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#### Academic debate over energy policy in the face of environmental destruction is critical to shape the direction of change and create a public consciousness shift---action now is key

Crist 4 (Eileen, Professor at Virginia Tech in the Department of Science and Technology, “Against the social construction of nature and wilderness”, Environmental Ethics 26;1, p 13-6, <http://www.sts.vt.edu/faculty/crist/againstsocialconstruction.pdf>)

Yet, constructivist analyses of "nature" favor remaining in the comfort zone of zestless agnosticism and noncommittal meta-discourse. As David Kidner suggests, this intellectual stance may function as a mechanism against facing the devastation of the biosphere—an undertaking long underway but gathering momentum with the imminent bottlenecking of a triumphant global consumerism and unprecedented population levels. Human-driven extinction—in the ballpark of Wilson's estimated 27,000 species per year—is so unthinkable a fact that choosing to ignore it may well be the psychologically risk-free option.¶ Nevertheless, this is the opportune historical moment for intellectuals in the humanities and social sciences to join forces with conservation scientists in order to help create the consciousness shift and policy changes to stop this irreversible destruction. Given this outlook, how students in the human sciences are trained to regard scientific knowledge, and what kind of messages percolate to the public from the academy about the nature of scientific findings, matter immensely. The "agnostic stance" of constructivism toward "scientific claims" about the environment—a stance supposedly mandatory for discerning how scientific knowledge is "socially assembled"[32]—is, to borrow a legendary one-liner, striving to interpret the world at an hour that is pressingly calling us to change it.

#### We should stop treating structures as unmovable wholes—all it takes is one crack to expose the fragility of oppressive institutions. The plan is a radical experiment in democratic politics.

Connolly ’12

[William E. Connolly, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, “Steps toward an Ecology of Late Capitalism,” Theory & Event, Vol. 15, Issue 1, 2012, Muse]

A philosophy attending to the acceleration, expansion, irrationalities, interdependencies and fragilities of late capitalism suggests that we do not know with confidence, in advance of experimental action, just how far or fast changes in the systemic character of neoliberal capitalism can be made. The structures often seem solid and intractable, and indeed such a semblance may turn out to be true. Some may seem solid, infinitely absorptive, and intractable when they are in fact punctuated by hidden vulnerabilities, soft spots, uncertainties and potential lines of flight that become apparent as they are subjected to experimental action, upheaval, testing, and strain. Indeed, no ecology of late capitalism, given the variety of forces to which it is connected by a thousand pulleys, vibrations, impingements, dependencies, shocks and thin threads, can specify with supreme confidence the solidity or potential flexibility of the structures it seeks to change. The strength of structural theory, at its best, was in identifying institutional intersections that hold a system together; its conceit, at its worst, was the claim to know in advance how resistant those intersections are to potential change. Without adopting the opposite conceit, it seems important to pursue possible sites of strategic action that might open up room for productive change. Today it seems important to attend to the relation between the need for structural change and identification of multiple sites of potential action. You do not know precisely what you are doing when you participate in such a venture. You combine an experimental temper with the appreciation that living and acting into the future inevitably carries a shifting quotient of uncertainty with it. The following tentative judgments and sites of action may be pertinent.

#### The plan specifically key to reconcile claims to justice and find specific solutions—blanket rejection of state engagement shut out voices from the conversation

Fan, professor of Public Administration and Institute of Public Policy – Tamkang University, ‘6

[Mei-Fang, “Environmental Justice and Nuclear Waste Conflicts in Taiwan,” Environmental Politics, Vol. 15, No. 3, p. 417 – 434, June]

It is necessary to rethink the multiple conceptions of environmental justice articulated by the Yami and Taiwanese groups. This section focuses on the questions of how we might respond to differing ways of understanding environmental justice, deal with the divisions within a multicultural society and **formulate environmental policy** regarding nuclear waste dilemmas. The Yami professional and teenage student groups tended to stress the preservation of a liveable environment for future generations and regarded it as the core element of the environmental justice movement and the basis for the Yami’s opposition to nuclear waste. Instead, for most of the Taiwanese participants, the Yami’s anti-nuclear movement did not exactly correspond to the claims of environmental justice. Those Taiwanese participants who hold utilitarian views considered that the Yami anti-nuclear waste movement involved political consideration, self-interest and the attempt to obtain benefits or celebrity. The gap between the Yami and Taiwanese groups and the lack of mutual understanding and communication between them are significant. The Yami groups expressed their doubts as to whether the Taiwanese people would treat the tribesmen sincerely as partners in dealing with environmental problems, while the Taiwanese participants seemed to view the Yami as insular. A growing number of environmental ethicists have tried to rethink the problem of what practical effect environmental ethics has had on the formation of environmental policy. Contrary to a monistic approach, moral pluralism as a practical philosophy allows a form of agreement on real cases in which agreement on the general formulation of moral principles is not essential. Practical philosophy seeks the integration of multiple values and tries to reduce the distance between disputants by finding a general policy direction that can achieve greater consensus. It searches for workable solutions to specific problems or a range of actions that are morally permissible or acceptable to a wide range of worldviews (Norton, 1995: 129– 33). The multiple conceptions of environmental justice articulated by the Yami and Taiwanese groups in the context of nuclear waste controversies provide support for a pluralistic account of environmental values rather than a monistic philosophical stance. A foundational approach to ethics that requires the application of a single theory **functionally equivalent to truth** fails to take a variety of conflicting moral insights into account and limits alternatives to nuclear waste management. In contrast, pragmatism represents an engagement with the actual problems in the specific historical and social context. Environmental pragmatism draws upon the pragmatist philosophical and political tradition in American thought, advocating a serious inquiry into the practical merits of moral pluralism (Light & Katz, 1996). The American philosophical school, represented mainly in the late 19th- and early 20thcentury writings of Charles Peirce, William James and John Dewey is marked most notably by its anti-foundational character that denies the existence of ‘a priori or self-justifying ‘‘truths’’ and moral absolutes’ (Minteer & Manning, 1999: 193). For Light (1996), there is much that we do agree on that has not been put into environmental policy or communicated to the public effectively. From the metaphilosophical perspective, what environmental pragmatists agree on is that the truth of any particular theoretical framework is not always fundamental for specific environmental problems and the ‘appropriateness of any one theory in a particular case is contingent on historical, cultural, social and resource conditions’. Environmental pragmatism chooses the approach that is most appropriate for purposes of environmental practice regardless of its theoretical origin (Light, 1996: 172, 177). Considering the multiple values held by the Yami and Taiwanese groups in the nuclear waste disputes, abstract moral norms provided by environmental ethicists do not appear to resolve the practical problems faced by the local residents on Orchid Island. **Instead of asking environmental ethicists to give up** their **debates** **about** non-anthropocentric natural **value**, environmental pragmatism endorses a pluralism that acknowledges the possible necessity of sometimes using the anthropocentric description of the value of nature to help support a morally responsible policy (Light, 2004). Furthermore, the pragmatists admit that our understandings and concepts are fallible, and that experience can at any time reveal our beliefs or the meaning of an idea as false. Environmental pragmatism recognises the importance of many diverse individuals, experiences and concepts coming together to offer insights into actual problems in the public sphere (Parker, 1996). A growing body of research has demonstrated the validity of a pragmatic approach to specific environmental and social issues, including the cases of policymaking for leaded gasoline (Thomson, 2003), forest resource management (Castle, 1996), animal welfare and hunting (Light, 2004). Environmental pragmatism, representing a democratic respect for diverse public values and ethical positions regarding the environment, is relevant to the multiple understandings of environmental justice.

#### Pragmatic energy policy is a way to foster a middle ground solution that enables deliberation and prevents excesses on both the right and left from manifesting

Craig 12 (Caroline, Worked for the Lower East Side Ecology Center and The Fund for Public Interest. Fellow, Jeannette K Watson Fellowship, “How Environmentalists and Skeptics Can Discover the Same Goals: Making Eco-Friendly More People-Friendly”, http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1116&context=honorscollege\_theses)

These are the discussions we need to start having outside of the Park Slope, Brooklyn apartments of married environmental lawyers and inside the homes of farmers and pastors. How do we get regular people to feel that they have a stake in the health of the environment, in the future? In some cases, it might involve attaching the idea that caring for the Earth is caring for a gift from God. In other cases, economic and social benefits, from tax breaks to green fashion trends, can help win some people over. We may simply never agree on one universal reason for action. Luckily for us and the Earth, not everyone must agree to do something for the same reason. There are many hurdles to jump and ground to tread lightly on. Concerned citizens must actively work to prevent "green washing," or the spread of misleading information, by people or organizations with hidden agendas. However, if we make environmentally-conscious living the norm and not just the exception, entities such as that only stand to make themselves look bad. It is about trust. It is about using diverse and pragmatic tactics to be united. A person is still reducing their fuel consumption, whether they do it to slow climate change or to decrease dependence on foreign oil. In fact, if we are able to list several reasons for taking action, criticisms and faults in individual reasons almost seem to matter less. I return to the quote on the Starbuck's cup: "So-called global warming is just a secret ploy by wacko tree-huggers to make America energy independent, clean our air and water, improve the fuel efficiency of our vehicles, kick-start 21st-century industries, and make our cities safer and more livable. Don't let them get away with it!" The same idea is being echoed everywhere, especially from my generation, arguably a very open-minded generation. This is possibly due, not only because of globalization, but the wealth of accessible information that allows us to peek outside of our own social norms and create a more versatile green movement. Accomplishing environmental goals can do much more than protect the natural world, and if it takes the acceptance of anthropocentric reasoning or economic prosperity in some cases, environmentalists must be more pragmatic. If not, we never stand a chance of the broader public hearing us out and we will remain stuck on arguments that many people do not find convincing. While some environmentalists can continue to seek to make dramatic shifts in social and economic systems, there must be boots on the ground seeking to improve the unity that would allow those shifts to happen. By nudging people like conservative Christians, republicans, and hunters to see why they should not be afraid to think like environmentalists, we plant the seeds, no pun intended, for more holistic discussions. Fostering the human connections that already exist, we can allow these discussions to spread through the close communities that are home to much of the American population that currently feels so disconnected from the supposedly "elitist" or "hippie" environmental movement. This paper grew out of a frustration of the political and social polarity surrounding environmental issues today and the dissatisfaction at how few people realize how much common ground there really is. It is about harnessing patriotism and molding future Americans who will take environmental concepts with them into practice as they become leaders, business people, and parents. Here in the US, we need to find what makes people tick, on a case by case basis, and apply these findings to environmental initiatives. We do not need to be deceptive to instill a sense of empowerment in environmentalism. We cannot stop trying to get people involved, even if it means constantly rethinking our strategies. We cannot stop pushing until we finally hear the words: "Of course I care about the environment! I'm an American, aren't I?"

#### The discussion of pragmatic solutions within the debate space is a key place for investigating and challenging our privilege.

Boor-Toon, Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland, ‘5

[Mari, “Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public” Rhetoric& Public Affairs Vol. 8, No. 3]

This widespread recognition that access to public deliberative processes and the ballot is a baseline of any genuine democracy points to the most curious irony of the conversation movement: portions of its constituency. Numbering among the most fervid dialogic loyalists have been some feminists and multiculturalists who represent groups historically denied both the right to speak in public and the ballot. Oddly, some feminists who championed the slogan "The Personal Is Political" to emphasize ways relational power can oppress tend to ignore similar dangers lurking in the appropriation of conversation and dialogue in public deliberation. Yet the conversational model's emphasis on empowerment through intimacy can duplicate the power networks that traditionally excluded females and nonwhites and gave rise to numerous, sometimes necessarily uncivil, demands for democratic inclusion. Formalized participation structures in deliberative processes obviously cannot ensure the elimination of relational power blocs, but, as Freeman pointed out, the absence of formal rules leaves relational power unchecked and potentially capricious. Moreover, the privileging of the self, personal experiences, and individual perspectives of reality intrinsic in the conversational paradigm mirrors justifications once used by dominant groups who used their own lives, beliefs, and interests as templates for hegemonic social premises to oppress women, the lower class, and people of color. Paradigms infused with the therapeutic language of emotional healing and coping likewise flirt with the type of psychological diagnoses once ascribed to disaffected women. But as Betty Friedan's landmark 1963 The Feminist Mystique argued, the cure for female alienation was neither tranquilizers nor attitude adjustments fostered through psychotherapy but, rather, unrestricted opportunities.102 The price exacted by promoting approaches to complex public issues- models that cast conventional deliberative processes, including the marshaling of evidence beyond individual subjectivity, as "elitist" or "monologic"-can be steep. Consider comments of an aide to President George W. Bush made before reports concluding Iraq harbored no weapons of mass destruction, the primary justification for a U.S.-led war costing thousands of lives. Investigative reporters and other persons sleuthing for hard facts, he claimed, operate "in what we call the reality-based community." Such people "believe that solutions emerge from [the] judicious study of discernible reality." Then baldly flexing the muscle afforded by increasingly popular social-constructionist and poststructuralist models for conflict resolution, he added: "That's not the way the world really works anymore . . . We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality- judiciously, as you will-we'll act again, creating other new realities."103 The recent fascination with public conversation and dialogue most likely is a product of frustration with the tone of much public, political discourse. Such concerns are neither new nor completely without merit. Yet, as Burke insightfully pointed out nearly six decades ago, "A perennial embarrassment in liberal apologetics has arisen from its 'surgical' proclivity: its attempt to outlaw a malfunction by outlawing the function." The attempt to eliminate flaws in a process by eliminating the entire process, he writes, "is like trying to eliminate heart disease by eliminating hearts."104 Because public argument and deliberative processes are the "heart" of true democracy, supplanting those models with social and therapeutic conversation and dialogue jeopardizes the very pulse and lifeblood of democracy itself.