# 1AC

### Advocacy

I advocate just governments ought to require employers pay a living wage.

I am willing to specify in cross-ex.

Living wage is indexed to cost of living.

LWAC 6 Living Wage Action Coalition (a coalition for action on living wage). “Campus Living Wage Resources: What’s a Living Wage?” May 1st, 2006. http://www.livingwageaction.org/resources\_lw.htm

What's a Living Wage? A living wage is a decent wage. It affords the earner and her or his family the most basic costs of living without need for government support or poverty programs. With a living wage an individual can take pride in her work and enjoy the decency of a life beyond poverty, beyond an endless cycle of working and sleeping, beyond the ditch of poverty wages. A living wage is a complete consideration of the cost of living. **Wages vary according to location, as costs of living vary.** A living wage in rural Louisiana is around $9.33, while in Washington, DC it's closer to $15 an hour. (learn how to calculate a living wage here: Living Wage 101) **A living wage** as opposed to the federal poverty line, **takes into account** the many **necessary factors in calculating** the **actual costs in a specific geographic area**. Both the Economic Policy Institute’s “Basic Family Budget” and Wider Opportunities for Women’s “Self Sufficiency Standard” use thorough research into the seven components of the cost of living to arrive at similar minimum incomes. You would do best to read the two organizations’ own descriptions and detail of their data and approach, but both are summarized here.

### Adv 1 = Income Inequality

Raise in minimum wage is key addressing wage inequality-multiple statistical analyses confirm.

Gindling and Terrell 4 T.H. Gindling (University of Maryland, Baltimore County) and Katherine Terrell (University of Michigan, CEPR, WDI and IZA Bonn) “Minimum Wages, Inequality and Globalization” IZA DP No. 1160 May 2004 <http://repec.iza.org/dp1160.pdf> JW 2/22/15

The results of the estimates of equation (2) are also reported in Table 4. In the equation estimated using data on workers without higher education, the coefficient β1 is positive (0.432) and significant. In the equation estimated with data on workers with higher education, the coefficient β 1 is also positive (0.817) and significant. These results provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that the reduction in the inequality of minimum wages for workers with and without higher education caused a reduction in the inequality of actual wages for each of these categories workers. In the equation estimated using data on both workers without and without higher education, the coefficient β 1 is positive (0.245) but not significant The literature on the impact of minimum wages on inequality has generally analyzed the impact of changes in the “minimum minimum wage” (rather than the dispersion of minimum wages) on wage inequality. The argument generally made is that an increase in the minimum minimum wage will increase the wages of the lowest-paid workers, and therefore reduce the inequality of wages by truncating the left tail of the distribution. To test this hypothesis, we estimate an equation similar to equation (2), but that includes the log of real minimum minimum wage (lnMinMWit) as an independent variable rather than the standard deviation of the log of minimum wages: 0 1 it γtYRt μit T t 1 SD Wit ln MinMW Σ + = (ln ) = β + A negative and significant coefficient on the real minimum minimum wage variable would provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that an increase in the minimum minimum wage reduces inequality in actual wages. We estimate this equation with data on all workers and less educated workers and present the results in Table 4. In both cases, the coefficient on the real minimum minimum wage is positive and insignificant. These findings allows us to reject the hypothesis that an increase in the minimum minimum wage causes a reduction in inequality in actual wages in Costa Rica. Finally, to examine the relative impacts of changes in the dispersion and the levels of minimum wages, we estimate an equation that includes both the standard deviation of the log of the minimum wage and the real value of the minimum minimum wage as independent variables: (ln ) 0 1 (ln ) 2 it γtYRt μit . T t 1 SD Wit SD MWit ln MinMW Σ + = = β + β + β + (4) coefficients confirm our previous results. That is, they provide evidence that changes in the dispersion of minimum wages are positively and significantly correlated with the changes in the dispersion of the wages of workers without higher education, while changes in the real minimum minimum wage do not have statistically significant effects on the dispersion of wages. This finding is important since many studies use the level of the minimum wage as an explanatory factor in their analysis of the rising skilled to unskilled wage ratio over time (e.g., Bell, 1997 and Cortez, 2001). Whereas the minimum wage can increase the average wage, it is not clear that it should reduce dispersion. And when only one minimum wage is used in cases when there are multiple minimum wage (as in the case of studies of Mexico, e.g. Bell, 1997), then it is not surprising that there are no significant results. In Table 4, we present the coefficient estimates of β1 and β2 from estimating equations (4) using data for all workers and for less educated workers, separately. These estimated In summary, we show that Costa Rica experienced rising wage inequality in the 1990s, during the period it opened its economy to global forces. We know from Robbins and Gindling (1999) that the rise in the relative wages of more skilled workers in Costa Rica could be attributed in part to rising demand for more skilled workers due to trade liberalization. Work by Gindling and Trejos (2003) finds a number of other factors that can also help explain rising earnings inequality (including changes in the levels or supply of education) but notes there is a large part of the change in inequality that they cannot explain with such variables as education, gender, region, hours worked or job characteristics. In this paper, we test whether minimum wage legislation is part of the missing story. Our examination of Costa Rica’s complex minimum wage structure and its dynamics suggested three hypotheses: (1) The increase in the gap between the minimum wages of workers with and without higher education cause the gap between the actual wages of workers with and without higher education to increase (and therefore cause an increase in wage inequality); (2) The reduction in the inequality of minimum wages for workers without higher education cause a reduction in the inequality of actual wages for these workers; and (3) The reduction in the inequality of minimum wages for workers with higher education cause a reduction in the inequality of actual wages for these workers. We find that the evidence supports [this] each of these three hypotheses. The level of minimum MW was not found to be important in affecting the dispersion of wages. It was expected that the minimum minimum would truncate the left tale of the earnings distribution and as such lower inequality. However, in a complex system such as that in Costa Rica (or Mexico and Argentina), it is not clear the either the minimum MW or the average MW should affect the distribution since there are a multitude of wages that can affect the distribution at higher levels. Nevertheless, since many studies have used this variable in trying to explain changes in earnings inequality, we thought it worthwhile testing for it as well. In sum, the structure of minimum wages matters, and we found it contributes to wage inequality in Costa Rica. This suggests that countries with an interest in mitigating inequality arising from trade liberalization have the levers to do so with a multiple minimum wage policy. In Costa Rica, the reduction in the inequality of legal minimum wages from 1987 to 1992 contributed to a decline in actual wage inequality, mitigating the disequalizing impact of the trade liberalization (found by Robbins and Gindling, 1999). However, when the addition of legal minimum wages for university-educated workers in 1993 increased the gap between the minimum wages of worker with and without higher education, changes in the structure of minimum wages contributed to an increase in wage inequality.

International living wage is key.

Shirkosh 5 Mehdi Shirkosh (University of Western Sydney) “The Case for an International Minimum Wage in the Context of Free Trade.” MPRA Paper No. 2463 January 2005 http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2463/1/MPRA\_paper\_2463.pdf

The approach taken in this study is that an “international wage standard” is necessary for an increasingly globalised economy. Minimum wage standards have been established in the industrial countries from the late nineteenth century but few theorists have examined this measure as a global solution for unemployment, poverty and economic recession. **An international solution is important** in a world **where national economies are increasingly becoming** more **interdependent**, making it more difficult to maintain a welfare state in the framework of the national state. The hypothesis in this study is that **labour standards** (rights) **need to be integrated into the globalisation process via an international minimum** wage implemented through international organisations and free trade agreements. In effect this will bring the benefits of Keynesian theories on effective demand to the global economy. In other words, **an increase in minimum wages** around the world **will modify the income gap** **and increase consumption**, increase health and education of the masses across the globe **and**, thus, **their productivity**. In other words, **increased effective demand will reduce overcapacity and economic recession in the global economy**. The focus of the thesis is on the determination of wage standards in the world economy, looking primarily at the minimum wage standards in the developing countries as a minimum wage standard is clearly related to minimum wages in these low wage countries. The thesis will propose that the world economy (both industrial and third world countries) would benefit from **a global wage standard** as this **would increase** the masses’ **income and** therefore world aggregate **demand**, **which would in turn increase world production and growth.** The argument of the thesis is developed on the basis of the labour theory of value and the Keynesian theory of effective demand. Key alternate approaches to the determination of wages under capitalism will be discussed. The experiences of NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement) will then be used to test two of these approaches (Heckscher-Ohlin theory and unequal exchange theory) against recent historical evidence.

Living wage is key to bargaining power. Counterplans can’t solve.

**NYT 14** New York Times Editorial Board. “The Case for a Higher Minimum Wage.” February 8th, 2014. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/09/opinion/sunday/the-case-for-a-higher-minimum-wage.html

WHAT’S THE POINT OF THE MINIMUM WAGE? Most people think of the minimum wage as the lowest legal hourly pay. That’s true, but it is really much more than that. As defined in the name of the law that established it — the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 — the minimum wage is a fundamental labor standard designed to protect workers, just as child labor laws and overtime pay rules do. Labor standards, like environmental standards and investor protections, are essential to a functional economy. Properly set and enforced, these standards check exploitation, pollution and speculation. In the process, they promote broad and rising prosperity, as well as public confidence. The **minimum wage** is specifically intended to **take aim at the** inherent **imbalance in power between employers and low-wage workers** that can push wages down to poverty levels. **A**n appropriate **wage floor** set by Congress effectively **substitutes for** the **bargaining power that low-wage workers lack**. **When low-end wages rise, poverty and inequality are reduced**. But that doesn’t mean the minimum wage is a government program to provide welfare, as critics sometimes imply in an attempt to link it to unpopular policies. An hourly minimum of $10.10, for example, as Democrats have proposed, would reduce the number of people living in poverty by 4.6 million, according to widely accepted research, without requiring the government to tax, borrow or spend. IS THERE AN ALTERNATIVE? No. **Other programs, including** food stamps, Medicaid and the **e**arned-**i**ncome **t**ax **c**redit, also **increase** the meager **resources** of low-wage workers, **but they do not provide bargaining power to claim a better wage**. In fact, they can drive wages down, because employers who pay poorly factor the government assistance into their wage scales. This is especially true of the earned-income tax credit, a taxpayer-provided wage subsidy that helps lift the income of working families above the poverty line. Conservatives often call for increases to the **E.I.T.C.** instead of a higher minimum wage, saying that a higher minimum acts as an unfair and unwise tax on low-wage employers. That’s a stretch, especially in light of rising corporate profits even as pay has dwindled. It also ignores how the tax credit **increases** the supply of **low-wage labor by encouraging more people to work, holding down** the **cost of labor for employers**. By one estimate, increasing the tax credit by 10 percent reduces the wages of high-school educated workers by 2 percent. There are good reasons to expand the tax credit for childless workers, as President Obama recently proposed. It is a successful antipoverty program and a capstone in the conservative agenda to emphasize work over welfare. But an expanded E.I.T.C. is no reason to stint on raising the minimum wage — just the opposite. **A higher minimum wage could** help **offset the wage-depressing effect of a bolstered E.I.T.C**., and would ensure that both taxpayers and employers do their part to make work pay.

Bargaining power is key to solve income inequality

**Gupta 15** Sarita Gupta (executive director of Jobs with Justice). “Protect and Expand Workers’ Ability to Bargain.” Moyers and Company. January 20th, 2015. http://billmoyers.com/2015/01/20/protect-expand-workers-ability-bargain/

**Greedy corporations** have been on a decades-long bender to **take advantage of working people — depressing wages, benefits and job standards, which has led to record inequality** and poverty. At Jobs With Justice, we believe that **fighting poverty requires expanding** and protecting **the ability of workers to bargain with their employers** to demand higher wages, better working conditions and better living standards. As the nature of work changes, we look at collective bargaining through the union workplace campaign lens, but also through nontraditional forms, including legislative, policy, rulemaking and industry-wide interventions that put more money in workers’ pockets and improve standards and conditions for workers. **Only through bargaining do workers have** the **power to directly confront** the **corporate actors behind poverty and inequality**.

### Warming

Scenario A is warming. Warming is anthropogenic and on the rise. The newest evidence confirms.

**Freedman 15** Andrew Freedman (Masters in Climate and Society from Columbia University, and a Masters in Law and Diplomacy from The Fletcher School at Tufts University). “Study unearths impacts of our growing carbon emissions — and it's not pretty.” Mashable. February 25th, 2015. http://mashable.com/2015/02/25/greenhouse-effect-surface-data/

**Scientists** have directly **confirmed** what they have long assumed to be true: **Increasing** amounts of **g**reen**h**ouse **g**ase**s** in the atmosphere, such as carbon dioxide, **are trapping heat** from escaping back into space **and** are thereby **causing** global **warming**. The observations of what is known as radiative forcing were made over the course of 11 years between 2000 and 2010 from two locations in North America, in Oklahoma and the North Slope of Alaska. Highly specialized instruments in both locations were used to measure thermal infrared energy fluctuations and analyze the source of such changes. SEE ALSO: The white-hot beauty of Iceland in 11 stunning photos **The study**, published Wednesday in the advance online edition of the journal Nature, explores the Earth's energy account balance. It **found that over time, the planet is running a surplus of energy** at the surface, **causing global** air and ocean **temperatures to increase** with a wide variety of mostly negative impacts. Before this study, scientists already knew that the energy balance was tilted in the direction of a growing surplus, but they lacked precise measurements at the surface. **The researchers were** also **able to trace this** energy **surplus mainly to manmade emissions of carbon dioxide and** other greenhouse gases through the **burning of fossil fuels** such as coal and oil, as well as forest fires. The research provides observational evidence that the increased heating of the atmosphere during the period was due in large part to the increase in carbon dioxide concentrations at the time. The study found that the 22 parts per million increase in carbon dioxide during this period caused the amount of energy absorbed at the Earth's surface to increase by about two-tenths of a Watt per square meter per decade. "We see, for the first time in the field, the amplification of the greenhouse effect because there's more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere to absorb what the Earth emits in response to incoming solar radiation," Daniel Feldman, a scientist in Berkeley Lab's Earth Sciences Division and lead author of the study, said in a press release. "Numerous studies show rising atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations, but our study provides the critical link between those concentrations and the addition of energy to the system, or the greenhouse effect," Feldman added. Earth's energy surplus is growing **The study's findings confirm longtime predictions as well as observations** of a manmade enhancement of the greenhouse effect, and also help to reinforce the results of many climate models that are predicated in part on accurately simulating the effects of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Income inequality causes warming-2 internal links.

1. Work Hours. Income inequality makes it difficult to work less; that causes GHG emissions. Wage increases solve.

**Cha 13** Mijin Cha (staff writer). “How Income Inequality Contributes to Climate Change.” Demos. February 8th, 2013. http://www.demos.org/blog/how-income-inequality-contributes-climate-change

Here’s another reason why **income inequality is** so destructive—it’s ruining our planet and **increasing** the severity of **climate change**. A new paper from the Center on Economic and Policy Research looks at a novel way to slow climate change: reduce the hours that we work. For reasons that are not entirely understood, **shorter work hours are linked with lower g**reen**h**ouse **g**as **emissions**. By just reducing the annual work hours by 0.5 percent for the rest of the century, one-quarter to one-half of global warming not locked in -- i.e. the warming that will already occur due to the 1990 levels of greenhouse gases already in the atmosphere -- would be eliminated. Unfortunately, the **high** level of income **inequality makes reducing work hours** very **difficult** in the U.S. Between 1973-2007, nearly two-thirds of all income gains went to just the top 1 percent of households. This very small minority of households could have their work hours reduced and absorb the accompanying decrease in pay. The vast majority of households, however, are working more hours and increasing productivity, but seeing a reduction in take home pay. As my colleague Joe Hines detailed, workers are increasing hours and output, but seeing their pay fall. **With** this level of **economic insecurity, workers cannot afford to work less**, even if it is better for the climate. ﻿ Americans already work many more hours more per year than western European countries. In 2005, Western European work hours per person were roughly 50 percent less than the U.S. The average German worker works 20 percent less per year than the average American. The greenhouse gas emissions per capita in America is nearly twice that of Germany. Again, the reasons for this relationship is not entirely clear but reduced work hours increases **leisure time**, which **gives people more time to cook, versus eating out, or walk, instead of drive**, and other sustainable practices. **Working less could** also **decrease commuting time and carbon footprint**. Unfortunately, only a few households can currently afford to work less and have more free time. **Increasing wages for the average worker is** not only good for our economy, it’s **good for our planet.**

2. Business compliance. Income inequality kills business compliance with international environmental agreements-those are uniquely key to solve warming.

**Wilkinson and Pickett 10** Richard Wilkinson (Professor Emeritus of Social Epidemiology at the University of Nottingham, retired in 2008) and Kate Pickett (Professor of Epidemiology in the Department of Health Sciences at the University of York and was a National Institute for Health Research Career Scientist from 2007-2012). “The impact of income inequalities on sustainable development in London.” Greater London Authority, March 2010.

**More Equal Societies are Greener** As well as helping to reduce consumerism, strengthening community life and enabling societies to respond more cohesively to crises, evidence shows that greater equality also leads people to treat environmental issues more seriously. **Because community life is stronger and people trust each other more** in more equal societies, they also seem to be more public spirited and more willing to work together towards shared objectives. The conflict between self and society is perhaps less stark and **people are more likely to do things** they feel are **for** the **public benefit**. Support for environmental policies is a sensitive indicator of the balance between feeling that life is about the pursuit of self-interests in opposition to the wider society, and the pursuit of common interests. Based on **data from the World Economic Forum**, Figure 25 **shows that business leaders in more equal countries regard complying with international environmental agreements as more important** than do their counterparts in less equal societies. **Believing that it is important to comply with international** environmental **agreements is** of course **essential if the world is to respond adequately to** the challenge of **climate change**.

Warming causes extinction from Earth exploding.

**Chalko 4** Dr. Tom J. Chalko, MSc, PhD (Head of Geophysics Division, Scientific E Research P/L, Mt Best, Australia). “No second chance? Can Earth explode as a result of Global Warming?” NU Journal of Discovery. Revised October 30th, 2004. http://nujournal.net/core.pdf

**Consequences of** global **warming are** far more **serious** than previously imagined. **The REAL danger** for our entire civilization **comes** not from slow climate changes, but **from overheating of the planetary interior. Life** on Earth **is possible** only **because of** the **efficient cooling of the** planetary **interior** - a process that is **limited primarily by the atmosphere**. This cooling is responsible for a thermal balance between the heat from the core reactor, the heat from the Sun and the radiation of heat into space, so that the average temperature on Earth’s surface is about 13 degrees Celsius. This article examines the possibility of **overheating and** the **“meltdown” of the solid planetary core due to** the atmospheric pollution trapping progressively more solar heat (**the** so-called **greenhouse effect**) and reducing the cooling rate of the planetary interior. The most serious consequence of such a ”meltdown” could be centrifugal segregation of unstable isotopes in the molten part of the spinning planetary core. Such segregation **can “enrich”** the **nuclear fuel in the core** to the point of **creating conditions for** a chain reaction and a **gigantic atomic explosion**. Will Earth become another ”asteroid belt” in the Solar system? It is common knowledge (experiencing seasons) that solar heat is the dominant factor that determines temperatures on the surface of Earth. Under the polar ice however, the contribution of solar heat is minimal and this is where the increasing contribution of the heat from the planetary interior can be seen best. Rising polar ocean temperatures and melting polar ice caps should therefore be the first symptoms of overheating of the inner core reactor. While politicians and businessmen debate the need for reducing greenhouse emissions and take pride to evade accepting any responsibility, the process of overheating the inner core reactor has already begun - polar oceans have become warmer and polar caps have begun to melt. Do we have enough imagination, intelligence and integrity to comprehend the danger before the situation becomes irreversible? **There will be NO SECOND CHANCE...**

### Food Security

Scenario B is food security.

Income inequality causes famine and societal collapse. We’re close to the brink-policy actions must be taken.

**Motesharrei et al 14** Safa Motesharrei and Eugenia Kalnay (University of Maryland researchers) and Jorge Rivas (University of Minnesota researcher). “Human and nature dynamics (HANDY): Modeling inequality and use of resources in the collapse or sustainability of societies.” Science Direct. May 2014. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800914000615

The scenarios most closely reflecting the reality of our world today are found in the third group of experiments (see the scenarios for an unequal society in Section 5.3), where we introduced economic stratification. Under such conditions, we find that collapse is difficult to avoid, which helps to explain why **economic stratification is** one of the elements **recurrently found in** past **collapsed societies**. Importantly, in the first of these unequal society scenarios, 5.3.1, the solution appears to be on a sustainable path for quite a long time, but even using an optimal depletion rate (δ\*) and starting with a very small number of Elites, the **Elites eventually consume too much, resulting in** a **famine among Commoners that** eventually **causes** the **collapse of society**. It is important to note that this Type-L **collapse is due to** an **inequality-induced famine that causes** a **loss of workers**, rather than a collapse of Nature. Despite appearing initially to be the same as the sustainable optimal solution obtained in the absence of Elites, economic stratification changes the final result: Elites' consumption keeps growing until the society collapses. The Mayan collapse – in which population never recovered even though nature did recover – is an example of a Type-L collapse, whereas the collapses in the Easter Island and the Fertile Crescent – where nature was depleted – are examples of a Type-N collapse. In scenario 5.3.2, with a larger depletion rate, the decline of the Commoners occurs faster, while the Elites are still thriving, but eventually the Commoners collapse completely, followed by the Elites. It is important to note that in both of these scenarios, the **Elites – due to their wealth – do not suffer** the **detrimental effects of** the **environmental collapse until** much **later than** the **Commoners. This** buffer of wealth **allows Elites to continue “business as usual” despite** the **impending catastrophe**. It is likely that this is an important mechanism that would help explain how historical collapses were allowed to occur by elites who appear to be oblivious to the catastrophic trajectory (most clearly apparent in the Roman and Mayan cases). This buffer effect is further reinforced by the long, apparently sustainable trajectory prior to the beginning of the collapse. While some members of society might raise the alarm that the system is moving towards an impending collapse and therefore advocate structural changes to society in order to avoid it, **Elites and their supporters**, who opposed making these changes, **could point to the** long **sustainable trajectory “so far” in support of doing nothing**. The final two scenarios in this set of experiments, 5.3.3 and 5.3.4, are designed to indicate the kinds of policies needed to avoid this catastrophic outcome. They show that, in the context of economic stratification, **inequality must be greatly reduced** and population growth must be maintained below critical levels in order **to avoid** a **societal collapse** (Daly, 2008).

Famine-induced societal collapse causes resource conflicts-outweighs other war impacts on probability.

**Vidal 12** John Vidal (the Guardian's environment editor) “UN warns of looming worldwide food crisis in 2013” The Guardian October 13th 2012 http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2012/oct/14/un-global-food-crisis-warning

"We've not been producing as much as we are consuming. That is why stocks are being run down. Supplies are now very tight across the world and reserves are at a very low level, leaving no room for unexpected events next year," said Abdolreza Abbassian, a senior economist with the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). **With** food **consumption exceeding the amount grown for** six of **the past 11 years, countries have run down reserves** from an average of 107 days of consumption 10 years ago to under 74 days recently. **Prices of** main food crops such as **wheat** and maize **are now close to those that sparked riots in 25 countries in** 20**08**. FAO figures released this week suggest that 870 million people are malnourished and the food crisis is growing in the Middle East and Africa. Wheat production this year is expected to be 5.2% below 2011, with yields of most other crops, except rice, also falling, says the UN. The figures come as one of the world's leading environmentalists issued a warning that the global food supply system could collapse at any point, leaving hundreds of millions more people hungry, sparking widespread riots and bringing down governments. In a shocking new assessment of the prospects of meeting food needs, Lester Brown, president of the Earth policy research centre in Washington, says that the climate is no longer reliable and the demands for food are growing so fast that a breakdown is inevitable, unless urgent action is taken. "**Food shortages undermined** earlier **civilisations**. We are on the same path. **Each country is now fending for itself**. The world is living one year to the next," he writes in a new book. According to Brown, **we are seeing the start of a food supply breakdown with a dash** by speculators **to "grab" millions of** square **miles of** cheap **farmland**, the **doubling** of international **food prices** in a decade, and the dramatic rundown of countries' food reserves. This year, for the sixth time in 11 years, the world will consume more food than it produces, largely because of extreme weather in the US and other major food-exporting countries. Oxfam last week said that the price of key staples, including wheat and rice, may double in the next 20 years, threatening disastrous consequences for poor people who spend a large proportion of their income on food. In 2012, according to the FAO, food prices are already at close to record levels, having risen 1.4% in September following an increase of 6% in July. "We are entering a new era of rising food prices and spreading hunger. Food supplies are tightening everywhere and land is becoming the most sought-after commodity as the world shifts from an age of food abundance to one of scarcity," says Brown. "The geopolitics of food is fast overshadowing the geopolitics of oil." His warnings come as the UN and world governments reported that extreme heat and drought in the US and other major food-exporting countries had hit harvests badly and sent prices spiralling. "The situation we are in is not temporary. These things will happen all the time. Climate is in a state of flux and there is no normal any more. "We are beginning a new chapter. We will see food unrest in many more places. "**Armed aggression is no longer the principal threat to our future**. The overriding threats to this century are climate change, population growth, spreading water shortages and rising food prices," Brown says.

Communal conflicts are 100% probable.

Brinkman and Hendrix 11 Henk-Jan Brinkman (Chief, Policy, Planning and Application in the Peacebuilding Support Office of the United Nations.) and Cullen S. Hendrix (Assistant Professor, The College of William & Mary, and Fellow, Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin) “Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges” World Food Programme Occasional Paper n° 24 July 2011 <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp238358.pdf> JW 2/21/15

Civil conflict is the prevalent type of armed conflict in the world today (Harbom and Wallersteen, 2010). It is almost exclusively a phenomenon of countries with low levels of economic development and high levels of food insecurity. Sixty-five percent of the world’s food-insecure people live in seven countries: India, China, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Bangladesh, Indonesia, Pakistan and Ethiopia (FAO, 2010), of which all but China have experienced civil conflict in the past decade, with DRC, Ethiopia, India and Pakistan currently embroiled in civil conflicts. Pinstrup-Andersen and Shimokawa (2008) find that poor health and nutrition [is] are associated with greater probability of civil conflict, though their findings are based on small sample sizes. Countries with lower per capita caloric intake are more prone to experience civil conflict, even accounting for their levels of economic development (Sobek and Boehmer, 2009). This relationship is stronger in those states where primary commodities make up a large proportion of their export profile. Some of the countries most plagued by conflict in the past 20 years are commodity-rich countries characterized by widespread hunger, such as Angola, DRC, Papua New Guinea and Sierra Leone. The mixture of hunger – which creates grievances – and the availability of valuable commodities – which can provide opportunities for rebel funding – is a volatile combination.

Food insecurity causes inter-state wars.

Brinkman and Hendrix 11 Henk-Jan Brinkman (Chief, Policy, Planning and Application in the Peacebuilding Support Office of the United Nations.) and Cullen S. Hendrix (Assistant Professor, The College of William & Mary, and Fellow, Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin) “Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges” World Food Programme Occasional Paper n° 24 July 2011 <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp238358.pdf> JW 2/21/15

The links between food insecurity and interstate war are less direct. While countries often go to war over territory, previous research has not focused directly on access to food or productive agricultural land as a major driver of conflict (Hensel, 2000). However, wars have been waged to reduce demographic pressures arising from the scarcity of arable land, the clearest examples being the move to acquire Lebensraum (“living space”) that motivated Nazi Germany’s aggression toward Poland and Eastern Europe (Hillgruber, 1981) and Japan’s invasion of China and Indochina (Natsios and Doley, 2009). Water, for drinking and for agriculture, is also a cause of conflict (Klare, 2002). Countries that share river basins are more likely to go to war than are other countries that border one another (Toset et al., 2000; Gleditsch et al., 2006). This relationship is strongest in countries with low levels of economic development. Institutions that manage conflicts over water and monitor and enforce agreements can significantly reduce the risk of war (Postel and Wolf, 2001). Jared Diamond (1997) has argued that for centuries military power was built on agricultural production. Zhang et al. (2007) show that long-term fluctuations in the prevalence of war followed cycles of temperature change over the period 1400–1900 CE, with more war during periods of relatively cooler temperatures and thus lower agricultural productivity and greater competition for resources. Similar findings linking cooler periods with more war have been established for Europe between 1000 and 1750 CE (Tol and Wagner, 2008).

Food wars go nuclear.

**Cribb 14** Julian, “Human extinction: it is possible?” Sydney Morning Herald, Published: April 2, 2014, p. http://www.smh.com.au/comment/human-extinction-it-is-possible-20140402-zqpln.html

However our own behaviour is liable to be a far more immediate determinant of human survival or extinction. Above two degrees – which we have already locked in – the world’s **food harvest is going to become increasingly unreliable**, as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change warned this week. **That means** mid-century **famines in** places like **India, China, the Middle East and Africa**. But what scientists cannot predict is how humans living in the tropics and subtropics will respond to this form of stress. So let us turn to the strategic and military think tanks, who like to explore such scenarios, instead. The Age of Consequences study by the US Centre for Strategic and International Studies says that under a 2.6 degree rise “nations around the world will be overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The **internal cohesion** of nations **will be under** great **stress**…as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world… has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities. **Armed conflict** between nations **over resources**… **is likely and nuclear war is possible**. The social consequences range from increased religious fervour to outright chaos.” Of five degrees – which the world is on course for by 2100 if present carbon emissions continue – it simply says the consequences are "inconceivable". **Eighteen nations** currently **have nuclear weapons** technology or access to it, **raising the stakes on nuclear conflict** to the highest level since the end of the Cold War. At the same time, with more than 4 billion people living in the world’s most vulnerable regions, scope for refugee tsunamis and pandemic disease is also large. It is on the basis of scenarios such as these that scientists like Peter Schellnhuber – **science advisor to German President** Angela Merkel – and Canadian author Gwynne Dyer have **warned of the** potential **loss of most of the human population in the conflicts, famines and pandemics** spinning out of climate impacts. Whether that adds up to extinction or not rather depends on how many of the world’s 20,000 nukes are let off in the process. These issues all involve assumptions about human, national and religious behaviour and are thus beyond the remit of scientific bodies like the IPCC, which can only hint at what they truly think will happen. So you are not getting the full picture from them.

### Util FW

The standard is maximizing life.

1. Actor specificity-key to the text of the resolution which is the basis for all burdens-the resolution is a question of government action for which there is no act/omission distinction.

Sunstein Cass Sunstein and Adrian Vermuele, “Is Capital Punishment Morally Required? The Relevance of Life‐Life Tradeoffs,” Chicago Public Law & Legal Theory Working Paper No. 85 (March 2005), p. 17.

The most fundamental point is that unlike individuals, **governments always** and necessarily **face a choice between** or among **possible policies for regulating third parties. The distinction between acts and omissions may not be intelligible in this context,** and even if it is, the distinction does not make a morally relevant difference. Most generally, government is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it is not omitting to do anything or refusing to act. **Moreover, the distinction between authorized and unauthorized private action** – for example, private killing – **becomes obscure when government** formally **forbids private action but chooses a** set of **policy** instruments **that do[es] not** adequately or **fully discourage it.**

Impacts: A. life comes first-its instrumental in pursuing all other values so means based frameworks collapse to the aff. B. no skep or presumption-governments are always forced to take some action so deflationary arguments have no impact, C. no generic util indicts-policymakers can act in cases of uncertainty-they still have a general idea.

2. Moral uncertainty means we should preserve life to find ethical truth in the future.

Bostrom Nick Bostrom, 2001 prof of Philosophy, Oxford University Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March 2002. First version: 2001 March, JStor

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest[s] an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.

### Underview

1. The role of the ballot is to vote to endorse the best postfiat policy option related to the resolution. Policy discussion is best for improving our decision making skills.

A. Mutually accessible information–there is a wide swath of literature on governmental policy topics–that ensures there will be informed, predictable, and in-depth debate over the aff’s decision. Individual policymaking is highly variable depending on the person and inaccessible to outsiders.

B. Harder decisions make better decision makers–the problems facing public policymakers are a magnitude greater than private decisions. We all know plans don’t actually happen, but practicing imagining the consequences of our decisions in the high-stakes games of public policymaking makes other decision-making easier.

Real world decision making comes first. A. Probability-no one has ever actually stopped structural violence by reading a role of the ballot in the aff but we garner out of round benefits all the time using mine B. severity-its more useful in the real world since we have to make decisions literally all the time but only have to deal with structural violence a limited few times. C. This also turns your impacts since if we learn how to make decisions we’ll be good at challenging violence in the world since we’ll be good at dealing with lots of situations.

2. the negative must concede that the role of the ballot if it is to vote to endorse the best postfiat policy option related to the resolution. You cannot read a prefiat K or anything that contests the discourse of the 1AC-key to ground-I have to speak first and create the starting point for the debate so changing the role of the ballot moots 6 minutes of 1AC offense so I have to restart in the 1AR-puts me a strategic disadvantage since you have a 13-7 timeskew skew-makes it impossible to affirm so outweighs on strength of link. Also link turns your kritikal offense since a world in which the aff chooses the role of the ballot allows us to better clash on issues underneath that role and gain actual kritikal education.

3. fairness comes first-it’s most specific to your role as a judge.

Desai 14 Shrey Desai (participated in elimination rounds of College Prep, Stanford, Cal, and other local tournaments) “Fairness vs. Critical Arguments” October 21st 2014 VBriefly <http://vbriefly.com/2014/10/21/fairness-vs-critical-arguments/> JW 2/24/15

First, the most important reason why fairness should come before critical arguments is because it is most pertinent to the judge’s obligations. Pay close attention to a ballot the next time you see one – tournaments often print something along the lines of, “The aff/neg is the winner because they did the better debating”, where the judge has to indicate the winner of the round. Therefore, the question here is whether fairness or critical arguments best cohere[s] with the role of the judge. There are two reasons why fairness is better in line with the judge’s obligations. 1) The judge, as a gatekeeper to this educational activity, must ensure that debaters are on equal footing and can properly engage each other. Obviously, if one debater had ten minutes to speak as opposed to another debater that had three, there would be an obvious incongruence because the latter debater would not be able to develop his or her arguments as well. Similar fairness claims also apply to this situation because some strategies put debaters in a harder spot, so the judge must ensure that each debater has an equal shot at winning the round. Theory shells tell the judge that because there is sufficient abuse in the round, the judge should drop the debater as a proportional response to the loss of substantive engagement. For example, if the alternative of a K is not a post-fiat policy option, it would probably moot a plan’s offense because the aff just spent 6 minutes setting up a policy framework. This is problematic because it makes the aff restart in the 1AR, which is already tough considering the unequivocal time constraint. 2) If critical debaters endorse role of the ballots that encompass touchy subjects such as oppression, their opponent may feel extremely uncomfortable in responding to this argument in a proper, intellectual way. For example, the opponent would not have arguments such as “the evidence supporting their role of the ballot has no warrant”, or “resisting oppression is not a priority” because these arguments can be seen as repugnant, or at the least, unintuitive and unconvincing. If the role of the ballot of “resisting oppression” is advanced at the expense of qualitative ground for the other debater, the judge should side with the latter because in weighing educational benefits, judges ought to endorse the in-round impacts derived from excluding the other debater from the discussion rather than resisting oppression in some utopia that people have never heard about. Critical debaters would disagree and say that they recontextualize the role of the judge and their obligations, but this is irrelevant for two reasons: a) this violates tournament rules where they asked the judge to determine who did the better debating as per the current resolution; this can make the debate extremely unpredictable since the role of the ballot can shift from something like resisting oppression to winning Mario Kart and b) this violates common usage because the intuitive conception of debate shared by the majority of people is that debate is a clash between competitive philosophies or ideologies rather than a forum for initiating resistance or implementing Wildersen’s plan of burning down society; this is important because if debate prepares us to be social advocates, we should take our education to apply to important topics as governmental policies rather than impacts such as resisting oppression that might not spillover outside the debate community.

Ocean studies prove warming causes extinction. **Sify 10** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of **greenhouse gases are driving irreversible** and dramatic **change**s **in** the way the **oceans** function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. **The findings** of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' **emerged from a synthesis of recent research** on the world's oceans, carried out **by two of the world's leading marine scientists**. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is **further evidence that we are well on the way to** the next great **extinction** event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly **if the trend continues.** The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added.

# 1AR

### A2 Edelman K

Representations of extinction are key to genuine resistance to violence. **Schatz 12**[[2]](#footnote-2)

Any **hesitancy to deploy images of apocalypse** out of the risk of acting in a biopolitical manner **ignores how any** particular **metaphor**—apocalyptic or not—**always risks getting co-opted. It does not excuse inaction**. Clearly hegemonic forces have already assumed control of determining environmental practices when one looks at the debates surrounding off--‐shore drilling, climate change, and biodiversity within the halls of Congress. “As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems … will go unsolved … only to fester more ominously into the future. … [E]cological crisis … cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context … of internationalized markets, finance, and communications” (Boggs 774). If it weren’t for people such as Watson connecting things like whaling to the end of the world it wouldn’t get the needed coverage to enter into public discourse. It takes big news to make headlines and hold attention spans in the electronic age. Sometimes it even takes a reality TV show on Animal Planet. As Luke reminds us, “Those who dominate the world exploit their positions to their advantage by defining how the world is known. Unless they also face resistance, questioning, and challenge from those who are dominated, they certainly will remain the dominant forces” (2003: 413). Merely **sitting back and theorizing** over metaphorical deployments does a grave injustice to the gains activists are making on the ground. It also **allows hegemonic institutions to continually define the debate** over the environment by framing out any attempt for significant change, whether it be radical or reformist. Only by jumping on every opportunity for resistance can ecocriticism have the hopes of combatting the current ecological reality. This means we must recognize that **we cannot fully escape the master’s house** since the surrounding environment always shapes any form of resistance. Therefore**, we ought to act even if we may get co-opted**. As Foucault himself reminds us, “instead of radial ruptures more often one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance, producing cleavages in a society that shift about[.] … And it is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a revolution possible, somewhat similar to the way in which the state relies on the institutional integration of power relationships. It is in this sphere of force relations that we must try to analyze the mechanisms of power” (96--‐97). Here Foucault “asks us to think about resistance differently, as not anterior to power, but a component of it. If we take seriously these notions on the exercise and circulation of power, then we … open … up the field of possibility to talk about particular kinds of environmentalism” (Rutherford 296). This is not to say that all actions are resistant. Rather, the revolutionary actions that are truly resistant oftentimes appear mundane since it is more about altering the intelligibility that frames discussions around the environment than any specific policy change. Again, this is why people like Watson use one issue as a jumping off point to talk about wider politics of ecological awareness. Campaigns that look to the government or a single policy but for a moment, and then go on to challenge hegemonic interactions with the environment through other tactics, allows us to codify strategic points of resistance in numerous places at once. Again, this does not mean we must agree with every tactic. It does mean that even failed attempts are meaningful. For example, while PETA’s ad campaigns have drawn criticism for comparing factory farms to the Holocaust, and featuring naked women who’d rather go naked than wear fur, their importance extends beyond the ads alone6. By bringing the issues to the forefront they draw upon known metaphors and reframe the way people talk about animals despite their potentially anti--‐Semitic and misogynist underpinnings. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s theorization of the multitude serves as an excellent illustration of how utilizing the power of the master’s biopolitical tools can become powerful enough to deconstruct its house despite the risk of co--‐optation or backlash. For them, the multitude is defined by the growing global force of people around the world who are linked together by their common struggles without being formally organized in a hierarchal way. While Hardt and Negri mostly talk about the multitude in relation to global capitalism, their understanding of the commons and analysis of resistance is useful for any ecocritic. They explain, [T]he multitude has matured to such an extent that it is becoming able, through its networks of communication and cooperation … [and] its production of the common, to sustain an alternative democratic society on its own. … Revolutionary politics must grasp, in the movement of the multitudes and through the accumulation of common and cooperative decisions, the moment of rupture … that can create a new world. In the face of the destructive state of exception of biopower, then, there is also a constituent state of exception of democratic biopolitics[,] … creating … a new constitutive temporality. (357) Once one understands the world as interconnected—instead of constructed by different nation--‐states and single environments—conditions in one area of the globe couldn’t be conceptually severed from any other. In short, we’d all have a stake in the global commons. Ecocritics can then utilize biopolitics to shape discourse and fight against governmental biopower by waking people up to the pressing need to inaugurate a new future for there to be any future. Influencing other people through argument and end--‐of--‐the--‐world tactics is not the same biopower of the state so long as it doesn’t singularize itself but for temporary moments. Therefore, “it is not unreasonable to hope that in a biopolitical future (after the defeat of biopower) war will no longer be possible, and the intensity of the cooperation and communication among singularities … will destroy its [very] possibility” (Hardt & Negri 347). In The context of capitalism, when wealth fails to trickle down it would be seen as a problem for the top since it would stand testament to their failure to equitably distribute wealth. In the context of environmentalism, not--‐in--‐my--‐backyard reasoning that displaces ecological destruction elsewhere would be exposed for the failure that it is. There is no backyard that is not one’s own. Ultimately, **images of planetary doom demonstrate how we are all interconnected and** in doing so **inaugurate a** new **world where multitudes**, and not governments, **guide** the fate of **the planet**.

#### Turn: the alt’s pessimism reinscribes the impacts of the K

**Snediker 06** (Michael, Visiting Assistant Professor of American Literature at Mount Holyoke College, Postmoden Culture, Vol 16, “Queer Optimism”, May, http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/postmodern\_culture/v016/16.3snediker.html)

Edelman's might be one way of refusing the logic of reproductive futurism, but not the only one. **That there would be many possible queer courses of action might indeed seem to follow from Edelman's invoking of Lacanian truth** ("Wunsch") **as characterized by nothing so much as its extravagant, recalcitrant particularity**. "The Wunsch," Lacan writes in a passage cited in No Future's introduction, "does not have the character of a universal law but, on the contrary, of the most particular of laws--even if it is universal that this particularity is to be found in every human being" (6). **This truth, which Edelman aligns with "queerness**" (and ergo with negativity, the death-drive, jouissance, etc.) "**does not have the character of a universal law**." Edelman, for all his attentiveness to the Lacanian "letter of the law," glosses Lacan's own argument with a symptomatic liberality. "Truth, like queerness," Edelman writes, "finds its value not in a good susceptible to generalization, but only in the stubborn particularity that voids every notion of a general good. The embrace of queer negativity, then, can have no justification if justification requires it to reinforce some positive social value" (6). Lacan, however, does not speak, even in Jacques-Alain Miller's translation, of a "general good." He speaks of a universal, which might be good or bad. Furthermore**, if the only characteristic universally applicable to this "truth, like queerness" is its particularity, what sort of particularity voids every notion of a general good? Might so intransigent a particularity sometimes not void a universal, good or bad?** My line of inquiry might seem petty, but my question, in fact, illuminates how little Edelman's argument can hold onto the particularity on which it is partly premised. "The queer," Edelman insists, "insists that politics is always a politics of the signifier" (6). Edelman likewise insists that "queer theory must always insist on its connection to the vicissitudes of the sign" (7). The ubiquity of "always" and "every" in Edelman's argument is nearly stunning, and it seems to me indicative of No Future's coerciveness, as a different passage from No Future's introduction quite handily demonstrates: Rather than rejecting, with liberal discourse, this ascription of negativity to the queer, we might, as I argue, do better to consider accepting and even embracing it. Not in the hope of forging thereby some more perfect social order--such a hope, after all, would only reproducce the constraining mandate of futurism, just as any such order would equally occasion the negativity of the queer--but rather to refuse the insistence of hope itself as affirmation, which is always affirmation of an order whose refusal will register as unthinkable, irresponsible, inhumane. And the trump card of affirmation? Always the question: If not this, what? Always the demand to translate the insistence, the pulsive force, of negativity into some determinate stance or "position" whose determination would negate it: always the imperative to immure it in some stable and positive form. (4)Always this, always this, always that. This absoluteness in Edelman's characterization of affirmation, meant to rally and provoke, recalls Sedgwick's incredulous reading of Fredric Jameson's ukase, "Always historicize." **"What could have less to do," Sedgwick rightly asks, "with historicizing than the commanding, atemporal adverb 'always'" ("Paranoid Reading" 125)? What, for that matter, could have less to do with particularizations? The axiomatic thrust of Edelman's "always" would seem to make the world so irrevocably one thing that response to the world would amount to one thing. But still: why would rejecting a primary attachment to futurity (regardless of what this futurity always does or doesn't do) necessarily require embodying negativity? Edelman's queer pessimism positions itself as "our" only option without having exhausted what other options might glimmeringly look like.** This glimmer doesn't conjure the sort of horizon Edelman would be so quick to dismantle. Rather, it suggests that not all optimisms are a priori equivalent to each other. And as importantly, that not all queer theories need look like Edelman's. "As a particular story . . . of why storytelling fails," Edelman writes, "queer theory, as I construe it, marks the 'other' side of politics . . . the 'side' outside all political sides, committed as they are, on every side, to futurism's unquestioned good" (7). **This account of queer theory**, even as construed by one theorist, **hardly seems like a "particular" story, not at least particular enough. Queer theory**, on this account, **doesn't seem like an escape from the political's claustrophobically refracted unavailing sides, but a claustrophobia unto itself**.

#### Turn: the Alt is sexist, racist, and too limited to succeed

**Fontenot 06** Andrea, grad students in English @ UC Santa Barbara, MFS: Modern Fiction Studies, vol. 52(1)

Edelman's acceptance of the cultural logics linking death and homosexuality may seem hard to swallow: **not only does he ask us to commit political suicide, he systematically refuses** the fantasy of an afterlife, of **an alternative future**. However bleak this may seem, Edelman's work envisions for queer theory something much more powerful than politics. In identifying the broad nexus of forces that participate in reproductive futurism, Edelman enables queer theory to be a voice of resistance to the dominant political order in a more comprehensive way than any issue or identity based politics could contain. Indeed, the challenge he puts forth is for queer theory to more effectively channel the dissonant and disruptive effect of sexuality rather than distance ourselves from it. From my perspective it is not the negativity of his theory that constitutes its weakness. Rather, it is his failure to imagine the sinthomosexual in more diverse terms and his unwillingness to recognize possibilities for allegiance with others who suffer under reproductive futurism's grip on our political culture. It is not just that **his examples happen to all be white middle-class childless men**—something we may excuse as product of the cultural register he chooses to investigate—but that **his entire imagining of the scope of the sinthomosexual is limited; his exclusive use of "he" to denote queers** and sinthomosexuals alike is only one manifestation. Though he illuminates the intricate displacements and disavowals required to figure the homosexual's difference in terms of their narcissistic love of sameness (see 56–60), **he** nonetheless **ignores the differences that exist among those positioned under the sign "homosexual**." This becomes a weakness for his analysis in the section where he deconstructs Jean Baudrillard's nauseating jeremiad, "The Final Solution," a treatise against "artificial insemination" and the "global extermination" of meaning it portends (64–65). Edelman dedicates six wonderfully reasoned pages to exposing Baudrillard's outrage at the imminent vanishing of sexual difference (and thus, for Baudrillard, difference at all) as a homophobic response to the way that the possibilities of sex without reproduction and reproduction without sex reveal the always already meaninglessness of sex, even in the heterosexual pairing (60–66). What Edelman misses here, though, is an opportunity to show another face of the figure of the sinthomosexual. In Baudrillard's paranoid reaction to new technologies of reproduction, it is not the gay male who is evoked but rather the lesbian mother, that most notorious beneficiary of this desexualized reproduction. Were Edelman to entertain this difference, he would find that she is figured in much the same terms as her male counterpart: imperiling both the child she would bear and the future that the Child is meant to guarantee, despite the efforts of some lesbian mothers to trade on the capital of reproductive futurism to purchase civil rights. **By simply dismissing queer parents** as "comrades in reproductive futurism" (19), capable only of contributing to the homophobic scapegoating of the sinthomosexual, **he ignores their possibility as allies on the frontier between the Child and children, between the future and tomorrow**. Regardless of these omissions, however, Edelman has certainly articulated a new direction for queer theory, making No Future required reading both within the field and beyond.

#### The K ignores the complexity of queer politics and erases the figure of the queer child – it cedes all intellectual ground to the far right

**Balasopoulos 06** Antonis, prof @ Univ of Cyprus, Journal of American Studies vol 40.2

Edelman’s book takes obvious pleasure in provocation, stylistically indulging in the ironic hermeneutics it methodologically advocates with at times infelicitous results (an excess of largely gratuitous verbal punning and a partiality for highly convoluted syntax are cases in point). More disconcertingly, **No Future** involves a vision of queer subjectivity that is so strongly invested in transvaluating the homophobic linkage of homosexuality with a “culture of death” that it **ends up ignoring the complexity and diversity of what has historically constituted queer** (lesbian and transgender as well as gay) **politics. Missing**, for instance, **is a serious** and sustained **attempt to engage with the multiple transformations the concepts of reproduction and parenthood have undergone in the last two decades**, partly as a result of the interventions of queer theory itself. **Equally absent is any analytical concern with the cultural and representational resonances of the queer child–a figure that** certainly **complicates the book’s one-dimensional treatment of the image of besieged childhood, while making apparent the** unreflectively eclectic and **historically untheorized nature of Edelman’s choice of primary texts**. The effect of such exclusions–a highly repetitive account of texts that are treated as virtually interchangeable–is particularly troubling from a theoretical standpoint. For though Edelman’s argument largely rests on a theoretical distinction between an ideologically normative and a radically destabilizing kind of repetition compulsion, his analytical practice makes the difference between them less than obvious. Paying the reader diminishing dividends with each page, No Future bulldozes its way from Plato to the Victorians and from Hitchcock to Judith Butler by unwaveringly locating the same Manichean conflict between reproductive ideology and its queer negation, a struggle to the death between monolithic and unchanging absolutes. To declare No Future a timely work is hence not an unambiguous compliment; for **its timeliness comes at the cost of intellectual surrender to the increasingly polarized and disconcertingly fundamentalist climate of American politics in the present**.

1. Citing Ove Hoegh-Gulberg, Professor @ University of Queensland and Director of the Global Change Institute AND Citing John Bruno, Associate Professor of Marine Science @ UNC (Sify News, “Could unbridled climate changes lead to human extinction?,” June 19th, <http://www.sify.com/news/could-unbridled-climate-changes-lead-to-human-extinction-news-international-kgtrOhdaahc.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. JL Schatz, Binghamton U, "The Importance of Apocalypse: The Value of End‐Of‐ The‐World Politics While Advancing Ecocriticism," The Journal of Ecocriticism: Vol 4, No 2 (2012) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)