on the electric grid, the opportunity unlocked for local ownership and the coincident political support for more renewable energy. In no place is that clearer than in the public support for renewable energy. An increasing number of renewable energy projects (primarily wind, but also large-scale solar) have met with resistance from local residents or environmentalists. Centralized, remote generation might seem to avoid NIMBY issues by placing wind turbines or solar power plants far from population centers; but in practice, there have been opponents to these projects as well. Large power plants raise questions about environmental impact from creature habitat to water consumption. Power from distant plants must be transmitted over high-voltage transmission lines to get to load centers without significant losses, and such lines are built only at great ratepayer expense, over many years, and with the taking of land with eminent domain. Some folks just hate the look of power plants, regardless of their sustainable nature. Resistance has been organized enough to win restrictive state siting policies (e.g. wind policy in Wisconsin) or to coordinate environmental advocacy organizations to oppose solar power plants on undeveloped desert lands. In some cases, resistance takes on the strange aspect of “wind turbine syndrome,” or other mysterious illnesses. At the heart of the matter, citizens rightly see renewable energy as different, and find it frustrating to see new, widely available resources like sun and wind developed under the old, centralized paradigm and owned by the usual suspects. In a recent study by the ever-methodical Europeans, they found that opponents to new wind and solar power have two key desires: “people want to avoid environmental and personal harm” and they also want to “share in the economic benefits of their local renewable energy resources.”32 It’s not that people are made physically ill by new renewable energy projects. Rather, they are sick and tired of seeing the economic benefits of their local wind and sun leaving their community. Such opposition is perfectly rational, since investments in renewable energy can be quite lucrative (private developers and their equity partners routinely seek 10% return on investment or higher). And the economic benefits of local ownership far outweigh the economic colonialism of absentee owners profiting from local renewable energy resources. Additionally, when projects are absentee owned, local residents see little to no economic advantage to offset their concerns about health or the environment. It’s not just centralized renewable energy projects facing opposition; distributed generation (DG) can also face resistance. While DG projects are of a more modest scale than centralized power generation, they also reside closer to actual electricity demand; thus, they are closer to population centers. For solar, this is largely a non-issue, because it can be easily installed on rooftops or other existing structures. Similarly, other technologies like geothermal or even natural gas generate little hostility from locals. On the other hand, for wind power there’s little distinction between a 30 MW and 300 MW project, because all the turbines are the same size. A distributed wind project will place very large turbines close to population centers and wind projects of all sizes have met with stiffer resistance. For both centralized and distributed generation, local ownership becomes the key to unlocking local support. For example, the following chart illustrates the local support for wind power in two German towns, Nossen and Zschadraß. With local ownership of the wind project, 45% of residents had a positive view toward more wind energy (Zschadraß). In the town with an absentee-owned project (Nossen), only 16% of residents had a positive view of expanding wind power; a majority had a negative view. By unlocking economic opportunity, distributed generation and local ownership of renewable energy create a positive feedback loop for more investment in renewable energy.

#### This form of corporate colonization turns the aff- makes effective politics impossible and dooms us to ecological and social extinction

O'Leary 08

(Brian, former astronaut, Cornell professor, physics faculty member at Princeton University and visiting faculty member in technology assessment at the University of California Berkeley School of Law, Mo Udall's energy advisor and speechwriter during his 1975 Presidential campaign, author, AAAS Fellow, World Innovation Foundation Fellow, NASA group achievement award recipient, and founder of the New Energy Movement, The Energy Solution Revolution, Chapter 1. “Pigs Can Fly!” October 1, 2008, Pg 18//wyo-mm)

My pessimism is well-founded, because the prospect for an energy solution revolution has been suppressed at every turn by powerful vested interests. The media again passes while mainstream scientists wallow in denial for fear of ridicule ("if it isn't reported or properly vetted by vested money and intellectual interests, it isn't real"). The result is an unwitting alliance between establishment scientists and the corrupting energy barons and their governmental and media mouthpieces. Meanwhile, we continue to be addicted to oil, so much so we don't seem to know a good thing when it comes along. Yet, most of us know, at least at some level, that we need to transform this addiction to chain-smoking our oil and coal and move on to alternatives before it's too late. We must lift the contradictory veil of credibility. From ten years' direct experience at witnessing new energy breakthroughs in laboratories around the world, I can personally vouch for the successes in solution energy research, whether it be cold fusion, advanced hydrogen chemistry or vacuum energy. But, like during the Wrights' first flights, we are not delivering the product yet. We are in the research phase of a research and development cycle. The research, if properly supported, will inevitably lead to the deployment of energy systems that will profoundly change the world. Why can't we perceive the truth hidden beneath the conundrum of credibility? It seems that credibility is simply a fantasy created by media, academe, politicians and corporate interests. In this game of smoke and mirrors, style has usurped substance, moreso than ever in these trying times. Hidden under the radar of the mass culture, we are missing out on concrete solutions, with the truth lying not so far below, but actively suppressed by current powers, who see such developments either as impossible or as a threat to an economy based mostly on polluting, destabilizing and unsustainable energy resources. Politicians rarely see beyond the next elections and corporations rarely see beyond their next earnings report. I am convinced we could have a comprehensive energy policy leading to near-zero emissions by 2020. The research is mature enough to set this goal, just as JFK had done for the Apollo lunar missions. I am also convinced that a publicly funded R&D effort of some hundreds of millions of dollars will catapult us into a sustainable future with many energy choices. On the other hand, we can maintain our cultural "credibility" by doing nothing. Meanwhile the research goes on in scattered locations by inventors in government labs, universities or on their own, with little or no support or acknowledgement from the government or the scientific mainstream. In my opinion, the development phase needs to become transparent and public. It is too important to be left to existing powers whose economic self-interest is suppressing solution energy at every turn. Yet we may need it to avert global disaster from pollution, climate change, prolonged blackouts, and wars over oil.

### Case

#### Wind turbines unreliable: susceptible to fatigue, inevitably experiences failure of vital components and decrease in performance.

Leary et al 12

(J., A. While and R. Howell, Leary and Howell work at E-Futures DTC, attended University of Sheffield, UK, Department of Mechanical Engineering, While works at E-Futures DTC, The University of Sheffield, UK and Department of Town and Regional Planning, Energy Policy, “Locally manufactured windpower technology for sustainable rural electrification,” April 2012, Science Direct//wyo-mm)

The natural variations in wind speed cause windpower systems to experience variable cyclic loads that make them particularly susceptible to the effects of fatigue. This leads to the inevitable decrease in performance and eventual failure of vital components that put the system out of action until a repair can be made. Simple, robust design and the following of proper operation and maintenance procedures can increase technological reliability.

#### Without making predictions you for-close on the possibility of solving warming

Mazo, 10 [Jeffrey Mazo, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 29], accessed 10/19/12,WYO/JF

The inherent uncertainty of climate projections is of a part with a more general problem of uncertainty in strategic planning, and defense planning in particular. On the one hand, the future is impossible to predict; on the other, without some guidance as to what is likely to happen planning becomes impossible too. There is always a temptation to rely on quantitative models for such guidance, on the principle that, although undoubtedly inaccurate in detail, they are better than nothing. But this may not be the case, if they draw attention to the wrong places. Rather than focus on particular cases, planners need to expect the unexpected, and focus on an increasing range of variability rather than simply the direction of the underlying trend**.** Militaries are particularly good at planning for such wide variability; although it is easy to point to specific failures for organizational or personality-related reasons, successes are often invisible.17

**Focusing on epistemology or ontology selfishly ignores real world problems**

**Jarvis, 2K** – Prof Philosophy @ U South Carolina (Darryl, Studies in International Relations, “International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism”, pg. 2)

While Hoffmann might well be correct, **these days one can neither begin nor conclude empirical research without first discussing epistemological orientations and ontological assumptions. Like a vortex, metatheory has engulfed us all and the question of "theory" which was once used as a guide to research is now the object of research.** Indeed, for a discipline whose purview is ostensibly outward looldng and international in scope, **and at a time of ever encroaching globalization and transnationalism, International Relations has become increasingly provincial and inward looking**. **Rather than grapple with the numerous issues that confront peoples** around the world, since the early 1980s the discipline has tended more and more toward obsessive self-examination.3 **These days the politics of famine, environmental degradation, underdevelopment, or ethnic cleansing**, let alone the cartographic machinations in Eastern Europe and the reconfiguration of the geo-global political-economy, **seem scarcely to concern theorists of international politics who define the urgent task of our time to be one of metaphysical reflection and epistemological investigation**. **Arguably, theory is no longer concerned with the study of international relations so much as the "manner in which international relations as a discipline, and international relations as a subject matter, have been constructed."4** To be concerned with the latter is to be "on the cutting edge," where novelty has itself become "an appropriate form of scholarship."5

#### prevent the Other from dying FIRST, only THEN can we consider questions of value to life

Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### Governments have ethical obligations to promote the welfare of everyone – even if they win their ethics framework preventing our disad impact is still an ethical imperative

Tim Stelzig, Attorney Advisor in the Competition Policy Division of the FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau, former associate with Arnold & Porter in Washington, D.C., JD from the University of Pennsylvania Law School, March 1998, University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 146 U. Pa. L. Rev. 901, p. 959

Libertarians have argued that such a state violates deontological norms, that governmental intervention going beyond what is minimally necessary to preserve social order is not justified. Deontology does not require such a timid state and, moreover, finds desirable a state which promotes the general welfare to the fullest extent possible, even if in so doing it acts in ways deontologically objectionable for anyone other than one filling the government's unique role in society. More specifically, I argued that the government must consequentially justify its policy choices. The elegance of this particular rationale for the contours of permissible governmental action is that it remains a deontological justification at base. One of the worries of full-blown consequentialism is that it requires too much, that any putative right may be set aside if doing so would produce greater good. The justification offered here does not suffer that flaw. The distributive exemption does not permit that any one be sacrificed for the betterment of others; rather, it only permits a redistribution of inevitable harms, a diversion of an existing threatened harm to many such that it results in harm to fewer individuals. The result of this application of the distributive exemption is a government that fundamentally seeks to promote to the fullest extent possible the welfare of all; a government that respects the rights of its citizens; and a government that realizes that its own intervention can have consequences counterproductive to the state's fundamental goal of general welfare that should be avoided for that reason. Such a state is a worthy totem, and accords with our most cherished principles molded through centuries of grappling with difficult legal and moral issues. Deontological premises have justified a plausible and attractive version of the liberal state in which consequential justification predominates, but rights are not neglected. This conclusion should be both surprising and reassuring to the deontologist - surprising because deontology and consequentialism are typically understood to be in opposition, and reassuring because most people's intuitions that the state is permitted to reason consequentially are firmly entrenched. To the degree that deontology could not account for these intuitions, deontology would be that much less credible.

#### THEIR ETHICS ARE INCOMPLETE—MOURNING CAN ALSO FUEL THE –ISMS THEY SEEK TO ADDRESS

Robin May **Schott**, PhD & Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, Education, and Rhetoric, University of Copenhagen, “Politics and the Art of Mourning,” December 20, 20**04**. Available from the World Wide Web at:: [www.kvinfo.dk/side/563/article/297/](http://www.kvinfo.dk/side/563/article/297/), accessed 9/30/06.

Third, what does it mean to make something politically out of grief? Butler notes, "it is not that mourning is the goal of politics, but that without the capacity to mourn, we lose that keener sense of life we need in order to oppose violence". She is right that loss and mourning are inevitably part of life. The emphasis on loss, mourning and failure is part of a tragic tradition in philosophy. And she is right that grief can lead to many things politically besides revenge and retaliation. Mourning can lead to a transformation not only of oneself but of the political conditions in which one finds oneself. Losing a close friend to AIDS intensifies my protest against the racism that made it impossible for him as a black man to reveal his illness. In Michael Moore's movie Bowling for Columbine the father whose six-year old daughter was shot to death by another six-year old in a school in Flint, Michigan began to protest against the National Rifle Association. And in Moore's Fahrenheit 9/11 a mother from Flint, whose son was killed while he was a soldier in Iraq, began to organize anti-war activities. So the capacity to mourn can fuel political protest. But it can also fuel racism, violence, and war. What Butler presumes here is that one can distinguish between proper and improper mourning. Whereas proper mourning involves protesting a system that has caused one's loss, improper mourning would involve hurting the person(s) who caused this loss, in revenge or retaliation. But she needs to give a much more careful discussion of mourning and the basis on which a judgment of grief can be made.

#### THEIR POLITICS DON’T SOLVE—SIMPLY SHIFT THE BOUNDARIES OF HUMAN/NON-HUMAN

Robin May **Schott**, PhD & Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, Education, and Rhetoric, University of Copenhagen, “Politics and the Art of Mourning,” December 20, 20**04**. Available from the World Wide Web at:: [www.kvinfo.dk/side/563/article/297/](http://www.kvinfo.dk/side/563/article/297/), accessed 9/30/06.

Second, I wonder whether her own theory can support her call for us to widen the concept of the human. Her theoretical work has elaborated on how the process of dehumanization, which excludes certain lives from being recognized as human, is also constitutive of the concept of the human. If this is right, can one ever eliminate the logic by which some lives are treated as non-human? Is the ethical task to try to limit the number of lives who fall into this category? Or do we merely shift who is considered non-human in different places and times?

#### THEIR POLITICS OF MOURNING ARE REALLY JUST MELANCHOLIA IN disguise, WHICH FORECLOSES UPON ANALYZING THE POLITICAL POTENTIALITIES OF OUR CURRENT SITUATION

Wendy **Brown**, Professor, Political Science and Women’s Studies, University of California-Berkeley, “Resisting Left Melancholia,” LOSS: THE POLITICS OF MOURNING, ed. David L. Eng & David Kazanjian, 20**02**, p. 458-459.

For the last two decades, cultural theorist Stuart Hall has insisted that the “crisis of the Left” is due neither to internal divisions in the activist or academic Left nor to the clever rhetoric or funding schemes of the Right. Rather, he has charged, this ascendancy is consequent to the Left’s own failure to apprehend the character of the age and to develop a political critique and a moral-political vision appropriate to this character. For Hall, the rise of the Thatcher-Reagan Right was a symptom rather than a cause of this failure, just as the Left’s dismissive or suspicious attitude toward cultural politics is for Hall a sign not of its unwavering principles but of its anachronistic habits of thought and its fears and anxieties about revising those habits.

But what are the content and dynamic of these fears and anxieties? I want to develop just one thread of this problem through a consideration of the phenomenon named “Left melancholia” by Walter Benjamin more than half a century ago. What did Benjamin mean by and with this pejorative appellation for a certain intellectual and political bearing? As most readers will know, Benjamin was neither categorically nor characterologically opposed to the value and valence of sadness as such, nor to the potential insights gleaned from brooding over one’s losses. Indeed, he had a well-developed appreciation of the productive value of acedia, sadness, and mourning for political and cultural work, and in his study of Baudelaire, Benjamin treated melancholia itself as something of a creative wellspring. But “Left melancholia” is Benjamin’s unambivalent epithet for the revolutionary hack who is, finally, more attached to a particular political analysis or ideal— even to the failure of that ideal— than to seizing possibilities for radical change in the present. In Benjamin’s enigmatic insistence on the political value of a dialectical historical grasp of “the time of the Now,” Left [458] melancholia represents not only a refusal to come to terms with the particular character of the present, that is, a failure to understand history in terms other than “empty time” or “progress.” It signifies as well a certain narcissism with regard to one’s past political attachments and identity that exceeds any contemporary investment in political mobilization, alliance, or transformation. 1

The irony of melancholia, of course, is that attachment to the object of one’s sorrowful loss supersedes any desire to recover from this loss, to live free of it in the present, to be unburdened by it. This is what renders melancholia a persistent condition, a state, indeed, a structure of desire, rather than a transient response to death or loss. In Freud’s 1917 meditation on melancholia, he reminds us of a second singular feature of melancholy: It entails “a loss of a more ideal kind [than mourning]. The object has not perhaps actually died, but has been lost as an object of love.” 2 Moreover, Freud suggests, the melancholic will often not know precisely what about the object has been loved and lost: “This would suggest that melancholia is in some way related to an object-loss which is withdrawn from consciousness, in contradistinction to mourning, in which there is nothing about the loss that is unconscious.” 3 The loss precipitating melancholy is more often than not unavowed and unavowable. Finally, Freud suggests that the melancholic subject— low in self-regard, despairing, even suicidal— has shifted the reproach of the once-loved object (a reproach waged for not living up to the idealization by the beloved) onto itself, thus preserving the love or idealization of the object even as the loss of this love is experienced in the suffering of the melancholic.

Now why would Benjamin use this term, and the emotional economy it represents, to talk about a particular formation on and of the Left? Benjamin never offers a precise formulation of Left melancholia. Rather, he deploys it as a term of opprobrium for those more beholden to certain long-held sentiments and objects than to the possibilities of political transformation in the present. Benjamin is particularly attuned to the melancholic’s investment in “things.” In the Trauerspiel, he argues that “melancholy betrays the world for the sake of knowledge,” here suggesting that the loyalty of the melancholic converts its truth (“every loyal vow or memory”) about its beloved into a thing, indeed, imbues knowledge itself with a thinglike quality. 4 Another version of this formulation: “In its tenacious self-absorption [melancholy] embraces dead objects in its contemplation.” 5 More simply, melancholia is loyal “to the world of things,” 6 suggesting a certain logic of fetishism— with all the conservatism and withdrawal from human relations that fetishistic desire implies— contained within the melancholic logic. In the critique of Kastner’s poems in which Benjamin first coins “Left melancholia,” Benjamin suggests that sentiments themselves become things for the Left melancholic who “takes as much pride in the [459] traces of former spiritual goods as the bourgeois do in their material goods.” 7 We come to love our Left passions and reasons, our Left analyses and convictions, more than we love the existing world that we presumably seek to alter with these terms or the future that would be aligned with them. Left melancholia, in short, is Benjamin’s name for a mournful, conservative, backward-looking attachment to a feeling, analysis, or relationship that has been rendered thinglike and frozen in the heart of the putative Leftist. If Freud is helpful here, then this condition presumably issues from some unaccountable loss, some unavowably crushed ideal, contemporarily signified by the terms Left, Socialism, Marx, or the Movement.

Certainly the losses, accountable and unaccountable, of the Left are many in our own time. The literal disintegration of socialist regimes and the legitimacy of Marxism may well be the least of it. We are awash in the loss of a unified analysis and unified movement, in the loss of labor and class as inviolable predicates of political analysis and mobilization, in the loss of an inexorable and scientific forward movement of history, and in the loss of a viable alternative to the political economy of capitalism. And on the backs of these losses are still others: we are without a sense of international, and often even local, Left community; we are without conviction about the Truth of the social order; we are without a rich moral-political vision of the Good to guide and sustain political work. Thus we suffer with the sense of not only a lost movement but also a lost historical moment, not only a lost theoretical and empirical coherence but also a lost way of life and a lost course of pursuits.

This much many on the Left can forthrightly admit, even if we do not know what to do about it. But in the hollow core of all these losses, perhaps in the place of our political unconscious, is there also an unavowed loss— the promise that Left analysis and Left commitment would supply its adherents a clear and certain path toward the good, the right, and the true? Is it not this promise that formed the basis for much of our pleasure in being on the Left, indeed, for our self-love as Leftists and our fellow feeling toward other Leftists? And if this love cannot be given up without demanding a radical transformation in the very foundation of our love, in our very capacity for political love or attachment, are we not doomed to Left melancholia, a melancholia that is certain to have effects that are not only sorrowful but also self-destructive? Freud again: “If the love for the object— a love which cannot be given up though the object itself is given up— takes refuge in narcissistic identification, then the hate comes into operation on this substitutive object, abusing it, debasing it, making it suffer and deriving sadistic satisfaction from its suffering.” 8

Wind

#### Wind power kills the environment: produces hazardous emissions increasing likelihood of warming, kills ecosystems, interferes with habitats, kills birds, deteriorates landscapes and destroys habitats.

Abbasi and Abasi 12

(Tasneem and S.A., Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology, “Is the Use of Renewable Energy Sources an Answer to the Problems of Global Warming and Pollution?” 2012, Taylor and Francis//wyo-mm)

Based on an LCA, Ardente et al. (2008) concluded that the largest environmental impacts caused by a wind farm are mainly due to wind turbines and building works. These impacts principally consist of air emissions, inert solid wastes, and small quantities of hazardous exhausted oils and lubricants. But there are several other impacts associated with wind energy that are beginning to acquire increasing poignancy with the increasing numbers and sizes of wind farms across the world. For example, wind generators interfere with habitats and cause noise pollution, aesthetic degradation, and interference with bird flight. It is feared that large-scale generation of electricity through windmills can reduce wind speeds and cause stress to ecosystems. Lakes that are downwind from the windmills may become warmer because of reduced evaporation from their surface. Soil moisture may also increase. In some situations, especially in developed countries, deterioration of landscape value due to installation of wind energy turbines is becoming a serious and contentious issue (Wolsink, 2007). At times it can deteriorate into stalemates and it has been suggested that attempts should be made to shift wind energy generation offshore (Söderholm et al., 2007). But that may entail serious environmental implications of its own. For example, an LCA of offshore and floating offshore wind turbines in comparison to natural gas–based electricity generation systems by Weinzettel et al. (2009) revealed that in comparison to the natural gas–based power plant, the offshore/floating wind–based power plants are worse in terms of human, water, and terrestrial ecotoxicity by 2–5.6 times, even as the latter are better than former in terms of global warming potential, photochemical oxidation, acidification, and eutrophication. The impacts on marine ecosystems may be negative as well as positive, but little is known about the extents of either and it is not possible to say to which side the balance would tilt (Inger et al., 2009). Nevertheless, by and large, the impacts of wind energy are not of great consequence except in certain sensitive areas and wind may prove to be a more ecologically benign source of energy for electricity production than most other options. All over the world, initiatives are being taken to enhance energy generation by wind power (Ardente et al., 2008; Araujo et al., 2008; Fadai, 2007; Himri et al., 2009; Ramesh, 2007; Sheble, 2009). In the state of Tamil Nadu, India, which is one of India's leading states in terms of wind energy utilization, up to 16% of the state's electricity production is now wind based (Subramanian, 2009). A few of the impacts associated with wind energy technology are discussed subsequently.

#### Environmental destruction causes extinction

Richard Margoluis, Biodiversity Support Program, 1996, http://www.bsponline.org/publications/showhtml.php3?10

Biodiversity not only provides direct benefits like food, medicine, and energy; it also affords us a "life support system." Biodiversity is required for the recycling of essential elements, such as carbon, oxygen, and nitrogen. It is also responsible for mitigating pollution, protecting watersheds, and combating soil erosion. Because biodiversity acts as a buffer against excessive variations in weather and climate, it protects us from catastrophic events beyond human control. The importance of biodiversity to a healthy environment has become increasingly clear. We have learned that the future well-being of all humanity depends on our stewardship of the Earth. When we overexploit living resources, we threaten our own survival.

#### Wind power causes soil erosion that has adverse effect on biodiversity.

Szarka et al 12

(Joseph, Richard Cowell, Geraint Ellis, Peter A. Strachan and Charles Varren, “Learning from Wind Power: Governance, Societal and Policy Perspectives on Sustainable Energy,” pg. 141//wyo-mm)

It would be an overstatement to suggest that the environmental impacts of wind developments are restricted to animals. For example, soil erosion can be a concern at any construction site, and the installation of wind projects is no exception. It can be particularly noticeable during site preparation, especially when turbines are erected on slopes. Scraping, filling, and over-steepening can all produce accelerated erosion, gullying, sediment transfer and land slippage. A 2008 court decision in Derrybrien, Ireland, held wind developers accountable for causing a 2003 landslide that killed 50,000 fish (EU 2008). Similar impacts result in other environments as well. For example, arid areas are notoriously slow to recover from these insults, so scars produced in these locations can be long-lived (Gipe 2002; see Figure 7.3).