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## \*\*Big Framework\*\*

#### OUR INTERPRETATION: The resolution asks a yes/no question as to the desirability of the United States Federal Government action. The role of the ballot should be to affirm or reject the actions and outcomes of the plan.

#### 1. THE TOPIC IS DEFINED BY THE PHRASE FOLLOWING THE COLON – THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS THE AGENT OF THE RESOLUTION, NOT THE INDIVIDUAL DEBATERS

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing 2K

<http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm>

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

#### 2. “RESOLVED” EXPRESSES INTENT TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary 2K

[www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved](http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved)

To find a solution to; solve …

To bring to a usually successful conclusion

#### 3. “SHOULD” DENOTES AN EXPECTATION OF ENACTING A PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary – 2K

[www.dictionary.com]

3 Used to express probability or expectation

#### 4. THE U.S.F.G. is the three branches of government

Dictionary.com 2k6 [<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/united+states+government>]

|  |
| --- |
| noun |
| the executive and legislative and judicial branches of the federal government of the United States |

#### Decisionmaking skills and engagement with the state energy apparatus prevents energy technocracy and actualizes radical politics

Hager, Bryn Mawr College political science professor, ‘92

[Carol J., “Democratizing Technology: Citizen & State in West German Energy Politics, 1974-1990” *Polity*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p. 45-70, accessed 10-7-12, AFB]

During this phase, the citizen initiative attempted to overcome its defensive posture and implement an alternative politics. The strategy of legal and technical challenge might delay or even prevent plant construction, but it would not by itself accomplish the broader goal on the legitimation dimension, i.e., democratization. Indeed, it worked against broad participation. The activists had to find a viable means of achieving change. Citizens had proved they could contribute to a substantive policy discussion. Now, some activists turned to the parliamentary arena as a possible forum for an energy dialogue. Until now, parliament had been conspicuously absent as a relevant policy maker, but if parliament could be reshaped and activated, citizens would have a forum in which to address the broad questions of policy-making goals and forms. They would also have an institutional lever with which to pry apart the bureaucracy and utility. None of the established political parties could offer an alternative program. Thus, local activists met to discuss forming their own voting list.

These discussions provoked internal dissent. Many citizen initiative members objected to the idea of forming a political party. If the problem lay in the role of parliament itself, another political party would not solve it. On the contrary, parliamentary participation was likely to destroy what political innovations the extraparliamentary movement had made. Others argued that a political party would give the movement an institutional platform from which to introduce some of the grassroots democratic political forms the groups had developed. Founding a party as the parliamentary arm of the citizen movement would allow these groups to play an active, critical role in institutionalized politics, participating in the policy debates while retaining their outside perspective. Despite the disagreements, the Alternative List for Democracy and Environmental Protection Berlin (AL) was formed in 1978 and first won seats in the Land parliament with 7.2 percent of the vote in 1981.43 The founders of the AL were encouraged by the success of newly formed local green parties in Lower Saxony and Hamburg,44 whose evolution had been very similar to that of the West Berlin citizen move-ment. Throughout the FRG, unpopular administrative decisions affect-ing local environments, generally in the form of state-sponsored indus-trial projects, prompted the development of the citizen initiative and ecology movements. The groups in turn focused constant attention on state planning "errors," calling into question not only the decisions themselves, but also the conventional forms of political decision making that produced them.45 Disgruntled citizens increasingly aimed their critique at the established political parties, in particular the federal SPD/ FDP coalition, which seemed unable to cope with the economic, social, and political problems of the 1970s. Fanned by publications such as the Club of Rome's report, "The Limits to Growth," the view spread among activists that the crisis phenomena were not merely a passing phase, but indicated instead "a long-term structural crisis, whose cause lies in the industrial-technocratic growth society itself."46 As they broadened their critique to include the political system as a whole, many grassroots groups found the extraparliamentary arena too restrictive. Like many in the West Berlin group, they reasoned that the necessary change would require a degree of political restructuring that could only be accomplished through their direct participation in parliamentary politics. Green/alternative parties and voting lists sprang up nationwide and began to win seats in local assemblies. The West Berlin Alternative List saw itself not as a party, but as the parliamentary arm of the citizen initiative movement. One member explains: "the starting point for alternative electoral participation was simply the notion of achieving a greater audience for [our] own ideas and thus to work in support of the extraparliamentary movements and initia-tives,"47 including non-environmentally oriented groups. The AL wanted to avoid developing structures and functions autonomous from the citizen initiative movement. Members adhered to a list of principles, such as rotation and the imperative mandate, designed to keep parliamentarians attached to the grassroots. Although their insistence on grassroots democracy often resulted in interminable heated discussions, the participants recognized the importance of experimenting with new forms of decision making, of not succumbing to the same hierarchical forms they were challenging. Some argued that the proper role of citizen initiative groups was not to represent the public in government, but to mobilize other citizens to participate directly in politics themselves; self-determination was the aim of their activity.48

Once in parliament, the AL proposed establishment of a temporary parliamentary commission to study energy policy, which for the first time would draw all concerned participants together in a discussion of both short-term choices and long-term goals of energy policy. With help from the SPD faction, which had been forced into the opposition by its defeat in the 1981 elections, two such commissions were created, one in 1982-83 and the other in 1984-85.49 These commissions gave the citizen activists the forum they sought to push for modernization and technical innovation in energy policy.

Although it had scaled down the proposed new plant, the utility had produced no plan to upgrade its older, more polluting facilities or to install desulfurization devices. With prodding from the energy commission, Land and utility experts began to formulate such a plan, as did the citizen initiative. By exposing administrative failings in a public setting, and by producing a modernization plan itself, the combined citizen initiative and AL forced bureaucratic authorities to push the utility for improvements. They also forced the authorities to consider different technological solutions to West Berlin's energy and environmental problems. In this way, the activists served as technological innovators. In 1983, the first energy commission submitted a list of recommendations to the Land parliament which reflected the influence of the citizen protest movement. It emphasized goals of demand reduction and efficiency, noted the value of expanded citizen participation and urged authorities to "investigate more closely the positive role citizen participation can play in achieving policy goals."50 The second energy commission was created in 1984 to discuss the possibilities for modernization and shutdown of old plants and use of new, environmentally friendlier and cheaper technologies for electricity and heat generation. Its recommendations strengthened those of the first commission.51 Despite the non-binding nature of the commissions' recommendations, the public discussion of energy policy motivated policy makers to take stronger positions in favor of environmental protection.

III. Conclusion

The West Berlin energy project eventually cleared all planning hurdles, and construction began in the early 1980s. The new plant now conforms to the increasingly stringent environmental protection requirements of the law. The project was delayed, scaled down from 1200 to 600 MW, moved to a neutral location and, unlike other BEWAG plants, equipped with modern desulfurization devices. That the new plant, which opened in winter 1988-89, is the technologically most advanced and environmen-tally sound of BEWAG's plants is due entirely to the long legal battle with the citizen initiative group, during which nearly every aspect of the original plans was changed. In addition, through the efforts of the Alter-native List (AL) in parliament, the Land government and BEWAG formulated a long sought modernization and environmental protection plan for all of the city's plants. The AL prompted the other parliamentary parties to take pollution control seriously. Throughout the FRG, energy politics evolved in a similar fashion. As Habermas claimed, underlying the objections against particular projects was a reaction against the administrative-economic system in general.

One author, for example, describes the emergence of two-dimensional protest against nuclear energy: The resistance against a concrete project became understood simul-taneously as resistance against the entire atomic program. Questions of energy planning, of economic growth, of understanding of democracy entered the picture. . . . Besides concern for human health, for security of conditions for human existence and protec-tion of nature arose critique of what was perceived as undemocratic planning, the "shock" of the delayed public announcement of pro-ject plans and the fear of political decision errors that would aggra-vate the problem.52 This passage supports a West Berliner's statement that the citizen initiative began with a project critique and arrived at *Systemkritik*.53 I have labeled these two aspects of the problem the public policy and legitima-tion dimensions. In the course of these conflicts, the legitimation dimen-sion emergd as the more important and in many ways the more prob-lematic.

Parliamentary Politics

In the 1970s, energy politics began to develop in the direction Offe de-scribed, with bureaucrats and protesters avoiding the parliamentary channels through which they should interact. The citizen groups them-selves, however, have to a degree reversed the slide into irrelevance of parliamentary politics. Grassroots groups overcame their defensive posture enough to begin to formulate an alternative politics, based upon concepts such as decision making through mutual understanding rather than technical criteria or bargaining. This new politics required new modes of interaction which the old corporatist or pluralist forms could not provide. Through the formation of green/alternative parties and voting lists and through new parliamentary commissions such as the two described in the case study, some members of grassroots groups attempted to both operate within the political system and fundamentally change it, to restore the link between bureaucracy and citizenry.

Parliamentary politics was partially revived in the eyes of West German grassroots groups as a legitimate realm of citizen participation, an outcome the theory would not predict. It is not clear, however, that strengthening the parliamentary system would be a desirable outcome for everyone. Many remain skeptical that institutions that operate as part of the "system" can offer the kind of substantive participation that grass-roots groups want. The constant tension between institutionalized politics and grassroots action emerged clearly in the recent internal debate between "fundamentalist" and "realist" wings of the Greens. Fundis wanted to keep a firm footing outside the realm of institutionalized politics. They refused to bargain with the more established parties or to join coalition governments. Realos favored participating in institutionalized politics while pressing their grassroots agenda. Only this way, they claimed, would they have a chance to implement at least some parts of their program.

This internal debate, which has never been resolved, can be interpreted in different ways. On one hand, the tension limits the appeal of green and alternative parties to the broader public, as the Greens' poor showing in the December 1990 all-German elections attests. The failure to come to agreement on basic issues can be viewed as a hazard of grass-roots democracy. The Greens, like the West Berlin citizen initiative, are opposed in principle to forcing one faction to give way to another. Disunity thus persists within the group. On the other hand, the tension can be understood not as a failure, but as a kind of success: grassroots politics has not been absorbed into the bureaucratized system; it retains its critical dimension, both in relation to the political system and within the groups themselves. The lively debate stimulated by grassroots groups and parties keeps questions of democracy on the public agenda.Technical Debate In West Berlin, the two-dimensionality of the energy issue forced citizen activists to become both participants in and critics of the policy process. In order to defeat the plant, activists engaged in technical debate. They won several decisions in favor of environmental protection, often proving to be more informed than bureaucratic experts themselves. The case study demonstrates that grassroots groups, far from impeding techno-logical advancement, can actually serve as technological innovators.

The activists' role as technical experts, while it helped them achieve some success on the policy dimension, had mixed results on the legitimation dimension. On one hand, it helped them to challenge the legitimacy of technocratic policy making. They turned back the Land government's attempts to displace political problems by formulating them in technical terms.54 By demonstrating the fallibility of the technical arguments, activists forced authorities to acknowledge that energy demand was a political variable, whose value at any one point was as much influenced by the choices of policy makers as by independent technical criteria.

Submission to the form and language of technical debate, however, weakened activists' attempts to introduce an alternative, goal-oriented form of decision making into the political system. Those wishing to par-ticipate in energy politics on a long-term basis have had to accede to the language of bureaucratic discussion, if not the legitimacy of bureaucratic authorities. They have helped break down bureaucratic authority but have not yet offered a viable long-term alternative to bureaucracy. In the tension between form and language, goals and procedure, the legitima-tion issue persists. At the very least, however, grassroots action challenges critical theory's notion that technical discussion is inimical to democratic politics.55 Citizen groups have raised the possibility of a dialogue that is both technically sophisticated and democratic.

In sum, although the legitimation problems which gave rise to grass-roots protest have not been resolved, citizen action has worked to counter the marginalization of parliamentary politics and the technocratic character of policy debate that Offe and Habermas identify. The West Berlin case suggests that the solutions to current legitimation problems may not require total repudiation of those things previously associated with technocracy.56

In Berlin, the citizen initiative and AL continue to search for new, more legitimate forms of organization consistent with their principles. No permanent Land parliamentary body exists to coordinate and con-solidate energy policy making.57 In the 1989 Land elections, the CDU/ FDP coalition was defeated, and the AL formed a governing coalition with the SPD. In late 1990, however, the AL withdrew from the coali-tion. It remains to be seen whether the AL will remain an effective vehi-cle for grassroots concerns, and whether the citizenry itself, now includ-ing the former East Berliners, will remain active enough to give the AL direction as united Berlin faces the formidable challenges of the 1990s. On the policy dimension, grassroots groups achieved some success. On the legitimation dimension, it is difficult to judge the results of grass-roots activism by normal standards of efficacy or success. Activists have certainly not radically restructured politics. They agree that democracy is desirable, but troublesome questions persist about the degree to which those processes that are now bureaucratically organized can and should be restructured, where grassroots democracy is possible and where bureaucracy is necessary in order to get things done. In other words, grassroots groups have tried to remedy the Weberian problem of the marginalization of politics, but it is not yet clear what the boundaries of the political realm should be. It is, however, the act of calling existing boundaries into question that keeps democracy vital. In raising alternative possibilities and encouraging citizens to take an active, critical role in their own governance, the contribution of grassroots environmental groups has been significant. As Melucci states for new social movements in general, these groups mount a "symbolic" challenge by proposing "a different way of perceiving and naming the world."58 Rochon concurs for the case of the West German peace movement, noting that its effect on the public discussion of secur-ity issues has been tremendous.59 The effects of the legitimation issue in the FRG are evident in increased citizen interest in areas formerly left to technical experts. Citizens have formed nationwide associations of environmental and other grassroots groups as well as alternative and green parties at all levels of government. The level of information within the groups is generally quite high, and their participation, especially in local politics, has raised the awareness and engagement of the general populace noticeably.60 Policy concessions and new legal provisions for citizen participation have not quelled grassroots action. The attempts of the established political parties to coopt "green" issues have also met with limited success. Even green parties themselves have not tapped the full potential of public support for these issues. The persistence of legitima-tion concerns, along with the growth of a culture of informed political activism, will ensure that the search continues for a space for a delibera-tive politics in modern technological society.61

#### Limits outweighs: You should embrace a model of debate that strikes a balance between predictability and creativity—it is a PRACTICAL REALITY that preparing to debate within a common framework enhances education because it maximizes elaboration and testing of ideas. That’s also a reason to SEVERLY DISCOUNT their impact claims because those claims have not been submitted to rigorous testing but are only shallow gut-shot reactions.

Goodin 03

[Robert E. Goodin and Simon J. Niemeyer- Australian National University- 2003, When Does Deliberation Begin? Internal Reflection versus Public Discussion in Deliberative Democracy, POLITICAL STUDIES: 2003 VOL 51, 627–649, uwyo//amp]

Suppose that instead of highly polarized symbolic attitudes, what we have at the outset is mass ignorance or mass apathy or non-attitudes. There again, people's engaging with the issue – focusing on it, acquiring information about it, thinking hard about it – would be something that is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the deliberative process. And more to our point, it is something that is most likely to occur within individuals themselves or in informal interactions, well in advance of any formal, organized group discussion. There is much in the large literature on attitudes and the mechanisms by which they change to support that speculation.31 Consider, for example, the literature on ‘central’ versus ‘peripheral’ routes to the formation of attitudes. Before deliberation, individuals may not have given the issue much thought or bothered to engage in an extensive process of reflection.32 In such cases, positions may be arrived at via peripheral routes, taking cognitive shortcuts or arriving at ‘top of the head’ conclusions or even simply following the lead of others believed to hold similar attitudes or values (Lupia, 1994). These shorthand approaches involve the use of available cues such as ‘expertness’ or ‘attractiveness’ (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986) – not deliberation in the internal-reflective sense we have described. Where peripheral shortcuts are employed, there may be inconsistencies in logic and the formation of positions, based on partial information or incomplete information processing. In contrast, ‘central’ routes to the development of attitudes involve the application of more deliberate effort to the matter at hand, in a way that is more akin to the internal-reflective deliberative ideal. Importantly for our thesis, there is nothing intrinsic to the ‘central’ route that requires group deliberation. Research in this area stresses instead the importance simply of ‘sufficient impetus’ for engaging in deliberation, such as when an individual is stimulated by personal involvement in the issue.33 The same is true of ‘on-line’ versus ‘memory-based’ processes of attitude change.34 The suggestion here is that we lead our ordinary lives largely on autopilot, doing routine things in routine ways without much thought or reflection. When we come across something ‘new’, we update our routines – our ‘running’ beliefs and procedures, attitudes and evaluations – accordingly. But having updated, we then drop the impetus for the update into deep-stored ‘memory’. A consequence of this procedure is that, when asked in the ordinary course of events ‘what we believe’ or ‘what attitude we take’ toward something, we easily retrieve what we think but we cannot so easily retrieve the reasons why. That more fully reasoned assessment – the sort of thing we have been calling internal-reflective deliberation – requires us to call up reasons from stored memory rather than just consulting our running on-line ‘summary judgments’. Crucially for our present discussion, once again, what prompts that shift from on-line to more deeply reflective deliberation is not necessarily interpersonal discussion. The impetus for fixing one's attention on a topic, and retrieving reasons from stored memory, might come from any of a number sources: group discussion is only one. And again, even in the context of a group discussion, this shift from ‘on-line’ to ‘memory-based’ processing is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the process, often before the formal discussion ever begins. All this is simply to say that, on a great many models and in a great many different sorts of settings, it seems likely that elements of the pre-discursive process are likely to prove crucial to the shaping and reshaping of people's attitudes in a citizens’ jury-style process. The initial processes of focusing attention on a topic, providing information about it and inviting people to think hard about it is likely to provide a strong impetus to internal-reflective deliberation, altering not just the information people have about the issue but also the way people process that information and hence (perhaps) what they think about the issue. What happens once people have shifted into this more internal-reflective mode is, obviously, an open question. Maybe people would then come to an easy consensus, as they did in their attitudes toward the Daintree rainforest.35 Or maybe people would come to divergent conclusions; and they then may (or may not) be open to argument and counter-argument, with talk actually changing minds. Our claim is not that group discussion will always matter as little as it did in our citizens’ jury.36 Our claim is instead merely that the earliest steps in the jury process – the sheer focusing of attention on the issue at hand and acquiring more information about it, and the internal-reflective deliberation that that prompts – will invariably matter more than deliberative democrats of a more discursive stripe would have us believe. However much or little difference formal group discussions might make, on any given occasion, the pre-discursive phases of the jury process will invariably have a considerable impact on changing the way jurors approach an issue.

#### Switch side debate is good-direct engagement, not abstract relation, with identities we do not identify with is critical to us to overcome the existential resentment we feel towards those with whom we disagree. Lack of switch-side facilitates a refusal to accept that our position is within question

Glover 10

[Robert, Professor of Political Science at University of Connecticut, Philosophy and Social Criticism, “Games without Frontiers?: Democratic Engagement, Agonistic Pluralism, and the Question of Exclusion”, Vol. 36, p. asp uwyo//amp]

In this vein, Connolly sees the goal of political engagement as securing a positive ‘ethos of engagement’ in relation to popular movements which alter existing assumptions, that is, a positive attitude towards attempts at pluralization. Connolly suggests we do so through thecultivation of two essential virtues: agonistic respect and critical responsiveness. 88 Agonisticrespect is defined as a situation whereby each political actor arrives at an appreciation for the factthat their own self-definition is bound with that of others, as well as recognition of the degree towhich each of these projections is profoundly contestable. 89 While Connolly notes that agonistic respect is a ‘kissing cousin’ of liberal tolerance, he distinguishes it by saying that the latter typically carries ‘the onus of being at the mercy of a putative majority that often construes itsown position to be beyond question.’ 90 Thus, agonistic respect is a reciprocal democratic virtue meant to operate across relations of difference, and Connolly deploys it as a regulative ideal forthe creation agonistic democratic spaces. 91 In a somewhat related way, the virtue of ‘critical responsiveness’ also attempts to move beyond liberal tolerance. 92 Critical responsiveness entails ‘ careful listening and presumptive generosity to constituencies struggling to move from an obscure or degraded subsistence below the field of recognition, justice, obligation, rights, or legitimacy to a place on one or more of those registers.’ 93 Critical responsiveness is not pity, charity, or paternalism but implies anenhanced degree of concern for others, driven by the cultivation of reciprocal empathic concern 21 for that which you are not. 94 This attitude cannot be developed in an abstract relation to thesenew and existing forms of radical cultural, political, religious, and philosophical difference.Critical responsiveness above all requires that one ‘get[s] a whiff of experiences heretofore aliento [us]’, recognizing that while this may be unsettling or cause discomfort, direct engagement isthe means by which you, ‘work tactically on yourself and others to overcome existential resentment of this persistent condition of human being.’

# K

### 1nc v. Queer Politics

#### The silence of the aff on the question of how colonialism produced and conditioned Queer Politics condemns their project to reifying colonialism- the call to come before decolonization bases the aff’s moral system on the continued benefit of genocidal occupation AND it’s a sequencing question- Queer politics must FIRST be informed by the historical, material, and fixed realities of the Native subject- you get no permutation

Morgensen 2010

[Morgensen, Scott, 2k10, GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 16, Number 1-2, “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities, 2010.]

Denaturalizing settler colonialism will mark it as not a fait accompli but a process open to change. While settlement suggests the appropriation of land, that history was never fixed: even the violence of allotment failed to erase collective Native land claims, just as land expropriation is being countered by tribal governments reacquiring sovereign land. In turn, as Thomas King and Paul Carter suggest, settlement narrates the land, and, as storytelling, it remains open to debate, End Page 122 such as in Native activisms that sustain Indigenous narratives of land or tell new stories to denaturalize settler landscapes. The processes of settler colonialism produce contradictions, as settlers try to contain or erase Native difference in order that they may inhabit Native land as if it were their own. Doing so produces the contortions described by Deloria, as settler subjects argue that Native people or their land claims never existed, no longer exist, or if they do are trumped by the priority of settler claims. Yet at the same time settler subjects study Native history so that they may absorb it as their own and legitimate their place on stolen land. These contradictions are informed by the knowledge, constantly displaced, of the genocidal histories of occupation. Working to stabilize settler subjectivity produces the bizarre result of people admitting to histories of terrorizing violence while basing their moral systems on continuing to benefit from them. The difference between conservative and liberal positions on settlement often breaks between whether non-Natives feel morally justified or conscionably implicated in a society based on violence. But while the first position embraces the status quo, the second does nothing necessarily to change it. As Smith pointedly argues, "It is a consistent practice among progressives to bemoan the genocide of Native peoples, but in the interest of political expediency, implicitly sanction it by refusing to question the illegitimacy of the settler nation responsible for this genocide." In writing with Kehaulani Kauanui, Smith argues that this complicity continues, as progressives have critiqued the seeming erosion of civil liberties and democracy under the Bush regime. How is this critique affected if we understand the Bush regime not as the erosion of U.S. democracy but as its fulfillment? If we understand American democracy as predicated on the genocide of indigenous people? . . . Even scholars critical of the nation-state often tend to presume that the United States will always exist, and thus they overlook indigenous feminist articulations of alternative forms of governance beyond the United States in particular and the nation-state in general. Smith and Kauanui remind us here that Indigenous feminists crucially theorize life beyond settler colonialism, including by fostering terms for national community that exceed the heteropatriarchal nation-state form. Non-Natives who seek accountable alliance with Native people may align themselves with these stakes if they wish to commit to denaturalizing settler colonialism. But as noted, their more frequent effort to stabilize their identities follows less from a belief that settlement is natural than from a compulsion to foreclose the Pandora's box of contradictions End Page 123 they know will open by calling it into question. In U.S. queer politics, this includes the implications of my essay: queers will invoke and repeat the terrorizing histories of settler colonialism if these remain obscured behind normatively white and national desires for Native roots and settler citizenship. A first step for non-Native queers thuscan be to examine critically and challenge how settler colonialism conditions their lives, as a step toward imagining new and decolonial sexual subjectivities, cultures, and politics. This work can be inspired by historical coalition politics formed by queers of color in accountable relationship to Native queer activists. Yet this work invites even more forms, particularly when Native queers choose to organize apart. White queers challenging racism and colonialism can join queers of color to create new queer politics marked explicitly as non-Native, in that they will form by answering Native queer critiques. As part of that work, non-Native queers can study the colonial histories they differently yet mutually inherit, and can trouble the colonial institutions in which they have sought their freedom, as steps toward shifting non-Native queer politics in decolonizing directions.

#### Fluid Identity is based on western conceptions of individual freedom that ignore the way that Indigenous peoples for their identity ties with the land, causes same forms of colonial domination

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

In addition, the undercurrent of fluidity and sense of displacedness that permeates, if not defines, mestizaje runs contrary to American Indian sensibilities of connection to place, land, and the Earth itself. Consider, for example, the following statement on the nature of critical subjectivity by Peter McLaren: The struggle for critical subjectivity is the struggle to occupy a space of hope - a liminal space, an intimation of the anti-structure, of what lives in the in-between zone of undecidedability - in which one can work toward a praxis of redemption .... A sense of atopy has always been with me, a resplendent placelessness, a feeling of living in germinal formlessness .... I cannot find words to express what this border identity means to me. All I have are what Georgres Bastille (1988) calls mots glissants (slippery words). (1997, pp. 13-14) McLaren speaks passionately and directly about the crisis of modern society and the need for a "praxis of redemption." As he perceives it, the very possibility of redemption is situated in our willingness not only to accept but to flourish in the "liminal" spaces, border identities, and postcolonial hybridities that are inherent in postmodern life and subjectivity. In fact, McLaren perceives the fostering of a "resplendent placelessness" itself as the gateway to a more just, democratic society. While American Indian intellectuals also seek to embrace the notion of transcendent subjectivities, they seek a notion of transcendence that remains rooted in historical place and the sacred connection to land. Consider, for example, the following commentary by Deloria (1992) on the centrality of place and land in the construction of American Indian subjectivity: Recognizing the sacredness of lands on which previous generations have lived and died is the foundation of all other sentiment. Instead of denying this dimension of our emotional lives, we should be setting aside additional places that have transcendent meaning. Sacred sites that higher spiritual powers have chosen for manifestation enable us to focus our concerns on the specific form of our lives.... Sacred places are the foundation of all other beliefs and practices because they represent the presence of the sacred in our lives. They properly inform us that we are not larger than nature and that we have responsibilities to the rest of the natural world that transcend our own personal desires and wishes. This lesson must be learned by each generation. (pp. 278, 281) Gross misunderstanding of this connection between American Indian subjectivity and land, and, more importantly, between sovereignty and land has been the source of numerous injustices in Indian country. For instance, I believe there was little understanding on the part of government officials that passage of the Indian Religious Freedom Act (1978) would open a Pandora's box of discord over land, setting up an intractable conflict between property rights and religious freedom. American Indians, on the other hand, viewed the act as a invitation to return to their sacred sites, several of which were on government lands and were being damaged by commercial use. As a result, a flurry of lawsuits alleging mismanagement and destruction of sacred sites was filed by numerous tribes. Similarly, corporations, tourists, and even rock climbers filed suits accusing land managers of unlawfully restricting access to public places by implementing policies that violate the constitutional separation between church and state. All of this is to point out that the critical project of mestizaje continues to operate on the same assumption made by the U.S. government in this instance, that in a democratic society, human subjectivity - and liberation for that matter - is conceived of as inherently rightsbased as opposed to land-based.

#### Lack of decolonization results in ongoing genocide, assimilation and annihilation of indigenous peoples and culture-k2 solve environmental degradation, heterosexism, classism, racism, sexism and militarism

Churchill 96 (Ward, Prof. of Ethnic Studies @ U. of Colorado, Boulder BA and MA in Communications from Sangamon State, “From a Native Son”,mb)

I’ll debunk some of this nonsense in a moment, but first I want to take up the posture of self-proclaimed leftist radicals in the same connection. And I’ll do so on the basis of principle, because justice is supposed to matter more to progressives than to rightwing hacks. Let me say that the pervasive and near-total silence of the Left in this connection has been quite illuminating. Non-Indian activists, with only a handful of exceptions, persistently plead that they can’t really take a coherent position on the matter of Indian land rights because “unfortunately,” they’re “not really conversant with the issues” ( as if these were tremendously complex ). Meanwhile, they do virtually nothing, generation after generation, to inform themselves on the topic of who actually owns the ground they’re standing on. The record can be played only so many times before it wears out and becomes just another variation of “hear no evil, see no evil.” At this point, it doesn’t take Albert Einstein to figure out that the Left doesn’t know much about such things because it’s never wanted to know, or that this is so because it’s always had its own plans for utilizing land it has no more right to than does the status quo it claims to oppose. The usual technique for explaining this away has always been a sort of pro forma acknowledgement that Indian land rights are of course “really important stuff” (yawn), but that one” really doesn’t have a lot of time to get into it ( I’ll buy your book, though, and keep it on my shelf, even if I never read it ). Reason? Well, one is just “overwhelmingly preoccupied” with working on “other important issues” (meaning, what they consider to be more important issues). Typically enumerated are sexism, racism, homophobia, class inequities, militarism, the environment, or some combination of these. It’s a pretty good evasion, all in all. Certainly, there’s no denying any of these issues their due; they are all important, obviously so. But more important than the question of land rights? There are some serious problems of primacy and priority imbedded in the orthodox script. To frame things clearly in this regard, lets hypothesize for a moment that all of the various non-Indian movements concentrating on each of these issues were suddenly successful in accomplishing their objectives . Lets imagine that the United States as a whole were somehow transformed into an entity defined by the parity of its race, class, and gender relations, its embrace of unrestricted sexual preference, its rejection of militarism in all forms, and its abiding concern with environmental protection (I know, I know, this is a sheer impossibility, but that’s my point). When all is said and done, the society resulting from this scenario is still, first and foremost, a colonialist society, an imperialist society in the most fundamental sense possible with all that this implies. This is true because the scenario does nothing at all to address the fact that whatever is happening happens on someone else’s land, not only without their consent, but through an adamant disregard for their rights to the land. Hence, all it means is that the immigrant or invading population has rearranged its affairs in such a way as to make itself more comfortable at the continuing expense of indigenous people. The colonial equation remains intact and may even be reinforced by a greater degree of participation, and vested interest in maintenance of the colonial order among the settler population at large. The dynamic here is not very different from that evident in the American Revolution of the late 18th century, is it? And we all know very well where that led, don’t we? Should we therefore begin to refer to socialist imperialism, feminist imperialism, gay and lesbian imperialism, environmental imperialism, African American, and la Raza imperialism? I would hope not. I would hope this is all just a matter of confusion, of muddled priorities among people who really do mean well and who’d like to do better. If so, then all that is necessary to correct the situation is a basic rethinking of what must be done., and in what order. Here, I’d advance the straightforward premise that the land rights of “First Americans” should serve as a first priority for everyone seriously committed to accomplishing positive change in North America. But before I suggest everyone jump off and adopt this priority, I suppose it’s only fair that I interrogate the converse of the proposition: if making things like class inequity and sexism the preeminent focus of progressive action in North America inevitably perpetuates the internal colonial structure of the United States, does the reverse hold true? I’ll state unequivocally that it does not. There is no indication whatsoever that a restoration of indigenous sovereignty in Indian Country would foster class stratification anywhere, least of all in Indian Country. In fact, all indications are that when left to their own devices, indigenous peoples have consistently organized their societies in the most class-free manners. Look to the example of the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy). Look to the Muscogee (Creek) Confederacy. Look to the confederations of the Yaqui and the Lakota, and those pursued and nearly perfected by Pontiac and Tecumseh. They represent the very essence of enlightened egalitarianism and democracy. Every imagined example to the contrary brought forth by even the most arcane anthropologist can be readily offset by a couple of dozen other illustrations along the lines of those I just mentioned. Would sexism be perpetuated? Ask one of the Haudenosaunee clan mothers, who continue to assert political leadership in their societies through the present day. Ask Wilma Mankiller, current head of the Cherokee nation , a people that traditionally led by what were called “Beloved Women.” Ask a Lakota woman—or man, for that matter—about who it was that owned all real property in traditional society, and what that meant in terms of parity in gender relations. Ask a traditional Navajo grandmother about her social and political role among her people. Women in most traditional native societies not only enjoyed political, social, and economic parity with men, they often held a preponderance of power in one or more of these spheres. Homophobia? Homosexuals of both genders were (and in many settings still are) deeply revered as special or extraordinary, and therefore spiritually significant, within most indigenous North American cultures. The extent to which these realities do not now pertain in native societies is exactly the extent to which Indians have been subordinated to the mores of the invading, dominating culture. Insofar as restoration of Indian land rights is tied directly to the reconstitution of traditional indigenous social, political, and economic modes, you can see where this leads: the relations of sex and sexuality accord rather well with the aspirations of feminist and gay rights activism. How about a restoration of native land rights precipitating some sort of “environmental holocaust”? Let’s get at least a little bit real here. If you’re not addicted to the fabrications of Smithsonian anthropologists about how Indians lived, or George Weurthner’s Eurosupremacist Earth First! Fantasies about how we beat all the wooly mammoths and mastodons and saber-toothed cats to death with sticks, then this question isn’t even on the board. I know it’s become fashionable among Washington Post editorialists to make snide references to native people “strewing refuse in their wake” as they “wandered nomadically about the “prehistoric” North American landscape. What is that supposed to imply? That we, who were mostly “sedentary agriculturalists” in any event. Were dropping plastic and aluminum cans as we went? Like I said, lets get real. Read the accounts of early European arrival, despite the fact that it had been occupied by 15 or 20 million people enjoying a remarkably high standard of living for nobody knows how long: 40,000 years? 50,000 years? Longer? Now contrast that reality to what’s been done to this continent over the past couple of hundred years by the culture Weurthner, the Smithsonian, and the Post represent, and you tell me about environmental devastation. That leaves militarism and racism. Taking the last first, there really is no indication of racism in traditional Indian societies. To the contrary, the record reveals that Indians habitually intermarried between groups, and frequently adopted both children and adults from other groups. This occurred in precontact times between Indians, and the practice was broadened to include those of both African and European origin—and ultimately Asian origin as well—once contact occurred. Those who were naturalized by marriage or adoption were considered members of the group, pure and simple. This was always the Indian view. The Europeans and subsequent Euroamerican settlers viewed things rather differently, however, and foisted off the notion that Indian identity should be determined primarily by “blood quantum,” an outright eugenics code similar to those developed in places like Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa. Now that’s a racist construction if there ever was one. Unfortunately, a lot of Indians have been conned into buying into this anti- Indian absurdity, and that’s something to be overcome. But there’s also solid indication that quite a number of native people continue to strongly resist such things as the quantum system. As to militarism, no one will deny that Indians fought wars among themselves both before and after the European invasion began. Probably half of all indigenous peoples in North America maintained permanent warrior societies. This could perhaps be reasonably construed as “militarism,” but not, I think, with the sense the term conveys within the European/Euro-American tradition. There were never, so far as anyone can demonstrate,, wars of annihilation fought in this hemisphere prior to the Columbian arrival, none. In fact, it seems that it was a more or less firm principle of indigenous warfare not to kill, the object being to demonstrate personal bravery, something that could be done only against a live opponent. There’s no honor to be had in killing another person, because a dead person can’t hurt you. There’s no risk. This is not to say that nobody ever died or was seriously injured in the fighting. They were, just as they are in full contact contemporary sports like football and boxing. Actually, these kinds of Euro- American games are what I would take to be the closest modern parallels to traditional inter-Indian warfare. For Indians, it was a way of burning excess testosterone out of young males, and not much more. So, militarism in the way the term is used today is as alien to native tradition as smallpox and atomic bombs. Not only is it perfectly reasonable to assert that a restoration of Indian control over unceded lands within the United States would do nothing to perpetuate such problems as sexism and classism, but the reconstitution of indigenous societies this would entail stands to free the affected portions of North America from such maladies altogether. Moreover, it can be said that the process should have a tangible impact in terms of diminishing such oppressions elsewhere. The principle is this: sexism, racism, and all the rest arose here as a concomitant to the emergence and consolidation of the Eurocentric nation-state form of sociopolitical and economic organization. Everything the state does, everything it can do, is entirely contingent on its ongoing domination of Indian country. Given this, it seems obvious that the literal dismemberment of the nation-state inherent to Indian land recovery correspondingly reduces the ability of the state to sustain the imposition of objectionable relation within itself. It follows that the realization of indigenous land rights serves to undermine or destroy the ability of the status quo to continue imposing a racist, sexist, classist, homophobic, militaristic order on non-Indians.

#### Our first priority is to give back the land.

#### Decolonization must be our ethically first priority, any form of liberation that perpetuates the occupation of Indigenous territory is only colonialism in another form. The demand to end the occupation of First American lands is a necessary prerequisite to solving other forms of oppression and any form of positive social change

Churchill 96 (Ward, Prof. of Ethnic Studies @ U. of Colorado, Boulder BA and MA in Communications from Sangamon State, “From a Native Son”,mb)

The question which inevitably arises with regard to indigenous land claims, especially in the United States, is whether they are “realistic.” The answer, of course is , “No, they aren’t.” Further, no form of decolonization has ever been realistic when viewed within the construct of a colonialist paradigm. It wasn’t realistic at the time to expect George Washington’s rag-tag militia to defeat the British military during the American Revolution. Just ask the British. It wasn’t realistic, as the French could tell you, that the Vietnamese should be able to defeat U.S.-backed France in 1954, or that the Algerians would shortly be able to follow in their footsteps. Surely, it wasn’t reasonable to predict that Fidel Castro’s pitiful handful of guerillas would overcome Batista’s regime in Cuba, another U.S. client, after only a few years in the mountains. And the Sandinistas, to be sure, had no prayer of attaining victory over Somoza 20 years later. Henry Kissinger, among others, knew that for a fact. The point is that in each case, in order to begin their struggles at all, anti-colonial fighters around the world have had to abandon orthodox realism in favor of what they knew to be right. To paraphrase Bendit, they accepted as their agenda, a redefinition of reality in terms deemed quite impossible within the conventional wisdom of their oppressors. And in each case, they succeeded in their immediate quest for liberation. The fact that all but one (Cuba) of the examples used subsequently turned out to hold colonizing pretensions of its own does not alter the truth of this—or alter the appropriateness of their efforts to decolonize themselves—in the least. It simply means that decolonization has yet to run its course, that much remains to be done. The battles waged by native nations in North America to free themselves, and the lands upon which they depend for ongoing existence as discernible peoples, from the grip of U.S. (and Canadian) internal colonialism are plainly part of this process of liberation. Given that their very survival depends upon their perseverance in the face of all apparent odds , American Indians have no real alternative but to carry on. They must struggle, and where there is struggle here is always hope. Moreover, the unrealistic or “romantic” dimensions of our aspiration to quite literally dismantle the territorial corpus of the U.S. state begin to erode when one considers that federal domination of Native North America is utterly contingent upon maintenance of a perceived confluence of interests between prevailing governmental/corporate elites and common non- Indian citizens. Herein lies the prospect of long-term success. It is entirely possibly that the consensus of opinion concerning non-Indian “rights” to exploit the land and resources of indigenous nations can be eroded, and that large numbers of non-Indians will join in the struggle to decolonize Native North America. Few non- Indians wish to identify with or defend the naziesque characteristics of US history. To the contrary most seek to deny it in rather vociferous fashion. All things being equal, they are uncomfortable with many of the resulting attributes of federal postures and actively oppose one or more of these, so long as such politics do not intrude into a certain range of closely guarded selfinterests. This is where the crunch comes in the realm of Indian rights issues. Most non-Indians (of all races and ethnicities, and both genders) have been indoctrinated to believe the officially contrived notion that, in the event “the Indians get their land back,” or even if the extent of present federal domination is relaxed, native people will do unto their occupiers exactly as has been done to them; mass dispossession and eviction of non-Indians, especially Euro-Americans is expected to ensue. Hence even progressives who are most eloquently inclined to condemn US imperialism abroad and/or the functions of racism and sexism at home tend to deliver a blank stare of profess open “disinterest” when Indigenous land rights are mentioned. Instead of attempting to come to grips with this most fundamental of all issues the more sophisticated among them seek to divert discussion into “higher priority” or “more important” topics like “issues of class and gender equality” in with “justice” becomes synonymous with a redistribution of power and loot deriving from the occupation of Native North America even while occupation continues. Sometimes, Indians are even slated to receive “their fair share” in the division of spoils accruing from expropriation of their resources. Always, such things are couched in terms of some “greater good” than decolonizing the .6 percent of the U.S. population which is indigenous. Some Marxist and environmentalist groups have taken the argument so far as to deny that Indians possess any rights distinguishable from those of their conquerors. AIM leader Russell Means snapped the picture into sharp focus when he observed n 1987 that: so-called progressives in the United States claiming that Indians are obligated to give up their rights because a much larger group of non-Indians “need” their resources is exactly the same as Ronald Reagan and Elliot Abrams asserting that the rights of 250 million North Americans outweigh the rights of a couple million Nicaraguans (continues). Leaving aside the pronounced and pervasive hypocrisy permeating these positions, which add up to a phenomenon elsewhere described as “settler state colonialism,” the fact is that the specter driving even most radical non-Indians into lockstep with the federal government on questions of native land rights is largely illusory. The alternative reality posed by native liberation struggles is actually much different: While government propagandists are wont to trumpet—as they did during the Maine and Black Hills land disputes of the 1970s—that an Indian win would mean individual non-Indian property owners losing everything, the native position has always been the exact opposite. Overwhelmingly, the lands sought for actual recovery have been governmentally and corporately held. Eviction of small land owners has been pursued only in instances where they have banded together—as they have during certain of the Iroquois claims cases—to prevent Indians from recovering any land at all, and to otherwise deny native rights. Official sources contend this is inconsistent with the fact that all non-Indian title to any portion of North America could be called into question. Once “the dike is breached,” they argue, it’s just a matter of time before “everybody has to start swimming back to Europe, or Africa or wherever.” Although there is considerable technical accuracy to admissions that all non-Indian title to North America is illegitimate, Indians have by and large indicated they would be content to honor the cession agreements entered into by their ancestors, even though the United States has long since defaulted. This would leave somewhere close to two-thirds of the continental United States in non-Indian hands, with the real rather than pretended consent of native people. The remaining one-third, the areas delineated in Map II to which the United States never acquired title at all would be recovered by its rightful owners. The government holds that even at that there is no longer sufficient land available for unceded lands, or their equivalent, to be returned. In fact, the government itself still directly controls more than one-third of the total U.S. land area, about 770 million acres. Each of the states also “owns” large tracts, totaling about 78 million acres. It is thus quite possible— and always has been—for all native claims to be met in full without the loss to non-Indians of a single acre of privately held land. When it is considered that 250 million-odd acres of the “privately” held total are now in the hands of major corporate entities, the real dimension of the “threat” to small land holders (or more accurately, lack of it) stands revealed. Government spokespersons have pointed out that the disposition of public lands does not always conform to treaty areas. While this is true, it in no way precludes some process of negotiated land exchange wherein the boundaries of indigenous nations are redrawn by mutual consent to an exact, or at least a much closer conformity. All that is needed is an honest, open, and binding forum—such as a new bilateral treaty process—with which to proceed. In fact, numerous native peoples have, for a long time, repeatedly and in a variety of ways, expressed a desire to participate in just such a process. Nonetheless, it is argued, there will still be at least some non-Indians “trapped” within such restored areas. Actually, they would not be trapped at all. The federally imposed genetic criteria of “Indian –ness” discussed elsewhere in this book notwithstanding, indigenous nations have the same rights as any other to define citizenry by allegiance (naturalization) rather than by race. Non-Indians could apply for citizenship, or for some form of landed alien status which would allow them to retain their property until they die. In the event they could not reconcile themselves to living under any jurisdiction other than that of the United States, they would obviously have the right to leave, and they should have the right to compensation from their own government (which got them into the mess in the first place). Finally, and one suspects this is the real crux of things from the government/corporate perspective, any such restoration of land and attendant sovereign prerogatives to native nations would result in a truly massive loss of “domestic” resources to the United States, thereby impairing the country’s economic and military capacities (see “Radioactive Colonialism” essay for details). For everyone who queued up to wave flags and tie on yellow ribbons during the United States’ recent imperial adventure in the Persian Gulf, this prospect may induce a certain psychic trauma. But, for progressives at least, it should be precisely the point. When you think about these issues in this way, the great mass of non-Indian in North America really have much to gain and almost nothing to lose, from the success of native people in struggles to reclaim the land which is rightfully ours. The tangible diminishment of US material power which is integral to our victories in this sphere stands to pave the way for realization of most other agendas from anti-imperialism to environmentalism, from African American liberation to feminism, from gay rights to the ending of class privilege- pursued by progressives on this continent. Conversely, succeeding with any or even all of these other agendas would still represent an inherently oppressive situation in their realization is contingent upon an ongoing occupation of Native North America with the consent of Indian people. Any North American revolution which failed to free indigenous territory from non-Indian domination would be simply a continuation of colonialism in another form. Regardless of the angle from which you view the matter, the liberation of Native North America, liberation of the land first and foremost, is the key to fundamental and positive social changes of many other sorts. One thing they say, leads to another. The question has always been, of course, which “thing” is to be the first in the sequence. A preliminary formulation for those serious about radical change in the United State might be “First Priority to First Americans.” Put another way this would mean, “US out of Indian Country.” Inevitably, the logic leads to what we’ve all been so desperately seeking: The United States- at least what we’ve come to know it- out of North America all together. From there is can be permanently banished from the planet. In its stead, surely we can join hands to create something new and infinitely better. That’s our vision of “impossible realism,” isn’t it time we all worked on attaining it?

# Case

#### Structural change is key for queer movements – language-based opposition is insufficient to maintain the community and energy to confront organized opposition

Max Kirsch, professor of comparative studies at Florida Atlantic University, Queer Theory and Social Change, 2000, p.117

Strategy in this context consists of the ways in which we organize energy to meet the ends we seek to achieve. Strategy as such is the mechanism by which true politics is generated, both on the personal and the political level. A true resistance politics has to incorporate both the micro and the macro levels of analysis to mediate differences and to confront effectively the forces of well-organized opposition. Lesbian, gay, and queer movements have, so far, depended on the involvement of individuals as the primary drivers of social change (and particularly the experience of labor movements) that individuals need to have structural representation in order to maintain the energy needed for sustained opposition. Individuals working against their oppressors, whether in the workplace or neighborhood, cannot succeed without a mechanism that can play a larger role in incorporating them into communities of resistance where mutual recognition is present. “We’re Queer and We’re Here” is a necessary declaration of identity. But it is only a moment. Required is a strategy that can institutionalize a movement towards resistance so that change may be recognized as a social necessity. Differences will continue to exist. Black women face the sexism inherent in their relations with men while confronting racism; lesbians are confrtoned with the hierarchy of sexual politics while dealing with arguments around pornography and sexual pleasure. And more economic issues such as the pervasive and growing feminization of poverty. Bisexual, transsexual, and transgendered peoples are often ignored by all. Queers, in general, encounter the real differences based on status and class as they experience the oppression of the dominant culture. But these are all in fact part of a larger class struggle which is borne out in the conflict of the uses and control of energy and, ultimately, human regeneration. They need to be recognized as such. The test of successful movement will be whether we might honor all these divergent interests and experiences while joining together to forge a successful attempt to redistribute the rewards of labor and to end the violence of prejudice. Resistance, then, involves more than language-based opposition to noxious forces. Real opposition takes place in the realm of reproduction of community and the larger social sphere, on the basis of daily existence and in the realm of social and productive power.

#### Destabilizing the notion of gender doesn’t overthrow its ability to oppress

Raia Prokhovnik, Senior lecturer in politics at the Open University, UK, “Rational woman: a feminist critique of dichotomy “2002. p. 134

Walters’ conclusions are well-made. On the positive side she argues that ‘we should embrace [queer theory’s] recognition that much slips out of the rigid distinctions of hetero/homo, man/woman and that our theoretical and political engagements need to reckon creatively with the excess that dares not speak its name’. She also commends the ‘queer attempt to understand that sexuality and sexual desire is not reducible to gender’ (Walters 1996: 963). Nevertheless she is skeptical that destabilizing gender can ‘top the power of gender- a power that still sends too many women to the hospital, shelter, rape crisis center, despair’ (ibid.: 866). She observes, “we cannot afford to lose sight of the materiality of oppression and its operation in structural and institutional spaces’, and she suspects that queer theory fails to understand that ‘[d]estabilizing gender (or rendering its surface apparent) is not the same as overthrowing it’ (ibid.).

#### Queer theory erases Lesbians and transgendered people

Gust Yep, Karen Lovass, and John Elia, Prof @ San Fransico University, Journal of Homosexual Studies, Vol. 45, No. 2/3/4, 2003 p. 45

Gender Trouble. As a non-gender-specific term, “queer” appears inclusive of all genders. However, such terminological breaks can be read as reactionary and potentially dangerous (Thomas, 2000). Under a non-gender specific umbrella, Jeffreys (1997) is concerned about the disappearance of the lesbian and denial of lesbian oppression under patriarchy and heteronormativity. Similarly, Wolfe and Penelope (1993) contend that destabilization of identity categories, a typical move in queer analysis, leads to lesbian erasure. They write, We [cannot] afford to allow privileged patriarchal discourse (of which poststructuralism is but a new variant) to erase the collective identity Lesbians have only recently begun to establish. . . . For what has in fact resulted from the incorporation of deconstructive discourse, in academic “feminist” discourse at least, is that the word Lesbian has been placed in quotation marks, whether used or mentioned, and the existence of real Lesbians has been denied, once again. (p. 3) Given the history that “gay,” as a label, came to signify male homosexuality in a number of contexts, the concern that “queer” might become a male generic is certainly not unwarranted. Queer theory is also guilty of transgender erasure. Namaste (2000), for example, argues that queer theory, with its focus on performativity, fails to take into account the context in which gender performances occur. She points out that Butler’s drag queens perform in gay male cultural spaces and reduces drag to something a person does on stage rather than a person who is. In addition, queer theory ignores the material realities, the lived experiences and the subjectivities of transgendered people. Elliot and Roen (1998) call for the development and articulation of transgender theories, that is, ideas and assertions that inform and are informed by transgender political movements and articulated by transgenderists. Queer theory is committed to the deconstruction of gender and sexual categories. Engagement with the social context and the material realities associated with gender performance under heteropatriarchy would diminish the danger of excluding, erasing, and othering genders that are not male.

#### Creating safe spaces for coming out of the closet makes confessional discourse possible—the aff reifys normalization

Foucault 1978, (Michel, Former director @ the Institut Francais at Hamburg. The History of Sexuality Volume I. 1978. pgs 59-67)

The confession is a ritual of discourse in which the speaking subject is also the subject of the statement; it is also a ritual that unfolds within a power relationship, for one does not confess without the presence (or virtual presence) of a partner who is not simply the interlocutor but the authority who requires the confession, prescribes and appreciates it, and intervenes in order to judge, punish, forgive, console, and reconcile; a ritual in which the truth is corroborated by the obstacles and resistances it has had to surmount in order to be formulated; and finally, a ritual in which the expression alone, independently of its external consequences, produces intrinsic modifications in the person who articulates it: it exonerates, redeems, and purifies him; it unburdens him of his wrongs, liberates him, and promises him salvation. For centuries, the truth of sex was, at least for the most part caught up in this discursive form. Moreover, this form was not the same as that of education (sexual education confined itself to general principles and rules of prudence); nor was it that of initiation (which remained essentially a silent prac­tice, which the act of sexual enlightenment or deflowering merely rendered laughable or violent). As we have seen, it is a form that is far removed from the one governing the “erotic art.” By virtue of the power structure immanent in it, the confessional discourse cannot come from above, as in the ars erotica, through the sovereign will of a master, but rather from below, as an obligatory act of speech which, under some imperious compulsion, breaks the bonds of discretion or forgetfulness. What secrecy it presupposes is not owing to the high price of what it has to say and the small number of those who are worthy of its benefits, but to its obscure familiarity and its general baseness. Its veracity is not guaranteed by the lofty authority of the magistery, nor by the tradition it trans­mits, but by the bond, the basic intimacy in discourse, be­tween the one who speaks and what he is speaking about. On the other hand, the agency of domination does not reside in the one who speaks (for it is he who is constrained), but in the one who listens and says nothing; not in the one who knows and answers, but in the one who questions and is not supposed to know. And this discourse of truth finally takes effect, not in the one who receives it, but in the one from whom it is wrested. With these confessed truths, we are a long way from the learned initiations into pleasure, with their technique and their mystery. On the other hand, we belong to a society which has ordered sex’s difficult knowledge, not according to the transmission of secrets, but around the slow surfacing of confidential statements.

#### Confession creates a relationship of the submissive confesse and a dominant receiver of the confession. The dominator judges, intervenes and attains the power to determine what the confession means. This reifies relations of dominance and submission and a continuance of existing hierarchies.

Anne Coughlin, Associate Prof. of Law @ Vanderbilt Law School. Virginia Law Review. August 1995. “Regulating the Self: Autobiographical Performances in Outsider Scholarship. L/N.

Like so many of the autobiographical practices to which the outsider storytellers have recourse, the **confess**ion has a long and complicated (indeed, one can say, tortured) past. West does not appear to have considered that past, including particularly the power relations that condition the truth that **confess**ional discourse may produce. Contrary to the liberating spirit with which West recommends her confessional technique, many critics (beginning with Michel Foucault) have been skeptical of the claim that confession holds out freedom (whether spiritual, psychological, or material) to the subject who offers the confession. To be sure, **confess**ional discourse does make that claim, as West's argument reflects, but Foucault has speculated that this promise of liberation may be the "internal ruse of confession." Confession implies, if not requires, a relationship of dominance and submission between, respectively, the subject who listens and the subject who speaks "for one does not confess without the presence (or virtual presence) of a partner who is not simply the interlocutor but the authority who requires the confession, prescribes and appreciates it, and intervenes in order to judge, punish, forgive, console, and reconcile." The speaking subject may feel, as West clearly does, that she is the sole author of the truth that her confession produces, and, surely, she contributes to and participates in the production of that truth. However, Foucault's remarks remind us of the power that confession confers on those who listen, the power to decipher what is said and decide what activity is to follow it. West's confessional strategy reproduces the relations of dominance and submission remarked by Foucault, and, further, it embeds those relations within the familiar gender hierarchy. Thus, in West's vision, women must submit the truth about their sexual experiences to men because it is only with their assistance that women can go about changing law. When we consider the particular experiences that West's confessional technique is designed to elicit - dominance and submission feel good in bed to men and women, respectively - and the political truth she derives from those experiences - law must be revised so that it directly supports female (masochistic) pleasure and by implication male (sadistic) pleasure - we must wonder whether her strategy is just another instance of the traditional deployment of the **confess**ional to regulate women's sexuality.

#### Their destroy the possibility of queer resistance by locating it within the position of academia and debate space

Mann in 1996

(Paul, Professor of English @ Pomona College, “The Nine Grounds of Intellectual Warfare”, PMC 6.2, pMUSE-rkc)

Without exception, all positions are oriented toward the institutional apparatus. Marginality here is only relative and temporary: the moment black studies or women's studies or queer theory conceives of itself as a discipline, its primary orientation is toward the institution. The fact that the institution might treat it badly hardly constitutes an ethical privilege. Any intellectual who holds a position is a function of this apparatus; his or her marginality is, for the most part, only an operational device. It is a critical commonplace that the state is not a monolithic hegemony but rather a constellation of disorganized and fragmentary agencies of production. This is often taken as a validation for the political potential of marginal critical movements: inside-outside relations can be facilely deconstructed and critics can still congratulate themselves on their "resistance." But the contrary is clearly the case. The most profitable intellectual production does not take place at the center (e.g., Romance Philology), where mostly obsolete weapons are produced; the real growth industries are located precisely on the self-proclaimed margins. It will be argued that resistance is still possible; nothing I propose here argues against such a possibility. I wish only to insist that effective resistance will never be located in the position, however oppositional it imagines itself to be. Resistance is first of all a function of the apparatus itself. What would seem to be the transgressive potential of such institutional agencies as certain orders of gender criticism might demonstrate the entropy of the institution, but it does nothing to prove the counterpolitical claims of the position. Fantasies of resistance often serve as alibis for collusion. Any position is a state agency, and its relative marginality is a mode of orientation, not an exception. Effective resistance must be located in other tactical forms.

#### Criticism fails by revealing itself to its enemies, and by getting caught up in the very cultural commodification they criticize

Mann, 99 (Paul, Prof. of English at Pomona College, Masocriticism. “The Afterlife of the Avant-Garde, 3-4, mb)

Now autopsies of the putative corpse of the avant-garde usually reveal a predictable etiology In general, it seems the avant-garde died because it was unable to sustain its alterity, its difference, its otherness It produced too many signs of the same and hence exhausted its credibility. The avant-garde died because all major forms of anti-art or aesthetic resistance end up in the very museums and cultural institutions that they began by calling into question; because the avant-garde insistence on innovation reduced itself to the most trivial market for novelties; because its attacks on tradition became tradition; because its attacks on the culture of the commodity only produced more cultural commodities; because it could not at one and the same time oppose mainstream culture and serve as its research and development agency; because anti-art succeeded despite itself in becoming Art; because, in short, the avant-garde continually turned itself into everything it denounced: fashion, commodities, high art, museum culture, Western civilization, bourgeois self- indulgence, and academic commentary. These are the causes or symptorn of the avant-garde’s fatality in the standard accounts. For the most part, I was more interested in what those accounts suggested about the perceived order of contemporary culture than in whether or not any one of them was, strictly speaking, true; but in any case, let us accept them for the moment as a set of facts and gather them into another diagnosis: The avant-garde died of exposure. It died by revealing itself to its enemies. It put itself to death by continually articulating itself within the discursive economy of the cultures it claimed to subvert. It buried itself alive in the very manifestoes, events, collages, poems, and assemblages in which it proposed to live a disruptive and utopian existence. It died by putting itself in a position where people like me can appropriate it. It died of discourse. It talked, wrote, and painted itself to death.

#### It is better intellectual strategy to move away from the logic of position

Mann 95 (Paul, “Stupid Undergrounds.” PMC 5.3, projectmuse, MB)

Intelligence is no longer enough.[5](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern_culture/v005/5.3mann.html" \l "foot5) We have witnessed so many spectacles of critical intelligence's dumb complicity in everything it claims to oppose that we no longer have the slightest confidence in it. One knows with the utmost certainty that the most intense criticism goes hand in hand with the most venal careerism, that institutional critiques bolster the institution by the mere fact of taking part in their discourse, that every position is ignorant of its deepest stakes. Each school of critical thought sustains itself by its stupidity, often expressed in the most scurrilous asides, about its competitors, and a sort of willed blindness about its own investments, hypocrisies, illusory truths. And one can count on each critical generation exposing the founding truths of its predecessors as so much smoke and lies. Thought, reading, analysis, theory, criticism has transported us to so many Laputas that we should hardly be surprised to encounter a general--or perhaps not general enough--mistrust of intelligence as such. What is most "subversive" now is neither critical intelligence nor romantic madness (the commonplace is that they are two sides of the same Enlightenment coin) but the dull weight of stupidity, spectacularly elaborated, and subversive only by means of evacuating the significance of everything it touches--including the romance of subversion itself. To abandon intelligence because it has been duplicitous or built such grandly inane intellectual systems might seem to be throwing the baby out with the bathwater, but if rejecting intelligence is rejecting too much, never underestimate the stupid exhilaration of **too much**; and flying babies are a nicely stupid image, quite suitable for a record cover. Let us insist that we are not arguing for poetic madness breaking out of the prison of reason, nor for the philosophical acephalism of Bataille and his university epigones, still helplessly playing out the dialectic of the enlightenment. The rationalization of unreason is not much of a remedy; that is why we took the trouble to diagnose the recuperation and critical evacuation of Bataille. What confronts us in the stupid underground is also the rationalization of unreason, but it is accompanied by a much more naked idiocy, sheer stupidity posing as value, as the last truth of culture, value without value, and an irresistible lure for suicidal reason. That is, for us, the value--precisely worthless--of the expansive, aggressively sophomoric network of the Church of the SubGenius, of these exaggerated revolutionary claims for a few noisy CDs and nipple piercings, or of the posturing of the so-called Hakim Bey: "I am all too well aware of the 'intelligence' which prevents action. Every once in a while however I have managed to behave as if I were stupid enough to try to change my own life. Sometimes I've used dangerous stupifiants like religion, marijuana, chaos, the love of boys. On a few occasions I have attained some degree of success."[6](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern_culture/v005/5.3mann.html" \l "foot6) The only undergrounds that surface any more are moronic: cross-eyed obfuscators, cranks, latahs,[7](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/postmodern_culture/v005/5.3mann.html" \l "foot7) deadly-serious self-parodists, adolescent fraternities of deep thinkers riding the coattails of castoff suits. What animates the stupid underground is not merely heroic madness or libidinal ideology or a drooping IQ **against** reason, although we still have to listen to all of that repeated, precisely, past the point of endurance; it is something like stupid intelligence, the manic codification of the inane, the willingness to pursue, absolutely at the risk of abject humiliation, absolutely at the risk of making oneself a perfect fool, lines of inquiry that official intelligence would rather have shut down. The dismissal of some dubious scientific fact or method by official intelligence is taken as a clear sign that the powers that be are hiding something important, and that by this very means assumes the status of truth. Enormous labors will be devoted to unlocking its secrets and locating it in a worldview that is as logical as it is laughable, and that sustains the force of truth in large part by giving the lie to official truth. Reactive research, parody of science. Or of the mission of art and cultural commentary. Once it was crucial to separate high and low, art and kitsch, for the very good of the human spirit; then one tried to "transgress" these distinctions, without quite managing to get rid of them. But to copy comic books on vast canvases or laminate a few thriftshop tchotchkis and exhibit them in a major museum is not what used to be called a critical gesture, no matter what the catalogues say. It is not a critical reflection on the commodification of art, but a means of rendering the very distance required for such reflection null and void; not a "deconstruction" (sic) of the institution of art but the evacuation of criticism itself. In this zone, criticism is stupid, hence only stupidity can be critical. The illogic of this proposition cannot entirely eliminate its force. We are caught up in culture's inability to purge itself of the inanity utterly native to it. The patent stupidity of certain postmodern works of art, and of the commentary that tags along behind them, is a symptom of a virulent truth that infects everything and everyone, the holy blood of Van Gogh, Cezanne at his sublime labors, the Sistine Chapel englobing a void, empty frame after empty frame, vast libraries of special pleading, the whole dumb hollow of culture. Criticism as stupidity; the inanity of intelligence and the intelligence of inanity; the absurd hybrid of critical theory and blatant foolishness that today constitutes all that is left of the critical. One must assess the force of this stupidity without simply reasserting for oneself, however tacitly, the superiority of critical intelligence. **Stupid** is no more a term of derision here than it is a term of praise; it is crucial not to mistake this epithet for a gesture of rejection, an attempt to mark out and claim for oneself any critical distance. It indicates a cultural condition that can hardly be embraced but that the pathetic enterprise of criticism is powerless to overcome by the application of more rigorous intellectual tools. We are pursuing a logic for which we have no taste; it binds and tangles one's writing in the most maddening ways; but ultimately the stupid underground constitutes a critique of criticism that must be taken up, however aggravating it is, precisely because it is aggravating. The spectacle of the masocritic trying to give stupidity its due while thinking it through with all the proper rigor, using it to judge himself judging, to judge judgment itself, humiliating himself, elaborating his own discourse as the vehicle of a death that is anything but heroic or sublime: let us take this as the true spectacle of criticism. Stupid vigilance, resistance to what one has already made certain would occur, and would have occurred in any case. Such a project will appear to you merely frivolous, self-indulgently self-defeating, like the course of the fabulous bird that flies in tighter and tighter circles until it disappears up its own asshole. Masocriticism must not defend itself against this perfect and proper charge. What it seeks is precisely guilt by association, stupid abasement. If it is therefore impossible for me to be either on the side of this essay or at any remove from it, that is, for me, its "value." Its ethical value: its stupid value.

We should just turn off the tv their resistance fails—vote neg

Victor Pelevin, “Intel Inside”, AUTODAFE, Spring, 2003, <http://www.autodafe.org/autodafe/autodafe_03/art_15.htm> accessed 9/16/04)

When I hear the expression “intellectual resistance” it reminds me of a souvenir I brought back from Gran Canaria: a large, red fluffy towel with a portrait of Che Guevara. The phrase “intellectual resistance” carries a host of noble connotations, amongst them an echo of nineteen-sixty-eight that stirs the blood pleasantly, making the resister feel somehow younger and sexier. At the same time it is entirely without risk, like sex in two condoms. As a certain remarkable Russian writer has expressed it, it is a means of “creating a non-contradictory unity of liberal values and revolutionary romanticism within the bounds of a single sexually aroused consciousness”. I am not trying to say that I believe intellectuals are dishonest. Or that I think they are cowards. Honesty and courage have nothing to do with it. How can you be honest and courageous in answering a question about which film you like best—Batman or Spiderman? But in this world of ours it is extremely rare for anyone to trouble intellectuals about any other concerns. Intellect is capable of doing anything at all except filling its owner’s belly without selling itself. And so for the modern-day intellectual it is exactly as difficult and as necessary to comment on Pop-Reality as it is for a violinist interned in a concentration camp to play at the guards’ party. So how can you win? It couldn’t be easier. But resistance can only be successful in the internal human dimension, because all openly declared forms of intellectual resistance will incorporated into the censorship as rapidly as new trends in fashion are taken up by consumer chain-store designers. The intellectual’s practical victory does not lie in “exposing television”—you can restart that exposure all over again any day of the week, you will always find a pretext. Victory lies in turning the thing off. I call the quietness that fills the room following this simple action the Third Pole—the point at which you realise that all poles are inside your head, and your head’s just been in a cesspit. That farewell click of the button on the TV, expelling the monopolar glow from the tube, is my heroic contribution to the cause of global intellectual resistance.

# 2NC

# Impact

### 2NC Impact Calc

#### Ongoing colonization results in the justification for the continued genocide of Native peoples- legitimating militarism, environmental destruction, racism, sexism, and homophobia- extinction

#### Ow/s the aff- violence committed against Native people must be understood as qualitatively different than the marginalizations that occur to other minority groups- key to recognizing the colonialist privilege these groups seek to attain on stolen land

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

In this article, Sandy Marie Anglas Grande outlines the tensions between American Indian epistemology and critical pedagogy. She asserts that the deep structures of critical pedagogy fail to consider an Indigenous perspective. In arguing that American Indian scholars should reshape and reimagine critical pedagogy, Grande also calls for critical theorists to reexamine their epistemological foundations. Looking through these two lenses of critical theory and Indigenous scholarship, Grande begins to redefine concepts of democracy, identity, and social justice. Until Indians resolve for themselves a comfortable modern identity that can be used to energize reservation institutions, radical changes will not be of much assistance. (Deloria & Lytle, 1984, p. 266) Our struggle at the moment is to continue to survive and work toward a time when we can replace the need for being preoccupied with survival with a more responsible and peaceful way of living within communities and with the everchanging landscape that will ever be our only home. (Warrior, 1995, p. 126) Broadly speaking, this article focuses on the intersection between dominant modes of critical pedagogy' and American Indian intellectualism.2 At present, critical theories are often indiscriminately employed to explain the sociopolitical conditions of all marginalized peoples. As a result, many Indigenous scholars view the current liberatory project as simply the latest in a long line of political endeavors that fails to consider American Indians as a unique populations Thus, while critical pedagogy may have propelled mainstream educational theory and practice along the path of social justice, I argue that it has muted and thus marginalized the distinctive concerns of American Indian intellectualism and education. As such, I argue further that the particular history of imperialism enacted upon Indigenous peoples requires a reevaluation of dominant views of democracy and social justice, and of the universal validity of such emancipatory projects - including critical pedagogy. It is not that critical pedagogy is irrelevant to Indigenous peoples, as they clearly experience oppression, but rather that the deep structures of the "pedagogy of oppression" fail to consider American Indians as a categorically different population, virtually incomparable to other minority groups. To assert this is not to advocate any kind of hierarchy of oppression but merely to call attention to the fundamental difference of what it means to be a sovereign and tribal people within the geopolitical confines of the United States.

#### If we win the alt resolves most of the affirmative, you frame your ballot in terms of the risk of a link-

#### The deconstruction of heternormativity relies on colonialist power to realize its goal, ultimately replicating the same violence committed against queer bodies and resulting in failed solvency of the aff-Our criticism is key to inform solvency of case impacts

Driskill, 2010 (Qwo-Li, “Doubleweaving Two-Spirit critiques: Building alliances between Native and Queer Studies.” GLQ Vol 16, #1-2, 2010, Projectmust, MB)

David Eng, Judith Halberstam, and Muñoz have asked, "What does queer studies have to say about empire, globalization, neoliberalism, sovereignty, and terrorism? What does queer studies tell us about immigration, citizenship, prisons, welfare, mourning, and human rights?"59 While these moves in queer studies are creating productive theories, they haven't addressed the complicated colonial realities of Native people in the United States and Canada. In an attempt to answer the questions posited above within specifically Native contexts, Two-Spirit critiques point to queer studies's responsibility to examine ongoing colonialism, genocide, survival, and resistance of Native nations and peoples. Further, they challenge queer studies to complicate notions of nationhood and diaspora by paying attention to the specific circumstances of nations Indigenous to the land bases the United States and Canada are colonizing. To push the above questions farther, [End Page 86] I would like to ask what Two-Spirit critiques can tell us about these same issues. In addition, what can Two-Spirit critiques tell us about nationhood, diaspora, colonization, and decolonization? What do they have to say about Native nationalisms, treaty rights, citizenship, and noncitizenship? What can they tell us about the boarding/residential schools, biopiracy, the Allotment Act, the Removal Act, the Relocation Act, the Reorganization Act, and the Indian Act? How can they inform our understandings of the roles of misogyny, homophobia, transphobia, and heterosexism in colonization? What do they have to say about Native language restoration, traditional knowledge, and sustainability? What do Two-Spirit critiques teach us about survival, resistance, and continuance?

# Link

## 2NC Link Wall v. ISU

#### Aff rhetoric is sufficient to link- rhetoric on Sedwick “queer bodies cannot be distinctly marked out by one visible identifier”

And another sedwick card- in the vicinity of the closet, even what counts as a speech act is problematized on a perfectly routine basis. As Foucault says: "there is no binary division to be made between what one says and what one does not say

Rodriguez-

Fantasy is¶ what allows us to imagine ourselves and others otherwise

Sedwick

Unlike genocide directed against Jews, Native Americans, Africans, or other groups, then, gay genocide, the once-and-for-all eradication of gay populations, however potent and sustained as a project or fantasy of modern Western culture, is not possible short of the eradication of the whole human species.

#### Aff cx description- problem is stable identity categories that are not seen as productive- get rid of these categories

The aff’s strategic silence must be read as a narrative of settlement- the absence of the Native is a story of settler qualities, subjects, and culture

Morgensen 2010

[Scott, 2k10, GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 16, Number 1-2, “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities, 2010. 5http://muse.jhu.edu.ezprox.bard.edu/journals/journal\_of\_lesbian\_and\_gay\_studies/v016/16.1-2.morgensen.html#]

Settler colonialism is the open secret in most historical work in U.S. sexuality studies and queer studies. Settler colonialism conditioned every aspect of the history of sexuality in the United States, but only rarely has it been made a focus of study. My account has suggested a convergence between the sexual colonization of Native peoples and the growth in the United States of techniques of modern sexuality. These proliferated in the decades following the frontier's "closure," a time that in fact represented a heyday of state and religious efforts to institute a colonial education of desire, as in the events at the Crow Agency or during the 1879 – 1918 tenure of the Carlisle Indian School. Far from reflecting finality, this period witnessed tense negotiations of active and contested settlement. In such a time, any iteration of modern sexuality that placed Native people in the past knew itself to be a contingent claim that remained open to challenge. Thus scholars must recognize that modern sexuality is not a product of settler colonialism, as if it came into being in the United States after settlement transpired. Modern sexuality arose in the United States as a method to produce settler colonialism, and settler subjects, by facilitating ongoing conquest and naturalizing its effects. The normative function of settlement is to appear inevitable and final. It is naturalized again whenever sexuality or queer studies scholars inscribe it as an unexamined backdrop to the historical formation of modern U.S. sexual cultures and politics.Scholars in Native and American studies have theorized settler colonialism as the social processes and narratives that displace Native people MARKED while granting settlers belonging to Native land and settler society. With Renée Bergland and [End Page 117] James Cox, I examine how this displacement is enabled by settler narratives of Native absence or disappearance.41 Both terms share a quality of invoking the very thing being argued as not present. Stories of Native absence or disappearance thus precisely do not erase Native people but produce particular forms of knowledge about Native people, as already or inevitably gone. Cox argues that tales of Native disappearance should also be read as narratives of settlement. The very absence of Native people in a story is telling us a story about qualities of settler subjects, cultures, and social life.

#### Grande isolates another link-

#### Fluid Identity-fluidity is based on western conceptions of individual freedom that ignore the way that Indigenous peoples for their identity ties with the land, causes same forms of colonial domination- perm can’t solve because it begins under the auspice that fixed identity can never be good, when in reality it is essential to a critique of colonialism

#### Objective Truth-Deconstruction erases the objective truth of sovereignty and Native histories – perm can’t solve because it denies the possibility of objective truth in the name of radical sexual politics, thereby erasing the facticity of the genocide of the Native American

Gorelova, 2009 (Olena, “Postmodernism, native American literature, and Issues of sovereignty.” http://etd.lib.montana.edu/etd/2009/gorelova/GorelovaO0509.pdf, online, MB)

Postmodernism is all about bringing margins into the play and rejecting grand narratives. Michael Dear and Gregg Wassmansdorf point out in *Postmodern Consequences* that postmodernists learn to contextualize and reject meta-theories in favor of undecidability and microexplanations and renounce the universal truth. Nevertheless, Craig Womack’s statement that there is Native American truth and it is worth looking for (Womack 4) seems to be more convincing, especially in terms of quest for sovereignty and re-establishment of Native histories and their validity. It is way too premature for Native scholars to deconstruct history when we haven’t yet constructed it. We need, for example, to recover the nineteenth century, especially in terms of understanding what Native writers were up to during that time and how their struggles have evolved toward what Indian writers can say in print today, as well as foundational principles they provide for an indigenous criticism. (Womack 3) Deconstructing history and identity would negate the whole purpose of American Indian literature, which, by many scholars, is identified as a support of sovereignty. Postmodernism deconstructs identity and gets rid of Native American points of view, thus putting Native perspective as well as Native narrative and story out of existence. Womack points out that postmodernism has a “tendency to decenter everything, including the legitimacy of a Native perspective” (Womack 6). Therefore, on the one hand, it undermines the ideology of the dominant mainstream society by ridding it of the notion of “alien other” and introducing it into the positive world of differences. On the other hand, the loss of center leads to the loss of meaning and history, therefore devaluing Native perspective as well as five hundred years of colonization that is still ongoing.

# Perm

## 2NC A2 Perm

#### Third, There is no permutation- Non-native queers are constructed as subjects of life within the biopolitical regime of colonialism whereas Natives are subjects of death- this understanding conditioned and informs queer politics

Morgensen 2010

[Scott, 2k10, GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 16, Number 1-2, “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities, 2010. 5http://muse.jhu.edu.ezprox.bard.edu/journals/journal\_of\_lesbian\_and\_gay\_studies/v016/16.1-2.morgensen.html#]

Stoler's reading of colonial biopolitics helps illuminate how in the United States the sexual colonization of Native peoples relates to the settler sexuality that arose to control and supplant them. While Stoler focused on historical colonies rather than settler societies, feminist and queer work in Native studies more directly inspires study of the biopolitics of settler colonialism. Modern sexuality arose in the United States amid the colonial conditions of a settler society. Terrorizing violence marked Native peoples as sexually deviant populations to be subjected to a colonial education of desire, while agents and beneficiaries of sexual colonization became subjects of settler sexuality. Settlement and its naturalization then conditioned the emergence of modern queer formations, including their inheritance and sustaining of colonial biopolitics in the form of settler homonationalism. [End Page 110]But what historical dynamics produced Native peoples as queered populations marked for death, and settlers as subjects of life —including, at times, as homonationalists? Detailed accounts have yet to be written. Yet signs appear already in histories of the sexual colonization of Native peoples that mark the trajectory suggested by Foucault, in which the spectacular violence of a sovereign right of death was incorporated into the deadly logic of disciplinary regulation. Colonial brutality always targeted sexual transgressions to control Native communities. But the growth of modern biopolitics linked the discipline of individuals to that of communities and defined Native people as racial and sexual populations for regulation. I now reread such histories in the United States as contexts in relation to which non-Native queer formations could

arise as modern inheritors of the discipline of Native communities in a settler state.

#### Fifth, The permutation is a thinly veiled attempt at reconstituting colonialism in that it obscures queer politics’ relationship to the terror of violence visited on Native people as a unique experience- any attempt to join the two projects fails

Morgensen 2010

[Scott, 2k10, GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 16, Number 1-2, “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities, 2010. 5http://muse.jhu.edu.ezprox.bard.edu/journals/journal\_of\_lesbian\_and\_gay\_studies/v016/16.1-2.morgensen.html#]

What would it mean for U.S. queers to confront their settler formation? What would resistance to settler homonationalism look like? While I cannot foresee an end to these questions, I begin with the deceptively simple argument that queers must denaturalize settler colonialism in all its forms. Queers naturalize settler colonialism whenever conquest and the displacement of Native peoples are ignored or appear inevitable. They also do so whenever they produce sexuality and gender from the desires of settler subjects for a home on Native land and relationship to Native histories and culture. Settler colonialism thus must be challenged not only in social and political spaces but also in the definition or experience of subjectivity. For instance, non-Natives may think that as queer subjects, they inherit ties to Native histories of gender or sexual diversity that grant them a kind of kinship with Native peoples. Identifying this way, non-Native queers may think that the terrors of sexual colonization visited on Native peoples were caused by persons unrelated to them or that those same violences were visited on themselves, either of which may obscure their specific non-Native relation to Native peoples and settler colonialism. At its extreme, non-Native queer longing for Native histories of sexuality or gender can seem to invite alliance when it performs a racial or national "passing" [End Page 121] that appropriates Native culture in order to indigenize non-Native queers. Native queer and Two-Spirit activists critique such practices, including offers of alliance that try to absorb them or Native histories into non-Native politics. While Two-Spirit activists have sought recognition in U.S. queer spaces, they have done so less to join them than to hold them responsible to the distinctions of Native histories, which remind non-Natives that colonization continues to shape contemporary life.

#### AND Fixed identities are good

#### Fragmenting the identity of the Native assumes that they have an identity to begin with- it is the ultimate bourgeoisie colonialist luxury to call for deconstruction of that which no one else has ever even been able to access

#### The permutation is the colonialist status quo, stripping the alternative of its intellectualism and adding the native identity as just another marginalized voice, fluid identity is a dangerous strategy that makes modern day colonialism possible

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

Corporate Commodification

The forces of both ethnic fraud and cultural encroachment operate to create a climate ripe for the corporate commodification of American Indianness. While this commodification takes many forms, it is perhaps most visible in the marketing of Indian narratives, particularly publishing, in which literary/cultural forms of Indian intellectualism have been historically favored over critical forms. For instance, Indigenous scholar Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (1998) questions why the same editors and agents who solicit her "life story" also routinely reject her scholarly work. She writes, "While I may have a reasonable understanding why a state-run university press would not want to publish research that has little good to say about America's relationship to tribes.... I am at a loss to explain why anyone would be more interested in my life story (which for one thing is quite unremarkable)" (p. 121). The explanation, of course, is that the marketable narrative is that which subscribes to the Whitestream notion of Indian as romantic figure, and not Indian as scholar and social critic. Such a predisposition works to favor not only cultural/literary forms of American Indian intellectualism over critical forms, but also the work of "fraudulent" Indians over that of "legitimate" American Indian scholars. Cook-Lynn (1998) argues that, just as the rights to our land remain in the hands of the Whitestream government, the rights to our stories remain in non-Indian enclaves. Deloria (1998) similarly contends that what passes in the academic world as legitimate scholarship on American Indians is often the product of average scholars (often White) advocating a predetermined anti-Indian agenda2 and "fraudulent" Indians. That such work has been allowed to corner the market raises the question of who controls access to the intellectual property of American Indian peoples. Deloria himself asks, "Who is it that has made such people as Adolph Hungry Wolf, Jamake Highwater, Joseph Epes Brown, Su Bear, Rolling Thunder, Wallace Black Elk, John Redtail Freesoul, Lynn Andrews, and Dhyani Ywahoo the spokespeople of American Indians?" (p. 79). He responds by naming Whitestream America as both patron and peddler of the Hollywood Indian. He writes, "They [the fraudulent Indians] represent the intense desire of Whites to create in their own minds an Indian they want to believe in" (p. 79). As such, the market is flooded with tragic stories of lost cultures, intimate narratives of "frontier life," and quasi-historic accounts of the Native Americans' plight. Such stories are told and retold as part of America's dark and distant past, a bygone era of misguided faith where cultural genocide is depicted as an egregious but perhaps unavoidable consequence of the country's manifest destiny toward democracy. While I would never argue that stories depicting the truth of Native peoples' tragic experiences (e.g., Indian boarding schools, the Trail of Tears) do not deserve a central place in the telling of American history, such accounts become problematic in the wider context of Whitestream consumption of Indian history. Why are these stories the ones most often presented as the prime-time programs in the commodified literary network of Indian history? What is gained by focusing on these particular aspects of White domination and Indian subjugation? I argue that such stories serve several purposes, none of which contributes to the emancipatory project of American Indians. First, by propagating the romantic image of American Indians and concomitantly marginalizing the work of Indigenous intellectuals and social critics, Whitestream publishers maintain control over the epistemic frames that define Indians, and thus over the fund of available knowledge on American Indians. Second, such control is underwritten by the understanding that American Indian intellectualism exists as a threat to the myth of the everevolving democratization of Indian-White relations, and to the notion that cultural genocide is a remnant of America's dark and distant past. Third, the often oversimplified accounts of Indian history, framed in good-v.-badguy terms, allow the consumer to fault rogue groups of dogmatic missionaries and wayward military officers for the slow but steady erosion of Indigenous life, thereby distancing themselves and mainstream government from the ongoing project of cultural genocide. Finally, the focus on Indian history allows the Whitestream to avoid issues facing American Indians in the twenty-first century. As a result, Indians as a modern people remain invisible, allowing a wide array of distorted myths to flourish as contemporary reality - for example, that all the "real" Indians are extinct, that the surviving Indians are all alcoholic-drug addicts who have forsaken traditional ways to become budding capitalists, gaming entrepreneurs, and casino owners - and find their way into public discourse. At the same time these images are circulated, the intensive, ongoing court battles over land, natural resources, and federal recognition are ignored, fueling the great lie of twenty-first century democracy - that America's "Indian problem" has long been solved. Discussion. The forces of identity appropriation, cultural encroachment, and corporate commodification pressure American Indian communities to employ essentialist tactics and construct relatively fixed notions of identity, and to render the concepts of fluidity and transgression highly problematic. It is evident from the examples above that the notion of fluid boundaries has never worked to the advantage of Indigenous peoples: federal agencies have invoked the language of fluid or unstable identities as the rationale for dismantling the structures of tribal life and creating greater dependency on the U.S. government; Whitestream America has seized its message to declare open season on Indians, thereby appropriating Native lands, culture, spiritual practices, history, and literature; and Whitestream academics have now employed the language of postmodern fluidity to unwittingly transmute centuries of war between Indigenous peoples and their respective nation-states into a "genetic and cultural dialogue" (Valle & Torres, 1995, p. 141). Thus, in spite of its aspirations to social justice, the notion of a new cultural democracy based on the ideal of mestizaje represents a rather ominous threat to American Indian communities.

# Method

### 2NC-Method key F/L

#### First, this debate is a question of methods-if we prove their approach to politics is epistemologically bankrupt and informed by colonialism, the aff lacks solvency and cannot resolve the k impact

#### Second, Their methodology is bad- it arose on stolen land and thus colonialism created the conditions for its rise as well as informed its politics

Morgensen 2010

[Scott, 2k10, GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 16, Number 1-2, “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities, 2010. 5http://muse.jhu.edu.ezprox.bard.edu/journals/journal\_of\_lesbian\_and\_gay\_studies/v016/16.1-2.morgensen.html#]

While I argue that homonationalism arises whenever settler colonialism is naturalized in U.S. queer projects, tracing this process demands more than simply adding the word "settler" to the term. Puar examines homonationalism as a formation of national sexuality linked to war and terror, and both must inform a theory of [End Page 107] settler homonationalism. Puar argues that in the biopolitics of U.S. empire, homonationalism makes the subjects of queer modernities "regulatory" over queered and "terrorist" populations that are placed under terrorizing state control. In kind, a theory of settler homonationalism must ask how in the United States, the terrorizing sexual colonization of Native peoples produced the colonial biopolitics of modern sexuality that conditioned queer formations past and present. My essay reinterprets historical writing on sexual colonization and on modern queer formations to explain how these processes relationally positioned varied non-Native and Native people within a colonial biopolitics. But this account rests, first, on linking insights in Native studies on gender and sexuality to feminist scholarship on biopolitics in colonial studies.

#### Third, our Methodology is good and key, rather than beginning from an understanding of identity that perpetuates colonial structures, you should endorse a methodology which addresses the needs of colonized people and begins from Indigenous Intellectualism

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

In the first draft of the final report of the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force, Indigenous scholar and activist Michael Charleston (1994) writes of the importance of coalition and its central role in the development of effective American Indian schools and Indian-centered curricula. Rather than the abstract language of critical pedagogy, however, Charleston invokes the Lakota tradition of the Ghost Dance as a metaphor of the need for healing through community, ceremony, sacrifice, and tradition.23 He writes: The new Ghost Dance calls Native and non-Native peoples to join together and take action. It calls us to be responsible for the future of the people of our tribes. It calls us to protect, revive and restore our cultures, our Native languages, our religions and values. It calls us to heal our people, our families, our tribes, and our societies. It calls for harmony and respect among all relations of creation. It offers a future of co-existence of tribal societies with other American societies ... indeed domination, oppression, and bigotry are exactly what we are overcoming in the new Ghost Dance as we seek to establish harmony and co-existence of tribes with other societies in the modern world. (p. 28) This spirit of coalition reflects the growing desire among American Indians to work together and form alliances with Native and non-Native forces in a mutual quest for American Indian sovereignty and self-determination. Though Charleston's rendition of coalition reflects the spirit of mestizaje - that is, the blurring of political, racial, and cultural borders in the service of social justice - he carefully relegates such coalition to the realm of sociopolitical action. In other words, the new Ghost Dance calls to Indian and non-Indian peoples to take collective action against U.S. policies that continue the project of colonization and cultural genocide. It is thus not a call for the embodiment, in critical-theoretical terms, of a transcultural, transnational subject that calls into question the very notion of authentic identities (McLaren, 1997), but rather a metaphor for collective political action. This is not to say that Charleston or other American Indian scholars do not support the notion that identity is constructed through multiple, intersecting, and contradictory elements. Rather, they remain wary of constructionist understandings of identity that, in the process of providing a corrective to static notions of culture, ignore the real possibility of culture loss that is, the real existing threat of cultural genocide of Indigenous peoples. Hale (2000) is worth quoting at length: When (cultural) transformation is conflated with loss ... the collective trauma is obscured and the brute historical fact of ethnocide is softened. The culprits in this erasure are the Indians' . . . enemies, but even more centrally ... elites who embraced classic nineteenth century liberalism cast in the idiom of mestizaje. A homogeneous and individualized notion of citizenship could not be compatible with the rights of Indian communities whose collective histories and identities stood opposed to the dominant mestizo culture.Just beneath the alluring promises to Indians who would accept these individual rights of citizenship was incomprehension, invisibility, and punishing racism for those who would not. (p. 269) Again, though the contemporary critical project of mestizaje is in many ways antithetical to the Latin American one, both projects ignore the "brute historical fact of ethnocide" and the invisibility of Indians within the broader democratic project. In contradistinction to the critical notion of mestizaje, American Indian scholars seek understandings of identity that not only reflect the multiple and contradictory aspects of contemporary experience, but also maintain a sense of American Indians as historically placed, sovereign peoples. For them, sovereignty is not a political ideology but a way of life (Warrior, 1995). As Charleston (1994) writes, "Our tribes are at a very critical point in our history again. We can stand by and wait for our children and grandchildren to be assimilated into mainstream American society as proud ethnic descendants of extinct tribal peoples. . . . Or, we can protect our tribes, as our ancestors did, and ensure a future for our children and grandchildren as tribal people" (p. 28).

# 1NR

#### Queer theory has NO ability to incorporate into practical solutions

Berlant and Warner 95 (Lauren and Michael, professor of English at the University of Chicago/author of The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopia, and Everyday life/essays on citizenship, sexuality, identity and the public sphere/coeditor of Critical Inquiry and Public Culture AND associate professor of English at Rutgers University, New Brunswick/author of Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century America/editor of Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory/coeditor of The Origins of Literary Studies in America/The English Literatures of America, PMLA 110, UPenn, <http://www.english.upenn.edu/~cavitch/pdf-library/BerlantWarner_WhatDoesQueerTheory.pdf>)

If queer commentary were expected either to master or to adjucate “the politics” of a developing critical culture, it would be condemned to the failure of mere theory or to the resentfulness of a critique that could not usefully be heard. One of the stresses on queer intellectuals in the academy is that there are few queer intellectual publics outside it. Like the mainstream straight press, the organs of the national gay press – in particular, the Advocate, Out, Denueve, Ten Percent – have been either oblivious or hostile to queer theory. (Exceptions to this trend are On Our Backs and Girlfriends.) And even inside the academy, questions about queer theory’s political utility are occasionally not in the best faith. Sometimes they serve to ward off theory from a model of gay studies that has a more affirmative relations to its imagine constituency. In this context, queer commentary provides exactly what some fear it will: perspectives and archives to challenge the comforts of privilege and unself-consciousness. Sometimes, though, the questions of political utility arise from a real sense of political need. We have been asked, for example, “What does queer theory teach us about twelve-step programs?” “the power of new markets?” “spirituality?” What does queer theory teach us about x? When a new thing emerges, people want to know how it is going to solve problems. When it is called theory, it is expected to produce a program, and when the theory addresses the broad issue of queerness, the program is expected to explain queer life. But queer theory has not yet undertaken the kind of general description of the world that would allow it to produce practical solutions. People want to know what costs, risks, and tactics are involved in getting from this order of things to a better one. Asked for these reasons, the question of x is both a challenge and a hope. And it is a hard question.

#### Queer theory offers nothing in terms of political solutions- means you can’t affect change- prefer specificity- you only >academic experiments

Berlant and Warner 95 (Lauren and Michael, professor of English at the University of Chicago/author of The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopia, and Everyday life/essays on citizenship, sexuality, identity and the public sphere/coeditor of Critical Inquiry and Public Culture AND associate professor of English at Rutgers University, New Brunswick/author of Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century America/editor of Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory/coeditor of The Origins of Literary Studies in America/The English Literatures of America, PMLA 110, UPenn, <http://www.english.upenn.edu/~cavitch/pdf-library/BerlantWarner_WhatDoesQueerTheory.pdf>)

Sometimes the question of what queer theory teaches us about x is not about politics in the usual sense but about personal survival. Like feminist, African American, Latina/Latino, and other minority projects, queer work strikes its readers as knowledge central to living. This demand puts tremendous pressure on emerging work, pressure that makes the work simultaneously conventional and unprecedented in the humanities and social sciences – traditional insofar as pedagogy has long involved the formation of identities and subjectivities, radical in the aspiration to live another way now, here. What does queer theory teach us about x? As difficult as it would be to spell out programmatic content for an answer, this simple question still has the power to wrench frames. What does queer commentary teach us about literature or about the L in PMLA? How doe literary engagements participate in queer world building? This question is not frequently posed, for fear that the answer would be, Nothing. Queer commentary has involved a certain amount of experimenting, of prancing and squatting on the academic stage. This is partly to remind people that there is an academic stage and that its protocols and properties have maintained an invisible heteronormativity, one that infiltrates our profession, our knowledge, and this editorial. This does not mean we embrace, or disavow, the indecorous per sec. indecorum can be a way of bringing some dignity to the abject. But it is also a way of changing the public for academic work, of keeping the door ajar.

#### Lesbian and transgendered D/A-

#### Creating a construct of what’s acceptable gender identity and ignoring the material obstructions faced by these identities makes a flawed epistemology that leads to the erasure of lesbians who want to have children- he says they include transsexuals- obviously not true- you may orient yourself towards other bodies but the end result is people feel dismissed ans obstructed when they’re bastardized for an identity that falls outside your realm- especially true as causes transgendered persons to feel ashamed of their identities- which is the squo-

#### 2. as per your natives card- gender relations always context-specific meaning the ideology of the aff always happens prior to the inclusion of other entities- turns the aff because your can’t create a space for all bodies

#### Fluid subject boundaries are used to deny others state protection – it’s not all about you.

Joshua Gamson, Professor of sociology at University of San Francisco, “Must Identity Movements Self-Destruct? A Queer Dilemma” from the book Social Perspectives in Lesbian & Gay Studies: A Reader, 1995.

The overwhelmingly female participation in the Bay Times disputes over bisexuality and transgender inclusion underscores this point. **Lesbians are especially threatened by the muddying of male/female and gay/straight categorizations exactly because it is by keeping sexual and gender categories hard and clear that gains are made. Lesbian visibility is more recent and hard won; in struggles against patriarchal control, moreover, lesbianism and feminism have often been strongly linked. Gay men react with less vehemence because of the stronger political position from which they encounter the queer challenge: as men, as gay men with a more established public identity.** Just as they are gaining political ground as lesbians, lesbians are asked not only to share it but to subvert it, by declaring woman and lesbian to be unstable, permeable, fluid categories. Similar pitfalls were evident in the 1993 fight over Colorado's Amendment 2, which prohibits "the state or any of its subdivisions from outlawing discrimination against gay men, lesbians, or bisexuals" (Minkowitz 1993). The Colorado solicitor general, as reporter Donna Minkowitz put it, made arguments" that could have appeared in a queer core rant, "promoting" a remarkably Foucaultian view of queerness as a contingent category, whose members can slip in and out of its boundaries like subversive fish" (Minkowitz 1993:27). "We don't have a group that is easily confinable," the solicitor general argued. **Here, the fluidity of group boundaries and the provisional nature of collective identity was used to argue that no one should receive legal benefits or state protection-because there is no discernible group to be protected.** Although the solicitor-general-as-queer-theorist is a strange twist, the lesson is familiar: **as long as membership in this group is unclear, minority status, and therefore rights and protection, are unavailable.**

#### Confessionaism D/A-

#### yYou make an obligatory act of speech that wherein the you don’t reconcile how the power held by the receiver will receive the secret- only makes possible more normalization and erasure of productive politics because hierarchal and dominant powers will intervene in the process of reception and determine what they belief the secret ought to mean

you don’t get an eroticism d/a- roger concedes in crossx that these power relations are flawed- confessionalism allows the heteronormative of the squo to dominate over their projects

and you link to this- Confessionism can undertake many forms. The act of confession always establishes new practices and recreates the act one is to be confessing- means the aff makes a forced choice where people come

Michel Foucault, Former director @ the Institut Francais at Hamburg. The History of Sexuality Volume I. 1978. pgs 59-67

The confession was, and still remains, the general standard governing the production of the true discourse on sex. It has undergone a considerable transformation, however. For a long time, it remained firmly entrenched in the practice of penance. But with the rise of Protestantism, the Counter Reformation, eighteenth-century pedagogy, and nineteenth-century medicine, it gradually lost its ritualistic and exclu­sive localization; it spread; it has been employed in a whole series of relationships: children and parents, students and educators, patients and psychiatrists, delinquents and ex­perts. The motivations and effects it is expected to produce have varied, as have the forms it has taken: interrogations, consultations, autobiographical narratives, letters; they have been recorded, transcribed, assembled into dossiers, pub­lished, and commented on. But more important, the confes­sion lends itself, if not to other domains, at least to new ways of exploring the existing ones. It is no longer a question simply of saying what was done—the sexual act—and how it was done; but of reconstructing, in and around the act, the thoughts that recapitulated it, the obsessions that accom­panied it, the images, desires, modulations, and quality of the pleasure that animated it. For the first time no doubt, a society has taken upon itself to solicit and hear the imparting of individual pleasures.

The ability to interpret and determine the truth of a confession enables the listener of the confession to achieve a status of master, an arbiter of truth and absolver of sin.

Anne Coughlin, Associate Prof. of Law @ Vanderbilt Law School. Virginia Law Review. August 1995. “Regulating the Self: Autobiographical Performances in Outsider Scholarship. L/N.

Upon locating within confessional discourse the same relations of dominance and submission that West prizes as the source of erotic pleasure, we also must remark the complicated and productive relationship between confessional discourse and the pleasurable experiences it reproduces. Although West does not examine that relationship, popular culture is well-acquainted with the erotic charge produced by confessional activity. Yet again, Foucault's provocative discussion of confession contains relevant speculations, as he wonders whether Western culture's admonition to confess the truth of sex functions as a kind of "ars erotica." Foucault's remarks remind us of the pleasure that the speaking subject takes in the confessional activity itself, as distinct from the pleasure provided by the sexual activity to which she confesses: The anguish of answering questions and the delights of having one's words interpreted; all the stories told to oneself and to others, so much curiosity, so many confidences offered in the face of scandal, sustained - but not without trembling a little - by the obligation of truth; the profusion of secret fantasies and the dearly paid right to whisper them to whoever is able to hear them .... T he listener in whom the speaking subject confides also finds the confessional activity to be pleasurable, albeit of a different quality. A confessional narrative arouses in the listener the desire to discover its meaning; thus, its allure for the listener resides in the "pleasure of mastery," which he secures by his authority to interpret and thereby contribute to the truth that the confession contains.

Ignoring the role of power allows the sovereign to reinscribe the silent war inequality. This turns your project.

Foucault 2003, (Michel, Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976,2003, p. 15-6)

Second—second off-the-cuff answer, if you like—if power is indeed the implementation and deployment of a relationship of force, rather than analyzing it in terms of surrender, contract, and alienation, or rather than analyzing it in functional terms as the reproduction of the relations of production, shouldn’t we be analyzing it first and foremost in terms of conflict, confrontation, and war? That would give us an alternative to the first hypothesis—which is that the mechanism of power is basically or essentially repression—or a second hypothesis: Power is war, the continuation of war by other means. At this point, we can invert Clausewitz’s proposition~ and say that politics is the continuation of war by other means. This would imply three things. First, that power relations, as they function in a society like ours, are essentially anchored in a certain relationship of force that was established in and through war at a given historical moment that can be historically specified. And while it is true that political power puts an end to war and establishes or attempts to establish the reign of peace in civil society, it certainly does not do so in order to suspend the effects of power or to neutralize the disequilibrium revealed by the last battle of § Marked 15:41 § the war. According to this hypothesis, the role of political power is perpetually to use a sort of silent war to reinscribe that relationship of force, and to reinscribe it in institutions, economic inequalities, language, and even the bodies of individuals. This is the initial meaning of our inversion of Clausewitz’s aphorism—politics is the continuation of war by other means. Politics, in other words, sanctions and reproduces the disequilibrium of forces manifested in war. Inverting the proposition also means something else, namely that within this “civil peace,” these political struggles, these clashes over or with power, these modifications of relations of force—the shifting balance, the reversals—in a political system, all these things must be interpreted as a continuation of war. And they are interpreted as so many episodes, fragmentations, and displacements of the war itself. We are always writing the history of the same war, even when we are writing the history of peace and its institutions.

The hearer of the confession is the ultimate master, not only do they regulate the truth but they possess the power to interpret the meaning and importance of the confession. It’s the ultimate act of commodification.

Foucault 1978, (Michel, Former director @ the Institut Francais at Hamburg. The History of Sexuality Volume I. 1978. pgs 59-67)

Through the method of interpretation. If one had to confess, this was not merely because the person to whom one confessed had the power to forgive, console, and direct, but because the work of producing the truth was obliged to pass through this relationship if it was to be scientifically vali­dated. The truth did not reside solely in the subject who, by confessing, would reveal it wholly formed. It was constituted in two stages: present but incomplete, blind to itself, in the one who spoke, it could only reach completion in the one who assimilated and recorded it. It was the latter’s function to verify this obscure truth: the revelation of confession had to be coupled with the decipherment of what it said. The one who listened was not simply the forgiving master, the judge who condemned or acquitted; he was the master of truth. His was a hermaneutic function. With regard to the confession, his power was not only to demand it before it was made, or decide what was to follow after it, but also to constitute a discourse of truth on the basis of its decipherment. By no longer making the confession a test, but rather a sign, and by making sexuality something to be interpreted, the nineteenth century gave itself the possibility of causing the procedures of confession to operate within the regular formation of a scientific discourse.

Revealing secrets detrimental—plan risk radical backfire that alienates individuals from their social network

Kelly and McKillop, 1996

[Anita and Kevin, Univ. of Notre Dame and Washington College, “Consequences of revealing personal secrets.” Psychological bulletin, Vol. 120, # 3, 450-465] /Wyo-MB

The most common reason a sample of long-term therapy cli- ents gave for not revealing their secrets during sessions was that they were too ashamed or embarrassed to tell their counselor about them (Hill et al., 1993). This sample was composed of clients who were selected by their therapists for the research, so they were likely to have had a good relationship with their therapist--yet the clients felt unable to share their secrets anyway. It makes sense that even therapy clients would fear revealing some secrets to their counselors because they have probably been rejected for revealing them in the past. Unfortunately, the people who most desperately need supportive feedback, such as those who are extremely depressed or have suffered a major loss, are the least likely to receive the support (Silver, Wortman, & Crofton, 1990). If individuals who have experienced negative life events "maximize their chances for personal adjustment by openly expressing their distress, they may risk alienating their social network" (p. 401 ). Research has shown that those who express their struggles actually elicit more rejection from others than do people who act as if they are coping quite well (Coates, Wortman, & Abbey, 1979) and that people respond negatively to depressed individuals (see Gurtman, 1986, for a review). For instance, in one experiment, Strack and Coyne (1983) demon- strated that depressed people elicited depression, anxiety, hos- tility, and rejection from others with whom they interacted for only 15 min. People also tend to be avoided by confidants altogether after revealing secrets to them (e.g., Coates et al., 1979; and Lazarus, 1985). For example, patients with cancer live with constant fear, but they do not share their fear with family, friends, and health care staff because these individuals do not respond well to such revelations (Spiegel, 1992). The patients, therefore, end up withdrawing from others and feeling isolated (Spiegel, 1992). This isolation is potentially extremely problematic for the patient: Considerable evidence has shown that weaker social support is associated with less protection from stress and its related physical problems (see Broadhead et al., 1983; Kessler & McLeod, 1985; Kessler, Price, & Wortman, 1985; Levy, 1983; Mueller, 1980; Turner, 1983; and Wortman, 1984, for reviews). Moreover, Baumeister and Leary (1995) have gathered a great deal of empirical support for the idea that the need to belong is a fundamental human motivation. Any severe threat to one's network of social attachments should prove both physically and psychologically detrimental to the individual. Another reason people give for not sharing their traumatic or negative secrets is that they are concerned that they will upset others if they do reveal secrets to them (Pennebaker, 1993; Pen- nebaker, Barger, & Tiebout, 1989). One study showed that peo- ple who lived with a person having depression reported that they were upset by that person's complaints of worthlessness and ex- pressions of worry (Coyne et al., 1987 ). Research has also dem- onstrated that when people observe the distress of others, they often respond with increased physiological and psychological arousal (Lazarus, Speisman, Mordkof, & Davison, 1962; Ler- ner, 1980), sharp changes in mood (Tannenbaum & Gaer, 1965), and aversive ruminations related to the distress (Horowitz, 1975, 1976; Horowitz & Wilner, 1976; Wilner & Horowitz, 1975).

Ignoring the role of power allows the sovereign to reinscribe the silent war inequality. This turns your project.

Foucault 2003, (Michel, Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976,2003, p. 15-6)

Second—second off-the-cuff answer, if you like—if power is indeed the implementation and deployment of a relationship of force, rather than analyzing it in terms of surrender, contract, and alienation, or rather than analyzing it in functional terms as the reproduction of the relations of production, shouldn’t we be analyzing it first and foremost in terms of conflict, confrontation, and war? That would give us an alternative to the first hypothesis—which is that the mechanism of power is basically or essentially repression—or a second hypothesis: Power is war, the continuation of war by other means. At this point, we can invert Clausewitz’s proposition~ and say that politics is the continuation of war by other means. This would imply three things. First, that power relations, as they function in a society like ours, are essentially anchored in a certain relationship of force that was established in and through war at a given historical moment that can be historically specified. And while it is true that political power puts an end to war and establishes or attempts to establish the reign of peace in civil society, it certainly does not do so in order to suspend the effects of power or to neutralize the disequilibrium revealed by the last battle of the war. According to this hypothesis, the role of political power is perpetually to use a sort of silent war to reinscribe that relationship of force, and to reinscribe it in institutions, economic inequalities, language, and even the bodies of individuals. This is the initial meaning of our inversion of Clausewitz’s aphorism—politics is the continuation of war by other means. Politics, in other words, sanctions and reproduces the disequilibrium of forces manifested in war. Inverting the proposition also means something else, namely that within this “civil peace,” these political struggles, these clashes over or with power, these modifications of relations of force—the shifting balance, the reversals—in a political system, all these things must be interpreted as a continuation of war. And they are interpreted as so many episodes, fragmentations, and displacements of the war itself. We are always writing the history of the same war, even when we are writing the history of peace and its institutions.

Exclusion D/A-

#### Queer politics push gender and sexuality to the point of obscuring race altogether.

Katrina Roen, Associate Professor of Psychology at Oslo University, “Transgender Theory and Embodiment: the risk of racial marginalization”, Journal of Gender Studies, Vol. 10, No. 3, pg 257-258. 2001

Don provides an example of reclaiming a traditional sexuality/gender subject position which is very distinct from, but in some respects resembles, transgenderism. He talks about the importance of fa'afafine in Samoan culture, and how his own sense of self-esteem relates to being fa'afafine. To begin with, he describes the relationship between his Samoan and fa'afafine identities by saying: 'for me culture is always first and then sexuality', and 'any interaction I have with anybody, the two things I want them to find out about me is the fact that I'm Samoan first and foremost and ... [secondly] that I'm fa'afafine'. In stating his priorities thus, Don sets himself in sharp relief to queer and transgender stances which often highlight gender and sexuality to the point of obscuring race altogether. Elaborating on this contrast Don describes how, to him, fa'afafine simply 'means like a woman', whereas: All the Palagi [4] [English] terms: gay, faggot, queer ... [they're] awful ... [Those terms] actually tell you how that society views that person. My culture just views it 'like a woman'. And it's like a special woman. It's a knowledgeable woman but recognised [as] ... anatomically male. (Don, interviewed: May, 1996) He describes being taught from an early age that to be fa'afafine was to be valued and respected, despite shifting to New Zealand as a child and having to learn that fa'afafine were far less tolerated there. I was never put down or anything ... I grew up with this really arrogant opinion of myself: for some reason the world is rather special with me in it! Being fa'afafine was really special. Jesus, when I came to New Zealand that was soon cut out! ... I remember my mother saying: 'You mustn't walk like that, Don'; I said: 'Why not?' [and she replied:] 'Well, they don't do that in New Zealand'. ... That's something I never ever accepted. (Don, interviewed: May, 1996) For Don, cultural identity precedes gender/sexuality identity in political importance, but the two are intrinsically linked: one does not make sense without the other. Although he plays an active role in his local gaylesbitrans support networks, he is highly sceptical about the Palagi system of dividing and labeling sexualities and genders, preferring to espouse a more holistic approach. He is also critical of Palagi attempts to reclaim words such as queer, suggesting that this only reflects Palagi cultures' intolerant attitudes towards sexuality and gender variance. Don points out that the division-by-labels of sexuality and gender categories makes it hard to talk about concepts of fa'afafine and holism, for the language assumes categories which obscure the importance of the inclusivity of fa'afafine. For Don, being fa'afafine does not imply dissatisfaction with sexed embodiment nor does it make specifications about partner-gender: fa'afafine is constructed across sexuality and gender. However, he echoes his elders in expressing concern about younger fa'afafine being attracted by the glamour and lifestyle of cities where they come to think of themselves more in terms of western transvestite and transsexual identities, rather than according to traditional understandings of fa'afafine Some of these young fa'afafine opt for sex reassignment surgery. Don hastens to add that he is not simply opposed to sex reassignment surgery: he has some older fa'afafine friends who have waited years, ensuring that they are making the right decision, before going ahead with surgery. Nevertheless, he is concerned about the general westernization and subsequent degra¬dation of fa'afafine identities, saying: 'I know of some of the traditional fa'afafines and each time I've gone back to Samoa it's always been the case "Oh gosh, we're being reduced to a ... cock in a frock" '. Don's willingness to accept that some of his fa'afafine friends seek sex reassignment surgery, accompanied by his concern for younger fa'afafine who are completely seduced by Palagi understandings of sexuality and gender, remind me of Besnier's comment: `Further discussion of gender liminality in Polynesia cannot take place without locating the category in a specific historical context and must address its relationship to modernization and change' (1994, p. 328). To this I add that discussion of transgenderism would benefit from further consideration of the effects of westernisation on gender liminality: not for the sake of a simplistic reclaiming of a 'third gender' [5] status, but for the sake of contextualising transgender theorising with respect to cross-cultural under-standings of gender as those understandings change over time.

#### Within queer communities, affluent white gays and lesbians have been dominant in relation to GLBT people of color and experience greater social privileges outside of the gay community.

Maura Rya**n**, PhD, University of Florida, "Queer Internal Colonialism: Aiding Conquest Through Borderless Discourse" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, TBA, New York, New York City Online 2007.

In a queer context, the first criteria might be rephrased to say that queer internal colonialism includes a voluntary relationship between the dominant and subordinate group via entrance into the queer community, but where the dominant group members assert themselves as *the* representatives of the community and where subordinate group members cannot successfully make their needs visible to dominant group members or members outside the group. The second criteria might be paralleled to the white queer erasure, if not the destruction, of the specific needs of queer people of color. Finally, racism, both in overt and covert manifestations, is woefully present in the queer community. Certainly, for white queer people to be a “dominant group,” they would need to be a group that enjoyed the rights of full citizenship participation, which they do not. However, within gay enclaves, gay and lesbian organizations, and national positioning of GLBT rights issues, affluent white gays and lesbians have been dominant in relation to GLBT people of color and experience greater social privileges outside of the gay community. Because of external forces of institutionalized discrimination outside the gay community, white gays are able to marginalize queers of color within gay communities *and* through a racist discourse that attempts to legitimize affluent white gays as normal citizens, it reifies the larger U.S. internal colonialism of people of color in a more general fashion.
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## \*\*Big Framework\*\*

#### OUR INTERPRETATION: The resolution asks a yes/no question as to the desirability of the United States Federal Government action. The role of the ballot should be to affirm or reject the actions and outcomes of the plan.

#### 1. THE TOPIC IS DEFINED BY THE PHRASE FOLLOWING THE COLON – THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS THE AGENT OF THE RESOLUTION, NOT THE INDIVIDUAL DEBATERS

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing 2K

<http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm>

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

#### 2. “RESOLVED” EXPRESSES INTENT TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary 2K

[www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved](http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved)

To find a solution to; solve …

To bring to a usually successful conclusion

#### 3. “SHOULD” DENOTES AN EXPECTATION OF ENACTING A PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary – 2K

[www.dictionary.com]

3 Used to express probability or expectation

#### 4. THE U.S.F.G. is the three branches of government

Dictionary.com 2k6 [<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/united+states+government>]

|  |
| --- |
| noun |
| the executive and legislative and judicial branches of the federal government of the United States |

#### Decisionmaking skills and engagement with the state energy apparatus prevents energy technocracy and actualizes radical politics

Hager, Bryn Mawr College political science professor, ‘92

[Carol J., “Democratizing Technology: Citizen & State in West German Energy Politics, 1974-1990” *Polity*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p. 45-70, accessed 10-7-12, AFB]

During this phase, the citizen initiative attempted to overcome its defensive posture and implement an alternative politics. The strategy of legal and technical challenge might delay or even prevent plant construction, but it would not by itself accomplish the broader goal on the legitimation dimension, i.e., democratization. Indeed, it worked against broad participation. The activists had to find a viable means of achieving change. Citizens had proved they could contribute to a substantive policy discussion. Now, some activists turned to the parliamentary arena as a possible forum for an energy dialogue. Until now, parliament had been conspicuously absent as a relevant policy maker, but if parliament could be reshaped and activated, citizens would have a forum in which to address the broad questions of policy-making goals and forms. They would also have an institutional lever with which to pry apart the bureaucracy and utility. None of the established political parties could offer an alternative program. Thus, local activists met to discuss forming their own voting list.

These discussions provoked internal dissent. Many citizen initiative members objected to the idea of forming a political party. If the problem lay in the role of parliament itself, another political party would not solve it. On the contrary, parliamentary participation was likely to destroy what political innovations the extraparliamentary movement had made. Others argued that a political party would give the movement an institutional platform from which to introduce some of the grassroots democratic political forms the groups had developed. Founding a party as the parliamentary arm of the citizen movement would allow these groups to play an active, critical role in institutionalized politics, participating in the policy debates while retaining their outside perspective. Despite the disagreements, the Alternative List for Democracy and Environmental Protection Berlin (AL) was formed in 1978 and first won seats in the Land parliament with 7.2 percent of the vote in 1981.43 The founders of the AL were encouraged by the success of newly formed local green parties in Lower Saxony and Hamburg,44 whose evolution had been very similar to that of the West Berlin citizen move-ment. Throughout the FRG, unpopular administrative decisions affect-ing local environments, generally in the form of state-sponsored indus-trial projects, prompted the development of the citizen initiative and ecology movements. The groups in turn focused constant attention on state planning "errors," calling into question not only the decisions themselves, but also the conventional forms of political decision making that produced them.45 Disgruntled citizens increasingly aimed their critique at the established political parties, in particular the federal SPD/ FDP coalition, which seemed unable to cope with the economic, social, and political problems of the 1970s. Fanned by publications such as the Club of Rome's report, "The Limits to Growth," the view spread among activists that the crisis phenomena were not merely a passing phase, but indicated instead "a long-term structural crisis, whose cause lies in the industrial-technocratic growth society itself."46 As they broadened their critique to include the political system as a whole, many grassroots groups found the extraparliamentary arena too restrictive. Like many in the West Berlin group, they reasoned that the necessary change would require a degree of political restructuring that could only be accomplished through their direct participation in parliamentary politics. Green/alternative parties and voting lists sprang up nationwide and began to win seats in local assemblies. The West Berlin Alternative List saw itself not as a party, but as the parliamentary arm of the citizen initiative movement. One member explains: "the starting point for alternative electoral participation was simply the notion of achieving a greater audience for [our] own ideas and thus to work in support of the extraparliamentary movements and initia-tives,"47 including non-environmentally oriented groups. The AL wanted to avoid developing structures and functions autonomous from the citizen initiative movement. Members adhered to a list of principles, such as rotation and the imperative mandate, designed to keep parliamentarians attached to the grassroots. Although their insistence on grassroots democracy often resulted in interminable heated discussions, the participants recognized the importance of experimenting with new forms of decision making, of not succumbing to the same hierarchical forms they were challenging. Some argued that the proper role of citizen initiative groups was not to represent the public in government, but to mobilize other citizens to participate directly in politics themselves; self-determination was the aim of their activity.48

Once in parliament, the AL proposed establishment of a temporary parliamentary commission to study energy policy, which for the first time would draw all concerned participants together in a discussion of both short-term choices and long-term goals of energy policy. With help from the SPD faction, which had been forced into the opposition by its defeat in the 1981 elections, two such commissions were created, one in 1982-83 and the other in 1984-85.49 These commissions gave the citizen activists the forum they sought to push for modernization and technical innovation in energy policy.

Although it had scaled down the proposed new plant, the utility had produced no plan to upgrade its older, more polluting facilities or to install desulfurization devices. With prodding from the energy commission, Land and utility experts began to formulate such a plan, as did the citizen initiative. By exposing administrative failings in a public setting, and by producing a modernization plan itself, the combined citizen initiative and AL forced bureaucratic authorities to push the utility for improvements. They also forced the authorities to consider different technological solutions to West Berlin's energy and environmental problems. In this way, the activists served as technological innovators. In 1983, the first energy commission submitted a list of recommendations to the Land parliament which reflected the influence of the citizen protest movement. It emphasized goals of demand reduction and efficiency, noted the value of expanded citizen participation and urged authorities to "investigate more closely the positive role citizen participation can play in achieving policy goals."50 The second energy commission was created in 1984 to discuss the possibilities for modernization and shutdown of old plants and use of new, environmentally friendlier and cheaper technologies for electricity and heat generation. Its recommendations strengthened those of the first commission.51 Despite the non-binding nature of the commissions' recommendations, the public discussion of energy policy motivated policy makers to take stronger positions in favor of environmental protection.

III. Conclusion

The West Berlin energy project eventually cleared all planning hurdles, and construction began in the early 1980s. The new plant now conforms to the increasingly stringent environmental protection requirements of the law. The project was delayed, scaled down from 1200 to 600 MW, moved to a neutral location and, unlike other BEWAG plants, equipped with modern desulfurization devices. That the new plant, which opened in winter 1988-89, is the technologically most advanced and environmen-tally sound of BEWAG's plants is due entirely to the long legal battle with the citizen initiative group, during which nearly every aspect of the original plans was changed. In addition, through the efforts of the Alter-native List (AL) in parliament, the Land government and BEWAG formulated a long sought modernization and environmental protection plan for all of the city's plants. The AL prompted the other parliamentary parties to take pollution control seriously. Throughout the FRG, energy politics evolved in a similar fashion. As Habermas claimed, underlying the objections against particular projects was a reaction against the administrative-economic system in general.

One author, for example, describes the emergence of two-dimensional protest against nuclear energy: The resistance against a concrete project became understood simul-taneously as resistance against the entire atomic program. Questions of energy planning, of economic growth, of understanding of democracy entered the picture. . . . Besides concern for human health, for security of conditions for human existence and protec-tion of nature arose critique of what was perceived as undemocratic planning, the "shock" of the delayed public announcement of pro-ject plans and the fear of political decision errors that would aggra-vate the problem.52 This passage supports a West Berliner's statement that the citizen initiative began with a project critique and arrived at *Systemkritik*.53 I have labeled these two aspects of the problem the public policy and legitima-tion dimensions. In the course of these conflicts, the legitimation dimen-sion emergd as the more important and in many ways the more prob-lematic.

Parliamentary Politics

In the 1970s, energy politics began to develop in the direction Offe de-scribed, with bureaucrats and protesters avoiding the parliamentary channels through which they should interact. The citizen groups them-selves, however, have to a degree reversed the slide into irrelevance of parliamentary politics. Grassroots groups overcame their defensive posture enough to begin to formulate an alternative politics, based upon concepts such as decision making through mutual understanding rather than technical criteria or bargaining. This new politics required new modes of interaction which the old corporatist or pluralist forms could not provide. Through the formation of green/alternative parties and voting lists and through new parliamentary commissions such as the two described in the case study, some members of grassroots groups attempted to both operate within the political system and fundamentally change it, to restore the link between bureaucracy and citizenry.

Parliamentary politics was partially revived in the eyes of West German grassroots groups as a legitimate realm of citizen participation, an outcome the theory would not predict. It is not clear, however, that strengthening the parliamentary system would be a desirable outcome for everyone. Many remain skeptical that institutions that operate as part of the "system" can offer the kind of substantive participation that grass-roots groups want. The constant tension between institutionalized politics and grassroots action emerged clearly in the recent internal debate between "fundamentalist" and "realist" wings of the Greens. Fundis wanted to keep a firm footing outside the realm of institutionalized politics. They refused to bargain with the more established parties or to join coalition governments. Realos favored participating in institutionalized politics while pressing their grassroots agenda. Only this way, they claimed, would they have a chance to implement at least some parts of their program.

This internal debate, which has never been resolved, can be interpreted in different ways. On one hand, the tension limits the appeal of green and alternative parties to the broader public, as the Greens' poor showing in the December 1990 all-German elections attests. The failure to come to agreement on basic issues can be viewed as a hazard of grass-roots democracy. The Greens, like the West Berlin citizen initiative, are opposed in principle to forcing one faction to give way to another. Disunity thus persists within the group. On the other hand, the tension can be understood not as a failure, but as a kind of success: grassroots politics has not been absorbed into the bureaucratized system; it retains its critical dimension, both in relation to the political system and within the groups themselves. The lively debate stimulated by grassroots groups and parties keeps questions of democracy on the public agenda.Technical Debate In West Berlin, the two-dimensionality of the energy issue forced citizen activists to become both participants in and critics of the policy process. In order to defeat the plant, activists engaged in technical debate. They won several decisions in favor of environmental protection, often proving to be more informed than bureaucratic experts themselves. The case study demonstrates that grassroots groups, far from impeding techno-logical advancement, can actually serve as technological innovators.

The activists' role as technical experts, while it helped them achieve some success on the policy dimension, had mixed results on the legitimation dimension. On one hand, it helped them to challenge the legitimacy of technocratic policy making. They turned back the Land government's attempts to displace political problems by formulating them in technical terms.54 By demonstrating the fallibility of the technical arguments, activists forced authorities to acknowledge that energy demand was a political variable, whose value at any one point was as much influenced by the choices of policy makers as by independent technical criteria.

Submission to the form and language of technical debate, however, weakened activists' attempts to introduce an alternative, goal-oriented form of decision making into the political system. Those wishing to par-ticipate in energy politics on a long-term basis have had to accede to the language of bureaucratic discussion, if not the legitimacy of bureaucratic authorities. They have helped break down bureaucratic authority but have not yet offered a viable long-term alternative to bureaucracy. In the tension between form and language, goals and procedure, the legitima-tion issue persists. At the very least, however, grassroots action challenges critical theory's notion that technical discussion is inimical to democratic politics.55 Citizen groups have raised the possibility of a dialogue that is both technically sophisticated and democratic.

In sum, although the legitimation problems which gave rise to grass-roots protest have not been resolved, citizen action has worked to counter the marginalization of parliamentary politics and the technocratic character of policy debate that Offe and Habermas identify. The West Berlin case suggests that the solutions to current legitimation problems may not require total repudiation of those things previously associated with technocracy.56

In Berlin, the citizen initiative and AL continue to search for new, more legitimate forms of organization consistent with their principles. No permanent Land parliamentary body exists to coordinate and con-solidate energy policy making.57 In the 1989 Land elections, the CDU/ FDP coalition was defeated, and the AL formed a governing coalition with the SPD. In late 1990, however, the AL withdrew from the coali-tion. It remains to be seen whether the AL will remain an effective vehi-cle for grassroots concerns, and whether the citizenry itself, now includ-ing the former East Berliners, will remain active enough to give the AL direction as united Berlin faces the formidable challenges of the 1990s. On the policy dimension, grassroots groups achieved some success. On the legitimation dimension, it is difficult to judge the results of grass-roots activism by normal standards of efficacy or success. Activists have certainly not radically restructured politics. They agree that democracy is desirable, but troublesome questions persist about the degree to which those processes that are now bureaucratically organized can and should be restructured, where grassroots democracy is possible and where bureaucracy is necessary in order to get things done. In other words, grassroots groups have tried to remedy the Weberian problem of the marginalization of politics, but it is not yet clear what the boundaries of the political realm should be. It is, however, the act of calling existing boundaries into question that keeps democracy vital. In raising alternative possibilities and encouraging citizens to take an active, critical role in their own governance, the contribution of grassroots environmental groups has been significant. As Melucci states for new social movements in general, these groups mount a "symbolic" challenge by proposing "a different way of perceiving and naming the world."58 Rochon concurs for the case of the West German peace movement, noting that its effect on the public discussion of secur-ity issues has been tremendous.59 The effects of the legitimation issue in the FRG are evident in increased citizen interest in areas formerly left to technical experts. Citizens have formed nationwide associations of environmental and other grassroots groups as well as alternative and green parties at all levels of government. The level of information within the groups is generally quite high, and their participation, especially in local politics, has raised the awareness and engagement of the general populace noticeably.60 Policy concessions and new legal provisions for citizen participation have not quelled grassroots action. The attempts of the established political parties to coopt "green" issues have also met with limited success. Even green parties themselves have not tapped the full potential of public support for these issues. The persistence of legitima-tion concerns, along with the growth of a culture of informed political activism, will ensure that the search continues for a space for a delibera-tive politics in modern technological society.61

#### Limits outweighs: You should embrace a model of debate that strikes a balance between predictability and creativity—it is a PRACTICAL REALITY that preparing to debate within a common framework enhances education because it maximizes elaboration and testing of ideas. That’s also a reason to SEVERLY DISCOUNT their impact claims because those claims have not been submitted to rigorous testing but are only shallow gut-shot reactions.

Goodin 03

[Robert E. Goodin and Simon J. Niemeyer- Australian National University- 2003, When Does Deliberation Begin? Internal Reflection versus Public Discussion in Deliberative Democracy, POLITICAL STUDIES: 2003 VOL 51, 627–649, uwyo//amp]

Suppose that instead of highly polarized symbolic attitudes, what we have at the outset is mass ignorance or mass apathy or non-attitudes. There again, people's engaging with the issue – focusing on it, acquiring information about it, thinking hard about it – would be something that is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the deliberative process. And more to our point, it is something that is most likely to occur within individuals themselves or in informal interactions, well in advance of any formal, organized group discussion. There is much in the large literature on attitudes and the mechanisms by which they change to support that speculation.31 Consider, for example, the literature on ‘central’ versus ‘peripheral’ routes to the formation of attitudes. Before deliberation, individuals may not have given the issue much thought or bothered to engage in an extensive process of reflection.32 In such cases, positions may be arrived at via peripheral routes, taking cognitive shortcuts or arriving at ‘top of the head’ conclusions or even simply following the lead of others believed to hold similar attitudes or values (Lupia, 1994). These shorthand approaches involve the use of available cues such as ‘expertness’ or ‘attractiveness’ (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986) – not deliberation in the internal-reflective sense we have described. Where peripheral shortcuts are employed, there may be inconsistencies in logic and the formation of positions, based on partial information or incomplete information processing. In contrast, ‘central’ routes to the development of attitudes involve the application of more deliberate effort to the matter at hand, in a way that is more akin to the internal-reflective deliberative ideal. Importantly for our thesis, there is nothing intrinsic to the ‘central’ route that requires group deliberation. Research in this area stresses instead the importance simply of ‘sufficient impetus’ for engaging in deliberation, such as when an individual is stimulated by personal involvement in the issue.33 The same is true of ‘on-line’ versus ‘memory-based’ processes of attitude change.34 The suggestion here is that we lead our ordinary lives largely on autopilot, doing routine things in routine ways without much thought or reflection. When we come across something ‘new’, we update our routines – our ‘running’ beliefs and procedures, attitudes and evaluations – accordingly. But having updated, we then drop the impetus for the update into deep-stored ‘memory’. A consequence of this procedure is that, when asked in the ordinary course of events ‘what we believe’ or ‘what attitude we take’ toward something, we easily retrieve what we think but we cannot so easily retrieve the reasons why. That more fully reasoned assessment – the sort of thing we have been calling internal-reflective deliberation – requires us to call up reasons from stored memory rather than just consulting our running on-line ‘summary judgments’. Crucially for our present discussion, once again, what prompts that shift from on-line to more deeply reflective deliberation is not necessarily interpersonal discussion. The impetus for fixing one's attention on a topic, and retrieving reasons from stored memory, might come from any of a number sources: group discussion is only one. And again, even in the context of a group discussion, this shift from ‘on-line’ to ‘memory-based’ processing is likely to occur earlier rather than later in the process, often before the formal discussion ever begins. All this is simply to say that, on a great many models and in a great many different sorts of settings, it seems likely that elements of the pre-discursive process are likely to prove crucial to the shaping and reshaping of people's attitudes in a citizens’ jury-style process. The initial processes of focusing attention on a topic, providing information about it and inviting people to think hard about it is likely to provide a strong impetus to internal-reflective deliberation, altering not just the information people have about the issue but also the way people process that information and hence (perhaps) what they think about the issue. What happens once people have shifted into this more internal-reflective mode is, obviously, an open question. Maybe people would then come to an easy consensus, as they did in their attitudes toward the Daintree rainforest.35 Or maybe people would come to divergent conclusions; and they then may (or may not) be open to argument and counter-argument, with talk actually changing minds. Our claim is not that group discussion will always matter as little as it did in our citizens’ jury.36 Our claim is instead merely that the earliest steps in the jury process – the sheer focusing of attention on the issue at hand and acquiring more information about it, and the internal-reflective deliberation that that prompts – will invariably matter more than deliberative democrats of a more discursive stripe would have us believe. However much or little difference formal group discussions might make, on any given occasion, the pre-discursive phases of the jury process will invariably have a considerable impact on changing the way jurors approach an issue.

#### Switch side debate is good-direct engagement, not abstract relation, with identities we do not identify with is critical to us to overcome the existential resentment we feel towards those with whom we disagree. Lack of switch-side facilitates a refusal to accept that our position is within question

Glover 10

[Robert, Professor of Political Science at University of Connecticut, Philosophy and Social Criticism, “Games without Frontiers?: Democratic Engagement, Agonistic Pluralism, and the Question of Exclusion”, Vol. 36, p. asp uwyo//amp]

In this vein, Connolly sees the goal of political engagement as securing a positive ‘ethos of engagement’ in relation to popular movements which alter existing assumptions, that is, a positive attitude towards attempts at pluralization. Connolly suggests we do so through thecultivation of two essential virtues: agonistic respect and critical responsiveness. 88 Agonisticrespect is defined as a situation whereby each political actor arrives at an appreciation for the factthat their own self-definition is bound with that of others, as well as recognition of the degree towhich each of these projections is profoundly contestable. 89 While Connolly notes that agonistic respect is a ‘kissing cousin’ of liberal tolerance, he distinguishes it by saying that the latter typically carries ‘the onus of being at the mercy of a putative majority that often construes itsown position to be beyond question.’ 90 Thus, agonistic respect is a reciprocal democratic virtue meant to operate across relations of difference, and Connolly deploys it as a regulative ideal forthe creation agonistic democratic spaces. 91 In a somewhat related way, the virtue of ‘critical responsiveness’ also attempts to move beyond liberal tolerance. 92 Critical responsiveness entails ‘ careful listening and presumptive generosity to constituencies struggling to move from an obscure or degraded subsistence below the field of recognition, justice, obligation, rights, or legitimacy to a place on one or more of those registers.’ 93 Critical responsiveness is not pity, charity, or paternalism but implies anenhanced degree of concern for others, driven by the cultivation of reciprocal empathic concern 21 for that which you are not. 94 This attitude cannot be developed in an abstract relation to thesenew and existing forms of radical cultural, political, religious, and philosophical difference.Critical responsiveness above all requires that one ‘get[s] a whiff of experiences heretofore aliento [us]’, recognizing that while this may be unsettling or cause discomfort, direct engagement isthe means by which you, ‘work tactically on yourself and others to overcome existential resentment of this persistent condition of human being.’
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#### Bataille’s economic principles provide no approach to political economy, they destroy any attempt to manage the distribution of wealth, and transgression and useless expenditure lead to the complete destruction of all human life—the aff is a completely failed approach to the possibility of a systemic critique of capitalism

Sorenson, 2012

[Asger, philosophy of education at Aarhus University, On a universal scale: Economy in Bataille’s general economy, Philosophy and Social Criticism, 38(2) 169–197] /Wyo-MB

In a practical perspective one can consider the natural foundation of society as con- sisting of energy in different forms, some of which make energy accessible to human exploitation. In spite of the theory of relativity and our knowledge of the world as one big ecosystem, in a practical perspective it therefore makes good sense to distinguish between dead and living matter and between matter and energy.120 These distinctions make plain the conflict between on the one side the circulation of money and commod- ities understood mechanically as dead matter and on the other side living organisms that are transformed quantitatively and qualitatively because of the accumulated energy inside living matter. The traditional models of economical thought are clearly hostile to the self-organizing life of nature,121 and this is with good reason. Economy in the ordi- nary sense aims at the optimal management of resources, and management is possible only if one assumes an appropriate degree of standstill and unchangeability; if every- thing moves and emerges by itself, then conscious management is impossible.¶ Bataille’s theoretical fight to think the unreduced desire and the flow of energy in nature into economy leaves an impression of economy as totally unmanageable and uncontrollable in a practical sense. The anti-authoritarian, theoretical perspective means that the general economy loses its character of political economy and instead transforms itself into a scientistic ontology, the alleged necessity of which contributes to legitimate ideologically a total liberation of desire and consumption, which in turn can legitimate a capitalist development without any restrictions. As mentioned, this was clearly not Bataille’s intention, but the conceptual logic in this part of his thinking does not leave him much choice. However, in this account of the objective basis for the general econ- omy, as it is presented in the first part of The Accused Share, one does not see many signs of the dialectical thinking, which is the foundation of the other two parts,122 and this ten- sion makes the project as a whole vulnerable to critiques of inconsistency. Actually Bataille himself became aware of the problems with reconciling the wish for political result, which was connected with the account of the objectively given, and the more in-depth reflections concerning the inner subjectively given experiences,123 and he actu- ally ended up declaring the very attempt to create the connection between the subjective¶ experiences of eroticism and sovereignty and what is objectively given by the use of resources as deeply problematic.124¶ It is thus as political economy that the general economy turns out to have its greatest limitations. The basic problem is that with Bataille’s extended sense of economy it becomes very difficult to recommend a definite economical strategy at the ordinary polit- ical level. His main concern is the material conflict between the human being and life as such, between the human expression of desire, which liberates energy for loss, and the accumulation of energy on the earth and in nature in general. The human being has in the historical development of civilization developed a still greater consumption of energy, and it is thus not just capitalism, which is self-destructive, but the very human way of being. What Bataille has pointed out at the individual and the historical level is actually an onto- logical problem. The full actualization of the potential of human desire in sovereignty can lead only to emptying out all disposable energy resources on earth, and that will mean the end, if not of life as such, then at least of the human way of living. The complete realization of the human potential of civilization liberates the energy piled up in and on the earth to take up again the interrupted flow, which destines energy to a final loss in the tepidness of the universe.

#### They are wrong about utility and rationality—their desire to sacrifice utility is the logic that enables capitalism to overcome its contradictions and expand so quickly it overcomes all other alternatives—they disable a critique of capitalism or any meaningful form of social transition

Sorenson, 2012

[Asger, philosophy of education at Aarhus University, On a universal scale: Economy in Bataille’s general economy, Philosophy and Social Criticism, 38(2) 169–197] /Wyo-MB

Bataille considers his general economy a political economy, and even though it can be thought of as apolitical, one can of course detect a more or less implicit preference for a kind of economical principle, as I have also argued. The problem is that the kind of eco- nomical thinking that actually can get some legitimacy from Bataille’s general economy, precisely is a kind of economical thinking that normally is considered very questionable from a left-wing perspective. According to Jean-Joseph Goux the general economy can be considered a precursor of the postmodern way to legitimize capitalism, which is found with the modern neo-conservative ideologist George Gilder. With reference to Mauss Gilder thinks of modern capitalism as an economy of excess, which provides objects for desire, before they are in demand. Desire as such is undetermined and can be formed according to the possibilities for satisfaction, which are offered. That means that it is sup- ply that determines demand, not the other way round.105 According to Gilder capitalism is irrational as a system, and it is precisely its nucleus of play and gambling, which has secured its ideological success confronted with the rationality of socialism. In postmo- dern capitalism you do not know which object your desire will be directed towards, and all kinds of satisfaction of desire can be developed into a profit-making industrial pro- duction of objects. In such an economic system, however, one cannot distinguish at a fundamental level between necessity and luxury, that is, between needs and desire, such as it has traditionally been the case in political economy. In consumer capitalism objec- tive utility is finally reduced to a contingent choice,106 a preference, which at the same time expresses subjective needs and desire.¶ Using this way of thinking in the development of a postmodern ideology for post- bourgeois hedonist consumer capitalism thus places Bataille, who think of himself as a radical leftist, in ‘bad company’.107 The general economy does not seem, as Bataille had hoped, to offer a clear alternative to an in-principle always restricted capitalist economy; quite on the contrary, it actually seems that the principles of general economy precisely are what capitalism needed to expand beyond its own ideological contradic- tions and limitations, in particular the conflict between neoclassical economy as a mechanical system, including the ideal of Homo economicus and then the idea of value as defined by subjective preferences, demand and desire. Economy in Bataille’s general sense thus seems to be realized as part of the neo-liberal world order, which is actually not an order at all, and the general economy can therefore be considered the ideological foundation for postmodern desire-capitalism run amok.

#### Fellow-feeling or compassion are impossible under a capitalist logic that monetizes all life, enabling the worst atrocities imaginable

Joel **Kovel**, Alger Hiss Professor, Social Studies, Bard College, THE ENEMY OF NATURE: THE END OF CAPITALISM OR THE END OF THE WORLD, 20**02**, p. 141.

Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. Because money is all that ‘counts’, a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz. Africa) or inconvenient sub-sets of the population (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way The presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accom­panied by a racist drumbeat; for global capital, the losses are regrettable necessities.

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

#### 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.

# Case

### 1NC - Case Frontline

#### Utilitarianism is good and is key to ethical decision making, because it ensures beings are treated as equal—any other approach to ethics is arbitrary because it considers one’s preferences as more important than others

Lillehammer, 2011

[Hallvard, Faculty of Philosophy Cambridge University, “Consequentialism and global ethics.” Forthcoming in M. Boylan, Ed., Global Morality and Justice: A Reader, Westview Press, Online, <http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/teaching_staff/lillehammer/Consequentialism_and_Global_Ethics-1-2.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

Contemporary discussions of consequentialism and global ethics have been marked by a focus on examples such as that of the shallow pond. In this literature, distinctions are drawn and analogies made between different cases about which both the consequentialist and his or her interlocutor are assumed to have a more or less firm view. One assumption in this literature is that progress can be made by making judgements about simple actual or counterfactual examples, and then employing a principle of equity to the effect that like cases be treated alike, in order to work out what to think about more complex actual cases. It is only fair to say that in practice such attempts to rely only on judgements about simple cases have a tendency to produce trenchant stand-offs. It is important to remember, therefore, that for some consequentialists the appeal to simple cases is neither the only, nor the most basic, ground for their criticism of the ethical status quo. For some of the historically most prominent consequentialists the evidential status of judgements about simple cases depends on their derivability from basic ethical principles (plus knowledge of the relevant facts). Thus, in The Methods of Ethics, Henry Sidgwick argues that ethical thought is grounded in a small number of self-evident axioms of practical reason. The first of these is that we ought to promote our own good. The second is that the good of any one individual is objectively of no more importance than the good of any other (or, in Sidgwick’s notorious metaphor, no individual’s good is more important ‘from the point of view of the Universe’ than that of any other). The third is that we ought to treat like cases alike. Taken together, Sidgwick takes these axioms to imply a form of consequentialism. We ought to promote our own good. Yet since our own good is objectively no more important than the good of anyone else, we ought to promote the good of others as well. And in order to treat like cases alike, we have to weigh our own good against the good of others impartially, all other things being equal. iv It follows that the rightness of our actions is fixed by what is best for the entire universe of ethically relevant beings. To claim otherwise is to claim for oneself and one’s preferences a special status they do not possess. When understood along these lines, consequentialism is by definition a global ethics: the good of everyone should count for everyone, no matter their identity, location, or personal and social attachments, now or hereafter. v Some version of this view is also accepted by a number of contemporary consequentialists, including Peter Singer, who writes that it is ‘preferable to proceed as Sidgwick did: search for undeniable fundamental axioms, [and] build up a moral theory from them’ (Singer 1974, 517; Singer 1981). For these philosophers the question of our ethical duties to others is not only a matter of our responses to cases like the shallow pond. It is also a matter of whether these responses cohere with an ethics based on first principles. If you are to reject the consequentialist challenge, therefore, you will have to show what is wrong with those principles.

#### Instrumentalization is not bad or violent

Bush, 2012

[Stephen, assistant professor of religious studies at Brown University, GEORGES BATAILLE’S MYSTICAL CRUELTY, 0.3:551–555, 2012 Journal of Religious Ethics, Inc.] /Wyo-MB

However, I do not think that the instrumentalization/non- instrumentalization distinction has the ethical significance that Brint- nall attributes to it, and I do not think, as Brintnall and Bataille do, that subject-object relations involve “inherently alienating violence.” Not all instrumentalization is ethically problematic or tends toward violence. We instrumentalize each other all the time and could not carry on our affairs without doing so. Many goods we rightly regard as valuable require instrumentalizing relations. What matters is that when we treat others as a means to an end, we simultaneously respect them as an end in themselves. We cannot treat them as a mere means. It is possible to¶ regard someone as both a means and an end, in other words. This is what the Kantians tell us, and though I do not count myself among their number, they are on to something here. When we buy a head of lettuce at a farmer’s market, we treat the farmer as a means to our end, but the important thing is we do not treat her as merely a means. We must treat her in such a way that regards her as a means to our end (of obtaining salad ingredients) but also as someone who has her own ambitions, desires, concerns, attachments, and decision-making capacities. To give an extreme example: if we abducted her and kept her in captivity, forcing her to grow and provide food for us, then we would be treating her merely as a means. So the ethically relevant distinction is not between instrumentalizing and non-instrumentalizing relations with others, but rather between different types of instrumentalizing, subject-object relations.

#### Aff fails—rational utility inevitable—their author

Biles, 2011

[Jeremy, The Remains of God: Bataille/Sacrifice/Community, Culture, Theory and Critique Volume 52, Issue 2-3, 2011 Special Issue: The God Who Would Not Die: Theological Remnants and Traces of a Hidden God in Twentieth Century French Thought, Taylor and Francis online] /Wyo-MB

And yet, the sacred, by its very nature, is fleeting; the passional effluxes of sacrifice inevitably wane, and the aims of instrumental reason invariably reassert themselves, giving rise again to the fear of the loss of self, and with it, the tendency to hypostasise work in the form of God. The remains of God, like the profane self that always returns, are never finally eradicated; prohibitions are re-installed, and the world of rational utility endures. Individuals are again themselves, discontinuous and isolated by the profane concerns of the workaday world and traditional social structures, deprived of the deep sense of continuity, or intimacy, that is afforded in transitory experiences of sacred community.

#### The sacrifice of the 1ac leads to the destruction of alterity

Biles, 2011

[Jeremy, The Remains of God: Bataille/Sacrifice/Community, Culture, Theory and Critique Volume 52, Issue 2-3, 2011 Special Issue: The God Who Would Not Die: Theological Remnants and Traces of a Hidden God in Twentieth Century French Thought, Taylor and Francis online] /Wyo-MB

Jean-Luc Nancy's inquiry into the possibilities of an ‘inoperative community’ proceeds through a constellation of Bataillean concepts – sacrifice, death, sovereignty, ecstasy, and un-working. And yet, Nancy distances himself from Bataille, whom he believes succumbs to an ethically insupportable fascination with sacrifice. Bataille is beholden to the work of negativity, placing death at the heart of any possible community. Nancy seeks to correct this tendency by elaborating a vision of community based on ‘unworking’, a notion deriving from Bataille and Blanchot that is strongly reminiscent of the sacrificial logic it is meant to displace. In fact, as we will see below, Nancy's later writings on community appear to reinscribe sacrifice at the centre of community. Community, Nancy writes, ‘necessarily takes place in what Blanchot has called “unworking”, referring to that which, before or beyond the work, withdraws from the work, and which, no longer having to do either with production or with completion, encounters interruption, fragmentation, suspension. Community’, he continues, ‘is made of the interruptions of singularities … [it is] the unworking of work that is social, economic, technical, and institutional’ (Nancy 1991a: 31).¶ In this sense, ‘one does not produce [community], one experiences or one is constituted by it as the experience of finitude’ (Nancy 1991a: 31). Nancy affirms that the shared experience of finitude is a passion ‘of and for community itself, and this passion emerges as the desubjectivization of the passion for death’ (Nancy 1991a: 34). But Nancy's critique of Bataille also emerges with this point. By his reading, one danger of Bataille's emphasis on sacrifice is in the manner in which the passion for death is betrayed. The emphasis on ‘fusion’ – the loss of self in the experience of immanent continuity – is read by Nancy as too close to an appropriative totality, an erasure of alterity in an undifferentiated unity. Nancy's inoperative community would be established in the eruptive contact with singularities preserved, not lost in fusion.¶ In an essay entitled ‘The Unsacrificeable’ (1991b), Nancy adapts Heideggerian language in extending his critique of sacrifice and of Bataille. He argues that although existence is offered or ‘given’, it is neither given by nor to anyone. ‘The existent arrives’, he says, ‘takes place, and this is nothing but a being-thrown into the world. In this being-thrown, it is offered. But it is offered by no one, to no one. Nor is it self-sacrificed, if nothing—no being, no subject —precedes its being-thrown’. In light of this point, Nancy claims, Bataille ‘must be relentlessly corrected … withdrawn from the slightest tendency towards sacrifice’, for such a tendency ‘is always linked to a fascination with an ecstasy turned towards an Other or towards an absolute Outside, into which the subject is diverted/spilled the better to be restored’ (Nancy 1991b: 36).

#### Causes no value to life that turns the K

Baudrillard, 1990 (Jean, “The Transparency of Evil: Essay on Extreme Phenomena.”121-122, MB).

Inasmuch as the individual no longer confronts the other, he finds himself face to face with himself. On account of an aggressive backlash on the part of his immune system, a dislocation of his own code and the destruction of his own defences, the individual becomes in a sense an antibody to himself. Our society is entirely dedicated to neutralizing otherness, to destroying the other as a natural point of reference in a vast flood of aseptic communication and interaction, of illusory exchange and contact. By dint of communication, our society develops an allergy to itself. By becoming transparent in its genetic, biological and cybernetic being, the body even develops an allergy to its own shadow. Otherness denied becomes a spectre and returns in the form of a self destructive process. This, too, is the transparency of Evil. Alienation is no more: the Other as gaze, the Other as mirror, the Other as opacity - all are gone. Henceforward it is the transparency of others that represents absolute danger. Without the Other as mirror, as reflecting surface, consciousness of self is threatened with irradiation in the void. The utopia of the end of alienation has likewise disappeared. The subject has not succeeded in negating himself as subject, within the framework of a totalization of the world. A determinate negation of the subject no longer exists: all that remains is a lack of determinacy as to the position of the subject and the position of the other. Abandoned to this indeterminacy, the subject is neither the one nor the other - he is merely the Same. Division has been replaced by mere propagation. And whereas the other may always conceal a second other, the Same never conceals anything but itself. This is our clone ideal today: a subject purged of the other, deprived of its divided character and doomed to self-metastasis, to pure repetition. No longer the hell of other people, but the hell of the Same.

#### Batailles theory of expenditure leads to warfare and violence

Wilson, no date

[Julie, Unproductive expenditure and the spatial ground of the Earth: Bataille on the other side of Deleuze & Guattari, http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpbataille6.htm] /Wyo-MB

Both Bataille and Deleuze & Guattari’s ontological projects are fueled by attempts to understand the most radical of human movements through a conceptualization of war and its different forms. These different forms of war are absolutely fundamental for grasping the political claims of each project, not to mention the stakes that surround the category of unproductive expenditure. In the thought of Bataille two different forms of war emerge: war as mystical or inner experience, and war in the more conventional sense as death and destruction on the battlefield. Much of Bataille’s wartime writings can be read as attempts to see an equivalence between actual war and mystical experience. In his book Saints of the Impossible: Bataille, Weil, and the Politics of the Sacred, Alexander Irwin references Bataille’s own words in “The Practice of Joy before Death:” “’I want to show that an equivalence exists between war, ritual sacrifice, and the mystical life.’ All these forms of behavior reflect ‘the same play of ‘ecstasies’ and ‘terrors’ in which man joins in the games of heaven’”(136). Bataille thus sees a fundamental similarity between the violence of the battlefield and mysticism in the ecstasy and terror that characterize both experiences; his insistence on the equivalence stems from both his energetic framework-- better known as general economy-- and the latter’s commitment to thinking through the category of unproductive expenditure, or the moment when production (and/or growth) has reached its terrestrial limits and must turn unproductive, or rather, destructive of energetic resources.¶ For Bataille, the emergence of war in both instances is intimately bound up in the category of unproductive expenditure; in fact, war is the moment and movement of unproductive expenditure, or profitless expenditure. In the energeticist ontology of Bataille, unproductive expenditure—consumptions and dissipations—are linked to the realm of the necessary; thus, so is war. In “The Practice of Joy before Death,” Bataille writes: “’I MYSELF AM WAR.’ I imagine human movement and excitation, whose possibilities are limitless: this movement and excitation can only be appeased by war” (Visions of Excess, 239). War, for Bataille, is the necessary and universal response to expansive and growth-seeking being; in this sense, war as profitless expenditure is fundamental to maintaining the balance of forces on Earth. War (and thus unproductive expenditure) engender destructions of forces and energies, but what Bataille desperately wants us to understand is that although war in-itself is immanent to and necessary for life, the form it will take is not an a priori. In Volume One of The Accursed Share, Bataille clarifies the central claims of his ontological project:¶ The living organism, in a situation determined by the play of energy on the surface of the globe, ordinarily receives more energy than is necessary for maintaining life; the excess energy (wealth) can be used for the growth of the system (e.g., an organism); if the system can no longer grow, or if the excess cannot be completely absorbed in growth, it must necessarily be lost without profit; it must be spent, willingly or not, gloriously or catastrophically (21).

#### Bataille’s philosophy causes a hostility to liberal democracy and humanism that results in fascism

Geroulanos, 2006

[OCTOBER 117, Summer 2006, pp. 3–24. © 2006 October Magazine, Ltd. and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, The anthropology of exit: Bataille on Heidegger and Fascism] /Wyo-MB

¶ The association of Bataille with fascism has been a matter of considerable¶ ¶ debate, most of it pointing to his peculiar role in antifascist milieux. This is not the¶ ¶ place to retrace or replay that debate; still, the problem is signiﬁcant, because¶ ¶ Bataille’s political equivocation sets up his analysis and colors his identiﬁcation of¶ ¶ Heidegger with fascism. To quote Zeev Sternhell, “fascism had a fascination for men . . .¶ ¶ for whom any attempt to transcend bourgeois mediocrity and democratic ﬂaccidity¶ ¶ was highly praiseworthy.”3 That Bataille shared this fascination has given much ammunition to Bataille’s detractors, who argue that his nonconformism played an active¶ ¶ role in the delegitimation of the Third Republic.4¶ ¶ Some contemporary cultural historians have echoed Jean-Paul Sartre and other critics in arguing that Bataille’s¶ ¶ philosophical anthropology relied on a strategy of (a) articulating human experience¶ ¶ on the basis of vitalist or mystical postulates, and (b) providing a consequent critique¶ ¶ of bourgeois secularism (a critique ex deﬁnitione hostile to liberal democracy and¶ ¶ socialist utopia) that rivaled fascism in its reactionary aims and substance. Some further argue that Bataille’s claims on heterogeneity evince a hidden pro-Nazism that is¶ ¶ supposedly part and parcel of postwar critiques of liberal humanism.5¶

#### Fascism results in multiple scenarios for violence that outweigh the aff

Mills, 2004

[David, Attorney, 11-10-04, It's the Corporate State, Stupid, http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article7260.htm] /Wyo-MB

¶ Other notable characteristics of fascism described by Britt which are directly produced by corporatism are: ¶ < The suppression of organized labor (organized labor is the bane of corporations and the only real check on corporate power other than government or the legal system);¶ < Supremacy of the military (it is necessary to produce and protect corporate profits abroad and threats from abroad); ¶ < Cronyism and governmental corruption (it is very beneficial to have ex-corporate employees run the agencies or make the laws that are supposed to regulate or check corporations);¶ < Fraudulent elections (especially those where corporations run the machinery of elections and count the votes or where judges decide their outcomes); ¶ < Nationalism (disdain for other countries that might promote individual rights);¶ < Obsession with national security (anti-corporatists are a security risk to the corporate status quo); ¶ < Control of the media (propaganda works);¶ < Obsession with crime and punishment (anti-corporatists belong in jail); and ¶ < Disdain for intellectuals and the arts (these people see corporatism for what it is and are highly individualistic). ¶ All of these characteristics have a fairly obvious corporate component to them or produce a fairly obvious corporate benefit. Even Britt’s last two characteristics, the merger of state with the dominant religion and rampant suppression of divorce, abortion and homosexuality produce at least some indirect corporate benefit. ¶ In sum, it’s the corporate state, stupid. ¶ As I have pondered what could be done about America’s steady march toward the fascist state, I also have pondered what can be done internally to stop it. The Germans couldn’t seem to do it. The Italians couldn’t seem to do it. The only lesson from recent history where an indigenous people seemed to have uncoupled the merger of economic power with governmental power is the French Revolution. The soft underbelly of consolidated economic power is that the power resides in the hands of a few. Cut off the money supply of the few and the merger between economic power and government becomes unglued. The French systematically took out their aristocracy one by one. It was ugly; the French couldn’t seem to figure out when there had been enough bloodletting to solve the problem. ¶ The thought of an American twenty-first century French Revolution is ugly. But the thought of an American twenty-first century fascist state is far uglier. It would be a supreme irony that the state most responsible for stopping worldwide fascism would become fascist 60 years later. But far worse than this irony is the reality that an American fascist state with America’s power could make Nazi Germany look like a tiny blip on the radar screen of history. ¶ For some years now we have lived with the Faustian bargain of the corporation. Large corporations are necessary to achieve those governmental and social necessities that small enterprises are incapable of providing. The checks on corporate power have always been fragile. Left unchecked, the huge economic power of corporations corrupts absolutely. Most of the checks are badly eroded. Is there still time to get the checks back in balance? Or will we be left with two unthinkable options?

#### Battaile’s philosophy causes a rejection of democracy

Geroulanos, 2006

[OCTOBER 117, Summer 2006, pp. 3–24. © 2006 October Magazine, Ltd. and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, The anthropology of exit: Bataille on Heidegger and Fascism] /Wyo-MB

Of interest in “Critique of Heidegger” is Bataille’s theologico-political analysis of modern democracy and his rejection of fascism as illusory and insufﬁcient.¶ In this regard, his 1930s work recalls other contemporaries not fully committed to a political cause, in that it is concerned less with a critique of democracy per se¶ than with the contestation of the primacy of secular/liberal/positivist motifs in¶ European Spirit. Such condemnations of existing democracies often mingled with¶ attacks on claims of nineteenth-century science or on the Enlightenment potential¶ for barbarism—in a sense they sought to save a spirit of autonomy by rejecting¶ democracy. In the context Bataille was among the ﬁrst to analyze fascism’s sacralization of politics, its inversion of the Augustinian idea of the City of Man, and its attack¶ on the claims of modern individualism.13 He identiﬁed fascism’s “overcoming” of¶ profane democratic reality with a political Unhappy Consciousness that replaces the¶ good God with the Chef-Dieu (“God-Leader”). The attention paid to themes like sovereignty and freedom in “Critique of Heidegger” further expresses Bataille’s hostility¶ toward democracy, the regime that he accuses of obliterating them in favor of a society composed of (and constructing) undifferentiated, unself-conscious subjects.

#### DEMOCRACY NECESSARY TO AVERT NUCLEAR WAR AND EXTINCTION

**CARNEGIE COMMISSION ON PREVENTING DEADLY CONFLICT**, “Promoting Democracy in the 1990’s,” October 19**95**. Available from the World Wide Web at: <http://www.carnegie.org/sub/pubs/deadly/dia95_01.html>, accessed 2/20/04.

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

#### The aff cedes the political

Fortuna 10

(John J., University of California Santa Barbara, approved Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science, “Ordinary Sacrifices: An Approach to Loss in Democratic Politics,” March, 2010, http://gradworks.umi.com/3398839.pdf//wyo-mm)

As to the question of whether Bataille’s theory of sacrifice works to help individuals better understand their status as citizens, and in doing so assist them in navigating the difficult spaces of loss that inevitably attends political citizenship— the result is a mixed one. As seen above, focusing only upon Bataille’s theory of sacrifice does not yield much in the way of explicit political recommendations. Additionally, unlike some of his predecessors (e.g. Durkheim), Bataille’s thoughts on sacrifice appear much more individualistic—by which I mean that the latter’s focus on sacrifice is much less imbued with the idea of sacrifice taking place within a communal context then is seen in the thought of the former. Because Durkheim’s analysis of sacrifice (both ritual and civic) occurs within a context that emphasizes group membership, it is more naturally fitted to address questions of political citizenship. Bataille’s theory of sacrifice, by not focusing on sacrifice as a collective activity, is less able to easily inform discussions of citizenship.

#### And – Anti-Politics dooms their project, threatens the planet, and cedes politics to the Right.

Boggs ’97 (CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved -- perhaps even unrecognized -- only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context diseases, technological displacement of workers) of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites -- an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise -- or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec- tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75
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#### ALSO, ONTOLOGY AND EPISTEMOLOGY ARE INSEPERABLE—IF YOUR METHOD IS WRONG, SO IS YOUR ENTIRE POLITICAL UNIVERSE:

HOLLIS & SMITH 96

[martin & Steve, Prof’s Int’l Relations, A Response: Why Epistemology Matters]

Now, there are two problems with this: first it seems a very odd way of distinguishing between ontology and epistemology. It implies, inter alia, that historians who write biographies are epistemologists, whilst historians who survey periods and movements are ontologists. That strikes us as nonsensical. The second problem is that they fail to see the extent to which Gidden’s claims are only possible precisely because he has already made an epistemological choice. Indeed, this choice is spelt out very clearly in the preface to the book Jabri and Chan cite. Giddens explicitly rejects structural sociology, seeing the focus of social theory as being on the actors and their interpretations of situations. In this critically important way he has already dealt with epistemology! Far from downplaying the role of epistemology in favour of ontology, his stress on ontology can only be made because he has already decided what kinds of criteria allow us to judge what kinds of things exist in the social world. For Giddens, the appropriate epistemological position is one of what we call ‘Understanding’. He defines social structures as the rules and resources that are grounded in the knowledgeable activities of human agents. Structures are not external to actors but are internal to them. Here, Giddens shows just how important epistemology is: it is only because he is working n the right-hand column of our two-by-two matrix that he can say that epistemology is secondary. After all, if you settle epistemological questions by fiat you are then likely to see them as settled! Thus, whilst Gidden’s work is seen by Jabri and Chan as promoting a conception of structuration that overcomes questions of epistemology by concentrating instead on questions of ontology, the paradox is that he has done no such thing.
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#### Their transgressions fail—they are part and parcel of the capitalist system today, means their sacrifice fails and a critique of capitalism is a pre-requisite to the affirmative

Anthony, 2010

[Ross, University of London, This is Not an Exit”: The Sacred in the Age of Consumer Capitalism, http://www.revue-silene.com/images/30/article\_23.pdf] /Wyo-MB

The picture of consumer capitalism I have painted so far suggests a parallel¶ re-emergence of Bataillian excess. However, it will be recalled that for Bataille,¶ excess was always reserved for a minority, heterogeneous portion of the¶ population, and it is this marginalization which gives exuberance its sense of the¶ sacred. Yet in the context of consumer capitalism, excess, in both its economic and¶ erotic forms, seems no longer reserved for a marginalized few, but rather available¶ to a much wider spectrum of the population. In this sense, is it at all possible for a¶ society which is homogeneously excessive to maintain a sense of the sacred? If we¶ return to the above theories which suggest that exuberance has made a come back,¶ it is significant that most of these authors also note that the loss of the sacred is the¶ price to be paid for such wide spread luxury. For example, with regards Gilder’s¶ notion of the heroic stock trader, Goux goes on to claim that, ¶ It is precisely at the moment when the entrepreneur must think himself into the¶ model of the most advanced artistic genius, at the moment when the avantgarde strategy of innovation at any price becomes the paradigm of dominant¶ economic practice, that the artistic avant-garde necessarily loses its difference,¶ its marginality, its deviance-value. The aesthetic avant-gardes have won. That¶ is what paralyses them so seriously.¶ 1¶ The entrepreneur is therefore robbed of their deviance value because a¶ greater number of people in society have access to what was once considered¶ “luxurious” and “excessive”. Baudrillard agrees when he argues that the sheer¶ 1¶ J.-J. Goux, "General Economics and Postmodern Capitalism", Yale French Studies, 1996, no. 78,¶ p. 218.¶ 160number of participants engaged in the game of rank and expenditure, perpetually¶ divides the contrasts between one act of expenditure and another. He claims: ¶ The difference is that in our current system this spectacular squandering no¶ longer has the crucial symbolic and collective signification it could assume in¶ primitive feasting and Potlatch. This prestigious consumption has been¶ ‘personalized’ and mass-mediafied.¶ 1¶ Historically, Goux attributes this loss of the sacred to the rise of¶ “democratic” principles, which have abolished absolutely centralized power. In¶ archaic societies, expenditure lay in the hands of a privileged few, who used such¶ exuberance to dazzle the miserable masses. It was this heterogeneous/homogeneous¶ divide which was able to evoke the aura of bliss and rapture which has now been¶ lost precisely because such a divide no longer exists. ¶ In a similar vein, sexuality in the postmodern era has fallen prey to the same¶ process. Unlike Bataille’s eroticism, in which the sacred lay in sexualities ability to¶ transgress prohibitions, contemporary sexuality, Heath claims,¶ has been dragged into the public domain, where, the abundance of¶ representations – images, discourses, ways of picturing and describing sex now¶ makes it “the definition of a new mode of conformity.”¶ 2¶ Eroticism, now commmodified exhaustively through representation,¶ manifests itself in an array of media (advertising, TV, horror films, the internet), of¶ which pornography is arguably its most exemplary form. As Seltzer argues,¶ pornography, by definition, makes private desire publicly visible¶ 3¶ . This is the exact¶ opposite of eroticism which, Bataille claims, is confined to the darkness and made¶ divine through secrecy and prohibition. Pornography thus destroys this “darkness”¶ and desecrates the divisions between that which is sacred and that which is profane.¶ Its lack of sacredness is summed up in Sontag’s observation that pornography¶ “disdains fully formed persons and reports only on the motiveless tireless¶ transactions of depersonalized organs”¶ 4¶ . The mediafication of sexuality– of which¶ 1¶ J. Baudrillard, op. cit., p. 46.¶ 2¶ S. Heath, The Sexual Fix, London, Macmillan Press, 1984, p. 3.¶ 3¶ M. Seltzer, Serial Killers: Death and Life in America’s Wound Culture, London, Routledge,¶ 1998, p. 90.¶ 4¶ S. Sontag, "The Pornographic Imagination", in G. Bataille, Story of the Eye, London, Penguin,¶ 1982, p. 89.¶ 161pornography is only one manifestation – signifies its increasingly public,¶ desacralized nature.¶ American Psycho¶ The above portrayal of a world which is excessive but clearly lacking in¶ sacred qualities is captured in novels such as Bret Easton Ellis’ American Psycho,¶ first published in 1991. The story tells of a 1980s Wall Street psychopath golden¶ boy who, through the excesses of consumerism and sexual violence, attempts to¶ attain a sense of the sacred. However, the consumer-crazed world in which Patrick¶ Bateman lives makes it impossible to set himself apart from the rest of society¶ through useless expenditure. In this sense, the book’s dead-pan style, which¶ appears at odds with the luxurious and often excessively gruesome content,¶ captures the condition of Bataille’s general economy in the age of consumer¶ capitalism. ¶ A chief characteristic of the novel is the characters’ exuberant displays of¶ wealth in an attempt to outdo each other through rank. However, in the vein of¶ Baudrillard, because all the characters have access to similar amounts of surplus,¶ their displays of wealth do not set them apart, but rather make them¶ indistinguishable from each other. For instance, the majority of characters wear¶ expensive designer clothing described in minute detail, evident in the following¶ example. Scott Montgomery wears¶ a double breasted navy blue blazer with mock-tortoiseshell buttons, a¶ prewhashed wrinkled-cotton striped dress shirt with red accent stitching, a red¶ white and blue fireworks print silk tie by Hugo Boss and plum washed wooltrousers with a quadruple-pleated front and slashed pockets by Lazlo.¶ 1¶ The intense focus on luxurious details of characters’ dress, which repeat¶ themselves ad nauseum throughout the text, serves to obliterate rather than to¶ define characters in the traditional sense. It becomes increasingly difficult for the¶ narrator to distinguish his friends from each other, often confusing their names.¶ This theme, in which expenditure evokes a sense of alienation rather than intimacy,¶ 1¶ American Psycho, New York, Vintage Books, 2000, p. 42.¶ 162is pervasive at every level of consumption in the novel. In one scene, Patrick and¶ his friends show off their business cards to each other in what seems like a mock–¶ potlatch ceremony. The cards, which are all essentially white in color, are described¶ as “eggshell”, “off white”, “pale nimbus white” and “bone”. The “pale nimbus¶ white” card, with its “subtle off-white coloring and its tasteful thickness”¶ 1¶ , dazzles¶ the audience to which it is presented, although for the reader, the cards all seem¶ pretty much the same. This comical scene trivializes the notion that rank can be¶ attained through expenditure. A far cry from the spectacle of American Indian¶ potlatches, Patrick’s consumer-obsessed world in which excess is normalized,¶ prohibits the world of the sacred.¶ The protagonist quickly moves from conspicuous consumption to sexual¶ violence in order to break away from the profane world of things. While at first,¶ this shift seems to plunge him into the world of the sacred, highlighted by the few¶ rapturous moments in the text, his horrific deeds soon become as dull and repetitive¶ as his other consumer habits. In this sense, the eroticism in American Psycho is the¶ exact antithesis of that seen in the novels of Bataille’s hero, the Marquis de Sade.¶ Whereas Sade’s characters are able to sustain bliss throughout 1000-page novels,¶ Bateman’s libertine adventures are marked by a distinct lack of rapture. This is¶ conveyed through a literary style very similar to hard-core pornography. For¶ instance, Patrick is about to have sex with, and then murder, two women. He¶ describes the scene as “Silence. Arctic, frigid, the light burning over us in the¶ apartment is cold and electric […] Sex happens – a hard-core montage”¶ 2¶ . The¶ inability for sexual acts to be transgressive is additionally made manifest through¶ the emphasis on brightly lit rooms. In virtually every sex scene, halogen lamps burn¶ – nothing is confined to shadow, all is visible, suggesting a world in which desire¶ becomes public and in which everything is permitted. ¶ The inability to attain the sacred through sex repeats itself in the realm of¶ murder. During the murder of a young woman, he claims: “ I can already tell it’s¶ 1¶ Ibid., p. 44.¶ 2¶ Ibid., p. 288.¶ 163going to be a characteristically useless, senseless death, but then I’m used to the¶ horror.”¶ 1¶ Nearing the end of the novel, consumer products, body parts and sex all¶ merge on a single textual plane and are treated with equal weight. For example,¶ Patrick says ¶ I’m wearing a Joseph Abboud suit, a tie by Paul Stuart, shoes by J. Crew, a vest¶ by someone Italian and I’m kneeling on the floor beside a corpse, eating the¶ girl’s brain¶ 2¶ and further:¶ Things are lying in the corner of my bedroom: a pair of girl’s shoes from¶ Edward Susan Bennis Allen, a hand with a thumb and a fore-finger missing,¶ the new issue of Vanity Fair.¶ 3¶ American Psycho can be read as a critique of consumptive and erotic practices in¶ the age of late capitalism. Ironically, it is this world in which the consumer is God,¶ in which choice offers freedom from conformity, that the individual is placed¶ firmly within the realm of homogeneity which they so desperately wish to escape.¶ The lack of bliss, which characterizes this homogenous world, is reflected in¶ Patrick’s assessment of himself when he claims: ¶ It is hard for me to make sense on any given level. Myself is fabricated, an¶ aberration. I am a noncontingent human being. My personality is sketchy¶ (Ibid., 377) […] Reflection is useless, the world is senseless. […] Surface,¶ surface, surface was all that anyone found meaning in. (375)¶ In the last lines of the novel, our protagonist reads a sign above a door which¶ claims “THIS IS NOT AN EXIT”¶ 4¶ . The phrase seems to sum up both the theme of¶ the novel as well as Bataille’s theory of exuberance in a postmodern economy –¶ namely, that excess in a world in which excess is the norm, no longer guarantees¶ passage from the world of homogeneity to the world of the sacred.

# Permutation

### AT - Perm

#### Bataille can’t solve questions of political economy, his solutions based in desire and his conception of the general economy fail to make change

Sorenson, 2012

[Asger, philosophy of education at Aarhus University, On a universal scale: Economy in Bataille’s general economy, Philosophy and Social Criticism, 38(2) 169–197] /Wyo-MB

The theoretical-empirical perspective on economy makes it possible for Bataille to see donations of gifts and squandering with excess resources where ordinary economists see scarcity and barter between instrumentally rational egoists. In a political economy,¶ however, theoretical analyses must be followed up by practical recommendations, and this is also the case in Bataille’s general economy. As mentioned in the introduction, Bataille considered The Accursed Share as a work about political economy, i.e. as a piece of practically orientated macro-economical thinking, and the theoretical analysis of the general economy must therefore be able to give reasons for a specifically political organization of the economy. His general recommendations about getting rid of the problematic surplus by giving gifts actually give him reasons to make some apparently very explicit political statements on the global scale, but since he does not relate to anything less than the world economy, and since he is not concerned with justice, his recommendations are beyond what would normally be called the political sphere (A).¶ To this disappointment must be added, I will argue, that the whole idea of the general economy is based on some very problematic conceptual slides between the natural and the societal level and between what is ontologically necessary and what is merely histor- ical. By his way of conceptualizing human reality Bataille tends to disregard what is specifically political in this reality, and because of this he also seems to give up on hav- ing ideals concerning the government of society (B). And even worse, apparently the actual political economy, which is best supported by the general economy, is the kind of laissez-faire liberalist economy recommended by the modern inheritors of neoclassi- cal economy, namely the postmodern neo-liberals. However, it can be argued that Bataille’s general economy does not in the end back up a globalized capitalist economy, since it maintains the fundamental distinction between needs and desire, which will always imply a critique of capitalism (C). The attempt to overcome conceptually this opposition, together with the contradictions between theory and practice, as well as the objective and the subjective, is a philosophical challenge that makes the general economy an impressing idea of dialectical thought, but in all likelihood also an almost impossible practical political project (D).

#### Bataille’s method of critique offers no political solutions to the problem of the economy—his alternatives spur more capitalism or fascism—preventing a transition to a society outside of oppression

Sorenson, 2012

[Asger, philosophy of education at Aarhus University, On a universal scale: Economy in Bataille’s general economy, Philosophy and Social Criticism, 38(2) 169–197] /Wyo-MB

The movement of energy is regarded by Bataille as an ‘eternal necessity’,89 but we can nevertheless, as mentioned above, choose how to relate to it, i.e. whether it should be accumulated until the point of exploding, or it should be expended and squandered away before then. Bataille does not, however, go into much detail about who the we really are, and as will be clear in the following, it is actually because Bataille does not have any really good idea about how society should be organized politically. When Bataille is moralizing, he appeals to the acknowledgement of the natural ontological necessity, not to the societal or historical necessity. Furthermore the knowledge of this necessity is regarded as motivating in itself, and that means that for the human being, neither its will not its actions are bound causally by the eternal necessities of nature. Bataille thus maintains a rather traditional liberal concept of freedom, and this concept of freedom also puts itself through in Bataille’s general economy.¶ With regard to economy, Mauss thus considers generous interchange of gifts as the empirically original form of exchange. Interchange of gifts presupposes a higher degree of inequality than both barter and sharing, and the result of the interchange of gifts is typically a reinforcement of the inequality, since the donor in exchange gets higher social status and thereby power, whereas the recipient loses on both scales.90 Mauss is thinking of himself and is also recognized as a socialist, but he nevertheless thinks that morality and politics should be based upon such a generosity,91 and this way of thinking practi- cally is taken over by Bataille, again with a clear conscience about what giving gifts pre- supposes and will imply.92 By Bataille the structural inequality is even radicalized to the extreme, since he considers the sun as the ultimate donor and thinks of political economy only in the global perspective of a world government; but where Durkheim and Mauss consider society as a whole as analogous to an organism, which demands reasonable¶ but also authoritarian, government,93 Bataille considers sovereignty to be the essence of every single human being and societal life as in itself reifying. Bataille thereby shar- pens the Marxist critique of capitalism as well as the classical liberal contradiction between the individual and the society, and even though Bataille does not regard equality as being significant politically, as is the case with traditional liberals and socialists,94 he clearly distances himself from authority as a legitimate principle of government.95¶ Without acceptance of authority, however, it is not possible to make politics in an ordinary sense, that is, no regulation of social life can take place. The result is that as a political economy on the normal political scale the general economy turns out to be almost equivalent to a very liberal market economy, that is, an economy with few limita- tions. In the classical liberalism of Adam Smith the societal rule primarily takes place at the individual level, since every human being is gifted with the ability of having moral sympathies. The strong moral appeal of the general economy shows that for Bataille the main instrument for regulation is also the morality of the individual. Apparently he ima- gines that a fundamental change can be achieved in the moral outlook of every individ- ual, in order for him or her not just to accumulate, but also to consume. As mentioned, the general economy makes Bataille favour the bourgeois society in relation to the communist, not because of justice, but because of the flow of energy. What is really worrying, however, is that the prime examples analysed of societies in ideal balance with regard to the flow of energy, i.e. pre-Columbian societies in America and Tibet before the Chinese invasion, are societies with strongly authoritarian forms of govern- ment, and that this does not seem to bother Bataille that much. Even though Bataille considers his general economy as a political economy, apparently he is not worried by the various forms the political government of a society can take, i.e. monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy.¶ The apolitical perspective of Bataille’s general economy seems to go hand in hand with an apolitical understanding of social reality as a whole. Such a way of understand- ing social reality is characteristic of the early Protestant liberals, namely the idea of a single individual facing the absolute. This absolute is first of all God, then the state, but can eventually also be the market, when it has been hypostasized as a self-sustaining entity, as is the case in neoclassical economy. The ideal typically gained from this way of thinking is freedom in the negative sense of ‘freedom from’. What is missing in such an understanding of social reality, is the importance of all the institutions of a modern society, which mediate politically between the absolute and the particular at various levels. Recognizing the value of such intermediary institutions, as was also done by Durkheim,96 typically spurs ideals about a ‘freedom to’, namely to participate in the civic rule of society.97 The point to be made here is that, in spite of the critique levelled against both fascism and communism, Bataille does not stress any ideals about how soci- ety should be governed, and the reason is probably that he never got over the qualms of parliamentary democracy so widespread in Europe among both leftist and rightist in the 1920s and 1930s.98

# 1NR

#### We aren’t all hopeless now, and Bataille’s vision of ecstasy solely thrill-seeks us to death.

DAVID **JOHNSON** has a DPhil. in English and Related Literature (York University), an MA (Distinction) in Continental Philosophy (Warwick University) and a BA (Hons) in Literature and Philosophy (Middlesex Polytechnic). Time & Society copyright © 200**3** available via SAGE database

Bataille affirms the living moment, but as a moment that creates transience (the moment is ruinous) and which is itself transient (it cannot prevail in a dualist universe). The ecstatic moment, which should be a celebration of a kind of irrepressible flow of duration, **is over in a flash**, and either tends towards death or leads directly to death. Often, Bataille states that the wild expenditure of life’s forces can be described as life affirmed up to the point of death and not beyond, in order perhaps to avoid the accusation of morbidity. It is even possible that Bataille sense that his view of time was too teleological as it stood. He writes: ‘I believe eroticism to be the approval of life, up until death’ (Bataille, 1957b/1990b: 16). What Bataille is perhaps saying here is that beings caught up in the midst of the most extreme pleasure do not care whether they survive or not, thereby illustrating his equation of pleasure and ruin. However, the extreme indifference of beings in the midst of ecstasy to the whole question of survival suggests that death is of little importance to them compared to the experience of pleasurable duration enjoyed in the time up to death. On close inspection we can see that for Bataille ‘the approval of life up until death’ represents a very specific kind of behaviour that is almost totally death orientated, a foolhardy spirit of ruination that will end in death more or less directly. It can be seen that the exuberant devil-may-care spirit of affirming life up to the point of death can be accessed by individuals only if they open themselves up to death first. The vision of life affirmed up to the point of death **is still a vision of life dominated by death.** Although Bataille’s work shows him savouring, as it were, the taste of death in a sensual, poetic fashion, he concedes that an individual cannot physically experience the event of his or her own death in a concrete, knowing fashion, since in death the knower and known are wiped out at a single stroke. Only a living being can affirm death, through the ecstatic abandonment of toilsome life-conservation and care which a sense of mortality allows. Such a view could be seen to link up with Bataille’s partial admission that life affirmed up to the point of death is more important than a mere leap from life into death.

#### Bataille wildly inflates the value of ecstasy and tempting death – in doing so, he ignores the value of *living*

DAVID **JOHNSON** has a DPhil. in English and Related Literature (York University), an MA (Distinction) in Continental Philosophy (Warwick University) and a BA (Hons) in Literature and Philosophy (Middlesex Polytechnic). Time & Society copyright © 200**3** available via SAGE database

Life is a serious business of highly charged temporal stakes, involving a being’s struggle to secure for itself the experience of pleasure time/free time rather than pain time/slave time. Since lived time is a living stake, death is not the profound phenomenon that Bataille thinks it is. For one who is racked by drawn-out pain, the pain of death situated at the end of time is an irrelevance. And for one who is caught up in the throes of extended pleasure, the dubious pleasure of death is likewise irrelevant. Death, far from being profound, may simply provide a pragmatic escape from a life of pain and toil, or a simple halt to a life of pleasure and freedom. We can see death as important to time in that it is the end of the great game of time, the great flow. But death is relative in importance to time for the same reason; it is simply the end of the great game of time, a game without which it would be pure abstraction. However, we are not suggesting that death has absolutely no importance for living beings. On the contrary. By countering Bataille’s view of death, which tries to domesticate death through attempting to engage it in ‘intimate’ dialogue, and which tries to make political gain out of death, we can see death as a real, non-negotiable phenomenon. Death can no longer be thought of as an ambiguous but essentially accessible deity, but must instead be seen as that which wipes out real substantial time with no hope of appeal. Death can now be viewed as a certain element in the game of time, as something to be dreaded or desired as the end of time, but which has no fixed moral or political meaning in itself. By affirming the reality of time we are in fact affirming the reality of death, and so we are proposing a more tragic philosophy than the one Bataille proposes – which is ironic, given that Bataille is considered by most postmodernist/ post-structuralist philosophers to be perhaps the cruellest thinker.

#### Either they set up a reason to vote aff, which establishes a utility value, and they lose because this contradicts with their 1ac.

Fortuna 10

(John J., University of California Santa Barbara, approved Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science, “Ordinary Sacrifices: An Approach to Loss in Democratic Politics,” March, 2010, http://gradworks.umi.com/3398839.pdf//wyo-mm)

By separating sacrifice and loss from a logic of utility Bataille at the very least clarifies what it really means to engage in a sacrifice. Sacrifice is no longer simply a stand-in for what is really an economic logic of trade-offs. Bataille clearly means to highlight the anguish and pain involved in sacrificial loss by incorporating the figure of death into his analysis. Just as physical death represents a kind of ultimate finality, the loss experienced in sacrifice is similarly final—one does not relinquish in sacrifice with the thought of what one might gain from doing so; it is rather the case that one simply sacrifices. Sacrifice is not about trading off one good or value in favor of another; but instead consists in the absolute relinquishment of a given good or value—and the mental and psychological states which accompany such a relinquishment. Conceptualizing loss in this way more accurately illuminates for citizens what is really at stake when the operation of politics may at certain times ask, and at other times command, that one engage in sacrifice. 27

Or You should reject them and vote negative of make they accept their sacrifice with the loss of a ballot

Fortuna 10

(John J., University of California Santa Barbara, approved Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science, “Ordinary Sacrifices: An Approach to Loss in Democratic Politics,” March, 2010, http://gradworks.umi.com/3398839.pdf//wyo-mm)

Such an understanding of loss provides a unique though difficult alternative to the typical ways in which loss, particularly sacrificial loss, is understood within the contemporary political context. It is usually the case that calls for sacrifice, when made at all, are couched in a rhetoric that at least implicitly seeks to sell that call to sacrifice. In other words, calls to sacrifice (and hence calls to lose) are often accompanied with arguments and explanations of the eventual gains that will result from the sacrificial loss that one is being asked to currently undergo. The Bataillean position would reject such attempts to sell others on sacrifice for a number of reasons, perhaps the most important of which is that these attempts misrepresent what it means to sacrifice in the first place. Sacrifice and loss for Bataille have nothing in common with an economic rationale that thinks only in terms of means/ends relationships. 26

#### theories=total collapse of civilization- continued from 1NC

Stoekl 07

(Allan, Professor of French and Comparative Literature at Penn State University University Park, “Excess and Depletion,” Chapter 12 in Reading Bataille Now, pgs 257-258//wyo-mm)

In a limited sense, then, Bataille and Ambrosino are right: all the energy we use ultimately derives from the sun. They are wrong in ignoring the fact that for society as we know it to function, with our attendant leisure made possible by “energy slaves,” energy derived from, fossil fuels, with their high EROEI, will be necessary for the indefinite future.10 There is simply no other equally rich source of energy available to us; § Marked 17:38 § moreover, no other source will likely be available to us in the future. Bataille’s theory, on the other hand, ultimately rests on the assumption that energy is completely renewable, that there will always be a high EROEI, and that, for that reason, we need not worry about our dependence on finite (depletable) energy sources. The Accursed Share for this reason presents us with a strange amalgam of awareness of the central role energy plays in relation to economics (not to mention life in general) and a willful ignorance concerning the social-technological modes of energy delivery and use, which are far more than mere technical details. We might posit that the origin of this oversight in Bataille’s thought is to be found in the economic theory, and ultimately philosophy, both bourgeois and Marxist, of the modern period, where energy resources and raw materials do not enter into economic (or philosophical) calculations, since they are taken for granted: the earth makes human activity possible, and in a sense we give the earth meaning, dignity, by using resources that otherwise would remain inert, unknown, insignificant (one thinks of Sarte’s “in-itself” here). Value has its origin, in this view, not in the “natural” raw materials or energy used to produce things, but in human activity itself. Bataille merely revises this model by characterizing human activity—in other words, production—as primarily involving gift giving and wasting, rather than production and accumulation. We can argue, then, that solar energy is indeed always produced, always in excess (at least in relation to the limited life spans of individuals, and even species); but it is fossil fuels that best conserve this energy and deliver it in a rich form that we humans can effectively use. Unfortunately, these fuels can be depleted, indeed, are in the process of being depleted. Why is this important in the context of Bataille? For a very simple reason: if Bataille does not worry about energy cost and depletion, he need not worry about energy conservation. Virtually every contemporary commentator on energy use sees only one short-term solution: conservation. Since fossil fuels are not easily replaceable by renewable sources of energy, our only option is to institute radical plans for energy conservation—or risk the complete collapse of our civilization when, in the near future, oil, coal, and natural gas production declines, and the price of fuel necessarily skyrockets.11 Indeed, some commentators, foreseeing the eventual complete depletion of fossil energy stores, predict a return to feudalism (Perelman 1981), or simply a quasi-Neolithic state of human culture, with a radically reduced global population (Price 1995).

#### Aff don’t solve—sacrifice is never complete

Biles, 2011

[Jeremy, The Remains of God: Bataille/Sacrifice/Community, Culture, Theory and Critique Volume 52, Issue 2-3, 2011 Special Issue: The God Who Would Not Die: Theological Remnants and Traces of a Hidden God in Twentieth Century French Thought, Taylor and Francis online] /Wyo-MB

Though the members of Acéphale were bound by an oath of secrecy, the fragmentary descriptions of the society's activities that have surfaced reveal that the initiated were instructed by Bataille to meet in the depths of night, in a forest, by a lightning-blasted tree, where they were to stage rituals whose contents remain largely hidden. What seems certain, however, is that Bataille, whose lifelong obsession would be ‘the enigma of sacrifice’, sought to enact a human sacrifice as the founding myth of this acéphalic community. Bataille is said to have offered himself as the victim of this mad act. According to the legend, however, no one in the group was willing to lift the blade that would render Bataille the headless victim of this headless community.3 The sacrifice never came to pass; the group disbanded, leaving Bataille to contemplate the dissolution of his communitarian project.¶ However scandalous Bataille's proposed gift of death, and however uncertain the accounts that have emerged from behind the veils of secrecy, this legend reveals something crucial about communication and community as they will come to be thought by Bataille. In the present pages, I want to investigate the role of the death of God within the sacrificial logic that underwrites and animates Bataille's notions of communication and community. Drawing upon Bataille's theory of general economics allows one to seize upon the importance of an often-overlooked element of Bataille's thought: time. I propose here that the sacrifice of God – the God that Bataille identifies with the will to eternity or limitless duration – is the means by which one solicits the ecstatic destructions of time and thus the ‘inner experience’ of the present moment. But as Bataille himself acknowledged, the sacrifice of God is destined to remain forever incomplete, never definitively achieved. In developing an account of the dynamics and ethical dimensions of Bataille's sacrifice of God, I examine key texts by two prominent contemporary thinkers – Jean-Luc Nancy and Giorgio Agamben – who find in Bataille at once an inception and limit point for thinking the logic of sacrifice, the sacred, and community. In confronting Bataille, Nancy and Agamben offer critiques of Bataille that, I argue, themselves require critical rethinking. Responding to their interpretations will in turn reveal the resources Bataille presents for thinking a community that, through the sacrifice of God, is experienced in its very dissolution.

#### No solvency- Bataille’s theory retains power relations- meanas capitalism will inevtbly be re-entrenced

Wolin, Distinguished Professor of History at the City University of New York Graduate Center, 2006 (Richard, “Left Fascism: Georges Bataille and the German Ideology”, <http://courses.ucsd.edu/nbryson/Graduate%20Readings/BatailleLeftFascism.pdf> Constellations vol. 2 issue 3, pp. 397-428)

Yet, in his celebratory discussions of sacrifice, potlach, and so forth, Bataille fundamentally misconstrues the historical and contextual parameters of such ritual practices. One could even go so far as to say that, in a certain measure, Bataille’s understanding of these phenomena succumbs to a type of “primitivism”: he decontextualizes the cultural practices he analyzes in order the better to incorporate them within his own theoretical agenda of his own critique of modernity. Here, Bataille seeks nothing less than “an anthropology that will itself provide a living – and orgiastic – myth to overturn, through its experience on a collective level, ‘modern’ sterile bourgeois society.”51 Bataille chooses to view sacrifice and gift-giving in the first instance as gratuitous, non-utilitarian, or, as he puts it, “having no ends beyond themselves” – but this is far from the case. While he is correct in characterizing such practices as related to the production of wealth, they are very much oriented toward the reproduction of existing relations of power. The act of human sacrifice as practiced among the Aztecs redounds to the credit of the sacrificer(s): it reinforces existing relations of authority, viz., the authority of those who are empowered to commission a sacrifice (in this case, the priests and aristocracy). It provides those in authority with a quasi-divine power to preside over life and death. In this sense, it is misleading to claim that sacrifice has no end beyond itself.

# \*\*\*RND 7 v. Gonzaga KO\*\*\*

# 1NC

# Procedural

### T: Solar Power- 1NC

#### First, interpretation: solar power is the direct conversion of radiation into electricity

World English Dictionary no date

[http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/solar+power]

solar power — n

heat radiation from the sun converted into electrical power

#### Second, violation: OTEC is indirect solar energy

Wolfson 11

[Richard, Benjamin F. Wissler Professor of Physics at Middlebury College, where he also teaches environmental studies, “Indirect from the Sun: Water, Wind, Biomass”, p. <http://www.sjsu.edu/people/dustin.mulvaney/courses/envs133/s1/wolfson%20biomass.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

10.4 OTHER INDIRECT SOLAR ENERGY

The same solar-induced temperature differences that power the wind also, in conjunction with differences in salt concentration and Earth's rotational energy, drive the great ocean currents. And wind itself produces ocean waves., providing a doubly indirect: form of solar energy. I briefly described schemes for harnessing the kinetic energy of waves and currents in Chapter 8's section on tidal energy, because these sources of mechanical ocean energy have much in common with tidal energy, except that their ultimate origin is primarily in sunlight rather than the mechanical energy of the Earth-Moon system.

OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY CONVERSION

As the Sun warms the tropical ocean, it creates a significant temperature difference between the surface waters and deeper water to which sunlight doesn't penetrate. As shown in Chapter 4, any time there's a temperature difference, there's the potential to run a heat engine and extract mechanical energy. Ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) harnesses this energy, in most cases to gen-crate electricity. The thermodynamic efficiency limit expressed in Equation 4.5, e = 1 - T/T/jS shows that we get the highest efficiency with the largest possible ratio of Th to T. Practically speaking, this limits the OTEC energy resource to the tropics, where the temperature difference from surface to depth is greatest. Tropical surface temperatures can exceed 25°C> while a few hundred meters down the temperature is around 5DC to 6DC- You can show in Exercise 15 that the thermodynamic efficiency limit for a heat engine operating between these temperatures is only about 7%, but with no fuel to pay for, this number isn't the liability it would be in a fossil-fueled or nuclear power plant. And the OTEC energy resource is vast; after all, oceans absorb much of the 174 PW of energy that the Sun delivers to Earth, Most of that energy is out of our reach,, but one serious estimate suggests that OTEC has the potential to produce as much as 10 TW, which is close to humankind's total energy-consumption rate. However, practical considerations suggest a far smaller OTEC contribution. The one significant advantage that OTEC has over solar-based schemes such as photovoltaic conversion and wind is its near constant availability.

#### Third, vote negative because:

#### Allowing Indirect solar power means EVERY renewable fuel is topical

Prasad 11

[P. Rhushi Prasad, Research Scholar, R&D centre, Department of Mechanical Engineering, “Performance Analysis of A Solar Water Heater With Flat Plate Collector Using Computer Program”, European Journal of Scientific Research, 53.1, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

Renewable energy utilization is synonymous with solar energy utilization, as Sun is the source of all renewable energy. The transition to a solar energy economy has begun all over the world and the renewable energy sector has moved progressively to the center stage of the energy mix and energy policy of the developed and developing nations of the world. Direct solar energy means the radiation intercepted by collectors and indirect solar energy includes Wind, Ocean and Biomass energy.

#### Education- a broad interpretation of solar pushes us towards recycling old Oceans topic backfiles and forcing the negative to rely on generics, destroying unique education.

#### Predictabilty- we voted on wind and solar only choices overwhelmingly to reject a broader view of renewable energy

#### Evaluate this debate under competing interpretations- key to a precies and stable topic that checks judge intervention

# T

# CP

### 1NC Counterplan

#### Text: The government of Japan and India should remove restrictions on and substantially increase incentives for the production of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion.

#### Indian-Japan joint project solves

Ravindran, 2k

[M., National Institute of Ocean Technology Director at the IIT Campus, Chennai, India, “The Indian 1 MW Floating OTEC Plant ¡V An Overview,” Summer 2000, IOA Newsletter, <http://www.clubdesargonautes.org/otec/vol/vol11-2-1.htm> //uwyo-baj]

In 1993, National Institute of Ocean Technology (NIOT) was formed by the Department of Ocean Development (DOD), Government of India to pursue the research activities on ocean energy as part of their various mission-based activities. Under this mission a major thrust was given for the technology development for OTEC. Early 1997, DOD, Government of India proposed to establish a 1 MW gross OTEC plant in India, which will be the first ever MW range plant established anywhere in the world. NIOT had been exploring the participation of national and international expertise for a joint research and development. Saga University in Japan, headed by Prof. Uehara, has been doing excellent and practically oriented R & D on OTEC for more than twenty five years and this team also showed keen interest in closely working with NIOT on OTEC technology development. Considering this, an MOU was signed in 1997 between NIOT and Saga University, Japan for a joint development of OTEC in India. NIOT conducted detailed surveys at the proposed OTEC site near Tuticorin, South India. Based on the temperature and bathymetric profiles, the optimization of the closed loop systems was done with the help of Saga University in 1998[1].

#### More funding is key – Japan-India program will beat US to plant development

Becca Friedman, The Harvard Political Review is a student-run organization at Harvard College but also an aff author, “Examining the future of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion: An Alternative Source Heats Up” Febuary 26th 2006 http://hprsite.squarespace.com/an-alternative-source-heats-up/

In fact, as the U.S. government is dragging its feet, other countries are moving forward with their own designs and may well beat American industry to a fully-functioning plant. In India , there has been significant academic interest in OTEC, although the National Institute of Ocean Technology project has stalled due to a lack of funding. Japan , too, has run into capital cost issues, but Saga University ’s Institute of Ocean Energy has recently won prizes for advances in refinement of the OTEC cycle. Taiwan and various European nations have also explored OTEC as part of their long-term energy strategy. Perhaps the most interest is in the Philippines , where the Philippine Department of Energy has worked with Japanese experts to select 16 potential OTEC sites.

# D/A

#### Obama will prevail on sequestration now but his political capital is finite- it is key to both keep dems in line and prevent a unified GOP opposition

Tobin, 1/18

[Jonathan S., senior online editor of Commentary magazine, “Time-Out May Be the GOP’s Best Option,” Commentary, January 18, 2013, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/01/18/time-out-may-be-the-gop-best-option-debt-ceiling/> //uwyo-tjc]

The top news out of the House Republican retreat in Williamsburg, Virginia is that the party is considering a short-term extension of the debt limit in order to give the party more time to try and convince their Democratic antagonists to start cutting spending. The proposal, which according to the New York Times, is being floated by Rep. Paul Ryan, could wind up connecting the debt ceiling issue with the deadline for the implementation of sequestration that would mandate devastating across-the-board spending cuts. That would theoretically give the GOP some room to maneuver in order to avoid a confrontation with President Obama that few think they would win. But it is hard to avoid the impression that the main object of a delay would be to deal with the Republicans’ biggest problems: a lack of unity. Like a sports team in disarray, the GOP needs a time out where they can catch their breath and somehow get on the same page with each other. As the votes over House Speaker John Boehner’s Plan B and then the final fiscal cliff deal revealed, the party is badly split between those who don’t want to give an inch on spending and taxes, those who think that compromise with the president is inevitable and those who believe the best the party can do is to speak out for its principles and oppose tactics that will blow up the economy and help demonize the party. But the problem for the Republican leadership is that even if they can buy themselves some more time to get their fractious caucus in line, the likelihood that a confident and aggressive President Obama will either accept a short-term extension or deal honestly with them on the issues. The argument for a time out is that in its current condition with a leadership that can’t count on its members to agree to back a unified strategy on fiscal issues, Republicans are doomed to defeat no matter what option they choose. The president is counting on the GOP splintering into warring factions and has done his best to help that process along by goading his opponents whenever possible including his stunning attack on them even as the two sides were negotiating a deal to prevent the nation from going over the fiscal cliff earlier this month. As Robert Costa and Andrew Stiles noted in their sum up from the retreat, even though Republicans remain in control of the House, the tone of the gathering was that of a defeated party searching for answers. Given the shock felt by many in the party over the president’s re-election and the beatings they’ve received over the debt ceiling and the fiscal cliff, that’s understandable. But Bill Kristol’s advice to them to “suck it up,” is exactly what they need to hear. I think those Republicans who want to make a stand on the debt ceiling are right. Even though the odds are against them prevailing in such a battle, the party can’t simply stand by and let President Obama off the hook without at least trying to stop him by whatever means are at their disposal. That sort of surrender would split the GOP and make it harder for them to recover at the next midterm. But the one given in this equation is that without a united caucus, House Republicans haven’t a prayer of doing anything effective to halt the country’s drift toward insolvency and to head off new taxes. For all of their pessimism, the GOP still controls the power of the purse. President Obama may have the wind at his back right now but his political capital is finite. So is his time. If conservatives can use the coming weeks to agree on a strategy to exploit his weaknesses — such as the division among Democrats and the president’s refusal to deal with entitlement reform — their position could be stronger than they think. The question is do Boehner, Eric Cantor or even Paul Ryan have the ability to convince their colleagues that if they don’t hang together, their hopes of stopping Obama from worsening the nation’s problems are nonexistent.

#### NOAA is perceived and Congress doesn’t like them, 2013 budget proves

Congress Committee Reports, 12

[Committee Reports 112th Congress (2011-2012)Senate Report 112-158 - DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2013, The Library of Congress, <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/cpquery/?&sid=cp112RyWvW&r_n=sr158.112&dbname=cp112&&sel=TOC_58486&> //uwyo-baj]

The Committee's recommendation provides $3,418,709,000 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA]. The recommendation is $1,474,966,000 below the fiscal year 2012 enacted level and $1,635,837,000 below the budget request. The Committee acknowledges that the administration's January 13, 2012, plan to reorganize the Federal Government called for moving NOAA to the Department of the Interior. However until that plan is approved, NOAA still comprises 54 percent of the Department of Commerce's discretionary appropriations and commands significant Committee oversight. NOAA's fishery decisions affect every coastal community, and NOAA's weather forecasts affect every American's daily life. Anyone who doubts Congress' perception of NOAA as the focal point of the Department's portfolio should revisit the transcripts from the Committee's March 22, 2013, hearing on the Department of Commerce's fiscal year 2013 budget request. The motivations behind the administration's unbalanced and incongruous budget request for NOAA was questioned by this Committee then and continues to be scrutinized in this bill. As the entire Federal Government has adjusted to more frugal budgets, the Department was expected to balance NOAA's internal overhead costs with that of the agency's external partnerships and commitments. To the Committee's disappointment, the 2013 budget request did not achieve this stability. Satellite acquisition spending continues to rise at the expense of core operations and competitive funding opportunities. Education and restoration programs were disproportionally targeted. Many proposed cuts to programs long supported by Congress come with little, if any, sensible justifications from the agency. Examples include reductions to the U.S. Tsunami Warning Network less than a year after the devastating Japanese earthquake showed the practical value of this warning network to our own west coast and Pacific Island communities. In addition, proposed reductions to local weather forecasting offices follow a year of some of the most severe weather events on record--but not the deadliest due to NOAA's weather warnings. Financial decisions like these that were made in light of ballooning satellite acquisition costs make the Committee question the guiding forces behind the Department's fiscal compass.

#### Policy makers don’t like OTEC, upfront costs and empirics prove

Marti et al 10

[Marti, J.A.; Plocek, T.J.; Laboy, M.A.; Ruiz, O.E. Offshore Infrastructure Associates, Inc., “Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion: Strategies for system integration and implementation using commercially-available components and technology,” Offshore Technology Conference, 2010, OnePetro, //uwyo-baj]

Although the lower environmental impact of OTEC may be a factor in selecting the technology, experience of the authors indicates that policymakers often tend to favor options with apparent lower immediate costs, unless methods are used to quantify environmental impacts in economic terms. This was probably the main reason why worldwide interest in OTEC waned when oil prices dropped in the late 1980’s and 1990’s. Carbon taxes or renewable energy credits are one of the ways in which environmental costs can be quantified and considered in an economic analysis.

#### Sequestration destroys US global military power—-collapses deterrence and triggers multiple scenarios for nuclear war

Hunter 9/30

[Duncan is a U.S. Representative from Alaska. "SEQUESTRATION SENDS WRONG MESSAGE TO U.S. FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE," 2012, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/sep/30/tp-sequestration-sends-wrong-message-to-us/?page=1~~%23article>]

The next 10 years are sure to be no different from the last. In the Middle East, Iran is desperately searching to fill a regional power vacuum and enhance its weapons program, while threatening to close the Strait of Hormuz and targeting Israel with unapologetic provocation. Meanwhile, the United States still has an obligation to Iraq. There is a necessity for diplomatic support and engagement, even though the ground combat mission is over. Africa is also experiencing power struggles of its own. The situations in Libya and Egypt are evolving, while Yemen and Somalia are acting as staging grounds for al-Qaeda. There is also the threat of Somali pirates in international waters. Multiple high-profile hostage situations and combat rescues show just how serious of a threat that rogue bands of pirates are to naval and commercial shipping lanes. There is also the threat of North Korea with its aggressive pursuit of advanced aerial weaponry, Russia with its focus on arms modernization, and China with its large-scale and rapid military buildup. China’s display of hostility toward Taiwan — a friend and ally of the United States — also shows no sign of diminishing. With all of this, more than 70,000 American troops are in Afghanistan, facing down a dangerous enemy. For the United States and other nations, interest in Afghanistan and the region will continue long after the last of the coalition ground forces leave and the next phase of the mission begins. Ignoring America’s obligation as a world leader and the patchwork of threats that exist today won’t eliminate the risk posed by an Iran that one day acquires nuclear weapons or a North Korea that eventually acquires effective strike capability. More likely, these and other threats will develop more quickly and efficiently, putting the global interests of the U.S. directly in the cross hairs. Through a robust national defense, the United States has always sent a clear message around the world that American intentions are good and we stand by our allies. The strength of the U.S. military has dissuaded conflict and suggested to adversaries that challenging freedom is a losing proposition. It was this deterrent, in fact, that won the Cold War and turned the U.S. military into the world’s most effective fighting force. Sequestration would change all of this, for the worse. In the words of Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, sequestration is a “nutty formula, and it’s goofy to begin with, and it’s not something, frankly, that anybody responsible ought to put into effect.” He also said sequestration is the equivalent of “shooting ourselves in the head.” Tough words, but Secretary Panetta is right.Sequestration would produce the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest Navy since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in Air Force history. Ironically, the president’s defense policy shift to the Pacific increases reliance on the Navy, but with the smallest fleet in nearly a century, controlling the oceans and projecting force will become an even more difficult and selective process, requiring prioritization that would create vulnerabilities elsewhere. Resetting America’s armed forces after a decade-plus of combat action is another necessity that cannot be overlooked. There is also a guarantee of pink slips throughout the uniformed services and every industry that directly supports the U.S. military. In San Diego, the military sustains hundreds of thousands of jobs, and billions of dollars in economic productivity. San Diego — even for all of its strategic value — is not immune to job loss and other economic impacts accompanying deep budget cuts. Sequestration is a term Americans should get to know and understand, because it will have real and lasting consequences if left unchecked. The upside is that the risks and dangers can be avoided as long as Congress and the president act in the coming months. The clock is ticking to stave off sequestration — a move that would signal to our friends and enemies alike that we uphold our promises and stand ready to defend our interests against any threat.

#### Collapse of heg leads to extinction-regional and great power wars

Brzezinski 2012

[Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, CSIS Counselor and Trustee, 2012, Strategic Vision, uwyo//amp]

IF AMERICA FALTERS, THE WORLD IS UNLIKELY TO BE DOMINATED by a single preeminent successor, such as China. While a sudden and massive crisis of the American system would produce a fast-moving chain reaction leading to global political and economic chaos, a steady drift by America into increasingly pervasive decay and/or into endlessly widening warfare with Islam would be unlikely to produce, even by 2025, the "coronation" of an effective global successor. No single power will be ready by then to exercise the role that the world, upon the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, expected the United States to play. More probable would be a protracted phase of rather inconclusive and somewhat chaotic realignments of both global and regional power, with no grand winners and many more losers, in a setting of international uncertainty and even of potentially fatal risks to global well-being. What follows analyzes the irnplications of that historically ominous—though certainly not predetermined—"if.".

# K

### 1NC – Consumption Kritik

#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production,

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### The impact to the mass consumption politics of the affirmative is planetary destruction, loss of value to life, and mass poverty and dehumanization—the alternative’s criticism of consumption is key to ethical engagement with the planet

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

As ¶ noted ¶ in ¶ the ¶ introduction, ¶ consumption ¶ presents ¶ itself ¶ as ¶ an ¶ area ¶ of ¶ ethical ¶ concern ¶ in ¶ at ¶ least ¶ three ¶ ways: ¶ first, ¶ because ¶ Western-­‐style ¶ consumption ¶ is ¶ putting ¶ an ¶ immense ¶ and ¶ unsustainable ¶ burden ¶ on ¶ the ¶ planet’s ¶ ecosystems, ¶ so ¶ much ¶ so ¶ that ¶ contemporary ¶ cultures ¶ of ¶ consumption ¶ are ¶ diminishing ¶ the ¶ capacity ¶ of ¶ the ¶ planet ¶ to ¶ support ¶ life ¶ as ¶ we ¶ know ¶ it ¶ in ¶ the ¶ future;50 ¶ second, ¶ because ¶ the ¶ high ¶ consumption, ¶ resource-­‐intensive ¶ lifestyles ¶ enjoyed ¶ by ¶ most ¶ people ¶ in ¶ the ¶ richest ¶ nations ¶ coexist ¶ in ¶ a ¶ world ¶ where ¶ great ¶ multitudes ¶ live ¶ lives ¶ oppressed ¶ by ¶ material ¶ deprivation;51 ¶ and ¶ thirdly, ¶ because ¶ there ¶ is ¶ a ¶ large ¶ and ¶ growing ¶ body ¶ of ¶ sociological ¶ and ¶ psychological ¶ literature ¶ indicating ¶ that ¶ once ¶ our ¶ basic ¶ material ¶ needs ¶ for ¶ food, ¶ shelter, ¶ clothing, ¶ etc. ¶ are ¶ met, ¶ the ¶ limitless ¶ pursuit ¶ of ¶ more ¶ money ¶ and ¶ possessions ¶ neither ¶ produces ¶ any ¶ lasting ¶ happiness ¶ nor ¶ satisfies ¶ the ¶ human ¶ need ¶ for ¶ meaning.52 ¶ Far ¶ from ¶ representing ¶ the ¶ peak ¶ of ¶ civilization, ¶ cultures ¶ of ¶ mass ¶ consumption ¶ are ¶ showing ¶ distinct ¶ signs ¶ of ¶ widespread ¶ social, ¶ even ¶ spiritual, ¶ malaise.53 ¶ Any ¶ one ¶ of ¶ these ¶ issues, ¶ it ¶ could ¶ be ¶ argued, ¶ would ¶ be ¶ sufficient ¶ for ¶ consumption ¶ to ¶ become ¶ a ¶ proper ¶ subject ¶ for ¶ ethical ¶ engagement, ¶ in ¶ the ¶ Foucauldian ¶ sense ¶ of ¶ ethics ¶ as ¶ ‘the ¶ self ¶ engaging ¶ the ¶ self.’ ¶ When ¶ the ¶ three ¶ issues ¶ are ¶ considered ¶ together, ¶ the ¶ case ¶ for ¶ ethical ¶ engagement ¶ is ¶ compelling. ¶ ¶ At ¶ once, ¶ however, ¶ we ¶ are ¶ confronted ¶ with ¶ a ¶ strange ¶ incongruity, ¶ even ¶ a ¶ contradiction, ¶ of ¶ sorts, ¶ one ¶ that ¶ seems ¶ to ¶ tear ¶ the ¶ present ¶ analysis ¶ apart. ¶ In ¶ an ¶ age ¶ when ¶ the ¶ facts ¶ of ¶ ecological ¶ degradation, ¶ extreme ¶ poverty, ¶ and ¶ consumer ¶ malaise ¶ lie ¶ quite ¶ plainly ¶ before ¶ our ¶ eyes, ¶ one ¶ might ¶ have ¶ thought ¶ that ¶ First ¶ World ¶ consumption ¶ practices ¶ were ¶ already ¶ a ¶ subject ¶ of ¶ widespread ¶ ethical ¶ engagement. ¶ That ¶ is, ¶ one ¶ might ¶ have ¶ expected ¶ consumption ¶ practices ¶ to ¶ be ¶ a ¶ domain ¶ of ¶ constant ¶ and ¶ dedicated ¶ ethical ¶ attention, ¶ given ¶ that ¶ overconsumption ¶ seems ¶ to ¶ be ¶ driving ¶ several ¶ of ¶ the ¶ world’s ¶ most ¶ pressing ¶ problems ¶ (including ¶ the ¶ problem ¶ of ¶ consumer ¶ malaise). ¶ And ¶ yet, ¶ it ¶ can ¶ hardly ¶ be ¶ denied ¶ that ¶ any ¶ ethical ¶ engagement ¶ that ¶ takes ¶ place ¶ within ¶ consumer ¶ cultures ¶ does ¶ not, ¶ as ¶ a ¶ rule, ¶ seek ¶ to ¶ reduce ¶ or ¶ moderate ¶ consumption ¶ but ¶ rather ¶ encourage, ¶ glorify, ¶ and ¶ increase ¶ consumption ¶ – ¶ and ¶ increase ¶ it ¶ without ¶ apparent ¶ limit.54 ¶ And ¶ here ¶ is ¶ the ¶ contradiction: ¶ consumption ¶ is ¶ at ¶ once ¶ an ¶ extremely ¶ obvious ¶ realm ¶ for ¶ ethical ¶ engagement, ¶ for ¶ the ¶ three ¶ reasons ¶ stated ¶ above, ¶ and, ¶ at ¶ the ¶ same ¶ time, ¶ engaging ¶ the ¶ self ¶ by ¶ the ¶ self ¶ for ¶ the ¶ purpose ¶ of ¶ deliberately ¶ reducing ¶ or ¶ moderating ¶ consumption ¶ seems ¶ to ¶ be ¶ more ¶ or ¶ less ¶ unthinkable ¶ within ¶ modern ¶ consumer ¶ societies. ¶ Indeed, ¶ there ¶ seems ¶ to ¶ be ¶ an ¶ almost ¶ unquestioned ¶ assumption ¶ throughout ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ that ¶ consumption ¶ practices ¶ are ¶ somehow ¶ ‘beyond ¶ ethics,’ ¶ in ¶ the ¶ sense ¶ that ¶ how ¶ much ¶ we ¶ consume ¶ does ¶ not ¶ really ¶ need ¶ to ¶ inform ¶ the ¶ answer ¶ we ¶ give ¶ to ¶ the ¶ question ¶ of ¶ ‘how ¶ one ¶ ought ¶ to ¶ live.’ ¶ On ¶ the ¶ contrary, ¶ it ¶ is ¶ presumed ¶ that ¶ everyone ¶ is ¶ justified ¶ seeking ¶ as ¶ high ¶ a ¶ material ¶ standard ¶ of ¶ living ¶ as ¶ possible, ¶ a ¶ pursuit ¶ that ¶ is ¶ limited, ¶ it ¶ would ¶ seem, ¶ only ¶ by ¶ the ¶ laws ¶ of ¶ a ¶ free ¶ market ¶ economy. ¶

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion our selves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

¶ The ¶ aim ¶ of ¶ this ¶ paper, ¶ however, ¶ is ¶ not ¶ to ¶ present ¶ a ¶ thorough ¶ analysis ¶ of ¶ Foucault’s ¶ notion ¶ of ¶ an ¶ aesthetics ¶ of ¶ existence. ¶ Several ¶ such ¶ analyses ¶ have ¶ appeared ¶ in ¶ recent ¶ times ¶ (after ¶ years ¶ of ¶ unfortunate ¶ scholarly ¶ neglect), ¶ and ¶ much ¶ of ¶ this ¶ emerging ¶ commentary ¶ is ¶ very ¶ probing ¶ and ¶ insightful.12 ¶ But ¶ this ¶ is ¶ not ¶ the ¶ time ¶ to ¶ focus ¶ on ¶ furthering ¶ that ¶ critical ¶ discussion ¶ or ¶ even ¶ providing ¶ a ¶ comprehensive ¶ literature ¶ review ¶ of ¶ it. ¶ Instead, ¶ after ¶ providing ¶ a ¶ brief ¶ exposition ¶ of ¶ Foucault’s ¶ ethics, ¶ this ¶ paper ¶ will ¶ undertake ¶ to ¶ actually ¶ apply ¶ the ¶ idea ¶ of ¶ an ¶ aesthetics ¶ of ¶ existence ¶ to ¶ a ¶ particular ¶ subject ¶ of ¶ ethical ¶ concern, ¶ namely, ¶ to ¶ our ¶ role ¶ as ¶ ‘consumers’ ¶ in ¶ the ¶ context ¶ of ¶ First ¶ World ¶ overconsumption. ¶ This ¶ is ¶ an ¶ area ¶ that ¶ raises ¶ ethical ¶ questions ¶ concerning ¶ how ¶ we ¶ ought ¶ to ¶ live ¶ for ¶ two ¶ main ¶ reasons: ¶ firstly, ¶ due ¶ to ¶ the ¶ impact ¶ Western-­‐style ¶ consumers ¶ are ¶ having ¶ on ¶ the ¶ natural ¶ environment; ¶ and ¶ secondly, ¶ due ¶ to ¶ the ¶ continued ¶ existence ¶ of ¶ poverty ¶ amidst ¶ plenty. ¶ There ¶ is, ¶ however, ¶ another ¶ perspective ¶ to ¶ consider ¶ also. ¶ A ¶ large ¶ body ¶ of ¶ sociological ¶ and ¶ psychological ¶ literature ¶ now ¶ exists ¶ indicating ¶ that ¶ Western-­‐style ¶ consumption ¶ practices ¶ are ¶ often ¶ failing ¶ to ¶ provide ¶ meaning ¶ and ¶ fulfillment, ¶ even ¶ to ¶ those ¶ who ¶ have ¶ ‘succeeded’ ¶ in ¶ attaining ¶ a ¶ high ¶ material ¶ standard ¶ of ¶ living.13 ¶ These ¶ three ¶ consumption-­‐related ¶ issues ¶ – ¶ ecological ¶ degradation, ¶ poverty ¶ amidst ¶ plenty, ¶ and ¶ consumer ¶ malaise ¶ – ¶ provide ¶ ample ¶ grounds ¶ for ¶ thinking ¶ that ¶ consumption ¶ is ¶ a ¶ proper ¶ subject ¶ for ¶ ethical ¶ engagement, ¶ in ¶ the ¶ Foucauldian ¶ sense ¶ of ¶ ethics ¶ as ¶ ‘the ¶ self ¶ engaging ¶ the ¶ self.’ ¶ If ¶ it ¶ is ¶ the ¶ case ¶ that ¶ our ¶ individual ¶ identities ¶ have ¶ been ¶ shaped, ¶ insidiously ¶ perhaps, ¶ by ¶ a ¶ social ¶ system ¶ that ¶ celebrates ¶ and ¶ encourages ¶ consumption ¶ without ¶ apparent ¶ limit ¶ – ¶ and ¶ it ¶ would ¶ not ¶ be ¶ unfair ¶ to ¶ describe ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ in ¶ these ¶ terms14 ¶ – ¶ then ¶ it ¶ may ¶ be ¶ that ¶ ethical ¶ practice ¶ today ¶ calls ¶ for ¶ a ¶ rethinking ¶ of ¶ our ¶ assumptions ¶ and ¶ attitudes ¶ concerning ¶ consumption, ¶ which ¶ might ¶ involve ¶ a ¶ deliberate ¶ reshaping ¶ of ¶ the ¶ self ¶ by ¶ the ¶ self. ¶ ¶ ¶ This ¶ paper ¶ will ¶ explore ¶ the ¶ possibility ¶ of ¶ such ¶ an ¶ ethics ¶ of ¶ consumption ¶ in ¶ the ¶ following ¶ ways. ¶ First, ¶ by ¶ explaining ¶ how ¶ neoclassical ¶ economics, ¶ which ¶ is ¶ arguably ¶ the ¶ most ¶ influential ¶ paradigm ¶ of ¶ thought ¶ in ¶ the ¶ world ¶ today, ¶ conceptualizes ¶ consumption ¶ as ¶ something ¶ that ¶ benefits ¶ both ¶ ‘self’ ¶ and ¶ ‘other’ ¶ and, ¶ therefore, ¶ as ¶ something ¶ that ¶ should ¶ be ¶ maximized. ¶ To ¶ the ¶ extent ¶ that ¶ modern ¶ consumers ¶ have ¶ internalized ¶ this ¶ conception ¶ of ¶ consumption, ¶ an ¶ ethics ¶ of ¶ consumption ¶ might ¶ involve ¶ engaging ¶ the ¶ self ¶ for ¶ the ¶ purpose ¶ of ¶ changing ¶ the ¶ self ¶ and ¶ creating ¶ something ¶ new. ¶ The ¶ second ¶ way ¶ an ¶ ethics ¶ of ¶ consumption ¶ will ¶ be ¶ explored ¶ will ¶ be ¶ through ¶ an ¶ examination ¶ of ¶ the ¶ theory ¶ and ¶ practice ¶ of ¶ ‘voluntary ¶ simplicity,’ ¶ a ¶ term ¶ that ¶ refers ¶ to ¶ an ¶ oppositional ¶ living ¶ strategy ¶ or ¶ ‘way ¶ of ¶ life’ ¶ with ¶ which ¶ people, ¶ somewhat ¶ paradoxically, ¶ perhaps, ¶ seek ¶ an ¶ increased ¶ quality ¶ of ¶ life ¶ through ¶ a ¶ reduction ¶ and ¶ restraint ¶ of ¶ one’s ¶ level ¶ of ¶ consumption.15 ¶ The ¶ paradox, ¶ so-­‐ called, ¶ consists ¶ in ¶ the ¶ attempt ¶ to ¶ live ¶ ‘more ¶ with ¶ less.’ ¶ Since ¶ voluntarily ¶ living ¶ simply ¶ means ¶ heading ¶ in ¶ the ¶ opposite ¶ direction ¶ to ¶ where ¶ most ¶ people ¶ in ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ (and ¶ increasingly ¶ elsewhere) ¶ seem ¶ to ¶ want ¶ to ¶ go, ¶ one ¶ would ¶ expect ¶ living ¶ simply ¶ to ¶ require ¶ a ¶ fundamentally ¶ creative ¶ engagement ¶ with ¶ life ¶ and ¶ culture, ¶ especially ¶ in ¶ contemporary ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ that ¶ seem ¶ to ¶ be ¶ predicated ¶ on ¶ the ¶ assumption ¶ that ¶ ‘more ¶ consumption ¶ is ¶ always ¶ better.’ ¶ This ¶ need ¶ for ¶ a ¶ fundamentally ¶ creative ¶ engagement ¶ with ¶ life ¶ is ¶ what ¶ prompted ¶ the ¶ present ¶ attempt ¶ to ¶ elucidate ¶ the ¶ idea ¶ of ¶ ‘voluntary ¶ simplicity ¶ as ¶ aesthetics ¶ of ¶ existence,’ ¶ and ¶ it ¶ is ¶ this ¶ attempt ¶ to ¶ infuse ¶ Foucauldian ¶ ethics ¶ with ¶ an ¶ emerging ¶ post-­‐consumerist ¶ philosophy ¶ of ¶ life ¶ that ¶ constitutes ¶ the ¶ original ¶ contribution ¶ of ¶ this ¶ paper. ¶ It ¶ is ¶ hoped ¶ that ¶ this ¶ practical ¶ application ¶ of ¶ Foucault’s ¶ ethics ¶ might ¶ also ¶ prompt ¶ others ¶ to ¶ consider ¶ how ¶ ethical ¶ engagement ¶ might ¶ produce ¶ new ¶ ways ¶ of ¶ being ¶ that ¶ are ¶ freer, ¶ more ¶ fulfilling, ¶ and ¶ yet ¶ less ¶ resource-­‐intensive ¶ and ¶ damaging ¶ than ¶ the ¶ modes ¶ of ¶ being ¶ which ¶ are ¶ dominant ¶ in ¶ consumer ¶ societies ¶ today. ¶ Could ¶ it ¶ be, ¶ for ¶ example, ¶ that ¶ the ¶ ‘Death ¶ of ¶ Man,’ ¶ to ¶ use ¶ Foucault’s ¶ phrase, ¶ was ¶ actually ¶ the ¶ first ¶ (and ¶ a ¶ necessary) ¶ phase ¶ in ¶ the ¶ demise ¶ of ¶ what ¶ one ¶ might ¶ call ¶ ‘homo ¶ consumicus’? ¶ And ¶ what ¶ forms ¶ of ¶ life, ¶ what ¶ modes ¶ of ¶ being, ¶ would ¶ or ¶ could ¶ materialize ¶ with ¶ the ¶ voluntary ¶ emergence ¶ of ¶ ‘homo ¶ post-­‐consumicus’? ¶ These ¶ are ¶ the ¶ large ¶ questions ¶ that ¶ motivated ¶ this ¶ study ¶ and ¶ in ¶ the ¶ following ¶ pages ¶ a ¶ preliminary ¶ attempt ¶ is ¶ made ¶ to ¶ grapple ¶ with ¶ them. ¶ The ¶ aim, ¶ however, ¶ is ¶ not ¶ to ¶ legitimate ¶ ‘what ¶ is ¶ already ¶ known,’16 ¶ since ¶ that ¶ would ¶ not ¶ be ¶ a ¶ very ¶ Foucauldian ¶ endeavor; ¶ rather, ¶ the ¶ aim ¶ is ¶ to ¶ explore ¶ whether ¶ or ¶ to ¶ what ¶ extent ¶ it ¶ is ¶ possible ¶ to ¶ ‘free ¶ thought ¶ from ¶ what ¶ it ¶ silently ¶ thinks,’17 ¶ in ¶ the ¶ hope ¶ that ¶ this ¶ might ¶ open ¶ up ¶ space ¶ to ¶ ‘think ¶ differently,’18 ¶ to ¶ think ¶ otherwise.

# Case

### 1NC – AT: Warming Advantage

#### Warming not real/anthropogenic- IPCC predictions fail and rely on faulty computer models – even if they win that the earth is warming, the rate is too slow to trigger their impacts

Bast & Taylor ‘11

[Joseph and James, CEO of the Heartland Institute, author of Rebuilding America’s Schools, Why We Spend Too Much on Health Care, Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism, Education & Capitalism, Climate Change Reconsidered, and The Patriot’s Toolbox, and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, Senior Fellow for The Heartland Institute, bachelor degree from Dartmouth College and law degree from the Syracuse University College of Law, “Global Warming: Not a Crisis,” The Heartland Institute, 8.2.11., http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis) //wyo-hdm]

How Much Warming? NASA satellite data recorded since 1979 allow us to check the accuracy of claims that the past three decades have been warming at an alarming rate. The data show a warming rate of 0.123 degrees C per decade. This is considerably less than what land-based temperature stations report during the same time period, and which are relied on by the IPCC (Christy, 2009). If the Earth’s temperature continues to rise at the rate of the past three decades, the planet would see only 1.23 degrees C warming over the course of an entire century. Most climate scientists, even “skeptics,” acknowledge that rising CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere would, all other things held constant, cause some small amount of warming. Alarmists claim that small amount will trigger increases in the amount of moisture in the atmosphere, which in turn will cause further warming. But other scientists have found no evidence of rising levels of moisture in those areas of the atmosphere where the models claim it should be found. Without this “amplification,” there is no global warming crisis (Singer, 2011). While the global climate warmed slightly during the 1980s and 1990s, it has not warmed at all since 2000, and there is some evidence that a cooling trend has begun (Taylor, 2007). This contradicts the predictions of the IPCC and poses a challenge to the theory that CO2 concentrations play a major role in global temperature trends. It confirms the views of many less-politicized climate scientists who acknowledge that the global climate is always warming or cooling (Michaels, 2005; Christy, 2006). The scientific community’s lack of certainty about future climate trends is rooted in the shortcomings of computer models. These models are the centerpiece of the IPCC’‘s reports, yet it is widely recognized that they fail to account for changes in precipitation, water vapor, and clouds that are likely to occur in a warmer world. It is a case of “garbage in, garbage out.” If we cannot predict how much warming will occur, how can we claim that continued human emissions of greenhouse gases is harmful?

#### OTEC causes massive CO2 release

NOAA, 1980

[U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office of Ocean Minerals and Energy, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Environmental Issues, September, http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CZIC-tk1056-o3-1980/html/CZIC-tk1056-o3-1980.htm] /Wyo-MB

Any effects of ocean thermal energy conversion on the C02 balance between¶ the oceans and atmosphere are of concern because of the role of C02 in long-¶ term weather changes. The C02 molecule serves a unique role regarding the heat¶ balance of the Earth, having little effect on short wavelength solar radiation¶ teaching the Earth yet absorbing longer wavelength radiation reemitted by the¶ Earth. This is the basis of the concern referred to as the "greenhouse" effect¶ when higher atmospheric C02 levels would result in a warming of global tempera-¶ tures due to increased absorption of the longer wAvelength radiation. It is a¶ major concern regarding continued use of fossil fuels.¶ Atmospheric C02 exists in equilibrium with dissolved C02 in the oceans and¶ other aquatic systems. Within the ocean and other waters, carbon dioxide exists¶ in equilibrium with the carbonate system which is composed of carbonic acid¶ (H2CO3), bicarbonate (HC03), and carbonate (C03)¶ The saturation concentration of c02 is greater in the deeper, colder waters¶ of the ocean than in the surface waters Thus, the operation of an OTEC plant¶ will bring large Volumes Of C02 rich water to the surface where it may have a¶ potential effect the amount Of co2 efflux from a 400-MW OtEC configuration¶ has been estimated to be about onefourth of that which would be released from¶ a coal-fired plant of equivalent capacity. Although there is some concern that¶ the release could have potential regional effects large-scale climate effects¶ are not anticipated.

#### Turns the advantage—causes warming and ocean acidification

CRRC, 2012

[Coastal Response Research Center, University of New Hampshire, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion: Information needs assessment, http://www.crrc.unh.edu/publications/OTEC%20Needs%20Assessment%20Revision%20FINAL.pdf] /Wyo-MB

The transport of water from the deep ocean to the surface will also likely result in the release of ¶ dissolved gases due to the change in partial pressure. Of most concern is the release of carbon ¶ dioxide, resulting in localized ocean acidification and consumption of buffering agents. Very ¶ little is known about the long-term impacts of transport of water from the deep ocean to the ¶ surface and resultant changes to the chemical properties of the water. Thorough analysis and ¶ modeling may be required to gain a better understanding of the volume of carbon dioxide ¶ released to the atmosphere as a greenhouse gas, the extent of ocean acidification, and ¶ consumption of buffering agents.

#### OTEC study proves upwelling causes warming and ecosystem change

Krishnakumar and Nihous 13

[Krishnakumar Rajagopalan, Post Doctoral Researcher, National Marine Renewable Energy Center in Hawaii, and Gérard C. Nihous, Associate Professor Dept. of Ocean and Resources Engineering University of Hawaii, “Estimates of global Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC) resources using an ocean general circulation model,” Renewable Energy, February 2013, ScienceDirect, uwyo-baj]

While under maximal OTEC net power production, a cooling of the upper ocean across tropical regions may be viewed as potentially beneficial, the corresponding warming trend elsewhere is worrisome. Regions of intense coastal upwelling appear to experience a significant warming, as shown in Fig. 4 along the west coasts of the Americas and, to a lesser degree, of Africa. Significant warming periodically occurs in Peruvian and Chilean coastal waters during El Niño events, with equally significant environmental consequences for the local food web. During El Niño, however, local upwelling processes weaken considerably and relatively warm offshore water moves (horizontally) toward the coast; this water is also depleted of nutrients (oligotrophic) and the normally very productive food web found along the coasts of Peru and Chile cannot be sustained. The warming occurring under maximal OTEC net power production in these regions does not correspond to a shutdown of the local upwelling processes; instead, it indicates that deeper water has considerably warmed up, as shown in Fig. 5. Under such a scenario, the availability of upwelled nutrients theoretically would persist, although significant ecosystem changes are still likely to take place. A credible assessment of such changes clearly is beyond the scope of this study.

#### No risk of impact- impacts won’t take hold for several centuries and in order to kill off the planet they would have to occur within one lifespan

Lomborg 8

[Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School

Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange>]

These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren’t for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver Tickell, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a “catastrophe” and the beginning of the “extinction” of the human race. This is simply silly. His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners’ scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland’s ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world’s coastal infrastructure and much of the world’s farmland – “undoubtedly” causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years’ time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. Tickell’s claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

# \*\*\*A2 Warming

#### No impact to ocean acidification -alt causes put the ocean more at risk

Goreham 2012

[Steve Goreham, a speaker, author, and researcher on environmental issues as well as an engineer and business executive, December 12, 2012, PBS News Hour spreads false Ocean Acidification alarm, <http://polymontana.com/pbs-news-hour-spreads-false-ocean-acidification-alarm/>, uwyo//amp]

But PBS wrongly told viewers that reef degradation was due to warmer ocean temperatures and “ocean acidification,” both allegedly caused by human carbon dioxide emissions. Sreenivasan concluded with, “Time that maybe is running out for coral reefs in Florida and elsewhere.” Scientists, environmental groups, and the United Nations promote the fear of ocean acidification. According to claims, man-made emissions of carbon dioxide are absorbed by the oceans and converted into carbonic acid, thereby changing the chemical balance of the oceans. The basic concept of acidification is correct, but hugely exaggerated. The PBS segment is wrong in several ways. First, while today’s temperatures are the warmest in the last 400 years, oceans were warmer still during the Medieval Warm Period ten centuries ago. Peer-reviewed studies found that both the Gulf of Mexico and nearby Sargasso Sea were warmer about 1000 AD than at present. These warm temperatures were due to natural climatic changes o f Earth―not man-made emissions. Caribbean reefs adapted to these warm seas to remain with us today. Second, the segment paints a misleading picture of carbon dioxide entering the oceans, without providing perspective for the viewer. Sreenivasan interviews scientist Chris Landon who states, “And it’s enough railroad cars stacked end to end to wrap around the earth seven times. That’s how much carbon is going into the ocean every single year.” This sounds alarming, unless you know that the oceans absorb and release about 90 times that amount of CO2 every year from the atmosphere naturally. In addition, carbon dioxide is absorbed by vast deposits of limestone rock in the ocean floor, removing it from sea water. Third, the oceans are alkaline, not acidic. We’re discussing a reduction in alkalinity. Solutions are measured as acidic or alkaline (basic) on a logarithmic 14-point scale, called the pH Scale. Battery acid has a pH of about one, while the base lye has a pH as high as thirteen. Milk is slightly acidic, as are most of the foods we eat. Measured in the open ocean, sea water is alkaline, with a pH of about 8.2. According to computer models, doubling of atmospheric CO2 would decrease ocean pH to about 7.9, still basic, but less so. The concern is that this change would destroy the coral reefs by dissolving the carbonate shells and skeletons of reef creatures. Sreenivasan states, “Acidification acts a lot like osteoporosis does in humans. But in marine animals, it makes their shells and skeletons brittle. The more acidic the water, the harder it is for corals to grow their skeletons.” But, empirical evidence does not show it harder for today’s marine animals to grow their shells. A study of corals at the Great Barrier Reef shows that shell calcium growth rates today are about 25 percent higher than 300‒400 years ago when both ocean temperatures and levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide were lower. Scientists still know little about the alkalinity of today’s ocean or the oceans of past centuries. Ocean pH varies by depth, becoming less basic as one goes deeper. It varies by latitude from the equator to the poles. It varies by location, such as the open ocean, coral reef, or kelp bed. But the PBS segment ignores this uncertainty and implies that the rate of change in ocean pH is alarming. Dr. Langdon states, “What’s really and completely unique about what’s going on now is the rate of change. And that’s what is so difficult for organisms.” However, evidence shows that a high rate of change in ocean alkalinity is natural. A 2011 study by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography found large variations in ocean pH by day, week, and month. Changes in some locations were as high as 0.35 units over the course of a day, higher than computer models are predicting for the next century. Scuba divers know that reef creatures already experience acidic conditions near CO2 vents in the ocean floor. These vents bubble CO2 gas amidst coral reefs and grassy ocean pastures in millions of locations. Fish and reefs appear to be doing quite well near these CO2 vents. The coral reefs in the Caribbean and other seas may be endangered due overfishing, chemical pollution, and human abuse. But let’s not blame reef degradation on misguided fears about global warming.

### 1NC – AT: Sea Colonies Advantage
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#### Temperature differential limits OTEC, not viable everywhere

Upshaw, 12

[Charles Roberts Upshaw, B.S.M.E., “Thermodynamic and Economic Feasibility Analysis of a 20 MW Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC) Power Plant,” Master’s thesis for Master of Science in Engineering at University of Texas, May 2012, <http://www.otecnews.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/OTEC-thesis-university-of-Texas-UPSHAW.pdf> //uwyo-baj]

Generally, for OTEC to be a viable power generation option for a location, there are a few basic constraints. The first and most important is the temperature differential of the ocean water nearby; even if the surface temperature is very warm, OTEC might not be viable if there is a lack of a cold water heat sink. The lack of cold-water resources is the limiting factor for areas such as the Middle East, where water temperatures can approach 90 ̊F on occasion, but the seas are shallow and so the water near the bottom is still quite warm. Another constraint is the cost of electricity for the area. For an island community like Hawaii, which is in a very remote location, the cost of generating power is much higher than the cost on the main land because fuel and equipment must be shipped halfway across the Pacific ocean. The high cost of power for island communities offers a potential opportunity for OTEC developers to build a smaller-scale pilot plant that would still be financially viable for electricity generation.

#### no resource wars

Barnett , 09

Thomas. visiting scholar at the University of Tennessee's Howard Baker Center. 3/23/9. <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2009/03/137_41779.html>.

Why do I so casually dismiss ``resource wars" as a strategic planning principle?  Remember when Cold Warriors predicted we'd fight the Soviets across the ``arc of crisis" for precious resources? Well, back then, both sides lived within miniature versions of today's global economy. In that bifurcated world economy, zero-sum resource wars were entirely plausible.  That bifurcated world no longer exists, as evidenced by the recent financial contagion. In globalization, demand determines power more than supply.  Don't believe me? Imagine a world where there's no Chinese demand for U.S. debt or no U.S. demand for Chinese exports.  Dreaming up future ``resource wars" to obviate our military's necessary adjustment to this era's security tasks will not render them moot.   Indeed, like Somalia's recent pirate epidemic, they invariably attract the collaborative efforts of other great powers, like China and India, which have no choice but to defend their growing economic networks.

#### Space travel and colonization impossible—biology prevents multiple reasons

Theunis, 10

(Why space is the impossible frontier,16 November 2010 by PiersmaTheunis. Piersma is professor of animal ecology at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and senior research scientist at the Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research in Den Burg. This article draws on his new book [The Flexible Phenotype: A body-centred integration of ecology, physiology, and behaviour](http://www.us.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/LifeSciences/EvolutionaryBiology/?view=usa&ci=9780199597246) (with Jan A. van Gils, Oxford University Press) <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20827860.100-why-space-is-the-impossible-frontier.html//> UWOKB)

**Hawking, Obama and other proponents of long-term space travel are making a grave error. Humans cannot leave Earth for the several years that it takes to travel to Mars and back, for the simple reason that our biology is intimately connected to Earth. To function properly, we need gravity**. Without it, the environment is less demanding on the human body in several ways, and this shows upon the return to Earth. **Remember the sight of weakened astronauts emerging after the Apollo missions? That is as nothing compared with what would happen to astronauts returning from Mars. One of the first things to be affected is the heart, which shrinks by as much as a quarter after just one week in orbit** ([The New England Journal of Medicine, vol 358, p 1370](http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMra072139)). **Heart atrophy leads to decreases in blood pressure and the amount of blood pushed out by the heart**. In this way heart atrophy leads to reduced exercise capacity. Astronauts returning to Earth after several months in the International Space Station experience dizziness and blackouts because blood does not reach their brains in sufficient quantities. Six weeks in bed leads to about as much atrophy of the heart as one week in space, suggesting that the atrophy is caused by both weightlessness and the concomitant reduction in exercise. Other muscle tissue suffers too. The effects of weightlessness on the muscles of the limbs are easy to verify experimentally. **Because they bear the body's weight, the "anti-gravity" muscles of the thighs and calves degenerate** significantly when they are made redundant during space flight. Despite the best attempts to give replacement exercise to crew members on the International Space Station, after six months they had still lost 13 per cent of their calf muscle volume and 32 per cent of the maximum power that their leg muscles could deliver ([Journal of Applied Physiology, vol 106, p 1159](http://dx.doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.91578.2008)). **Various metabolic changes** also occur, including a decreased capacity for fat oxidation, which can lead to the build-up of fat in atrophied muscle. **Space travellers also suffer deterioration of immune function both during and after their missions** ([Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine, vol 79, p 835](http://dx.doi.org/10.3357/ASEM.2276.2008)). Arguably the most fearsome effect on bodies is bone loss ([The Lancet, vol 355, p 1569](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(80)02208-8)). Although the hardness and strength of bone, and the relative ease with which it fossilises, give it an appearance of permanence, bone is actually a living and remarkably flexible tissue. In the late 19th century, the German anatomist Julius Wolff discovered that bones adjust to the loads that they are placed under. **A decrease in load leads to the loss of bone material**, while an increase leads to thicker bone. It is no surprise, then, that in the microgravity of space bones demineralise, especially those which normally bear the greatest load. Cosmonauts who spent half a year in space lost up to a quarter of the material in their shin bones, despite intensive exercise ([The Lancet, vol 355, p 1607](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02217-0)). Although experiments on chicken embryos on the International Space Station have established that bone formation does continue in microgravity, formation rates are overtaken by bone loss. What is of greatest concern here is that, unlike muscle loss which levels off with time, **bone loss seems to continue at a steady rate of 1 to 2 per cent for every month of weightlessness**. During a three-year mission to Mars, space travellers could lose around 50 per cent of their bone material, which would make it extremely difficult to return to Earth and its gravitational forces. **Bone loss during space travel certainly brings home the maxim "use it or lose it".**

#### Colonization Won’t Save Us From Extinction And We Don’t Need To Get Off The Rock For 5 Billion Years.

Williams 10

(Lynda Williams teaches physics at Santa Rosa Junior College in California. Irrational Dreams of Space Colonization, Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, January 1, 2010//UWYOKB)

According to scientific theory, the destruction of Earth is a certainty. **About five billion years from now, when our sun exhausts its nuclear fuel, it will expand in size and envelope the inner planets, including Earth, and burn them into oblivion. So yes, we are doomed, but we have five billion years, plus or minus a few hundred million, to plan our extraterrestrial escape**. **The need to colonize the moon or Mars to guarantee our survival is not pressing. There are also real risks due to collisions with asteroids and comets, although none are of immediate threat and do not necessitate extraterrestrial colonization.** There are many Earth-based technological strategies that can be developed in time to mediate such astronomical threats, such as gravitational tugboats that drag the objects out of range. The solar system could also potentially be exposed to galactic sources of highenergy **gamma ray bursts that could fry all life on Earth; any moon or Mars base would face a similar fate.** Thus, **human-based colonies on the moon or Mars would not protect us from any of these astronomical threats in the near future.**

#### Not feasible—too much energy waste

Masutani and Takahashi, 2001

[S. M. Masutani and P. K. Takahashi, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC), http://curry.eas.gatech.edu/Courses/6140/ency/Chapter2/Ency\_Oceans/OTEC.pdf] /Wyo-MB

The low energy conversion efficiency of OTEC¶ means that more than 90% of the thermal energy¶ extracted from the ocean’s surface is ‘wasted’ and¶ must be rejected to the cold, deep sea water. This¶ necessitates large heat exchangers and seawater¶ Sow rates to produce relatively small amounts of¶ electricity.¶ In spite of its inherent inefRciency, OTEC, unlike¶ conventional fossil energy systems, utilizes a renewable resource and poses minimal threat to the¶ environment. In fact, it has been suggested that¶ widespread adoption of OTEC could yield tangible¶ environmental beneRts through avenues such as reduction of greenhouse gas CO2¶ emissions; enhanced¶ uptake of atmospheric CO2¶ by marine organism¶ populations sustained by the nutrient-rich, deep¶ OTEC sea water; and preservation of corals and¶ hurricane amelioration by limiting temperature rise¶ in the surface ocean through energy extraction and¶ artiRcial upwelling of deep water.¶ Carnot efficiency applies only to an ideal heat¶ engine. In real power generation systems, irreversibilities will further degrade performance. Given its¶ low theoretical efficiency, successful implementation¶ of OTEC power generation demands careful engineering to minimize irreversibilities. Although OTEC¶ consumes what is essentially a free resource, poor¶ thermodynamic performance will reduce the¶ quantity of electricity available for sale and, hence,¶ negatively affect the economic feasibility of an¶ OTEC facility.¶ An OTEC heat engine may be configured following designs by J.A. D’Arsonval, the French engineer¶ who Rrst proposed the OTEC concept in 1881, or¶ G. Claude, D’Arsonval’s former student. Their designs are known, respectively, as closed cycle and¶ open cycle OTEC.

#### Super expensive and commercialization is farther off than 2020

The Economist, 7-7-12

[Power from the sea Second time around…, http://www.economist.com/node/21542381] /Wyo-MB

The actual experiment, though, is on Hawaii, where Lockheed is collaborating with a smaller firm, Makai Ocean Engineering, to build a ten megawatt (MW) pilot plant that should be operational by 2015. If that goes well, the idea is to follow it with a 100MW power station by 2020.¶ For this, however, a new piece of kit will be needed. The heat exchangers and pipework required to make a 10MW plant already exist, but the 100MW facility will need a pipe that is not only 1km long (in order to reach the cold water at depth) but ten metres in diameter (in order to bring enough of that cold water to the surface). This is quite some pipe, and it will also have to be rugged enough to survive for decades in the open ocean. Nor will it be cheap. Kerry Kehoe, the current head of OTEC activities at NOAA, estimates such a facility could cost $1 billion.

#### 2nd, Environment Turn—

#### OTEC causes massive environmental damage to species and ecosystems

CRRC, 2012

[Coastal Response Research Center, University of New Hampshire, Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion: Information needs assessment, http://www.crrc.unh.edu/publications/OTEC%20Needs%20Assessment%20Revision%20FINAL.pdf] /Wyo-MB

In June 2010, (CRRC) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) ¶ Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) hosted the workshop, “OTEC: ¶ Assessing Potential Physical, Chemical and Biological Impacts and Risks,” which aimed to ¶ identify potential environmental impacts of construction, installation, operation, and maintenance ¶ of an OTEC facility. The discussions at the workshop made it clear that the scale and extent of ¶ impacts, as well as the extent to which any regulatory thresholds may be exceeded, are likely to be ¶ proportional to the size and type of facility. ¶ Water quality is most likely to be impacted through the discharge of seawater from the warm ¶ and cold water pipes to different depths from which they originated and the displacement of water ¶ removed via the intake pipes. The discharge, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the OTEC ¶ facility, is predicted to be cooler than the ambient receiving water with higher concentrations of ¶ nutrients and dissolved gasses from the seawater transported from the bathypelagic zone. Water 6¶ quality may also be impacted from any chemical additions or erosion of the plant constituents ¶ (e.g., heat exchanger, cold and warm water pipes, turbines) from OTEC operations or accidental ¶ release of biocides or other potential pollutants. Any impacts to biota are likely to result from ¶ impingement, entrainment, secondary entrainment, attraction, avoidance, behavioral changes, ¶ shifts in predator/prey relationships, trauma, and broader ecological impacts. Impingement and ¶ entrainment are likely to be a function of intake velocity and screen size, while attraction, ¶ repulsion, and behavioral changes are most likely the result of the presence of the OTEC facility, ¶ and the light, noise, and EMF the facility would create. ¶ Many of these impacts are interdependent and inter- and intra-species related (i.e., impingement ¶ of zooplankton results in change to prey available for fish, thus leading to ecological impacts). ¶ Once the type, scale, and scope of the impacts are known, it is possible to determine if the impacts ¶ exceed any thresholds established by various regulations. If thresholds are not established for a ¶ particular regulation then qualitative evaluation of the significance of impacts must instead be ¶ made. Determination of impacts requires knowledge of pre-disturbance (i.e., baseline) water ¶ quality and biological information, as well as an understanding of the major stressors involved ¶ with OTEC and how they are likely to impact the previously mentioned parameters. A partial list ¶ of information, modeling, and baseline needs was developed in the previous workshop (See ¶ Appendix A); however, this should be viewed as a starting point and not a complete or final list.

#### Marine biodiversity key to the supportability of the biosphere- also key to check warming

BBB 2012

[Biodiversity, Bioinfomatics, Biotechnology, 07/23/2012, Marine microorganisms hold the key to life on earth, <http://www.microb3.eu/news/marine-microorganisms-hold-key-life-earth>, uwyo//amp]

New Marine Board position paper reveals the importance of marine microbial diversity for our environment and society and proposes concrete actions to guide future European research Few people realize that all life on earth evolved from microorganisms in the sea. Microorganisms, or microbes, are those organisms too small to be observed by the human eye and they are everywhere, often in huge numbers. Just one litre of coastal seawater contains up to a billion microbes including thousands of different types. Scientists have long recognized the importance of microbes, which form the basis of all food webs and drive the complex biogeochemical cycles which recycle key elements such as carbon and nitrogen. Given that the oceans account for more than 90% of the Earth’s biosphere - that portion of the earth able to support life - it is hardly surprising that marine microorganisms account for a large part of the total biomass of life on Earth. They also produce more than half of the entire global oxygen supply and, in doing so, use up a large proportion of human-generated CO2, a greenhouse gas that is accelerating global warming.

#### Extinction

Diner 1994

[David, Major in US Army, Winter, “THE ARMY AND THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT: WHO'S ENDANGERING WHOM?” Lexis]

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." [79](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=2c2079b6a9753fd72b599ac94393715a&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=5d418220b8f79eb99eb7ad7f7b46acfc#n79) By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, [80](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=2c2079b6a9753fd72b599ac94393715a&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=5d418220b8f79eb99eb7ad7f7b46acfc#n80) mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.
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### Impact

#### Nuclear war turns warming

Duncan Clark 9, editorial environmental consultant to the London Guardian, co-director of GreenProfile, January 2, 2009, “The carbon footprint of nuclear war,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2009/jan/02/nuclear-war-emissions

Almost 700m [million] tonnes of CO2 would be released into the Earth's atmosphere by even the smallest nuclear conflict, according to a US study that compares the environmental costs of developing various power sources Just when you might have thought it was ethically sound to unleash a nuclear attack on a nearby city, along comes a pesky scientist and points out that atomic warfare is bad for the climate. According to a new paper in the journal Energy & Environmental Science, even a very limited nuclear exchange, using just a thousandth of the weaponry of a full-scale nuclear war, would cause up to 690m tonnes of CO2 to enter the atmosphere – more than UK's annual total. The upside (kind of) is that the conflict would also generate as much as 313m tonnes of soot. This would stop a great deal of sunlight reaching the earth, creating a significant regional cooling effect in the short and medium terms – just like when a major volcano erupts. Ultimately, though, the CO2 would win out and crank up global temperatures an extra few notches. The paper's author, Mark Z Jacobson, a professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford University, calculated the emissions of such a conflict by totting up the burn rate and carbon content of the fabric of our cities. "Materials have the following carbon contents: plastics, 38–92%; tyres and other rubbers, 59–91%; synthetic fibres, 63–86%; woody biomass, 41–45%; charcoal, 71%; asphalt, 80%; steel, 0.05–2%. We approximate roughly the carbon content of all combustible material in a city as 40–60%." But why would a Stanford engineer bother calculating such a thing? Given that the nuclear exchange would also kill up to 17 million people, who's going to be thinking about the impact on global warming? The purpose of the paper is to compare the total human and environmental costs of a wide range of different power sources, from solar and wind to nuclear and biofuels. One of the side-effects of nuclear power, the report argues, is an increased risk of nuclear war: "Because the production of nuclear weapons material is occurring only in countries that have developed civilian nuclear energy programs, the risk of a limited nuclear exchange between countries or the detonation of a nuclear device by terrorists has increased due to the dissemination of nuclear energy facilities worldwide." "As such," Jacobson continues, "it is a valid exercise to estimate the potential number of immediate deaths and carbon emissions due to the burning of buildings and infrastructure associated with the proliferation of nuclear energy facilities and the resulting proliferation of nuclear weapons … Although concern at the time of an explosion will be the deaths and not carbon emissions, policy makers today must weigh all the potential future risks of mortality and carbon emissions when comparing energy sources."

#### 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."

#### Sequestration collapses Asia-Pacific pivot, power projection, ability to solve escalation, and air, sea, and land capabilities- now this means your china impact is only possible in a world with cuts in sequestration

Horowitz 12

[Michael Horowitz, NDT Champion, associate professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, 8/9/12, How Defense Austerity Will Test U.S. Strategy in Asia, thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/08/09/how-defense-austerity-will-test-u-s-strategy-in-asia/]

Decisions about defense spending are integrally linked to the United States’ overall strategy in the Asia-Pacific. Given ongoing uncertainty surrounding North Korea, China’s continuing development of anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) capabilities, and disputes over the East and South China seas, maintaining a robust presence in the region will be a high priority for any future administration. However, sequestration or other major defense cuts could undermine perceptions of U.S. resolve in the Asia-Pacific and make core U.S. allies such as Japan and South Korea doubt Washington’s willingness to invest appropriately in relevant capabilities. Concretely, such cuts could make it more difficult for the United States to maintain its current presence. The United States’ predominant military strategy for ensuring continued superiority in the Asia-Pacific is AirSea battle (ASB)—an operational concept designed to help the U.S. Air Force and Navy jointly respond to A2/AD challenges, enhance deterrence, and ensure freedom of action around the world over the next generation. Implementing ASB will require significant investments in advanced technologies, including long-range precision-strike capabilities and submarine modernization. Furthermore, ASB primarily involves investments in the air force and navy, raising questions about how best to rebuild the readiness of the army and marines. There is a trade-off between providing relatively equal budget shares to the services—potentially reducing inter-service rivalries—and rebalancing toward the Asia-Pacific. Even within the air force and navy, there are disagreements about which programs represent the highest priority for the U.S. military. One concern is the potential for large decreases in the procurement of F-35s—the multirole replacement fighter for the air force and navy. Unless the military can find substitutes, further cuts beyond those already planned could potentially make it more difficult for the U.S. military to control the skies in a future confrontation in the Asia-Pacific. Decreases in F-35 procurement could also make U.S. allies less likely to purchase the F-35, thereby reducing interoperability with allied Asian militaries and further raising F-35 unit costs. Budget cuts may also lead to the scaling back of plans to purchase the full slate of Virginia-class attack submarines that the navy has requested. Given China’s continuing investments in submarines and anti-ship missiles, the modernization of the U.S. fleet is critical to maintaining U.S. naval capabilities in the Asia-Pacific, particularly for antisubmarine warfare and strike operations. Major cuts could affect the size of the navy, in terms of ships afloat, and compromise the United States’ ability to project power in crisis situations. At even greater risk of funding cuts is research and development. R&D into next-generation robotics, a new long-range bomber, and C4ISR (command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance) is essential to guaranteeing U.S. military power over the long term. R&D for basic programs is also likely to be on the chopping block during periods of defense austerity. One example is the X-47B drone designed to launch from and recover to aircraft carriers. Decreases in funding for such cutting-edge programs could undermine the United States’ long-term capacity to control the commons in the Asia-Pacific. The unparalleled access the United States enjoys to air, sea, and space could decline if other nations develop new technologies capable of placing legacy platforms such as large carriers or manned fighters at risk. Rising powers in the region are not standing still. The United States will only maintain its conventional superiority if it continues investing in R&D that will pay off with new weapon systems down the road.

### UQ

#### Extend 1NC Tobin- Obama has leverage to cut a deal on sequestration now but his PC is finite, means any potential bump prevents passage

#### Your Glaser evidence doesn’t make a warranted claim- its from a contributor who’s asserting happens now- prefer evidence specificity- citing congressmen

#### The GOP will deal on sequestration right now because they perceive they have no leverage presently- they won’t let the cuts inevitably happen

Politico 1.23

[Next up: Sequester, budget resolution, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/next-fiscal-dramas-sequester-budget-resolution-86650.html]

Thune, the Senate Republican Conference chairman, said reversing the sequester would be difficult to accomplish in the current political climate.

“I think there will be a lot of pushback against trying to unwind it,” Thune said. “If we can’t come up with a better plan to find the same level of savings, I don’t think there’s any interest in delaying or eliminating it.”

That’s what Senate Democratic Whip Dick Durbin of Illinois is hearing as well. “Most Republican senators I spoke with said, ‘We’re for spending cuts — we want sequestration to go forward,’” he said. “If there is that sentiment on the Republican side … I think we’re committed to some form of sequestration spending cuts.”

But those Republicans won’t be the final word on the matter. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and other defense hawks said Wednesday they’re prepared to renew their case to reverse the sequestration cuts. And some top Democrats believe that the matter could be swept into larger talks over the budget blueprint the Senate is poised to advance.

Cornyn noted that Congress can always revisit any of the changes. “I think under the circumstances, we can always deal with the defense appropriation later.”

And he added that the real leverage points for Republicans to demand spending cuts will be in March over the government funding resolution, known as the continuing resolution, or CR, which expires on March 27.

“This is fundamentally a prioritization of these issues,” Cornyn said. “And I think the House wisely decided to put off the debt ceiling fight until after the sequester and the CR — where they think we have significant leverage. And I agree.”

#### And a strong democratic front will secure a GOP deal to avoid sequestration through the reconciliation process

Politico 1.23

[Next up: Sequester, budget resolution, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/next-fiscal-dramas-sequester-budget-resolution-86650.html]

But there are other avenues where defense cuts might become a political football — including during the budget process.

Schumer, the No. 3 Democrat, is publicly advocating using a process known in the Capitol as “reconciliation” to fast-track a tax reform plan through the budget process. Employing that process would allow the Democrats to avert a filibuster over a tax reform plan, paving the way for such a measure to advance by 51 votes. They would need buy-in from the House to do so, but Schumer believes that Republicans would ultimately be forced to back the process — which could produce higher tax revenues — in exchange for reversing the sequestration cuts.

### AT Cuts no impact

#### You say no impact- but 1. Your evidence doesn’t say what areas will be cut- ie. couldbe aerospace

#### Your evidence isn’t in the context of sequestration- obviously true because it was written in 2012- and says that gvts will be forced to manage their budget, but doesn’t say that where cuts will come from.

#### The key question is whether the defense cut is blind or not- devastates key readiness elements like aircraft maintenance- this also answers your they’re preparing for cuts evidewnce

Craig 1.23

[Victoria, “Defense Sector Caught in Crosshairs of Fiscal Fight,” Fox Business, January 23, 2013, <http://www.foxbusiness.com/government/2013/01/18/defense-sector-caught-in-crosshairs-fiscal-fight/#ixzz2IwYqWamA>]

Few argue over whether a budget deal or sequestration will impact the defense industry. What is up for debate is just how much and in what ways the impact will be felt. Despite a December letter from Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, who said there will not be a need for immediate furlough, Goldman Sachs says there’s no way around tough, immediate effects. “The administration would have little flexibility in how to implement this cut,” the January note said. “So every program, project and account would need to be cut by the same amount. That would mean, for example, furloughing most civilian defense employees for a full month before the end of the fiscal year, and cutting basic activities like health care for active-duty military and aircraft maintenance.”

#### Predictability and discretion are key to avoid the impact- a blind across the board cut is sufficient to trigger our impact

AllVoices 1.3

Democrat Adam Smith tells why he voted 'no' on fiscal cliff deal

http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/13728447-democrat-adam-smith-tells-why-he-voted-no-on-fiscal-cliff-deal

Smith went on to explain that sequestration still looms, it was simply delayed two months, and the debt ceiling was not addressed. As the Ranking Member on the Armed Services Committee, he is concerned the Department of Defense once again faces a situation where they do not know how much money they will have to spend, and the very real possibility of indiscriminate across-the-board cuts just two months from now. In addition, Smith pointed out that other areas of discretionary spending—education, transportation, infrastructure, housing, and more—face the same crippling uncertainty. He recognizes that defense and other areas of spending will face cuts, but it should be clear on what those cuts will be and they need to be more thoughtful than the blind across-the-board approach of sequestration. Smith’s statement concluded: Not only did this bill fail to address the long-term deficit with a ten-year plan, it made getting to a reasonable plan far more difficult by making permanent 90 percent of the Bush Tax Cuts. By not allowing those tax cuts to expire, and then making them permanent, we took $3.5 trillion of revenue off the table. This will lead to one of two results, both of which I am strongly against. Either our debt will climb over 100 percent of GDP or we will have to make devastating cuts in vital programs like Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, education, transportation, and more. So, the battle is expected to continue in Congress over the next two months, with numerous ugly choices to be hashed out in a hotly divisive atmosphere.

### Link

#### Obama is Velcro – all agency action sticks to him- means even if NOAA is day-to day Obama will still be perceived-

Hook 10

Peter Nicholas and Janet Hook, 7-30-2010, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to § Marked 16:01 § end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

### Republicans don’t like NOAA

#### Republicans don’t like NOAA, see it as a Democrat distraction from fiscal issues

States News Service, 12

[“Republicans Critical of Increased Spending and Lack of Prioritization in NOAA, EPA Budget Proposals,” Committee on Science, Space and Technology Press Releases, March 6, 2012 <http://science.house.gov/press-release/republicans-critical-increased-spending-and-lack-prioritization-noaa-epa-budget> //uwyo-baj]

“Only in Washington, as we face an unprecedented fiscal train wreck and continue to be forced to borrow 40 cents on the dollar, can a requested budget increase of 3.1 percent for NOAA and 1.4 percent for EPA be characterized as making ‘tough choices,’” said Subcommittee Chairman Andy Harris (R-MD). “The Administration is prioritizing its political environmental agendas ahead of the core scientific needs of the nation.” The President’s FY13 budget request for NOAA is $5.06 billion. However, the Agency failed to deliver its detailed congressional budget justifications to the Committee, making it difficult to examine program percentage increases and decreases for many of the Agency’s activities. Chairman Harris criticized NOAA Administrator Dr. Jane Lubchenco for the extreme tardiness in providing Congress with this critical information. “This abdication of such a simple responsibility influences the perception on the Hill that the Administration is not being a good steward of taxpayer money,” Harris said. Responding to a question about a possible gap in observational weather satellite data, Dr. Lubchenco admitted that the Administration failed to develop alternative plans to provide this critical information. Republicans questioned relative priorities within NOAA, including a 15 percent increase in funding for climate research in lieu of investments in weather programs that could protect lives and property.

#### His pc is key to sequestration deals

Stein, 1/21

[Sam, “Obama's Post-Partisan Promise Mellows Amid First Term Gridlock,” Huffington Post, January 21, 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/21/obama-post-partisan-promise_n_2490700.html> //uwyo-baj]

But gridlock has a way of grinding down even the most idealistic soul. During Obama's first term, Republicans rebuffed the president time and again. Eventually, the president's aides concluded that more could be done working around or against Congress, rather than with it. The seeds of that approach -- which involve barnstorming outside the Beltway, urging voters to pressure elected officials, and taking harder lines for negotiations § Marked 16:01 § -- were planted during the payroll tax cut fight in early 2012 and bloomed during the fiscal cliff standoff at year's end. With high-stakes budget fights over the debt ceiling, government funding, and sequestration coming in the first few months of 2013, the more combative Obama will be front and center once more. "The president took the case directly to the American people and involved them more fully in the discussion," Axelrod said of the payroll tax cut and fiscal cliff fights. "I do think that was a significant change and one that is still very much available to the president. Not just available to him. I think he is convinced that is essential going forward."

#### **Obama will push his agenda through; second term momentum**

Delamaide, 1/18

[Darrell, writes "Political Capital," a weekly column from Washington, D.C. on politics that affect financial markets, “Obama poised to serve up legislative barrage,” WSJ, January 18, 2013, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2013-01-18/commentary/36403142_1_immigration-reform-illinois-democrat-luis-gutierrez-white-house> //uwyo-baj]

At the start of his second term, the president seems determined to gain the upper hand in setting the political agenda in Washington, rather than reacting, as he did during much of the past four years, to a continuous pattern of obstruction from Republicans.

### AT Thumpers

#### Sequestration top of the docket

Milman, 1/3

[Jason, staff writer, “Why the 85 House Republicans voted ‘yes’ - No rift between Boehner, Cantor after opposing cliff votes - Welcoming the 113th Congress - Report: Health stocks rise after deal,” Politico, January 3, 2013, <http://www.politico.com/politicopulse/0113/politicopulse9748.html> //uwyo-baj]

OUT WITH THE OLD, IN WITH THE NEW CONGRESS -- Lawmakers have their first-day-of-Congress outfits all picked out for the start of the 113th Congress, which will be sworn in at noon. Then they’ll focus immediately on health care — well, maybe they’ll take some time to celebrate today, but entitlement cuts are at the top of the docket with sequestration and the debt limit now two months away.

#### Democrats won’t bring gun control bill to the floor, midterms

Eldridge, 1/21

[David, staff writer, “Senators say Obama's proposal for gun control has little support,” Washington Times, January 21, 2013, LexisNexis, //uwyo-baj]

On CNN, Sen. John Barrasso, Wyoming Republican, predicted that Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Nevada Democrat, won't even bring a gun control bill to the floor in an attempt to avoid putting red-state Democrats in a political bind. "He has six Democrats up for election in two years in states where the president received fewer than 42 percent of the votes. And he doesn't want his Democrats to have to choose between their own constituents and the president's positions," Mr. Barrasso said.

#### Assault ban inevitably gets shelved, neutralizing opposition to the proposals

Weignant Jan. 23

[Chris Weignant, political writer, Jan. 23, 2013, ,Handicapping Obama's Second Term Agenda, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/obama-second-term_b_2537802.html>, uwyo//amp]

Gun control will likely be the first of these debated in Congress. Vice President Biden laid out a wide array of possible actions Congress could take on the issue, all of which Obama then backed. While the Newtown massacre did indeed shift public opinion dramatically on the overall issue, the biggest initiative is not likely to become law. An assault rifle ban is very important to some Democrats, but the way I read it is that this was included to have something to "trade away" in the negotiations. If Obama gets most of the other gun control initiatives -- closing loopholes on background checks, much better tracking of weapons, and all the other "small bore" (sorry about that pun) ideas -- then he will at least be able to say he accomplished something at the end of the day. Perhaps this is pessimistic, but the mechanics of banning "assault weapons" become very tricky, when you have to actually define what they are in legal language. And such a ban may not get universal Democratic backing anyway, so I fully expect this will be shelved at some point in exchange for support for all the other initiatives. Without such a ban, the prospects for other meaningful gun control legislation get a lot better, though, and I think that a bill will eventually pass.

#### Interpretation: The negative should be able to test the opportunity costs of the plan

#### K2 neg ground- politics is a core generic disad- aff spectrum is so large on this topic we need to uniquely preserve our generics in order to give the neg a fair shot

#### K2 education-Politics tests a key opportunity cost

Saideman 11

[Steve Saideman, associate professor of political science - McGill University, 7/25/’11 “Key Constraint on Policy Relevance,” http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2011/07/key-constraint-on-policy-relevance.html]

Dan Drezner has a great post today about how the foreign policy smart set (his phrase) gets so frustrated by domestic politics that they tend to recommend domestic political changes that are never going to happen. I would go one step further and suggest that one of the key problems for scholars who want to be relevant for policy debates is that we tend to make recommendations that are "incentive incompatible." I love that phrase. What is best for policy may not be what is best for politics, and so we may think we have a good idea about what to recommend but get frustrated when our ideas do not get that far. Lots of folks talking about early warning about genocide, intervention into civil wars and the like blame "political will." That countries lack, for whatever reason, the compulsion to act. Well, that is another way of saying that domestic politics matters, but we don't want to think about it. Dan's piece contains an implication which is often false--that IR folks have little grasp of domestic politics. Many IR folks do tend to ignore or simplify the domestic side too much, but there is plenty of scholarship on the domestic determinants of foreign policy/grand strategy/war/trade/etc. Plenty of folks look at how domestic institutions and dynamics can cause countries to engage in sub-optimal foreign policies (hence the tradeoff implied in my second book--For Kin or Country). The challenge, then, is to figure out what would be a cool policy and how that cool policy could resonate with those who are relevant domestically. That is not easy, but it is what is necessary. To be policy relevant requires both parts--articulating a policy alternative that would improve things and some thought about how the alternative could be politically appealing. Otherwise, we can just dream about the right policy and gnash our teeth when it never happens.

#### Reject the argument, not the team

#### Third, The debate is irrelevant- PC impacts are not perceived until the vote when legislation crosses Obama’s desk

Drum 10

[Kevin, Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming off the back-burner”, <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>, March]

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active § Marked 16:04 § issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

# \*\*\*Semifinals\*\*\*

# 1NC

# 2NC

# CP

### Ov/vw

#### State action is better than the fed

Pursley and Wiseman 11 (Garrick, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Toledo College of Law, and Hannah, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Tulsa College of Law, “Local Energy”, Emory Law Journal, 60 Emory L.J. 877)

The familiar idea that empowering subnational governments allows for a greater influence of state or local preferences in policy and enhances the democratic responsiveness of the federal system is also relevant here. 325 In federalism scholarship, it is commonly claimed that state governments are "closer**"** - that is, more accessible and accountable - to citizens than the federal government. 326 The characteristics of state governments that support this claim - their smaller electorates, greater transparency and access to elected officials, and greater opportunities for citizen participation in governance - suggest that local governments are closest to the people. 327 Local "elected officials tend to be more responsive to voter demands because it is easier ... to monitor politicians and it is easier for new politicians to challenge unpopular incumbents[,] ... smaller political units allow for more deliberation and consensus building among members," and "politics on a small scale ... enables less affluent grassroots organizations to promote their interests through marches, speeches, and creative forms of activism that would not work on a national or regional scale." 328 In the distributed renewables area, this means that yet another argument against primarily federal-level action is that people in different locations may have different ideas about how much and what kind of renewable energy they want, and, as far as our broad energy [\*939] transition goals and the need to encourage citizens to do their part will allow, we should do what we can to honor those preferences. 329

#### States better for individual engagement – national politics are beholden to fossil fuel lobbies and disregard INDIVIDUALS. We’re a better platform for ADVOCACY

Byrne, 8

Byrne, et al., 2008.

In Peter Droege eds. Urban Energy Transition: From Fossil Fuels to Renewable Power.

Oxford, UK: Elsevier Pps.27-53.

Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Established in 1980 at the University of Delaware, the Center is a leading institution for interdisciplinary graduate education, research, and advocacy in energy and environmental policy. CEEP is led by Dr. John Byrne, Distinguished Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University. For his contributions to Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) since 1992, he shares the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with the Panel's authors and review editors.

The political momentum built in US cities, states and regions to initiate climate mitigation and related efforts is to be contrasted with inaction by the US national government in addressing the climate challenge. Support for climate protection can be found in polling of Americans which points to 83% support among the country's citizens for greater national leadership in addressing climate change, and even deeper support for state and community action to address climate concerns (Opinion Research Corporation 2006). If the American people appear to support such initiatives, the question becomes why are states, cities and regions leading the way, rather than the national government? US national politics has for decades exhibited a troubling amenability to the interests of fossil fuel and automaker lobbies (Leggett 2001; Public Citizen 2005; NRDC 2001). A recent example of this influence can be found in the history of the National Energy Policy Development Group, which took input 'principally' from actors associated with such interests (US General Accounting Office (GAO) 2003). At the same time, the national administration has been noted for the presence of individuals with backgrounds in the auto, mining, natural gas, electric, and oil industries, in positions at the White House, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Departments, respectively, of Energy, Commerce, and the Interior (Bogardus, 2004; Drew and Oppel Jr 2004; NRDC, 2001). State-level politics may be able to obviate this influence through their efforts to allow a more direct citizen influence upon decision making. For example, 23 states permit citizens to petition for a direct vote (Initiative and Referendum Institute 2007), a strategy that has helped ensure the advancement of environmentally minded initiatives within states in recent years, such as the State of Washington's enactment by ballot of an RPS proposal in 2006 (Initiative and Referendum Institute 2007).

# T

### 2NC Limits Impact

#### Second, hold the line on a narrow interp of solar because:

#### It is an independent education disad because it erodes the difference between fuel sources and turns the entire topic into the ‘solar topic’ and

#### Lets in unpredictable areas like biofuels, hydro-power, evaporation and rain-water

Sklar 7

[Scott, Founder and president of The Stella Group, Ltd., in Washington, DC, is the Chair of the Steering Committee of the Sustainable Energy Coalition and serves on the Boards of Directors of the Sustainable Buildings Industry Council, the Business Council for Sustainable Energy, and the Renewable Energy Policy Project. “What's the Difference Between Solar Energy and Solar Power?”, p. <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/u/scott-sklar-1495> //wyo-tjc]

Scott, I'm confused about the use of the terms solar energy and solar power. Is solar energy both a type of energy and a type of technology? Is solar power both a type of power and a type of technology? It seems like the terms get mixed up and used interchangeably, like kWh and kW do even though these units describe two different things. What are the general differences between solar energy and solar power? Thank you. -- Lee K. Lee, this is a question I get often, and believe it is worth addressing. Solar "power" usually means converting the sun's rays (photons) to electricity. The solar technologies could be photovoltaics, or the various concentrating thermal technologies: solar troughs, solar dish/engines, and solar power towers. Solar "energy" is a more generic term, meaning any technology that converts the sun's energy into a form of energy—so that includes the aforementioned solar power technologies, but also solar thermal for water heating, space heating and cooling, and industrial process heat. Solar energy includes solar daylighting and even passive solar that uses building orientation, design and materials to heat and cool buildings. Now in the early 1980's, I was Political Director of the Solar Lobby, formed by the big nine national environmental groups, that embraced all solar technologies—which we viewed as wind, hydropower, and biomass, along with the long list of traditional solar conversion technologies. The thesis, which is correct, is that the sun contributes to growing plants, wind regimes, and evaporation and rain (hydropower), so that all the renewables are part of the solar family. Now, of course, most would argue that geothermal, and tidal and wave (effected by the gravitational force of the moon) are not solar, but we included these technologies as well.

#### Third, vote negative to exclude bio-fuels alone: it is equivalent to tacking on multiple new topics

Galik 11

[Christopher, Climate Change Policy Partnership, Duke University, Integrating Biofuels into Comprehensive Climate Policy An Overview of Biofuels Policy Options, <http://www.nicholas.duke.edu/ccpp/ccpp_pdfs/biofuels.brief.11.09.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

The development of biofuels policy has historically neglected climate change policy objectives,

4 but ongoing rounds of energy and climate change policy debate provide an opportunity to integrate diverse policy mechanisms to create an optimal GHG reduction strategy.5Table 1 Notwithstanding this opportunity, determining how best to integrate biofuels with climate policy is a difficult undertaking. The dominant role that public policy plays in the production and use of biofuel is one reason. Large-scale production of biofuels requires the development of significant infrastructure and value chains, extending from the field to refinement to distribution and eventual end-use (Vertes et al. 2006), all of which may require policy intervention. Individually, these policies and their distributional effects are varied and complex (), with an expansive body of literature and research devoted to each.

When implemented as part of a larger policy portfolio, individual policies have the potential to be complementary or counter-productive in achieving policy objectives, instrumental in effecting change or redundant. For example, feedstock constraints can increase the difficulty in meeting mandates or counteract pricing policies by limiting the number of cost-effective alternatives. A carbon price can provide an added incentive to reduce the consumption of traditional fossil fuels, potentially complementing low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS) compliance. Biofuel demand can be buoyed by the existence of either a renewable fuel standard (RFS) or production tax credits, implying that the existence of both may be redundant from a production standpoint.

#### Fourth, they also unlimit the discussion of ocean-based energy because the sun impacts everything indirectly

DOE No Date (http://www.eere.energy.gov/basics/renewable\_energy/ocean.html)

Ocean Energy Technologies

Oceans cover more than 70% of the Earth's surface. As the world's largest solar collectors, oceans contain thermal energy from the sun and produce mechanical energy from tides and waves. Even though the sun affects all ocean activity, the gravitational pull of the moon primarily drives tides, and wind powers ocean waves.

#### Fifth, it’s the largest terminal impact- linked to decline in policy programs

Rowland 84 **-** (Robert C., Baylor U., “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective. Ed. Parson, p. 53-4)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

### 2NC AT: no topical version

#### And the plan simply says ‘passive solar’, which means the use of the sun for heat energy- this evidence also demonstrates our ground arguments- it is an energy efficiency technology with no moving parts and thus accesses independent literature

Passive Solar designs.com no date

[Sustainable Sources: 18 years of online Green Building information, p. http://passivesolar.sustainablesources.com/]

Passive solar design refers to the use of the sun’s energy for the heating and cooling of living spaces. In this approach, the building itself or some element of it takes advantage of natural energy characteristics in materials and air created by exposure to the sun. Passive systems are simple, have few moving parts, and require minimal maintenance and require no mechanical systems. Operable windows, thermal mass, and thermal chimneys are common elements found in passive design. Operable windows are simply windows that can be opened. Thermal mass refers to materials such as masonry and water that can store heat energy for extended time. Thermal mass will prevent rapid temperature fluctuations. Thermal chimneys create or reinforce the effect hot air rising to induce air movement for cooling purposes. Wing walls are vertical exterior wall partitions placed perpendicular to adjoining windows to enhance ventilation through windows.

# 1nR

#### Predictability and discretion are key to avoid the impact- a blind across the board cut is sufficient to trigger our impact- answes his apolcolyptic imaginary

AllVoices 1.3

Democrat Adam Smith tells why he voted 'no' on fiscal cliff deal

http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/13728447-democrat-adam-smith-tells-why-he-voted-no-on-fiscal-cliff-deal

Smith went on to explain that sequestration still looms, it was simply delayed two months, and the debt ceiling was not addressed. As the Ranking Member on the Armed Services Committee, he is concerned the Department of Defense once again faces a situation where they do not know how much money they will have to spend, and the very real possibility of indiscriminate across-the-board cuts just two months from now. In addition, Smith pointed out that other areas of discretionary spending—education, transportation, infrastructure, housing, and more—face the same crippling uncertainty. He recognizes that defense and other areas of spending will face cuts, but it should be clear on what those cuts will be and they need to be more thoughtful than the blind across-the-board approach of sequestration. Smith’s statement concluded: Not only did this bill fail to address the long-term deficit with a ten-year plan, it made getting to a reasonable plan far more difficult by making permanent 90 percent of the Bush Tax Cuts. By not allowing those tax cuts to expire, and then making them permanent, we took $3.5 trillion of revenue off the table. This will lead to one of two results, both of which I am strongly against. Either our debt will climb over 100 percent of GDP or we will have to make devastating cuts in vital programs like Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, education, transportation, and more. So, the battle is expected to continue in Congress over the next two months, with numerous ugly choices to be hashed out in a hotly divisive atmosphere.

#### Turn case bc only ones who create a new cite of ethics- Sequestration boosts HIV. Hurts research, prevention and disproportionally affects people of color

AMFAR ’12  
amfAR is an organization that plays a catalytic role in accelerating the pace of HIV/AIDS research and achieving real breakthroughs – November 8th – "Sequestration Will Cut %24659 Million from Domestic HIV/AIDS and Viral Hepatitis Programs"<http://www.amfar.org/Articles/In_The_Community/2012/Sequestration_Will_Cut_%24659_Million_from_Domestic_HIV/AIDS_and_Viral_Hepatitis_Programs/>, accessed 1/28/13,WYO/JF

“Sequestration will undermine everything we’ve done to accomplish the National HIV/AIDS Strategy (NHAS) goals of reducing HIV incidence and death,” said Chris Collins, Vice President and Director of Public Policy at amfAR. “Budget cuts through sequestration would bring crucial life-saving research at the National Institutes of Health to a halt, squandering enormous scientific opportunities including [AIDS vaccine](http://www.amfar.org/Articles/In_The_Community/2012/Sequestration_Will_Cut_%24659_Million_from_Domestic_HIV/AIDS_and_Viral_Hepatitis_Programs/) and cure research.” “These cuts will have a devastating impact and will be yet another blow for low- income individuals and people of color living with HIV/AIDS and viral hepatitis at a time when we can least afford it. Investing in our health care infrastructure will reduce long-term health care costs for chronic conditions like HIV and viral hepatitis, is the right thing to do, and is critical if we are to end these twin epidemics” concluded Kali Lindsey, Director of Legislative and Public Affairs at NMAC.

#### ( ) New round of mass violence vs. Native American populations ensues

LRG ’7

(Liberty Research Group is comprised of volunteers with a mission is to advocate for health care policies, provide technical support services, grantwriting and logistics for fundraising services to non-profits. http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:op01kf44Y1cJ:www.libertyresearchgroup.webs.com/+%26cd=5%26hl=en%26ct=clnk%26gl=us)

HIV/AIDS has affected the entire world. within the Indigenous People and Native American Indian Communities within the USA, Mexico and Canada HIV infection rates continue to spiral at a rate that is threatening to create a "genocide of a rich and diversified culture and history" of Indigenous Native Peoples.

#### ( ) Independently – even small blips in support cause millions of deaths.

Ramakant ’12

Bobby Ramakant, a World Health Organization Director-General’s WNTD Awardee in 2008, The author serves as Director (Policy and Programmes) Citizen News Service – internally quoting aid Mitchell Warren, Executive Director, ’AVAC: Global Advocacy for HIV Prevention’ – CNS – Nov 28th "Top-five critical global priority actions on AIDS in 2013" – http://reliefweb.int/report/world/top-five-critical-global-priority-actions-aids-2013

5) Safeguard HIV prevention research funding – New momentum on research into HIV vaccines, microbicides and other new tools is threatened due to the possibility of federal budget sequestration in the US and similar pressures in other countries. The potential cuts could slow or halt progress on some of the most promising HIV prevention research in many years. Policy makers must have the courage to preserve this vital research in 2013. "The most urgent questions about new prevention tools have been clear for months or even years, and yet the work to answer them is barely under way," said Warren. "That’s as unconscionable as it is unnecessary. Millions of lives depend on our ability to pick up the pace."

#### Virus Reps intrinsically neutral – doesn’t cause violent political responses. Also proves our reps reconceive dominant

Mayer ’7  
RUTH MAYER is the Chair of American Studies at the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz-University in Hanover, Germany – "Virus Discourse" Cultural Critique, No. 66 (Spring, 2007), pp. 1-20 – Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4539806> ., accessed 01/28/13,WYO/JF

There are several lineages to take into account if one wants to trace the career of virus imagery in contemporary cultural theory. For pur- poses that will become clear, I will not focus on fantastic or celebra- tory approaches to the trope of the virus, as taken by writers such as William Burroughs or the Canadian theorists Arthur and Marilouise Kroker.7 Pursuing a different track, the European scholars Gilles Deleuze and F6lix Guattari argued that one should turn to the logic of virulence-and its implications of contagion and the epidemic- to imagine a subversive "order" of infiltration, takeover, and spread rather than an order of "filiation by heredity" (241, 242). The logic of contagion, they hold, interlinks; it crisscrosses and overrides estab- lished categories; it disregards the borderlines and grids of an estab- lished system of meaning making. "Viruses," writes the philosopher Keith Ansell Pearson in 1997, with direct reference to this pattern of thought, "serve to challenge almost every dogmatic tenet in our thinking about the logic of life, defying any tidy division of the physical, such as we find in Kant, for example, into organisms, the inorganic, and engineered artifacts" (133). The virus, which may work its way from species to species through contaminated secretions or excretions and which is capable of changing the genetic material it comes into contact with, attests to a protean versatility that is further emphasized once the ambivalent nature of the pathogen-between life and death--comes into view. This ambivalence turns the virus into a perfect trope to envision con- temporary world-political developments and interactions. At this moment, the parameters of the viral are particularly appro- priate for a state-of-the-art description because, more obviously than ever before, the most diverse developments of our day-from poli- tics to economy to culture-present themselves as too complex to be captured in terms of individualized control. Moreover, the category of the viral allows for a neutral conceptualization of the current situ- ation: while suggesting a subversive thrust, viruses are not as easily romanticized as, say, guerilla fighters or rebels. But on the other hand, the figure of the virus does not lend itself to easy demonization either: the virus is, after all, a manipulative force rather than the good or the bad guy; it is a way of functioning, an agency, confusing and varie- gated. The virus is an ambivalent thing, an in-between creature, sub- ject to the logic of mutation that lets a pathogenic effect suddenly flip over into an apathogenic one. It thus effectively undermines the bina- ries of healthy/ill, good/bad, and harmless/ dangerous .8 And while many of the intricate insights of virology and immunology do not make their way into the popular imaginary, many others do, since viral threats such as H.I.V., smallpox, S.A.R.S. or the avian flu are dis- cussed almost daily in the press, on TV, or in popular entertainment, rendering the virus-more than other pathogenic microbes-a pow- erful presence in the public imagery of threat and an elementary part of contemporary debates around global contact and global contami- nation. This is why in the readings that follow I will also take all kinds of nonviral infectious agents into consideration, focusing on the "meta- phorical use" of the term "virus" that Brigitte Weingart exemplarily described (82)-a metaphorical use that is often transferred well be- yond the immediate medical scope of viral discourse.

#### We didn’t say a thing about GLOBAL pandemic. Modest depictions of REGIONAL problems create POSTIIVE REALITIES.

Palomba ’8

Junio Valerio Palomba – Università degli Studi di Trieste – "What are the risks of securitizing infectious disease pandemics such as HIV-AIDS and SARS ?" – July 19, 2008 – http://www.e-ir.info/2008/07/19/what-are-the-risks-of-securitizing-infectious-diseases-pandemics-such-as-hiv-aids-and-sars/

Nevertheless, when infectious diseases are disentangled from this compromised and partial securitizing framework depicted by Western Countries and when instead they are seen in those regional contexts where their impact and spread represent de facto an existential threats for millions of people – like in the Sub-Saharian region for example - it is difficult to disregard the (in)security implications of these illnesses, as well as some of the benefits that might arise from a securitizing approach. One of the main sector affected by the spread of HIV is the economic one. According to McInnes, the economic impact of HIV/AIDS includes a number of ‘negative externalities’ such as lost productivity due to worker illness, absenteeism and low morale. Business and external investment drop, as revenue and productivity decrease, while health costs rise. Statistics elaborated by the US Agency for International Development show a considerable negative impact on the GDP ( -2.6% per year ) in those countries where HIV prevalence rates are 20% or higher.[29] These severe economic consequences trigger – in turn – a whole set of social and political problems, generating or fuelling political instability and social unrest. Destabilising effects might also be provoked by the fact that – unlike other infectious diseases – HIV/AIDS affects in particular those skilled professionals – including civil servants, teachers, police and health workers – that represent the backbone of the bureaucratic and institutional machinery of the state-system.[30] If these ‘strategic’ elements of the societies are affected by the disease, their number and effectiveness may decline, meaning less education, less productivity and less public services in general. In addition to this, the stigma of HIV can bring civil society to the brink of collapse, “ creating alienation, fatalism and anger among those who are HIV-positive, who may then become prone to criminal violence or to following violent leaders”.[31] The military – HIV nexus it is certainly a very controversial and embarrassing one, as “ it has become increasingly well-known that deployed peacekeepers can contribute to the spread of HIV”.[32] The recognition that peacekeepers can be sources of HIV transmission has begun to create political problems, as countries appeal to this issue as a motive for refusing to host this kind of missions. Ultimately, the fear of contamination and spread of infectious disease might become a very comfortable cover for the sovereignty of failing states. Despite the validity of McInnes’ argument about the difficulties that arise in establishing a causal link between HIV and state failure,[33] it is nonetheless appropriate to affirm that the spread of infectious diseases in developing countries play a substantial part in creating instability and insecurity. Directly, by killing approximately 3 million people every year just in the Sub-Saharan Region; indirectly, by jeopardising what the International Crisis Group has defined “ the very fibre of what constitutes a nation”,[34] that is individuals, families and communities upon which political, social and economic institutions are built. The leadership of Thabo Mbeki in the Republic South Africa is paradigmatic to explain the benefits of the securitization process in a country where the spread of the HIV virus represent a true, vivid and daily existential threat to the entire population. In fact, South Africa is one of the countries more heavily affected by the HIV virus, where roughly 5.5 million people are infected over a population of nearly 49 million. At the beginning of his mandate, in 2000, Mbeki refused to consider HIV/AIDS as an urging matter, claiming that since the main cause of the spread of the virus was extreme poverty[35], efforts should be taken primarily to tackle the latter rather than the former. Certainly, there is a correlation between extreme poverty / inequality and the spread of HIV but – as we already mentioned – this is a disease that affects all kind of social classes, regardless of wealth or social position. Therefore, poverty cannot be considered the underlying cause of HIV. As Elbe points out, Mbeki’s refusal to instruct the South African government to prioritise efforts to address the AIDS pandemic…is, unfortunately, one case among many. Because of the stigmatised nature of the illness, and the long illness cycle, the strategy of denial has been particularly convenient for many governments to pursue in the past, albeit with catastrophic social consequences.”[36] Securitizing infectious diseases at an international level might represent the kind of pressure this negatory governments need to begin tackling this issue. In the case of South Africa securitizing HIV would not imply removing it from the political sphere and to shift it into the security sphere, “but instead to shift it out of its non-politicised status…and to begin a proper politicisation of the issue”.[37] Securitization on a national level can in addition overcome the problem of scarce medications available for the population. By framing HIV as a security threat to the population, it is in fact possible for developing countries to overcome the restrictive and expensive patents which protect most of the ARVs medications. These patents – currently protected under the legislation of the World Trade Organisation – impede poorer countries to produce generic ARVs therapies and other medicines in general at lower prices.[38] However, by appealing to the ‘security exceptions’ included in these patents, developing countries can invoke the raison d’état to overrule these legal agreements, increasing the domestic production of medications or importing it from other countries at competitive prices.[39] Appealing to these exceptions, in 2001 Mbeki’s managed to force one of the main producer of ARVs medications to lower the prices by 20%, clearly stressing a more securitizing ( and successful) approach to HIV[40] compared to the approach he embraced at the beginning of his mandate in 1999.

#### - No solar support coming now – plan causes huge political fights during election season and Solyndra scandal

Andrew Restuccia, The Hill, “Fury over Solyndra loan threatens to sunset solar energy investments”, E2 Wire, 9/18/2011

Political fury over a failed $535 million loan guarantee to an Obama administration-backed solar company is threatening to poison the well for future green investments. The Obama administration is doubling down on its support for renewable energy, stressing that it will move forward on more loans like the one to Solyndra, the California-based company that announced its bankruptcy late last month. In fact, as many as 14 new loan guarantees from the Energy Department — nine of which are for solar projects — could be finalized by the end of the month. But congressional Republicans have signaled they’re prepared to start a huge political fight with the White House over the investments. The fight could be a major campaign theme next year, particularly since the loans are tied to the 2009 economic stimulus package the GOP already believes is a political liability for President Obama. This fight, experts said, is likely to compound an already dismal outlook for federal investments in solar and wind power, despite arguments that the U.S. needs to act quickly to compete with China and other countries developing similar technologies. “Can you imagine the Congress voting on anything generous for the solar industry right now? I don’t think so,” said Paula Mints, a solar industry analyst at Navigant Consulting. Republicans ratcheted up their criticism of the administration over Solyndra this week, releasing a series of emails they say show that the White House tried to rush a final decision on the company’s financing so that Vice President Biden could announce approval of the loan guarantee at the September 2009 groundbreaking for the company’s new factory. The White House has dismissed the allegations, arguing that the emails were a “scheduling matter” and had no impact on the decision to finalize the loan guarantee. Still, Republicans have continued to pummel the administration on the Solyndra bankruptcy; Rep. Cliff Stearns (R-Fla.), chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee’s Oversight and Investigations subscommittee, said Friday that Jonathan Silver, executive director of the Energy Department’s Loan Programs Office, should be fired. “We’re not done with this issue yet and we’re going to see where this takes us,” full committee Chairman Fred Upton (R-Mich.) told The Hill Thursday. The solar industry is worried the fight will debilitate government support for a nascent industry. “The Solyndra bankruptcy has definitely given the Obama administration and the solar industry a black eye, there’s no denying that,” said M.J. Shiao, a solar market analyst at GTM Research.

#### - Ideological opposition to government support of solar is more virulent than ever

Jeff Johnson, Senior Correspondent and M.S. in journalism, University of Oregon, “Uncertainty Slows Energy Investments”, Chemical and Engineering News, Volume 89 Issue 47, November 21, 2011. http://cen.acs.org/articles/89/i47/Uncertainty-Slows-Energy-Investments.html

Stimulus money fueled Obama’s drive for clean energy projects, and in large part it fueled Republican opposition, notes David Goldston, who was staff director from 2001 to 2006 for the House Science Committee when it was in Republican Party hands. Today, he is director of government affairs for the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental group. “For decades there has been a large element within the conservative wing of the Republican Party that has not believed the government should do anything in the energy area beyond basic research,” Goldston says. For them, he says, government has no role supporting clean energy growth. They believe, he adds, that it is a “fantasy” that clean energy can ever be a significant part of the economy. “This goes back to the Ronald Reagan presidency, when that Administration eliminated all DOE applied research programs and tried to eliminate the department,” Goldston says. “What is different today is the virulence of the people making the argument.” The Solyndra failure, he says, provides a new way to fight this longtime ideological battle. And it makes conservative Republicans’ views more palatable to the general public because it appears they are exposing a wrong, rather than reengaging a 40-year battle against government involvement in the energy sector.

#### Obama is Velcro – all agency action sticks to him- means even if IRS has authority Obama will still be perceived-

Hook 10

Peter Nicholas and Janet Hook, 7-30-2010, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

### PC Key

#### His pc is key to sequestration deals

Stein, 1/21

[Sam, “Obama's Post-Partisan Promise Mellows Amid First Term Gridlock,” Huffington Post, January 21, 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/21/obama-post-partisan-promise_n_2490700.html> //uwyo-baj]

But gridlock has a way of grinding down even the most idealistic soul. During Obama's first term, Republicans rebuffed the president time and again. Eventually, the president's aides concluded that more could be done working around or against Congress, rather than with it. The seeds of that approach -- which involve barnstorming outside the Beltway, urging voters to pressure elected officials, and taking harder lines for negotiations -- were planted during the payroll tax cut fight in early 2012 and bloomed during the fiscal cliff standoff at year's end. With high-stakes budget fights over the debt ceiling, government funding, and sequestration coming in the first few months of 2013, the more combative Obama will be front and center once more. "The president took the case directly to the American people and involved them more fully in the discussion," Axelrod said of the payroll tax cut and fiscal cliff fights. "I do think that was a significant change and one that is still very much available to the president. Not just available to him. I think he is convinced that is essential going forward."

#### **Obama will push his agenda through; second term momentum**

Delamaide, 1/18

[Darrell, writes "Political Capital," a weekly column from Washington, D.C. on politics that affect financial markets, “Obama poised to serve up legislative barrage,” WSJ, January 18, 2013, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2013-01-18/commentary/36403142_1_immigration-reform-illinois-democrat-luis-gutierrez-white-house> //uwyo-baj]

At the start of his second term, the president seems determined to gain the upper hand in setting the political agenda in Washington, rather than reacting, as he did during much of the past four years, to a continuous pattern of obstruction from Republicans.

### AT Thumpers

#### Sequestration top of the docket

Milman, 1/3

[Jason, staff writer, “Why the 85 House Republicans voted ‘yes’ - No rift between Boehner, Cantor after opposing cliff votes - Welcoming the 113th Congress - Report: Health stocks rise after deal,” Politico, January 3, 2013, <http://www.politico.com/politicopulse/0113/politicopulse9748.html> //uwyo-baj]

OUT WITH THE OLD, IN WITH THE NEW CONGRESS -- Lawmakers have their first-day-of-Congress outfits all picked out for the start of the 113th Congress, which will be sworn in at noon. Then they’ll focus immediately on health care — well, maybe they’ll take some time to celebrate today, but entitlement cuts are at the top of the docket with sequestration and the debt limit now two months away.

#### Next, your bowman ev just says that Obama has a busy week traveling to vegas- doesn’t make a sequencing claim or reason it’s true- and you ought to discount it- no credentials means not verifiable- our ev cites congressmen within realm of ptx

#### Republican opposition doesn’t matter, democrats have the votes to confirm Hagel

Cassata, 1/25/13

[Donna, Political Editor at Associated Press, “Democratic support for Hagel grows,” Yahoo News, <http://news.yahoo.com/democratic-support-hagel-grows-232254328--politics.html> //uwyo-baj]

Democrats hold a 55-45 edge in the Senate and would have the votes to confirm Hagel. "Chuck is a combat veteran and foot soldier who has a unique understanding of the challenges faced by our men and women in uniform, and a practical leader who understands the need for common sense in military spending and national security strategy," Manchin said in a statement. Coons said he believes Hagel "will be a strong and effective secretary of defense, and I will be proud to vote for his confirmation." Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, D-N.Y., who met with Hagel on Thursday, said he had satisfied her concerns and she felt his responses were sincere. A member of the Armed Services Committee, she said she would reserve judgment until after the hearing but described Hagel as well-qualified for the job. Their statements came shortly after Sen. John Kerry, the president's choice for secretary of state, found himself defending Hagel at his confirmation hearing.

#### Schumer will support Hagel nomination, key to Senate confirmation

Timm, 1/15

[Jane C., staff writer, “Schumer says he’ll back Hagel, Senate approval now likely,” msnbc, January 15, 2013, <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/01/15/schumer-endorses-hagel-senate-approval-now-likely/> //uwyo-baj]

A key senator in the approval process, Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., said Tuesday he’ll support former Senator Chuck Hagel to be the next defense secretary; the former Nebraska Senator is now likely to receive Senate approval for the job.

#### Kerry encouraged Hagel nomination

Wright, 1/25

[Austin, defense reporter for POLITICO and author of the daily column Morning Defense, “Sequester now front and center - Navy warns of delayed deployments - AUSA Winter still on - Kerry defends Hagel - UN launches drone investigation,” Politico, January 25, 2013, http://www.politico.com/morningdefense/0113/morningdefense9904.html?hp=l6\_b4//uwyo-baj]

SECDEF WATCH: KERRY DEFENDS HAGEL AT CONFIRMATION HEARING — During his confirmation hearing yesterday, Sen. John Kerry defended his former Senate colleague, Chuck Hagel, after Republicans raised questions about the SecDef nominee. Kerry called Hagel a “strong, patriotic former senator” and said he’d be a “strong secretary of Defense.”

#### Obama holds all the cards on immigration reform-Republicans support it because they want to win another presidency and not die out as a party AND it won’t come on the agenda until right before the summer congressional break

Weignant Jan. 23

[Chris Weignant, political writer, Jan. 23, 2013, ,Handicapping Obama's Second Term Agenda, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chris-weigant/obama-second-term_b_2537802.html>, uwyo//amp]

The second big agenda item is immigration reform. President Obama holds virtually all the cards, politically, on this one. All Republicans who can read either demographics or polling numbers know full well that this may be their party's last chance not to go the way of the Whigs. Their support among Latinos is dismal, and even that's putting it politely. Some Republicans think they have come up with a perfect solution on how to defuse the issue, but they are going to be proven sadly mistaken in the end, I believe. The Republican plan will be announced by Senator Marco Rubio at some point, and it will seem to mirror the Democratic plan -- with one key difference. Republicans -- even the ones who know their party has to do something on the immigration problem -- are balking at including a "path to citizenship" for the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are already in America. The Republicans are trying to have their cake and eat it too -- and it's not going to work. "Sure," they say, "we'll give some sort of papers to these folks, let them stay, and even let them work... but there's no need to give them the hope of ever becoming a full citizen." This just isn't going to be good enough, though. There are essentially two things citizens can do which green card holders cannot: serve on juries, and vote. The Republicans are not worried about tainted juries, in case that's not clear enough. Republicans will bend over backwards in an effort to convince Latinos that their proposal will work out just fine for everyone. Latinos, however, aren't stupid. They know that being denied any path to citizenship equals an effort to minimize their voice on the national political stage. Which is why, as I said, Obama holds all the cards in this fight. Because this is the one issue in his agenda which Republicans also have a big vested interest in making happen. Obama and the Democrats will, I believe, hold firm on their insistence on a path to citizenship, and I think a comprehensive immigration bill will likely pass some time this year, perhaps before the summer congressional break. The path to citizenship it includes will be long, expensive and difficult (Republicans will insist on at least that), but it will be there.

#### Immigration won’t cost PC, GOP recognizes its importance

Hadar, 1/22

[Leon, “Much tougher job for Obama in second term; Mid-term Congressional elections in 18 months among his major hurdles,” The Business Times Singapore, January 22, 2013, LexisNexis, //uwyo-baj]

Mr Obama may have better luck in pressing forward new legislation to reform the current immigration policies that centres around a plan to provide the undocumented workers in the country - most of them Hispanics - a path towards citizenship. Republicans recognise that they would not be able to win the presidential elections without support from the growing number of Latino voters. Indeed, antagonised by the xenophobic and anti-immigration sentiments among Republican lawmakers and activists, the majority of Hispanics voted for Mr Obama in the last two elections.

#### Third, The debate is irrelevant- PC impacts are not perceived until the vote when legislation crosses Obama’s desk

Drum 10

[Kevin, Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming off the back-burner”, <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>, March]

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

#### Fourth, Obama won’t touch energy policy due to its potential for polarization

PIW 12

[Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, 1/9/12, Obama Plays Safe on Energy Policy, Lexis]

With less than a year to go until he faces re-election, US President Barack Obama is trying to avoid controversial energy policy decisions, postponing the finalization of restrictions on oil refinery and power plant emissions and delaying the approval of a major crude pipeline project. The president’s caution will prolong the status quo on issues where the industry both opposes and supports the administration’s plans, and also illustrates what's at stake for energy policy depending on whether or not Obama is given another four years in office. Most of Obama's original campaign pledges on promoting alternatives to fossil fuels and tackling climate change have not passed muster with Congress, most notably an ambitious plan for national carbon controls, a subsequent toned-down clean energy standard floated after the carbon legislation failed, and repeated efforts to repeal $30 billion-$40 billion worth of oil industry tax deductions over 10 years ( PIW May9'11 ). The one exception has been the passage of $90 billion in clean energy funding as part of an economic stimulus bill passed early in Obama's term, but the White House has been unable to repeat this success in other energy policy areas ( PIW Feb.23'09 ).

### UQ

#### Extend 1NC Tobin- Obama has leverage to cut a deal on sequestration now but his PC is finite, means any potential bump prevents passage

#### Your bols evidence just says congress members are deeply divided, but tobin is better- says republicans can gain leverage

#### The GOP will deal on sequestration right now because they perceive they have no leverage presently- they won’t let the cuts inevitably happen

Politico 1.23

[Next up: Sequester, budget resolution, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/next-fiscal-dramas-sequester-budget-resolution-86650.html]

Thune, the Senate Republican Conference chairman, said reversing the sequester would be difficult to accomplish in the current political climate.

“I think there will be a lot of pushback against trying to unwind it,” Thune said. “If we can’t come up with a better plan to find the same level of savings, I don’t think there’s any interest in delaying or eliminating it.”

That’s what Senate Democratic Whip Dick Durbin of Illinois is hearing as well. “Most Republican senators I spoke with said, ‘We’re for spending cuts — we want sequestration to go forward,’” he said. “If there is that sentiment on the Republican side … I think we’re committed to some form of sequestration spending cuts.”

But those Republicans won’t be the final word on the matter. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and other defense hawks said Wednesday they’re prepared to renew their case to reverse the sequestration cuts. And some top Democrats believe that the matter could be swept into larger talks over the budget blueprint the Senate is poised to advance.

Cornyn noted that Congress can always revisit any of the changes. “I think under the circumstances, we can always deal with the defense appropriation later.”

And he added that the real leverage points for Republicans to demand spending cuts will be in March over the government funding resolution, known as the continuing resolution, or CR, which expires on March 27.

“This is fundamentally a prioritization of these issues,” Cornyn said. “And I think the House wisely decided to put off the debt ceiling fight until after the sequester and the CR — where they think we have significant leverage. And I agree.”

#### And a strong democratic front will secure a GOP deal to avoid sequestration through the reconciliation process

Politico 1.23

[Next up: Sequester, budget resolution, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/next-fiscal-dramas-sequester-budget-resolution-86650.html]

But there are other avenues where defense cuts might become a political football — including during the budget process.

Schumer, the No. 3 Democrat, is publicly advocating using a process known in the Capitol as “reconciliation” to fast-track a tax reform plan through the budget process. Employing that process would allow the Democrats to avert a filibuster over a tax reform plan, paving the way for such a measure to advance by 51 votes. They would need buy-in from the House to do so, but Schumer believes that Republicans would ultimately be forced to back the process — which could produce higher tax revenues — in exchange for reversing the sequestration cuts.
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### 2NC – DOD Solves

Empirically the military solves OTEC and renewable development

Jean, 2010

[Grace, National Defense Industry Association, Renewable energy: Navy taps oceans for power, National Defense. 94.677 (Apr. 2010): p33, Academic Onefile] /Wyo-MB

As the Navy dives headlong into the challenge of meeting its alternative energy goals within the next decade, technologists are striving to help the service harness solar power trapped in ocean waters to generate electricity for its shore-side bases.¶ Facilities ashore consume a quarter of the Navy's annual energy resources. Most are powered by the U.S. electrical grid, which relies on fossil fuel generators. In addition to being tied to the turbulent prices of foreign oil, the grid infrastructure is vulnerable to hacker attacks, says R. James Woolsey, senior advisor at Vantage Point and former co-chair of the Defense Science Board's study on energy and defense.¶ Naval installations are shifting to grids powered by renewable energy sources, says Rear Adm. Philip Cullom, director of the Navy's fleet readiness division. Within the next 10 years, officials plan to generate half of the service's shore-based installation energy requirements from alternative sources.¶ "This is where renewables make a huge difference," says Cullom, who is leading the Navy's task force on energy. Officials intend to boost the use of solar, wind, ocean and geothermal energy sources on bases and in some cases also supply power to the U.S. grid.¶ At China Lake Naval Station, Calif., a geothermal plant produces 270 megawatts of power. A megawatt powers about 1,000 homes.¶ Solar and wind power too have become sources of renewable energy. But there are limitations: The sun does not always shine and the wind does not blow constantly. Grids that are powered by these resources often have to supplement the system with electricity made by conventional fuel-burning generators.¶ Thermal energy from the ocean is gaining interest because seawater is readily available around the clock to provide utilities with a consistent output of power, experts say.¶ Ocean thermal energy is a form of solar energy that is trapped in the upper layers of the sea. In tropical areas of the world, the water temperatures can be as warm as 80 degrees Fahrenheit. Several thousand feet below the surface, the water temperature drops below 40 degrees Fahrenheit.¶ The warm and cold waters can be used in an energy conversion system that drives turbine generators to produce electricity.¶ The Navy last fall awarded an $8.1 million contract to Lockheed Martin Corp. to continue development of a 10-megawatt ocean thermal energy conversion pilot plant.¶ "OTEC is essentially a very large heat pump," explains Robert Varley, program manager of the contract, which was awarded through the naval facilities engineering support center in Port Hueneme, Calif. Warm ocean water drawn up through a pipe evaporates liquid ammonia. The gaseous ammonia turns the turbine generators that produce electricity. Cold ocean water condenses the generator exhaust back into liquid form. The ammonia is pumped back to the evaporator to start the cycle anew.

#### The Navy is key to commercialization, they have a plan

McCallister and McLaughlin 2012

[Captain Michael A. McCallister, Senior Engineer with Sound and Sea Technology, Commander Steve, Critical Infrastructure Programs Manager at Sound and Sea Technology, January, "Renewable Energy from the Ocean", U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings]

Advancing OTEC technology to a commercially viable level is expected to require several interim steps. At this point, both industry and the Departments of the Navy and Energy are engaged in testing and demonstration of subsystems to validate critical component designs. An efficient and well-defined path is needed to complement and align these ongoing efforts. To that end, the Navy created an OTEC development roadmap to visualize, support, and implement the necessary steps leading to commercialization.

#### Funding for DOD military bases key to commercialization—it’s a pilot program

Cooper et al, 2009

[D.J. Cooper, L.E. Meyer, and R.J. Varley, Lockheed Martin Corporation, OTEC Commercialization Challenges, This paper was prepared for presentation at the 2009 Offshore Technology Conference held in Houston, Texas, USA, 4–7 May 2009, http://www.onepetro.org/mslib/servlet/onepetropreview?id=OTC-20170-MS&soc=OTC] /Wyo-MB

Figure 6 depicts our team’s approach to address risk and achieve commercialization. It was clear we needed to develop a preliminary design. Extensive engineering trade studies and analyses were accomplished to guide key design decisions. This initial effort culminated last year with our first cost estimates. The ability to validate design parameters requires tasks for tests and data gathering. A credible test program for large OTEC subsystems requires large scale testing. To-date, we are proceeding under a cooperative agreement with DoE to validate our ability to build our cold water pipe. We are also working on a heat exchanger test program. We estimate that heat exchangers may contribute up to 50% of the capital costs for larger plants. We believe we have a cost effective design approach and are in the process of building modules for performance and corrosion tests. Our team has sought R&D funding and we seek to restart large scale testing at the Natural Energy Laboratory, Hawaii Authority this year, exploiting their access to warm and cold sea water. We are also planning platform model tests. A key element in a commercialization program is the transition from design to full scale production. Given the need to address risk to the point where financing commercial plants would be feasible, we knew we needed to pursue a pilot plant. The pilot plant had to be of sufficient size to minimize performance and cost risks. It also had to be of sufficient size that subsequent scaling to utility capacities would be perceived as low risk. It also could not be so large that the cost to build and deploy the plant would be excessive. The pilot plant also has to be large enough to start providing meaningful data for long term environmental assessments. Our team chose 10 MW as the generation capacity. This size was an order of magnitude larger than any previous OTEC plant and was a capacity that would be attractive to several existing markets. Further, because of the maturity of the offshore industry, scaling up to initial utility capacities of 100 MW would be straightforward. We therefore focused our team effort on developing a pilot plant design. We completed a preliminary design last year and arrived at an initial cost estimate of $325 million. At that cost, the pilot plant could not be economically repaid under a power purchase agreement. Pilot plants are by nature very expensive if for no other reason than they are the first in class, the progenitor of new designs. We therefore are pursuing federal support for the pilot plant, based on several arguments.¶ 1. 2. 3.¶ One Department of Energy mission is to assist implementation of new energy technologies. Successful fielding of an OTEC pilot plant will initiate a new, renewable energy industry. Department of Defense renewable energy goals could be met with baseload OTEC plants at many military bases.¶ A successful pilot plant program would demonstrate OTEC performance at meaningful scales, provide cost data, begin capture of operation and maintenance information, and serve as a test bed for technology innovation.¶ Conclusion¶ The OTEC plant must be designed, built, installed, and operated at a price that can meet power purchase agreement rates. Technologies are available today that can provide the requisite performance. Federal funding for selected R&D tasks and for large scale tests is desirable. Additional federal support for a pilot plant is critical to validate technology and integration, to bridge the “valley of death”, and to convince industry to create the supply chain necessary to exploit the large resource. Once a pilot plant is operational, then risks become quantifiable and commercial markets will be ready to supply the capital funds to develop commercial scale plants. As of this session, we believe OTEC is ready for prime time.

### 2NC – AT: Links To Politics

#### DOD spending is insulated from politics

Appelbaum 12

[Binyamin Appelbaum 12, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R%26D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8-12,http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say, \\wyo-bb]

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said the Defense Department had been more successful than other federal agencies because it is the main user of the innovations that it finances. The Pentagon, which spends billions each year on weapons, equipment and technology, has an unusually direct stake in the outcome of its research and development projects. "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes." Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda in controversial areas. No matter which party is in power, the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy technology, for example, in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

#### DOD is key – solves, overcomes restrictions and doesn’t link to politics

Madia 12

[William Madia, Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University, Spring, "Small ModularReactors:APotential Game-changingTechnology",energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small\_Modular\_Reactors\_by\_William\_Madia,\\wyo-bb]

To determine if SMRs hold the potential for changing the game in carbon-free power generation, it is imperative that we test the design, engineering, licensing, and economic assumptions with some sort of public-private development and demonstration program. Instead of having government simply invest in research and development to “buy down” the risks associated with SMRs, I propose a more novel approach. Since the federal government is a major power consumer, it should commit to being the “first mover” of SMRs. This means purchasing the first few hundred MWs of SMR generation capacity and dedicating it to federal use. The advantages of this approach are straightforward. The government would both reduce licensing and economic risks to the point where utilities might invest in subsequent units, thus jumpstarting the SMR industry. It would then also be the recipient of additional carbon-free energy generation capacity. This seems like a very sensible role for government to play without getting into the heavy politics of nuclear waste, corporate welfare, or carbon taxes. If we want to deploy power generation technologies that can realize near-term impact on carbon emissions safely, reliably, economically, at scale, and at total costs that are manageable on the balance sheets of most utilities, we must consider SMRs as a key component of our national energy strategy.

#### DOD energy spending isn’t perceived by the public, even though other government spending is

Gail Reitenbach 12, Managing Editor, POWER Magazine, Senior Editor at The McGraw-Hill Companies, 1/1/12, “The U.S. Military Gets Smart Grid,” <http://www.powermag.com/print/smart_grid/The-U-S-Military-Gets-Smart-Grid_4228.html>

The military has an almost perfect set of conditions for developing a variety of advanced, "smart" technologies centered on electricity generation, delivery, and use.¶ Necessity. The DOD is one of the largest energy consumers worldwide and the single largest energy consumer in the U.S. At a White House Energy Security Forum in April 2011, Deputy Defense Secretary William J. Lynn III noted that the DOD accounts for 80% of U.S. federal energy use (and somewhere between 1% and 2% of nationwide consumption), consumes more energy than is used by two-thirds of all the nations on Earth, and has annual energy bills in the tens of billions of dollars ($15 billion in 2010). As in the civilian world, the number of electrically powered devices keeps increasing, so demand tends to rise as well. Consequently, ensuring a reliable supply of energy for both transportation and power can be challenging. ¶ Surety of supply poses challenges for both stationary and FOB installations. According to Lynn, more than 70% of convoys in Afghanistan are used to transport fuel or water and are easy targets for insurgents' roadside bombs. More than 3,000 U.S. troops and contractors had been killed or wounded protecting them as of April 2011. ¶ The desire to keep its people safe—by minimizing the amount of fuel that U.S. forces need to move around in combat zones to fuel electricity generators and vehicles—is a powerful motivating factor for many of the military's smart grid, energy efficiency, and renewable energy initiatives. ¶ Sharon E. Burke, assistant secretary of defense for operational energy plans and programs, told the audience at the Military Smart Grids and Microgrids Conference in October 2011: "When you consider that we move about 50 million gallons of fuel every month right now in Afghanistan, much of which is for power generation, you begin to understand the huge financial cost of this fuel." Burke noted that the fuel powers more than 15,000 generators in Afghanistan alone. She added that better combat power generation has benefits that include less need for fuel, reduced noise and heat signatures, less maintenance, and a lighter force. ¶ Protecting defense-related people, projects, and property at home is also a concern. Remember that DOD facilities are, for the most part, connected to the national grid, making them vulnerable to massive outages like those experienced in 2003 in the Northeast and in 2011 in the Southwest. ¶ Money. Though some Americans may balk at the Department of Energy (DOE) issuing grants and loan guarantees to advance utility smart grid or renewable projects, they are much less aware of the money spent through the Pentagon on similar projects for the military. ¶ For example, Dorothy Robyn, DOD deputy undersecretary for installations and environment, told Defense News on Oct. 31, 2011: "I've been delegated the authority to sign off on renewable projects that go out beyond the 10-year authority that most federal agencies have. We're the only federal agency that has the authority to go out to 30 years. What that does is allow us to do projects that are bigger and have a longer payback period." Robyn also noted that her department can take advantage of third-party financing for renewable and energy efficiency projects.

### AT add on

#### Economy is resilient and decline doesn’t cause war

Zakaria 9

Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability: Why terrorism and economic turmoil won't keep the world down for long” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.print.html>)

One year ago, **the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system**, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, **was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization**—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—**were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled**. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." **Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries**. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, **how much has the world really changed**? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. **Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.** A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' “says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" **This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many**. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think.** The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

#### Economic collapse does not cause war—their historical arguments are wrong

FERGUSON, Professor of History at Harvard , OCTOBER 6

(Niall, MA, D.Phil., is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University. He is a resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He is also a Senior Reseach Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct)

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

# T

### 2NC Violation Overview

#### Prefer competing interpretations- stable locus of a topic-no race to the bottom

#### Second, they will never meet because OTEC doesn’t directly use radiation- it extracts it from Thermoclines

Hurtt et al, 10

[James Hurtt, Alain Pellen, John Nagurny, Lockheed Martin Corporation "OTEC Power Efficiency Challenges," Offshore Technology Conference, May 2010, OnePetro, //uwyo-baj]

An OTEC power plant generates electricity by extracting energy from the ocean’s thermocline. In tropical and subtropical seas, there can be a 20 Deg C or greater temperature difference between the surface and a depth of approximately 1 kilometer. Warm surface seawater is used to evaporate a working fluid, typically ammonia, in a Rankine power cycle similar to that used in steam plants. The working fluid vapor is expanded through a turbine, which in turn drives an electric generator. To complete the cycle, cold seawater is pumped near to the surface and is used to re-condense the working fluid (1994 Avery).

#### Third, we will also win two links to extra-topicality because a) they produce energy from non-solar factors like depth, climate, latitude, longitude and local conditions

American Heritage Science Dictionary, 5

[The American Heritage® Science Dictionary, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/thermocline> //uwyo-baj]

thermocline  (thûrhttp://img.tfd.com/hm/GIF/prime.gifmhttp://img.tfd.com/hm/GIF/schwa.gif-klhttp://img.tfd.com/hm/GIF/imacr.gifnhttp://img.tfd.com/hm/GIF/lprime.gif)

A distinct layer in a large body of water, such as an ocean or lake, in which temperature changes more rapidly with depth than it does in the layers above or below. Thermoclines may be a permanent feature of the body of water in which they occur, or they may form temporarily in response to phenomena such as the solar heating of surface water during the day. Factors that affect the depth and thickness of a thermocline include seasonal weather variations, latitude and longitude, and local environmental conditions.

#### And b) OTEC is not exclusively for electricity production and the plan does not say ‘for energy production’.

Vega, 10

[Luis A. Vega Ph.D., National Marine Renewable Energy Center at the University of Hawai’I,

“Economics of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC): An Update,” Offshore Technology Conference, May 2010, OnePetro, //uwyo-baj]

Worldwide information indicates that although there are sufficient petroleum resources to meet demand for about 50 years, production is peaking and we will face a steadily diminishing petroleum supply. This situation justifies re-evaluating OTEC for the production of electricity, desalinated water and energy intensive products. It is postulated that the US should begin to implement the first generation of OTEC plantships providing electricity, via submarine power cables, to shore stations, followed, in about 20 years, with OTEC factories deployed along equatorial waters producing, for example, ammonia and hydrogen as the fuels that would support the post-petroleum era.

#### Second, hold the line on a narrow interp of solar because:

#### It is an independent education disad because it erodes the difference between fuel sources and turns the entire topic into the ‘solar topic’ and

#### Lets in unpredictable areas like biofuels, hydro-power, evaporation and rain-water

Sklar 7

[Scott, Founder and president of The Stella Group, Ltd., in Washington, DC, is the Chair of the Steering Committee of the Sustainable Energy Coalition and serves on the Boards of Directors of the Sustainable Buildings Industry Council, the Business Council for Sustainable Energy, and the Renewable Energy Policy Project. “What's the Difference Between Solar Energy and Solar Power?”, p. <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/u/scott-sklar-1495> //wyo-tjc]

Scott, I'm confused about the use of the terms solar energy and solar power. Is solar energy both a type of energy and a type of technology? Is solar power both a type of power and a type of technology? It seems like the terms get mixed up and used interchangeably, like kWh and kW do even though these units describe two different things. What are the general differences between solar energy and solar power? Thank you. -- Lee K. Lee, this is a question I get often, and believe it is worth addressing. Solar "power" usually means converting the sun's rays (photons) to electricity. The solar technologies could be photovoltaics, or the various concentrating thermal technologies: solar troughs, solar dish/engines, and solar power towers. Solar "energy" is a more generic term, meaning any technology that converts the sun's energy into a form of energy—so that includes the aforementioned solar power technologies, but also solar thermal for water heating, space heating and cooling, and industrial process heat. Solar energy includes solar daylighting and even passive solar that uses building orientation, design and materials to heat and cool buildings. Now in the early 1980's, I was Political Director of the Solar Lobby, formed by the big nine national environmental groups, that embraced all solar technologies—which we viewed as wind, hydropower, and biomass, along with the long list of traditional solar conversion technologies. The thesis, which is correct, is that the sun contributes to growing plants, wind regimes, and evaporation and rain (hydropower), so that all the renewables are part of the solar family. Now, of course, most would argue that geothermal, and tidal and wave (effected by the gravitational force of the moon) are not solar, but we included these technologies as well.

#### Third, vote negative to exclude bio-fuels alone: it is equivalent to tacking on multiple new topics

Galik 11

[Christopher, Climate Change Policy Partnership, Duke University, Integrating Biofuels into Comprehensive Climate Policy An Overview of Biofuels Policy Options, <http://www.nicholas.duke.edu/ccpp/ccpp_pdfs/biofuels.brief.11.09.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

The development of biofuels policy has historically neglected climate change policy objectives,

4 but ongoing rounds of energy and climate change policy debate provide an opportunity to integrate diverse policy mechanisms to create an optimal GHG reduction strategy.5Table 1 Notwithstanding this opportunity, determining how best to integrate biofuels with climate policy is a difficult undertaking. The dominant role that public policy plays in the production and use of biofuel is one reason. Large-scale production of biofuels requires the development of significant infrastructure and value chains, extending from the field to refinement to distribution and eventual end-use (Vertes et al. 2006), all of which may require policy intervention. Individually, these policies and their distributional effects are varied and complex (), with an expansive body of literature and research devoted to each.

When implemented as part of a larger policy portfolio, individual policies have the potential to be complementary or counter-productive in achieving policy objectives, instrumental in effecting change or redundant. For example, feedstock constraints can increase the difficulty in meeting mandates or counteract pricing policies by limiting the number of cost-effective alternatives. A carbon price can provide an added incentive to reduce the consumption of traditional fossil fuels, potentially complementing low-carbon fuel standard (LCFS) compliance. Biofuel demand can be buoyed by the existence of either a renewable fuel standard (RFS) or production tax credits, implying that the existence of both may be redundant from a production standpoint.

#### Fourth, they also unlimit the discussion of ocean-based energy because the sun impacts everything indirectly

DOE No Date (http://www.eere.energy.gov/basics/renewable\_energy/ocean.html)

Ocean Energy Technologies

Oceans cover more than 70% of the Earth's surface. As the world's largest solar collectors, oceans contain thermal energy from the sun and produce mechanical energy from tides and waves. Even though the sun affects all ocean activity, the gravitational pull of the moon primarily drives tides, and wind powers ocean waves.

#### Fifth, it’s the largest terminal impact- linked to decline in policy programs

Rowland 84 **-** (Robert C., Baylor U., “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective. Ed. Parson, p. 53-4)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

### 2NC A2 OTEC = ‘Sea Solar Power (Sea Solar Power ev)’

#### F

#### OTEC contextually different from solar

Upshaw, 12

[Charles Roberts Upshaw, B.S.M.E., “Thermodynamic and Economic Feasibility Analysis of a 20 MW Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC) Power Plant,” Master’s thesis for Master of Science in Engineering at University of Texas, May 2012, <http://www.otecnews.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/OTEC-thesis-university-of-Texas-UPSHAW.pdf> //uwyo-baj]

However, there are shortcomings with all of these technologies that prevent them from completely displacing fossil fuels. One problem with wind and solar generation technologies is that they are inherently variable, and therefore require back-up to cover any sudden drop-o s. Therefore, renewable energy from wind and solar will ultimately be limited by the amount of variability the grid can absorb [37]. Hydropower and biomass are not dependent on such limitations, and can provide the dispatchability to balance wind and solar. The problems with hydropower and biomass is that there is simply not enough of their respective resources to power significantly more than they already produce; the US has already built out the majority of its hydropower capacity, and scaling biomass to be a significant portion of power production would lead to deforestation or loss of arable cropland to fuel production. Consequently, there is a desire for dispatchable utility-scale renewable power, for which there are a few options: existing systems coupled with large-scale energy storage, geothermal, and Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC). OTEC might be an appealing option, and is the topic of this thesis.

#### Current EIA energy glossary lists it as a thermal energy process

EIA no date (http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm?id=O#ocean\_therm\_ec)

Ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC): The process or technologies for producing energy by harnessing the temperature differences (thermal gradients) between ocean surface waters and that of ocean depths. Warm surface water is pumped through an evaporator containing a working fluid in a closed Rankine-cycle system. The vaporized fluid drives a turbine/generator.

#### EIA Defines solar ENERGY as being either THERMAL or ELECTRIC- that means their interp links to the disad to conflating solar power with solar energy

EIA No Date (http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm?id=S)

Solar energy: The radiant energy of the sun, which can be converted into other forms of energy, such as heat or electricity.

#### .

#### Second, NREL, their author, recognizes the direct/indirect distinction and designates Ocean Thermal energy as separate from Solar power. – don’t prefer their ev, its authoritative and they define it separately, prefer our ev

NREL no date (National Renewable Energy Laboratories http://www.nrel.gov/learning/re\_basics.html)

Renewable Energy Basics

The United States currently relies heavily on coal, oil, and natural gas for its energy. Fossil fuels are nonrenewable, that is, they draw on finite resources that will eventually dwindle, becoming too expensive or too environmentally damaging to retrieve. In contrast, renewable energy resources—such as wind and solar energy—are constantly replenished and will never run out.

Solar

Most renewable energy comes either directly or indirectly from the sun. Sunlight, or solar energy, can be used directly for heating and lighting homes and other buildings, for generating electricity, and for hot water heating, solar cooling, and a variety of commercial and industrial uses.

Wind

The sun's heat also drives the winds, whose energy is captured with wind turbines. The Earth's rotation also contributes to the winds, particularly through the Coriolis effect.

Biomass

Along with the rain and snow, sunlight causes plants to grow. The organic matter that makes up those plants is known as biomass. Biomass can be used to produce electricity, transportation fuels, or chemicals. The use of biomass for any of these purposes is called biomass energy.

Hydrogen

Hydrogen also can be found in many organic compounds, as well as water. It's the most abundant element on the Earth. But it doesn't occur naturally as a gas. It's always combined with other elements, such as with oxygen to make water. Once separated from another element, hydrogen can be burned as a fuel or converted into electricity. Because energy is always needed to produce hydrogen, hydrogen is not in itself an energy source, but rather a way to store and transport energy, so it is often referred to as an energy carrier.

Geothermal

Not all renewable energy resources come from the sun. Geothermal energy taps the Earth's internal heat for a variety of uses, including electric power production and the heating and cooling of buildings.

Ocean

The ocean can produce thermal energy from the sun's heat and mechanical energy from the tides and waves. Tides are driven by the gravitational pull of the moon and sun upon the Earth, while waves are driven by winds blowing over the ocean's surface. NREL does not conduct research in ocean thermal energy or ocean mechanical energy. See the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Savers for basic information on ocean energy.

Hydropower

Flowing water creates energy that can be captured and turned into electricity. This is called hydroelectric power or hydropower. NREL doesn't perform any research in hydroelectric power technologies. For more information on hydroelectric power, see the Hydropower Basics from the U.S. Department of Energy’s Water Power Program.

#### And OTEC is an INDIRECT production source for electricity

Pollard 76

[Dr. Ken Pollard, a theoretical physicist, was Executive Director of Oak Ridge Associated Universities from its incorporation in 1946 until August 1974 staff member of the Institute for Energy Analysis, American Scientist, p. jstor //wyo-tjc]

Indirect solar energy : For thousands of years man has been using water and wind power for mechanical work. Both are, of course, derived from the sun, one through lifting vaporized water to high altitudes and the other through the atmospheric turbulence that accompanies the maintenance of thermal equilibrium between the earth and the sun. Water power has long been a major source of electricity at modest cost, and hydroelectric resources will certainly be developed further as the world population and its need for electricity increases in the decades ahead. Wind power was extensively used for pumping water in the Netherlands until cheaper, less demanding, and more convenient ways to do so became widely available. In rural America in the 1920s and 1930s, windmill electrification systems were common but were abandoned when central-station power became available through the Rural Electrification Program. Now, impending energy crises have reawakened interest in wind power as a source of electricity. The NASA-Lewis Laboratory, at Cleveland, Ohio, has built a prototype test unit that uses a two-bladed propeller, each blade of which is 62y2 ft long. Mounted on a high tower and turning at 40 revolutions per minute, it generates 100 kW(e) when the wind speed is above 18 miles per hour. It is structurally strong enough to with stand occasional gale-force winds. The initial test unit is quite expensive, but it is hoped that this cost can be substantially reduced as production models are built in quantity. In areas of frequent wind, such as Oklahoma and West Texas, wind speeds above 18 mph may occur up to 30% of the time. An actual unit tested in Vermont generated electricity 14% of the time, and one in Denmark 23% of the time. If electrical generation occurred 20% of the time on an annual basis, the output of the NASA-Lewis generator would be 175,000 kWhr/yr. It would require nearly 30,000 of such installations to equal the electrical output of the reference plant used in the solar-electric analysis. The intermittent nature of wind leads to many of the same problems of the solar-electric systems. The addition of large-capacity energy-storage facilities to an already large capital investment in wind machines and generators would militate against their commercial adoption. Among the various ways in which wind-generated electricity might be incorporated into existing electric utility systems, three seem the most promising. In con junction with hydroelectric dams, large wind machines might be used to pump water into existing impoundment reservoirs whenever wind is available, with corresponding increases in the hydroelectric generating capacity. In the second mode, wind electric generators could be built along utility transmission lines with line control of the frequency and phase of the electricity generated so that the output could be fed into the line at selected points by matching transformers. The third method would use wind machines to compress air in the vicinity of gas turbines used when utility power needs peak. The compressed air would be stored and drawn upon for injection with fuel to the turbine when needed, thus saving the energy otherwise taken from the turbine to drive a compressor on the same shaft. Electricity generated by the wind in any of these ways would simply re place what the electric utility system would have supplied without it by burning more fuel. The economics of such an application therefore de pends on whether the annual costs of capital recovery, operation, and maintenance of the wind system are less than the annual cost of the fuel it saves. At present fuel costs and expected capital costs of wind systems, this would hardly be the case. But in the long range, the situation might be revised, and we can anticipate some use of wind electricity in utility systems, though it seems doubtful that it would ever constitute more than a minor fraction of the total electrical output of the country. None of the considerations advanced so far in this analysis is intended to apply directly to rural areas in the United States and developing countries or to remote places in the world. Small, self-contained total energy systems using local wastes to supplement solar heat, combined with wind or photoelectric generation and limited storage and no trans mission costs, seem destined to play an increasingly important role in the total world energy system. There are attractive possibilities in such applications, and their economic and practical evaluation rests on quite different criteria from those for central-station power.

Two other solar electric systems that have been proposed should be described briefly. The one under most active development at present--the Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC) system—uses the difference in temperature between warm surface water and cold deep water in the tropical oceans. Several contractors of the Energy Research and Development Administration are testing engineering design and components for such systems. A plant would be hung from a large moored platform floating on an appropriate site in the tropical ocean. The working fluid would be pressurized ammonia gas driving a turbine generator. The exit gas would be condensed in a large condenser cooled by water drawn by marine propellers through a concrete pipe some 40 ft in diameter, from a depth of 1,000 ft or greater. The cool liquid ammonia would then go to an evaporator heated by surface water fed through a similar but shorter pipe. Electric power generated in this way would either be transmitted to land by submarine cables or used to produce electrolytic hydrogen from sea water, which would then be shipped to land in tankers. About 30% of the power generated would be needed to operate the system, mainly for cold and hot-water circulation. If hydro gen is generated, another 40% would be used in electrolysis and liquefaction. A design by Lockheed of a 160 MW(e) OTEC calls for 235,000 tons of concrete and 26,000 tons of steel for the platform, 8,700 tons of cold-rolled steel and 1,800 tons of titanium for the power system, 11,000 tons of steel for the mooring line, and 32,000 tons of concrete for the cold-water pipe. The capital investment in such a system for each net electrical kilowatt would be very large. Moreover, the problems of repair and maintenance over a 20- to 30-year lifetime seem formidable. The titanium heat-ex changer elements, for example, have a surface area of over 150 acres, and any fouling of them by growth of biological organisms would make the system inoperative. It seems very doubtfull that the massive private investment required to construct such a system could ever be justified commercially by electric utilities.

#### Third, prefer our interpretation- the HUMAN ACTIVITY used to harness the radiation is key element for any discussion on energy

Overgaard 8

[Sarah, Senior Executive Officer in Division for Energy Statistics at Statistics Norway, “Issue paper: Definition of primary and secondary energy”, September, p. <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/londongroup/meeting13/LG13_12a.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

Formal definitions have a regular, consistent pattern that enables us to identify one and only

one item from a larger set of related items. A formal definition3 consists of three parts:

1) the term to be defined,

2) the general class to which the term belongs, and

3) the defining particulars (the distinguishing characteristics) that separate this term from

all other members of its class.

The terms to be defined in this paper are primary energy and secondary energy.

For primary energy the class that is currently used by the UN is “sources”. The OECD/IEA/Eurostat manual on the other hand uses natural resources when describing the origin of primary energy commodities. The problem we encounter if stating that the energy source should be a natural resource is that we rule out energy embodied in waste as primary energy. If waste should be classified as primary energy, as is the case in the OECD/IEA/Eurostat manual, limiting the class to only natural resources will make the definition to narrow.

There are two options as we see it: The first option is to hold on to the class used in the UN definition, but include the specification that we are referring to the energy in a source and not the source in itself. The proposed class is then “energy embodied in sources”. The second option is to include waste in addition to natural resources in the definition, as the term primary energy gives strong associations to natural resources. Waste is a surplus from any other process that has no further use in the process it comes from. Waste enters the energy system as “new” energy. One way to see waste is as a non-energy commodity flow that enters the energy commodity flow as “new” energy. A definition should preferably not include exceptions, so there should be valid arguments for choosing such an option.

For secondary energy the class currently used in the UN manual is also “sources”. The OECD/IEA/Eurostat manual does not define a class, but refer to commodities. One could argue that secondary energy is not really what we think of as an energy source, but rather an energy commodity. When transformed from a primary energy source or commodity, it is done so for the purpose of trade or use, it becomes a commodity.

The most important distinguishing characteristics of primary and secondary energy are the process/activity involved for humans to make use of the energy in the source. To take it from the start, all energy on earth originally comes from the sun, through natural energy chains the energy from the sun is transferred to other forms of energy, kinetic or stored. The first law of thermodynamics state that “Energy can neither be created nor destroyed”. In other words it merely changes its form from one to another. So energy transformations occur naturally all the time, but it is first when humans use labour or materials to extract, collect or transform the energy embodied in a source that it enters our energy system. A formal definition should preferably be able to:

1) recognize the human factor,

2) recognize that the important differentiating factor is the activity or process of

extraction, capture or transformation and

3) include the purpose of the activity.

# 1NR

### D/A

#### Nuclear war turns warming

Duncan Clark 9, editorial environmental consultant to the London Guardian, co-director of GreenProfile, January 2, 2009, “The carbon footprint of nuclear war,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2009/jan/02/nuclear-war-emissions

Almost 700m [million] tonnes of CO2 would be released into the Earth's atmosphere by even the smallest nuclear conflict, according to a US study that compares the environmental costs of developing various power sources Just when you might have thought it was ethically sound to unleash a nuclear attack on a nearby city, along comes a pesky scientist and points out that atomic warfare is bad for the climate. According to a new paper in the journal Energy & Environmental Science, even a very limited nuclear exchange, using just a thousandth of the weaponry of a full-scale nuclear war, would cause up to 690m tonnes of CO2 to enter the atmosphere – more than UK's annual total. The upside (kind of) is that the conflict would also generate as much as 313m tonnes of soot. This would stop a great deal of sunlight reaching the earth, creating a significant regional cooling effect in the short and medium terms – just like when a major volcano erupts. Ultimately, though, the CO2 would win out and crank up global temperatures § Marked 23:08 § an extra few notches. The paper's author, Mark Z Jacobson, a professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford University, calculated the emissions of such a conflict by totting up the burn rate and carbon content of the fabric of our cities. "Materials have the following carbon contents: plastics, 38–92%; tyres and other rubbers, 59–91%; synthetic fibres, 63–86%; woody biomass, 41–45%; charcoal, 71%; asphalt, 80%; steel, 0.05–2%. We approximate roughly the carbon content of all combustible material in a city as 40–60%." But why would a Stanford engineer bother calculating such a thing? Given that the nuclear exchange would also kill up to 17 million people, who's going to be thinking about the impact on global warming? The purpose of the paper is to compare the total human and environmental costs of a wide range of different power sources, from solar and wind to nuclear and biofuels. One of the side-effects of nuclear power, the report argues, is an increased risk of nuclear war: "Because the production of nuclear weapons material is occurring only in countries that have developed civilian nuclear energy programs, the risk of a limited nuclear exchange between countries or the detonation of a nuclear device by terrorists has increased due to the dissemination of nuclear energy facilities worldwide." "As such," Jacobson continues, "it is a valid exercise to estimate the potential number of immediate deaths and carbon emissions due to the burning of buildings and infrastructure associated with the proliferation of nuclear energy facilities and the resulting proliferation of nuclear weapons … Although concern at the time of an explosion will be the deaths and not carbon emissions, policy makers today must weigh all the potential future risks of mortality and carbon emissions when comparing energy sources."

#### 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."

#### Sequestration collapses Asia-Pacific pivot, power projection, ability to solve escalation, and air, sea, and land capabilities- now this means your china impact is only possible in a world with cuts in sequestration

Horowitz 12

[Michael Horowitz, NDT Champion, associate professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, 8/9/12, How Defense Austerity Will Test U.S. Strategy in Asia, thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/08/09/how-defense-austerity-will-test-u-s-strategy-in-asia/]

Decisions about defense spending are integrally linked to the United States’ overall strategy in the Asia-Pacific. Given ongoing uncertainty surrounding North Korea, China’s continuing development of anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) capabilities, and disputes over the East and South China seas, maintaining a robust presence in the region will be a high priority for any future administration. However, sequestration or other major defense cuts could undermine perceptions of U.S. resolve in the Asia-Pacific and make core U.S. allies such as Japan and South Korea doubt Washington’s willingness to invest appropriately in relevant capabilities. Concretely, such cuts could make it more difficult for the United States to maintain its current presence. The United States’ predominant military strategy for ensuring continued superiority in the Asia-Pacific is AirSea battle (ASB)—an operational concept designed to help the U.S. Air Force and Navy jointly respond to A2/AD challenges, enhance deterrence, and ensure freedom of action around the world over the next generation. Implementing ASB will require significant investments in advanced technologies, including long-range precision-strike capabilities and submarine modernization. Furthermore, ASB primarily involves investments in the air force and navy, raising questions about how best to rebuild the readiness of the army and marines. There is a trade-off between providing relatively equal budget shares to the services—potentially reducing inter-service rivalries—and rebalancing toward the Asia-Pacific. Even within the air force and navy, there are disagreements about which programs represent the highest priority for the U.S. military. One concern is the potential for large decreases in the procurement of F-35s—the multirole replacement fighter for the air force and navy. Unless the military can find substitutes, further cuts beyond those already planned could potentially make it more difficult for the U.S. military to control the skies in a future confrontation in the Asia-Pacific. Decreases in F-35 procurement could also make U.S. allies less likely to purchase the F-35, thereby reducing interoperability with allied Asian militaries and further raising F-35 unit costs. Budget cuts may also lead to the scaling back of plans to purchase the full slate of Virginia-class attack submarines that the navy has requested. Given China’s continuing investments in submarines and anti-ship missiles, the modernization of the U.S. fleet is critical to maintaining U.S. naval capabilities in the Asia-Pacific, particularly for antisubmarine warfare and strike operations. Major cuts could affect the size of the navy, in terms of ships afloat, and compromise the United States’ ability to project power in crisis situations. At even greater risk of funding cuts is research and development. R&D into next-generation robotics, a new long-range bomber, and C4ISR (command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance) is essential to guaranteeing U.S. military power over the long term. R&D for basic programs is also likely to be on the chopping block during periods of defense austerity. One example is the X-47B drone designed to launch from and recover to aircraft carriers. Decreases in funding for such cutting-edge programs could undermine the United States’ long-term capacity to control the commons in the Asia-Pacific. The unparalleled access the United States enjoys to air, sea, and space could decline if other nations develop new technologies capable of placing legacy platforms such as large carriers or manned fighters at risk. Rising powers in the region are not standing still. The United States will only maintain its conventional superiority if it continues investing in R&D that will pay off with new weapon systems down the road.

### UQ

#### The GOP will deal on sequestration right now because they perceive they have no leverage presently- they won’t let the cuts inevitably happen

Politico 1.23

[Next up: Sequester, budget resolution, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/next-fiscal-dramas-sequester-budget-resolution-86650.html]

Thune, the Senate Republican Conference chairman, said reversing the sequester would be difficult to accomplish in the current political climate.

“I think there will be a lot of pushback against trying to unwind it,” Thune said. “If we can’t come up with a better plan to find the same level of savings, I don’t think there’s any interest in delaying or eliminating it.”

That’s what Senate Democratic Whip Dick Durbin of Illinois is hearing as well. “Most Republican senators I spoke with said, ‘We’re for spending cuts — we want sequestration to go forward,’” he said. “If there is that sentiment on the Republican side … I think we’re committed to some form of sequestration spending cuts.”

But those Republicans won’t be the final word on the matter. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and other defense hawks said Wednesday they’re prepared to renew their case to reverse the sequestration cuts. And some top Democrats believe that the matter could be swept into larger talks over the budget blueprint § Marked 23:09 § the Senate is poised to advance.

Cornyn noted that Congress can always revisit any of the changes. “I think under the circumstances, we can always deal with the defense appropriation later.”

And he added that the real leverage points for Republicans to demand spending cuts will be in March over the government funding resolution, known as the continuing resolution, or CR, which expires on March 27.

“This is fundamentally a prioritization of these issues,” Cornyn said. “And I think the House wisely decided to put off the debt ceiling fight until after the sequester and the CR — where they think we have significant leverage. And I agree.”

#### And a strong democratic front will secure a GOP deal to avoid sequestration through the reconciliation process

Politico 1.23

[Next up: Sequester, budget resolution, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/next-fiscal-dramas-sequester-budget-resolution-86650.html]

But there are other avenues where defense cuts might become a political football — including during the budget process.

Schumer, the No. 3 Democrat, is publicly advocating using a process known in the Capitol as “reconciliation” to fast-track a tax reform plan through the budget process. Employing that process would allow the Democrats to avert a filibuster over a tax reform plan, paving the way for such a measure to advance by 51 votes. They would need buy-in from the House to do so, but Schumer believes that Republicans would ultimately be forced to back the process — which could produce higher tax revenues — in exchange for reversing the sequestration cuts.

### AT Cuts no impact

#### You say no impact- but 1. Your Korb evidence doesn’t say what areas will be cut- also not in the context of sequestration- true because it was written in 2012- and says that gvts will be forced to manage their budget, but doesn’t say that where cuts will come from.

#### The key question is whether the defense cut is blind or not- devastates key readiness elements like aircraft maintenance- this also answers your they’re preparing for cuts evidewnce

Craig 1.23

[Victoria, “Defense Sector Caught in Crosshairs of Fiscal Fight,” Fox Business, January 23, 2013, <http://www.foxbusiness.com/government/2013/01/18/defense-sector-caught-in-crosshairs-fiscal-fight/#ixzz2IwYqWamA>]

Few argue over whether a budget deal or sequestration will impact the defense industry. What is up for debate is just how much and in what ways the impact will be felt. Despite a December letter from Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, who said there will not be a need for immediate furlough, Goldman Sachs says there’s no way around tough, immediate effects. “The administration would have little flexibility in how to implement this cut,” the January note said. “So every § Marked 23:10 § program, project and account would need to be cut by the same amount. That would mean, for example, furloughing most civilian defense employees for a full month before the end of the fiscal year, and cutting basic activities like health care for active-duty military and aircraft maintenance.”

#### Predictability and discretion are key to avoid the impact- a blind across the board cut is sufficient to trigger our impact

AllVoices 1.3

Democrat Adam Smith tells why he voted 'no' on fiscal cliff deal

http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/13728447-democrat-adam-smith-tells-why-he-voted-no-on-fiscal-cliff-deal

Smith went on to explain that sequestration still looms, it was simply delayed two months, and the debt ceiling was not addressed. As the Ranking Member on the Armed Services Committee, he is concerned the Department of Defense once again faces a situation where they do not know how much money they will have to spend, and the very real possibility of indiscriminate across-the-board cuts just two months from now. In addition, Smith pointed out that other areas of discretionary spending—education, transportation, infrastructure, housing, and more—face the same crippling uncertainty. He recognizes that defense and other areas of spending will face cuts, but it should be clear on what those cuts will be and they need to be more thoughtful than the blind across-the-board approach of sequestration. Smith’s statement concluded: Not only did this bill fail to address the long-term deficit with a ten-year plan, it made getting to a reasonable plan far more difficult by making permanent 90 percent of the Bush Tax Cuts. By not allowing those tax cuts to expire, and then making them permanent, we took $3.5 trillion of revenue off the table. This will lead to one of two results, both of which I am strongly against. Either our debt will climb over 100 percent of GDP or we will have to make devastating cuts in vital programs like Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, education, transportation, and more. So, the battle is expected to continue in Congress over the next two months, with numerous ugly choices to be hashed out in a hotly divisive atmosphere.

### Link

#### Obama is Velcro – all agency action sticks to him- means even if NOAA is day-to day Obama will still be perceived-

Hook 10

Peter Nicholas and Janet Hook, 7-30-2010, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. § Marked 23:11 § He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

### Republicans don’t like NOAA

#### Republicans don’t like NOAA, see it as a Democrat distraction from fiscal issues

States News Service, 12

[“Republicans Critical of Increased Spending and Lack of Prioritization in NOAA, EPA Budget Proposals,” Committee on Science, Space and Technology Press Releases, March 6, 2012 <http://science.house.gov/press-release/republicans-critical-increased-spending-and-lack-prioritization-noaa-epa-budget> //uwyo-baj]

“Only in Washington, as we face an unprecedented fiscal train wreck and continue to be forced to borrow 40 cents on the dollar, can a requested budget increase of 3.1 percent for NOAA and 1.4 percent for EPA be characterized as making ‘tough choices,’” said Subcommittee Chairman Andy Harris (R-MD). “The Administration is prioritizing its political environmental agendas ahead of the core scientific needs of the nation.” The President’s FY13 budget request for NOAA is $5.06 billion. However, the Agency failed to deliver its detailed congressional budget justifications to the Committee, making it difficult to examine program percentage increases and decreases for many of the Agency’s activities. Chairman Harris criticized NOAA Administrator Dr. Jane Lubchenco for the extreme tardiness in providing Congress with this critical information. “This abdication of such a simple responsibility influences the perception on the Hill that the Administration is not being a good steward of taxpayer money,” Harris said. Responding to a question about a possible gap in observational weather satellite data, Dr. Lubchenco admitted that the Administration failed to develop alternative plans to provide this critical information. Republicans questioned relative priorities within NOAA, including a 15 percent increase in funding for climate research in lieu of investments in weather programs that could protect lives and property.

#### **Obama will push his agenda through; second term momentum**

Delamaide, 1/18

[Darrell, writes "Political Capital," a weekly column from Washington, D.C. on politics that affect financial markets, “Obama poised to serve up legislative barrage,” WSJ, January 18, 2013, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2013-01-18/commentary/36403142_1_immigration-reform-illinois-democrat-luis-gutierrez-white-house> //uwyo-baj]

At the start of his second term, the president seems determined to gain the upper hand in setting the political agenda in Washington, rather than reacting, as he did during much of the past four years, to a continuous pattern of obstruction from Republicans.

### AT Intrinsicness

#### Interpretation: The negative should be able to test the opportunity costs of the plan

#### K2 neg ground- politics is a core generic disad- aff spectrum is so large on this topic we need to uniquely preserve our generics in order to give the neg a fair shot

#### K2 education-Politics tests a key opportunity cost

Saideman 11

[Steve Saideman, associate professor of political science - McGill University, 7/25/’11 “Key Constraint on Policy Relevance,” http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2011/07/key-constraint-on-policy-relevance.html]

Dan Drezner has a great post today about how the foreign policy smart set (his phrase) gets so frustrated by domestic politics that they tend to recommend domestic political changes that are never going to happen. I would go one step further and suggest that one of the key problems for scholars who want to be relevant for policy debates is that we tend to make recommendations that are "incentive incompatible." I love that phrase. What is best for policy may not be what is best for politics, and so we may think we have a good idea about what to recommend but get frustrated when our ideas do not get that far. Lots of folks talking about early warning about genocide, intervention into civil wars and the like blame "political will." That countries lack, for whatever reason, the compulsion to act. Well, that is another way of saying that domestic politics matters, but we don't want to think about it. Dan's piece contains an implication which is often false--that IR folks have little grasp of domestic politics. Many IR folks do tend to ignore or simplify the domestic side too much, but there is plenty of scholarship on the domestic determinants of foreign policy/grand strategy/war/trade/etc. Plenty of folks look at how domestic institutions and dynamics can cause countries to engage in sub-optimal foreign policies (hence the tradeoff implied in my second book--For Kin or Country). The challenge, then, is to figure out what would be a cool policy and how that cool policy could resonate with those who are relevant domestically. That is not easy, but it is what is necessary. To be policy relevant requires both parts--articulating a policy alternative that would improve things and some thought about how the alternative could be politically appealing. Otherwise, we can just dream about the right policy and gnash our teeth when it never happens.

#### Reject the argument, not the team

### Winners Win

#### 1. You get no link turn because the u/q controls the direction of the link

#### 2. this ev says regulation is cool- not in context of OTEC- which is proven to cost more

#### Doesn’t win on energy policy-previous term proves

Eisler 12

[Matthew N. Eisler, Research Fellow at the Center for Contemporary History and Policy at the Chemical Heritage Foundation, 12 “Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” Science Progress, April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/]

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital from his energy policy from either the left or the right by the end of his first term. The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy, but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

#### Winners win is wrong -- Obama votes neg

Calmes 2012

[Jackie Calmes, NYTimes, 11/12/12, In Debt Talks, Obama Is Ready to Go Beyond Beltway, mobile.nytimes.com/2012/11/12/us/politics/legacy-at-stake-obama-plans-broader-push-for-budget-deal.xml]

That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that Mr. Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies - in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney. George C. Edwards III, a leading scholar of the presidency at Texas A & M University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong. Yet Mr. Edwards, whose book on Mr. Obama's presidency is titled "Overreach," said, "He didn't understand the limits of what he could do." "They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we'd build this advancing-tide theory of legislation," Mr. Edwards said. "And that was very naïve, very silly. Well, they've learned a lot, I think." "Effective leaders," he added, "exploit opportunities rather than create them." § Marked 23:11 § The budget showdown is an opportunity. But like many, it holds risks as well as potential rewards. "This election is the second chance to be what he promised in 2008, and that is to break the gridlock in Washington," said Kenneth M. Duberstein, a Reagan White House chief of staff, who voted for Mr. Obama in 2008 and later expressed disappointment. "But it seems like this is a replay of 2009 and 2010, when he had huge majorities in the House and Senate, rather than recognizing that 'we've got to figure out ways to work together and it's not just what I want.' " For now, at least, Republican lawmakers say they may be open to raising the tax bill for some earners. "We can increase revenue without increasing the tax rates on anybody in this country," said Representative Tom Price, Republican of Georgia and a leader of House conservatives, on "Fox News Sunday." "We can lower the rates, broaden the base, close the loopholes." The challenge for Mr. Obama is to use his postelection leverage to persuade Republicans - or to help Speaker John A. Boehner persuade Republicans - that a tax compromise is in their party's political interest since most Americans favor compromise and higher taxes on the wealthy to reduce annual deficits. Some of the business leaders the president will meet with on Wednesday are members of the new Fix the Debt coalition, which has raised about $40 million to urge lawmakers and their constituents to support a plan that combines spending cuts with new revenue. That session will follow Mr. Obama's meeting with labor leaders on Tuesday. His first trip outside Washington to engage the public will come after Thanksgiving, since Mr. Obama is scheduled to leave next weekend on a diplomatic trip to Asia. Travel plans are still sketchy, partly because his December calendar is full of the traditional holiday parties. Democrats said the White House's strategy of focusing both inside and outside of Washington was smart. "You want to avoid getting sucked into the Beltway inside-baseball games," said Joel Johnson, a former adviser in the Clinton White House and the Senate. "You can still work toward solutions, but make sure you get out of Washington while you are doing that." The president must use his leverage soon, some Democrats added, because it could quickly wane as Republicans look to the 2014 midterm elections, when the opposition typically takes seats from the president's party in Congress.

#### Winners lose-sore losers in congress spur ex post facto agenda derailment

Mason, 11

Julie, Washington Examiner: Obama tapping personal charm, political capital to combat GOP

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/politics/white-house/2011/01/obama-tapping-personal-charm-political-capital-combat-gop#ixzz1MAkTodze>, accessed 5-12-2011, WYO/JF

After a string of late-session victories last month that included repealing the ban on gays serving openly in the military, cutting a tax-cut deal with Republicans and ratification of a nuclear arms treaty with Russia, Obama also is politically reanimated. His job approval ratings are back up to 50 percent after a long run in the mid-40s. Obama also has a potent weapon in the arsenal: a high personal approval rating of 73 percent, according to a recent CNN/Opinion Research Corp. poll. Even people who don't approve of the job Obama is doing like him personally. Chris Reardon, a political scientist and pollster at the University of New Hampshire, noted that presidents with high personal likability ratings can often be more effective than their popularity job approval ratings would suggest or political opponents might expect. "He hasn't done anything horrendous, people see he is a family man," Reardon said. "He might be cold and so forth, but he hasn't betrayed the country -- it's how he is perceived as a person." Still, Obama faces potentially strident opposition on Capitol Hill. House Republicans this month are expected to begin dismantling Obama's health care reforms. While a broad repeal is unlikely, opponents in Congress have various ways to scale back Obama's sweeping, signature achievement. § Marked 23:11 § "They can do a number of things," said Michael Tanner, a health care policy expert at the Cato Institute, including hauling administration officials up to Capitol Hill for hearings, refusing to fund elements of reform or delaying implementation of the reform provisions.

### AT Thumpers

#### Sequestration top of the docket

Milman, 1/3

[Jason, staff writer, “Why the 85 House Republicans voted ‘yes’ - No rift between Boehner, Cantor after opposing cliff votes - Welcoming the 113th Congress - Report: Health stocks rise after deal,” Politico, January 3, 2013, <http://www.politico.com/politicopulse/0113/politicopulse9748.html> //uwyo-baj]

OUT WITH THE OLD, IN WITH THE NEW CONGRESS -- Lawmakers have their first-day-of-Congress outfits all picked out for the start of the 113th Congress, which will be sworn in at noon. Then they’ll focus immediately on health care — well, maybe they’ll take some time to celebrate today, but entitlement cuts are at the top of the docket with sequestration and the debt limit now two months away.

#### Third, The debate is irrelevant- PC impacts are not perceived until the vote when legislation crosses Obama’s desk

Drum 10

[Kevin, Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming off the back-burner”, <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>, March]

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.