### 1NC—T—Policy

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must defend a policy action

#### Violation—they don’t

#### Recognition is defined as legal authority in the context of international law.

**Britannica N.D**, world- renowned encyclopedia//Aanya https://www.britannica.com/topic/recognition-international-law

Recognition is a process whereby certain facts are accepted and endowed with a certain legal status, such as statehood, sovereignty over newly acquired territory, or the international effects of the grant of nationality.

**Recognition means policy action. Merriam-Webster N.D.** //Aanya https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/recognize

to accept and approve of (something) as having legal or official authority ‘The U.S. government has now recognized the newly formed country.’ ‘They refused to recognize the treaty.’

#### “Resolved:” refers to a legislative debate.

Louisiana State Legislature 16, “Glossary of Legislative Terms,” http://www.legis.state.la.us/glossary2.htm

Resolution: A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11, 13.1, 6.8, and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### [1] Competitive equity—any alternative wrecks it—it’s impossible to negate alternative frameworks with the ground allocated to us by the parameters of the resolution—all 1AR defense to this claim will rely on concessionary ground which isn’t a stable basis for a year of debate.

#### They don’t get to weigh the aff – it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### [2] Switch Side Debate – read your stuff on the neg which non-uniques your offense and is net better since a Kritik on the neg has to be tailored to the aff– otherwise your discussion starts and ends at the 1AC.

#### [3] Precision – not defending the text of the resolution justifies the affirmative doing away with random words in the resolution which

#### a] means they’re not within the topic which is a voter for jurisdiction since you can only vote affirmative on the resolution and this debate never should have happened,

#### b] they’re unpredictable and impossible to engage in so we always lose

#### [4] TVA – defend the aff through the state

#### T isn’t violent –

#### A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time.

#### B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot excludes some arguments and even saying T bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether.

#### Reading T isn’t psychic violence – that was above, but especially if we’re not going for it since reading T can be used to prevent aff shiftiness and make substance a viable option.

#### No silencing DA - T is just like a disad or critique we’ve said a certain practice the aff took was bad and it would’ve been better had they done it differently not that they are bad debaters – just like the cap k says the aff engaged in some practice that reinforced capitalism and it would’ve been better if they had emphasized Marxism – impositions in some form are inevitable because the negative has the burden of rejoinder and needs link arguments – every disad link says the aff did something wrong and theres an implicit version of the aff that wouldn’t have linked

#### Theory before the K – A] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say.

#### B] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

#### No RVI’s or perf cons- illogical, baiting, if theory is bad and you vote on a turn to theory you are voting on theory

#### Reject aff pre empts – not clearly delineated, impossible to know implications

# Case

#### The aff is inherently contradictory, it uses strikes to recognize strikes with no explanation as to how it recognizes the initial strikes

#### Impossible to minimize excess double bind a) my whole life Is devoted bc its impossible or b) i recognize I cant achieve so theres no reason for me to do it

### 1NC – Top Line

#### 1. Vote neg on presumption – We don’t have to win anything, but the reading this aff in the first place is a double turn – it is impossible to reject productive expenditures while simultaneously actively asking for the ballot. IF they want the ballot, they must do literally nothing, which justifies voting negative on presumption, but IF they want to win, only a presumption ballot can truly desire nothing and fully embrace expenditure

### 1NC – Facism Turn

#### Bataille’s theory of expenditure causes violent fascism

Wolin**,** Distinguished Professor of History at the [City University of New York](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/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)

It seems that the admiration of fascist methods - primarily with respect to¶ the ethos of unbridled transgression that was so prominent in the fascist¶ regimes’ embrace of an aesthetics of violence - evinced in Bataille’s essays¶ of the 1930s had come to the fore in a way that proved profoundly¶ embarrassing to Breton and those allied with him. In Bataille’s view, the¶ fascist revolutions in Italy and Germany were alone successful in challenging¶ the existence of the democratic spirit. They alone had replaced the decrepit¶ value-system of bourgeois society with a new collective mythology - a¶ restoration of myth that was so avidly desired by the belief-starved masses.¶ This telltale flirtation with a “left fascism” - an avowed endorsement of¶ fascist methods for left-wing political ends -was apparent from the group’s¶ inaugural manifesto of October 1935, “Contre-Attaque: Union de lutte des¶ intellectuals rkvolutionnaire.” Here, Bataille’s views played the major¶ formative role. To wit, a sanguinary fascination with revolutionary violence¶ occupied a distinct position of prominence: one of the group’s resolutions¶ emphasized that in order to insure public safety (“le salut publique”) an¶ “uncompromising dictatorship of the armed people” was required. Europe’s¶ political destiny would be determined by “the creation of a vast network of¶ disciplined and fanatical forces capable of exercising one day a merciless¶ dictatorship.” And in conclusion, the admiration for fascist ‘methods was¶ explicitly invoked: “The time has come for all of us to behave like masters¶ and to physically destroy the slaves of capitalism . . . we intend to make use¶ of the weapons created by fascism, which has known how to make use of the¶ Fundamental human aspiration for affective exaltation and fanaticism. ”75¶ The stress on revolutionary violence, on emulating an ethos of mastership,¶ The celebration of “affective exaltation and fanaticism,” of the emotional¶ side of mass politics that contemporary fascism had been able to exploit so¶ well - all represent key aspects of the ideology of left fascism as propagated¶ by Bataille at this time. As Allan Stoekl has remarked: “Effervescence, the¶ subversive violence of the masses, the baseness of their refusal to enter into¶ boring discussions - all these things, then, without a clear and correct (even¶ of boring) theory behind them, could easily be reversed into fascism, as¶ Bataille quickly became aware.”76 In the context at hand it is of more than¶ passing interest to note that the notion of a “revolt of the masters”¶ (“Herren-Aufstand”) was one of the key ideas of Ernst Jiinger’s prophetic,¶ conservative revolutionary classic, Der Arbeiter (1932) .77

#### It becomes justified by the aff and solidifies violence

Shaviro, 90 (Steven, PhD from Yale, professor at Wayne State University, former professor at University of Washington, “Passion and Excess,” The Florida State University Press, pg. 40, Tashma)

Bataille was not alone at this time in being driven to what might seem to be "metaphysical" extremes. Walter Benjamin—whose relation with Bataille and with Bataille’s colleagues in the College de Sociologie has still not been adequately explored—was also obsessed with the role of catastrophe (in Benjamin’s terms, "shock") as a crucial experience of modern capitalist culture. Shock, for Benjamin, is an overdetermined, intensely ambiguous, and inescapable moment of violent condensation. Abolishing traditional structures of subjectivity, it is a dominating instance of both actual oppression and possible liberation. Both the psychological devastation caused by the worker’s enslavement to the assembly line and the unleashing of subversive energies as a result of unchecked processes of mechanical reproduction may be seen (like the experience of the urban crowd) as repercussions of "the disintegration of the anra in the experience of shock” (lllumiizatmm, I94). And the traumatic, double-bind structure of "shock," the simultaneous necessity and impossibility of mastering it or finding some adequate response to it, leads to an extreme polarization of political alternatives, The most obvious and frightening reaction is the fascist aestheticization of politics, its apotheosis of violence in the shape of spectacle.

#### The 1ac’s theory of expenditure leads to fascism and promotes fascist thought

#### Methods – Bataille defended catastrophe as a reason why we should get rid of violent expenditure claiming we needed to have actualized shock to solve

#### b) Success Stories – Bataille thought only fascist revolutions were the only successful methods to challenge the democratic spirit and dismissed other options

#### Two impacts

#### No Solvency – they can’t solve for their affirmative because Bataille doesn’t agree that these types of theories of expenditure cannot be resolved with things like state actions but only revolutions can solve

#### 2. The State turns case – They justify riots and violence in order to truly get rid of expenditure – that’s our 2nd wolin ev- prefer it because it’s more specific to their method then they are

### 1NC – AT: Excess Framing

#### Excess does not come first –

#### a. Vote for the team that does the best debating, basing a round off of the question of excess is arbitrary and incentives judge intervention based on personal opinions. That means winning a 1% risk of extinction outweighs any other impact

#### b. Excess is NOT inevitable – Working towards ends does not mean we have found the most efficient method NOR does exclude focusing on how we expend, rather, voting negative is a NET HIGHER expenditure of excess because we blow billion on our budgets because we don’t try to achieve efficiency

#### c. No impact – Excess is wasted through expenditures, BUT a multitude of unproductive means of expelling excess exist and don’t’ necessitate war or infinite violence.

#### Framing policy around death is legitimate---working through is key to overcome powerlessness.

Macy 2K Joanna Macy, adjunct professor at the California Institute of Integral Studies, 2000, Environmental Discourse and Practice: A Reader, p. 243

The move to a wider ecological sense of self is in large part a function of the dangers that are threatening to overwhelm us. We are confronted by social breakdown, wars, nuclear proliferation, and the progressive destruction of our biosphere. Polls show that people today are aware that the world, as they know it, may come to an end. This loss of certainty that there will be a future is the pivotal psychological reality of our time. Over the past twelve years my colleagues and I have worked with tens of thousands of people in North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia, helping them confront and explore what they know and feel about what is happening to their world. The purpose of this work, which was first known as “Despair and Empowerment Work,” is to overcome the numbing and powerlessness that result from suppression of painful responses to massively painful realities. As their grief and fear for the world is allowed to be expressed without apology or argument and validated as a wholesome, life-preserving response, people break through their avoidance mechanisms, break through their sense of futility and isolation. Generally what they break through into is a larger sense of identity. It is as if the pressure of their acknowledged awareness of the suffering of our world stretches or collapses the culturally defined boundaries of the self. It becomes clear, for example, that the grief and fear experienced for our world and our common future are categorically different from similar sentiments relating to one’s personal welfare . This pain cannot be equated with dread of one’s own individual demise. Its source lies less in concerns for personal survival than in apprehensions of collective suffering – of what looms for human life and other species and unborn generations to come. Its nature is akin to the original meaning of compassion – “suffering with.” It is the distress we feel on behalf of the larger whole of which we are a part. And, when it is so defined, it serves as a trigger or getaway to a more encompassing sense of identity, inseparable from the web of life in which we are as intricately connected as cells in a larger body. This shift in consciousness is an appropriate, adaptive response. For the crisis that threatens our planet, be it seen in its military, ecological, or social aspects, derives from a dysfunctional and pathogenic notion of the self. It is a mistake about our place in the order of things. It is the delusion that the self is so separate and fragile that we must delineate and defend its boundaries, that it is so small and needy that we must endlessly

**Global inequality decreasing---cap is key.**

**Tupy 15** (Marian L [a senior policy analyst at the Cato Institute's Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity]; Stop obsessing about inequality. It's actually decreasing around the world; Jan 8; www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/01/08/stop-obsessing-about-inequality-its-actually-decreasing-around-the-world/)

Is **inequality** increasing or decreasing? The answer **depends on our point of reference.** In America, the income gap between the top 1 percent and the rest has grown. But **if we look** not **at** America, but **the world, inequality is shrinking. We are witnessing**, in the words of the World Bank’s Branko Milanovic, **“the first decline in global inequality between world citizens since the Industrial Revolution**.” For most of human history, incomes were more equal, but terribly low. Two thousand years ago, GDP per person in the most advanced parts of the world hovered around $3.50 per day. That was the global average 1,800 years later. But by the early 19th century, a pronounced income gap emerged between the West and the rest. Take the United States. In 1820, the U.S. was 1.9 times richer than the global average. The income gap grew to 4.1 in 1960 and reached its maximum level of 4.8 in 1999. By 2010, it had shrunk by 19 percent to 3.9. **That narrowing is not a function of declining Western incomes**. During the Great Recession, for example, U.S. GDP per capita decreased by 4.8 percent between 2007 and 2009**. It rebounded by 5.7 percent over the next 4 years and stands at an all-time high today**. Rather, the narrowing of the income gap is a result of growing incomes in the rest of the world. Consider the spectacular rise of Asia. In 1960, the U.S. was 11 times richer than Asia. Today, America is only 4.8 times richer than Asia. To understand why, let’s look at China. Between 1958 and 1961, Mao Zedong attempted to transform China’s largely agricultural economy into an industrial one through the “Great Leap Forward.” His stated goal was to overtake UK’s industrial production in 15 years. Industrialization, which included building of factories at home as well as large-scale purchases of machinery abroad, was to be paid for by food produced on collective farms. But the collectivization of agriculture resulted in famine that killed between 18 and 45 million people. Industrial initiatives, such as Mao’s attempt to massively increase production of steel, were equally disastrous. People burned their houses to stoke the fires of the steel mills and melted cooking wares to fulfil the steel production quotas. The result was destruction, rather than creation of wealth. Deng Xiaoping, Mao’s successor, partially privatized the farmland and allowed farmers to sell their produce. Trade liberalization ensured that Chinese industrial output would no longer be dictated by production quotas, but by the demands of the international economy. But **Following liberalization in 1978, China’s GDP per capita has increased 12.5 fold,** rising from $545 in 1980 to $6,807 in 2013. Over the same time period, the Chinese poverty rate fell from 84 percent to 10 percent. **What is true of China is also true in much of the developing world. As** Laurence Chandy and Geoffrey Gertz of the Brookings Institution wrote in 2011, “**poverty reduction of this magnitude is unparalleled in history: never before have so many people been lifted out of poverty over such a brief period of time.” Developing countries have made strides in other areas too**. Take life expectancy. Between 1960 and 2010, global life expectancy increased from 53 years to 70. In the U.S. over the same period it rose from 70 to 78**. Similar stories can be told about child and maternal mortality, treatment of communicable diseases, and the spread of technology. Many** Americans **point to globalization as a bogeyman,** robbing our country of good jobs and resources. But really, **the phenomenon has ushered a period of unprecedented prosperity in many poor countries**. Even as we struggle with economic problems at home let us remember the global – and largely positive – perspective on the state of the world.

**Cap solves climate change and alternatives only accelerate it**

---dismantling systems isn’t easy takes time, means warming accelerates in the interim

---causes wars because it forces political upheaval and people will fight to keep capitalism which is both offense and means alt fails

---US has decreased emissions now, sustainable energy like wind, solar, and hydro solve, our ev cites a report that looked at over 7000 cases says sustainable is competitive and will be adopted universally in 10 years

---during transition in order to beat the system, the movement would have to massively ramp up emissions to build weapons which locks in warming

**Smith 19** [Noah Smith Noah Smith is a Bloomberg Opinion columnist. He was an assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University, and he blogs at Noahpinion, “Dumping Capitalism Won’t Save the Planet”, April 5, 2019, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-04-05/capitalism-is-more-likely-to-limit-climate-change-than-socialism, DOA: 8/20/19] Ian M

public-private cooperation will do more to limit climate change than eco-socialism. It has become fashionable on social media and in certain publications to argue that capitalism is killing the planet. Even renowned investor Jeremy Grantham, hardly a radical, made that assertion last year. The basic idea is that the profit motive drives the private sector to spew carbon into the air with reckless abandon. Though many economists and some climate activists believe that the problem is best addressed by modifying market incentives with a carbon tax, many activists believe that the problem can’t be addressed without rebuilding the economy along centrally planned lines. The climate threat is certainly dire, and carbon taxes are unlikely to be enough to solve the problem. But eco-socialism is probably not going to be an effective method of addressing that threat. Dismantling an entire economic system is never easy, and probably would touch off armed conflict and major political upheaval. In the scramble to win those battles, even the socialists would almost certainly abandon their limitation on fossil-fuel use — either to support military efforts, or to keep the population from turning against them. The precedent here is the Soviet Union, whose multidecade effort to reshape its economy by force amid confrontation with the West led to profound environmental degradation. The world's climate does not have several decades to spare. Even without international conflict, there’s little guarantee that moving away from capitalism would mitigate our impact on the environment. Since socialist leader Evo Morales took power in Bolivia, living standards have improved substantially for the average Bolivian, which is great. But this has come at the cost of higher emissions. Meanwhile, the capitalist U.S managed to decrease its per capita emissions a bit during this same period (though since the U.S. is a rich country, its absolute level of emissions is much higher). **Doubting the Carbon-Capitalism Equation** In other words, in terms of economic growth and carbon emissions, Bolivia looks similar to more capitalist developing countries. That suggests that faced with a choice of enriching their people or helping to save the climate, even socialist leaders will often choose the former. And that same political calculus will probably hold in China and the U.S., the world’s top carbon emitters — leaders who demand draconian cuts in living standards in pursuit of environmental goals will have trouble staying in power. The best hope for the climate therefore lies in reducing the tradeoff between material prosperity and carbon emissions. That requires technology — solar, wind and nuclear power, energy storage, electric cars and other vehicles, carbon-free cement production and so on. The best [climate](https://techcrunch.com/2019/02/15/how-to-decarbonize-america-and-the-world/) policy [plans](https://www.dataforprogress.org/green-new-deal) all involve technological improvement as a key feature. Recent developments show that the technology-centered approach can work. A recent report by Bloomberg New Energy Finance analyzed about 7000 projects in 46 countries, and found that large drops in the cost of solar power from photovoltaic systems, wind power and lithium-ion batteries have made utility-scale renewable electricity competitive with fossil fuels. A 76 percent decline in the cost of energy for short-term battery storage since 2012 is especially important. In a blog post, futurist and energy writer Ramez Naam underscores the significance of these developments. Naam notes the important difference between renewables being cheap enough to outprice new fossil-fuel plants, and being inexpensive enough to undercut existing plants. The former is already the case across much of the world, which is among the reasons for an 84 percent decrease in the number of new coal-fired plants worldwide since 2015. But when it becomes cheaper to scrap existing fossil-fuel plants and build renewables in their place, it will allow renewables to start replacing coal and gas much more quickly. Naam cites examples from Florida and Indiana where this is already being done. He cites industry predictions that replacing existing fossil-fuel plants with renewables will be economically efficient almost everywhere at some point in the next decade. Electricity is far from the only source of carbon emissions — there’s also transportation, manufacturing (especially of steel and cement), home and office heating, and agriculture to worry about. But the rapid advance of solar technology is a huge victory in the struggle against climate change, because it will allow people all over the world to have electricity without cooking the planet. And how was this victory achieved? A combination of smart government policy and private industry. Massachusetts Institute of Technology researchers Goksin Kavlak, James McNerney and Jessika Trancik in a recent paper evaluated the factors behind the solar-price decline from 1980 to 2012. They concluded that from 1980 to 2001, government-funded research and development was the main factor in bringing down costs, but from 2001 to 2012, the biggest factor was economies of scale. These economies of scale were driven by private industry increasing output, but with government subsidies helping to increase the incentive to ramp up production. It’s apparent, therefore, that both government and profit-seeking enterprises have their roles to play. Government funds the development of early-stage technology and then helps push the private sector toward adopting those technologies, while private companies compete to find ever-cheaper methods of implementation. Instead of eco-socialism, it’s eco-industrialism. If there’s any system that can beat climate change, this looks like it.

**Growth forces structural changes that solve environmental damage**

Faik **Bilgili et al. 16**. \*\*PhD in Economics, The City University of New York and Istanbul University; professor of Economics, Erciyes University, Turkey. \*\* Emrah Kocak, Researcher, Evran University. \*\*Ümit Bulut, PhD in Economics, Gazi University and Professor of Economics, Ahi Evran University. “The dynamic impact of renewable energy consumption on CO2 emissions: A revisited Environmental Kuznets Curve approach.” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 54(Feb): 838-9. Emory Libraries.

Some seminal papers reveal that, **within the process of economic growth, environmental pollution level first scales up and later scales down**. This is **an inverted U-shaped relationship between GDP** per capita **and pollution level** (Grossman and Krueger [3,4], Panayotou [5], Shafik [6], Selden and Song [7]). Since this relationship resembles the relationship between GDP per capita and income inequality produced by Kuznets [8], Panayotou [5] calls it Environmental **Kuznets Curve (EKC)**. According to the EKC hypothesis, **the level of environmental pollution** initially intensifies because of economic growth, later **tampers after GDP per capita reaches a threshold value** (Panayotou [5], Suri and Chapman [9]; Stern [10]). Therefore, this hypothesis implies a dynamic process in which **structural change occurs together with economic growth** (Dinda [2]). Grossman and Krueger [3] first clarify how the EKC arises. They explore that **economic growth affects environmental quality through three channels:** (i) **scale effect,** (ii) **structural effect, and** (iii) **technological effect**. Fig. 1 presents the EKC within the periods of (i), (ii) and (iii). According to the scale effect, given the level of technology, more resources and inputs are employed to produce more commodities at the beginning of economic growth path. Hence, more energy resources and production will induce more waste and pollutant emissions, and the level of environmental quality will get worse (Torras and Boyce [11], Dinda [2], Prieur [12]). **The structural effect states that the economy will have a structural transformation, and economic growth will affect environment positively along with continuation of growth**. In other words, **as national production grows the structure of economy changes**, and **the share of less polluting economic activities increases gradually**. Besides, **an economy experiences a transition from capital-intensive industrial sectors to service sector and reaches technology-intensive knowledge economy** (the final stage of the structural change). Due to the fact **that technology-intensive sectors utilize fewer natural sources, the impact of these sectors on environmental pollution will be less**. The last channel of the growth process is the technological effect channel. **Since a high-income economy can allocate more resources for research and development expenditures, the new technological processes will emerge**. Thus, **the country will replace old and dirty technologies with new and clean technologies, and environmental quality will deepen** (Borghesi [13], Copelan and Taylor [14]). Consequently, **environmental pollution** initially increases and later **decreases as a result of scale, structural and technological effect emerging along with growth path**. Some studies of EKC hypothesis consider income elasticity of clean environment demand (Beckerman [15], Selden and Song [16], McConnel [17], Panayotou [18], Carson et al. [19], Brock and Taylor [20]). Accordingly, the share of low-income people’s expenditures for food and basic necessities is higher than that of high-income societies’ expenditures for the same type of commodities (Engel’s Law). **As income level and life standards rise in conjunction with economic growth, the societies’ demand for clean environment advances**. Besides, **societies make often pressure on policy makers to protect the environment through new regulations**. One might argue that, because of these reasons, clean environment is a luxury commodity and the **demand elasticity of clean environment is higher than unity** (Dinda [2]).

**We’re past the tipping point – but carbon capture is attainable and solves**

**Mack 19** (Eric Mack, May 28, 2019, “Carbon positive: Turning a planetary pollutant into an asset”, Nesta, https://www.nesta.org.uk/feature/tipping-point/carbon-positive-turning-planetary-pollutant-asset/)

Last year, **the International Panel on Climate Change estimated** in a widely publicised and disturbing report that to avoid catastrophic change **we must not only drastically reduce our carbon dioxide output, but also begin actively pulling about 20 billion metric tons of CO2 out of the atmosphere each year** (IPCC, 2018). A suite of technologies known as “**carbon capture and utilisation” could go a long way** towards addressing the second part of the equation. While the name may sound drab and technical, these innovations could be one of our most powerful levers in addressing climate change. With justifiable scepticism about our collective ability and will to reduce emissions quickly enough, **carbon capture may be needed to stave off runaway climate change.** And even if it isn’t, there’s still a long-term need to get excess CO2 out of the system, a process that could take an extremely long time if left to nature’s depleted capacities. As “carbon wrangler” Julio Friedmann wrote in 2018: “We have a moral responsibility to clean up our mess and restore the world’s atmosphere to how we found it.” The basic concept behind capturing CO2 is to move vast amounts of air through a filter or solution that traps the carbon dioxide molecules. From there, it can be stored, used as-is or converted to a more useful molecule with the help of a little chemistry. Considerable attention has been paid to the idea of **simply burying it underground**: the idea that we can put it to good use has been comparatively neglected. But it is starting to gain traction. A **recent proposal suggests that the world’s air conditioners could also double as carbon capture systems, collecting CO2 and water vapor from the air** (Dittmeyer, R, et.al. 2019). Simple electrolysis can peel H2 off the water and combine it with carbon dioxide to locally produce hydrocarbon fuel using the Fischer-Tropsch process. Laboratory experiments have also used captured CO2, electricity and a little lithium to create carbon nanofibers (Ren, J., et.al. 2015) that **can be used in the manufacture of everything from better batteries and golf clubs to aircraft.** Climeworks is one of a handful of companies that has taken similar technology beyond the lab and is already pulling CO2 directly from the air. The Swiss start-up has set the ambitious goal of removing one per cent of global carbon dioxide emissions by 2025. The company’s small, modular direct air capture system is up and running in Switzerland and other locations in Europe, including a small demonstration unit in Italy that will capture 150 tons of CO2 per year to be converted into natural gas fuel. **Canada’s Carbon Engineering has also been capturing CO2 for several years, converting it into liquid fuels that could be used in today’s cars, trucks and even commercial jets.** CEO Steve Oldham claims the **technology can be “scaled up to capture gigatons of CO2 directly from the atmosphere**… we’re now ready to move into much larger scale.” The company published a breakdown of its technology in a peer-reviewed journal last year (Keith, 2018), and is aiming to scale up enough to pull a gigaton of CO2 from the air per year – more than two per cent of what the world emits in the same time-span.

**Aff causes transition wars**---links especially hard to the thesis that people are hardwired.

Lee **Harris 3**. Analyst – Hoover Institution. 2003. “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing.” Hoover Instituion. Policy Review. http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html.

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, **the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus** and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. **No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself,** **and it is utopian to think that any ever will**. Therefore, **in order to achieve the goal of socialism**, **nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means**, in point of fact, **a full-fledged civil war** not just within one society, but **across the globe**. **Without this catastrophic upheaval, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order** and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

**Transition wars cause extinction**

**Nyquist 5.** J.R. renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations, WorldNetDaily contributing editor, “The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash,” February 4, www.financialsense.com/stormw...2005/0204.html

Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America’s strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the **U**nited **S**tates from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth’s surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet’s economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs.

#### Bataille and his theories are hypermasculine for a laundry list of reasons

Brintnall 15 (J.D., Northeastern University School of Law; M.A., Pacific School of Religion; Ph.D., Emory University, director of the Graduate Certificate Program in Gender, Sexuality & Women’s Studies, More Credentials: <https://clas-pages.uncc.edu/kent-brintnall/>), 8-3-15 , (Kent, Negative Ecstasies: Georges Bataille and the Study of Religion, 79)

To conclude, I would like to suggest that the example of Tantra in north-eastern India not only illustrates the ways in which Bataille’s work can be used to shed light on South Asian materials to critique and rethink certain aspects of Bataille. The best use of Bataille—or of any modern theoretical approach, I would argue – is not just a simplistic application of his work to other historical and cultural examples but rather a more critical dialogue in which both sides are transformed by the encounter. Perhaps the most significantly, the case of Assamese Tantra highlights an important tension and ambivalence in Bataille’s otherwise very useful insights into the dynamics of sexuality, violence, and trasnsgression. On the one hand, Bataille clearly emphasizes the radical, orgiastic nature of sexuality and transgression, the power of erotism to dissolve and shatter fixed individual identities. Yet on the other hand, as various feminist critics have observed, Bataille’s work is also largely focus on male and phallic sexuality, to the general exclusion of female, nonphallic eroticism. Not only does Bataille share with other French theorists such as Michel Foucault a certain “gender blindness” and a lack of attention to the ways in which male and female erotic experience is constructed differently in different historical and cultural contexts; more fundamentally, many critics have argued, he reflects a clear masculine bias and a general tendency to treat women as passive objects and victims. As Ladellle McWhorter observes, most feminists find Bataille “disturbing and, to varying degrees, anti-feminist if not misogynist. A cursory reading of almost any of his texts at any stage of his career gives ample reason for this assessment…. Bataille’s perspectives on the world was that of a heterosexual male, and all too often that perspective valorizes itself, seemingly to the exclusion of all others, so that Bataille begins to sound like a heterosexist masculine supremacist.”