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#### Excessive consumption makes extinction inevitable- social and environmental factors build positive feedbacks create a cascade of destruction. **Our alternative is to reject the politics of technological production-** only social reorganization away from consumption can save the planet

Ehrenfeld ‘5,

(David, Dept. of Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources @ Rutgers University, “The Environmental Limits to Globalization”, *Conservation Biology* Vol. 19 No. 2 April 2005)

The known effects of globalization on the environment are numerous and highly significant. Many others are undoubtedly unknown. Given these circumstances, the first question that suggests itself is: Will globalization, as we see it now, remain a permanent state of affairs (Rees 2002; Ehrenfeld 2003a)? The principal environmental side effects of globalization—climate change, resource exhaustion (particularly cheap energy), damage to agroecosystems, and the spread of exotic species, including pathogens (plant, animal, and human)—are sufficient to make this economic system unstable and short-lived. The socioeconomic consequences of globalization are likely to do the same. In my book *The Arrogance of Humanism* (1981), I claimed that our ability to manage global systems, which depends on our being able to predict the results of the things we do, or even to understand the systems we have created, has been greatly exaggerated. Much of our alleged control is science fiction; it doesn’t work because of theoretical limits that we ignore at our peril. We live in a dream world in which reality testing is something we must never, never do, lest we awake. In 1984 Charles Perrow explored the reasons why we have trouble predicting what so many of our own created systems will do, and why they surprise us so unpleasantly while we think we are managing them. In his book *Normal Accidents*, which does not concern globalization, he listed the critical characteristics of some of today’s complex systems. They are highly interlinked, so a change in one part can affect many others, even those that seem quite distant. Results of some processes feed back on themselves in unexpected ways. The controls of the system often interact with each other unpredictably. We have only indirect ways of finding out what is happening inside the system. And we have an incomplete understanding of some of the system’s processes. His example of such a system is a nuclear power plant, and this, he explained, is why system-wide accidents in nuclear plants cannot be predicted or eliminated by system design. I would argue that globalization is a similar system, also subject to catastrophic accidents, many of them environmental—events that we cannot define until after they have occurred, and perhaps not even then. The comparatively few commentators who have predicted the collapse of globalization have generally given social reasons to support their arguments. These deserve some consideration here, if only because the environmental and social consequences of globalization interact so strongly with each other. In 1998, the British political economist John Gray, giving scant attention to environmental factors, nevertheless came to the conclusion that globalization is unstable and will be short-lived. He said, “There is nothing in today’s global market that buffers it against the social strains arising from highly uneven economic development within and between the world’s diverse societies.” The result, Gray states, is that “The combination of [an] unceasing stream of new technologies, unfettered market competition and weak or fractured social institutions” has weakened both sovereign states and multinational corporations in their ability to control important events. Note that Gray claims that not only nations but also multinational corporations, which are widely touted as controlling the world, are being weakened by globalization. This idea may come as a surprise, considering the growth of multinationals in the past few decades, but I believe it is true. Neither governments nor giant corporations are even remotely capable of controlling the environmental or social forces released by globalization, without first controlling globalization itself. Two of the social critics of globalization with the most dire predictions about its doom are themselves masters of the process. The late Sir James Goldsmith, billionaire financier, wrote in 1994, It must surely be a mistake to adopt an economic policy which makes you rich if you eliminate your national workforce and transfer production abroad, and which bankrupts you if you continue to employ your own people.... It is the poor in the rich countries who will subsidize the rich in the poor countries. This will have a serious impact on the social cohesion of nations. Another free-trade billionaire, George Soros, said much the same thing in 1995: “The collapse of the global marketplace would be a traumatic event with unimaginable consequences. Yet I find it easier to imagine than the continuation of the present regime.” How much more powerful these statements are if we factor in the environment! As globalization collapses, what will happen to people, biodiversity, and ecosystems? With respect to people, the gift of prophecy is not required to answer this question. What will happen depends on where you are and how you live. Many citizens of the Third World are still comparatively self-sufficient; an unknown number of these will survive the breakdown of globalization and its attendant chaos. In the developed world, there are also people with resources of self-sufficiency and a growing understanding of the nature of our social and environmental problems, which may help them bridge the years of crisis. Some species are adaptable; some are not. For the non- human residents of Earth, not all news will be bad. Who would have predicted that wild turkeys (Meleagris gallopavo), one of the wiliest and most evasive of woodland birds, extinct in New Jersey 50 years ago, would now be found in every county of this the most densely populated state, and even, occasionally, in adjacent Manhattan? Who would have predicted that black bears (Ursus americanus), also virtually extinct in the state in the mid-twentieth century, would now number in the thousands (Ehrenfeld 2001)? Of course these recoveries are unusual—rare bright spots in a darker landscape. Finally, a few ecological systems may survive in a comparatively undamaged state; most will be stressed to the breaking point, directly or indirectly, by many environmental and social factors interacting unpredictably. Lady Luck, as always, will have much to say. In his book *The Collapse of Complex Societies,* the archaeologist Joseph Tainter (1988) notes that collapse, which has happened to all past empires, inevitably results in human systems of lower complexity and less specialization, less centralized control, lower economic activity, less information flow, lower population levels, less trade, and less redistribution of resources. All of these changes are inimical to globalization. This less-complex, less-globalized condition is probably what human societies will be like when the dust settles. I do not think, however, that we can make such specific predictions about the ultimate state of the environment after globalization, because we have never experienced anything like this exceptionally rapid, global environmental damage before. History and science have little to tell us in this situation. The end of the current economic system and the transition to a postglobalized state is and will be accompanied by a desperate last raid on resources and a chaotic flurry of environmental destruction whose results cannot possibly be told in advance. All one can say is that the surviving species, ecosystems, and resources will be greatly impoverished compared with what we have now, and our descendants will not thank us for having adopted, however briefly, an economic system that consumed their inheritance and damaged their planet so wantonly. Environment is a true bottom line—concern for its condition must trump all purely economic growth strategies if both the developed and developing nations are to survive and prosper. Awareness of the environmental limits that globalized industrial society denies or ignores should not, however, bring us to an extreme position of environmental determinism. Those whose preoccupations with modern civilization’s very real social problems cause them to reject or minimize the environmental constraints discussed here ( Hollander 2003) are guilty of seeing only half the picture. Environmental scientists sometimes fall into the same error. It is tempting to see the salvation of civilization and environment solely in terms of technological improvements in efficiency of energy extraction and use, control of pollution, conservation of water, and regulation of environmentally harmful activities. But such needed developments will not be sufficient—or may not even occur— without corresponding social change, including an end to human population growth and the glorification of consumption, along with the elimination of economic mechanisms that increase the gap between rich and poor. The environmental and social problems inherent in globalization are completely interrelated—any attempt to treat them as separate entities is unlikely to succeed in easing the transition to a postglobalized world. Integrated change that combines environmental awareness, technological innovation, and an altered world view is the only answer to the life-threatening problems exacerbated by globalization (Ehrenfeld 2003b). If such integrated change occurs in time, it will likely happen partly by our own design and partly as an unplanned response to the constraints imposed by social unrest, disease, and the economics of scarcity. With respect to the planned component of change, we are facing, as eloquently described by Rees (2002), “the ultimate challenge to human intelligence and self-awareness, those vital qualities we humans claim as uniquely our own. *Homo sapiens* will either. . .become fully human or wink out ignominiously, a guttering candle in a violent storm of our own making.” If change does not come quickly, our global civilization will join Tainter’s (1988) list as the latest and most dramatic example of collapsed complex societies. Is there anything that could slow globalization quickly, before it collapses disastrously of its own environmental and social weight? It is still not too late to curtail the use of energy, reinvigorate local and regional communities while restoring a culture of concern for each other, reduce nonessential global trade and especially global finance (Daly & Cobb 1989), do more to control introductions of exotic species (including pathogens), and accelerate the growth of sustainable agriculture. Many of the needed technologies are already in place. It is true that some of the damage to our environment—species extinctions, loss of crop and domestic animal varieties, many exotic species introductions, and some climatic change— will be beyond repair. Nevertheless, the opportunity to help our society move past globalization in an orderly way, while there is time, is worth our most creative and passionate efforts. The citizens of the United States and other nations have to understand that our global economic system has placed both our environment and our society in peril, a peril as great as that posed by any war of the twentieth century. This understanding, and the actions that follow, must come not only from enlightened leadership, but also from grassroots consciousness raising. It is still possible to reclaim the planet from a self-destructive economic system that is bringing us all down together, and this can be a task that bridges the divide between conservatives and liberals. The crisis is here, now. What we have to do has become obvious. Globalization can be scaled back to manageable proportions only in the context of an altered world view that rejects materialism even as it restores a sense of communal obligation. In this way, alone, can we achieve real homeland security, not just in the United States, but also in other nations, whose fates have become so thoroughly entwined with ours within the global environment we share.

#### Wind power massively increases consumption while erasing the question “consumption of what” – abstract reveling in consumption re-produces unequal neoliberal social relations and risks environmental crises

Byrne & Toly 6

(Josh, director of the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy and distinguished professor of energy and climate policy at the University of Delaware, Noah, Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Politics & International Relations, Director of Urban Studies Program at Wheaton, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse”, pgs. 1-32 in Transforming Power: Energy, Environment, and Society in Conflict, eds. Josh Byrne, Noah Toly, and Leigh Glover)

What are the characteristics of this success? One envied feature is the remarkable decline in the price of wind-generated electricity, from $0.46 per kWh in 1980 to $0.03 to $0.07 per kWh today (Sawin, 2004), very close to conventionally-fueled utility generating costs in many countries, even before environmental impacts are included. Jubilant over wind’s winning market performance, advocates of sustainable energy foresee a new era that is ecologically much greener and, yet, in which electricity remains (comparatively) cheap. Lester Brown (2003: 159) notes that wind satisfies seemingly equally weighted criteria of environmental benefit, social gain, and economic efficiency: Wind is...clean. Wind energy does not produce sulfur dioxide emissions or nitrous oxides to cause acid rain. Nor are there any emissions of health-threatening mercury that come from coal-fired power plants. No mountains are leveled, no streams are polluted, and there are no deaths from black lung disease. Wind does not disrupt the earth’s climate...[I]t is inexhaustible...[and] cheap. This would certainly satisfy the canon of economic rationalism. It is also consistent with the ideology of modern consumerism. Its politics bestow sovereignty on consumers not unlike the formula of Pareto optimality, a situation in which additional consumption of a good or service is warranted until it cannot improve the circumstance of one person (or group) without decreasing the welfare of another person (or group).17 How would one know “better off” from “worse off” in the wind-rich sustainable energy era? Interestingly, proponents seem to apply a logic that leaves valuation of “better” and “worse” devoid of explicit content. In a manner reminiscent of modern economic thinking, cheap-and-green enthusiasts appear willing to set wind to the task of making “whatever”—whether that is the manufacture of low-cost teeth whitening toothpaste or lower cost SUVs. In economic accounting, all of these applications potentially make some in society “better off” (if one accepts that economic growth and higher incomes are signs of improvement). Possible detrimental side effects or externalities (an economic term for potential harm) could be rehabilitated by the possession of more purchasing power, which could enable society to invent environmentally friendly toothpaste and make affordable, energy-efficient SUVs. Sustainable energy in this construct cooperates in the abstraction of consumption and production. Consumption- of-what, -by-whom, and -for-what-purpose, and, relatedly, production-of-what, -by-whom, and -for-what-purpose are not issues. The construct altogether ignores the possibility that “more-is-better” consumption- production relations may actually reinforce middle class ideology and capitalist political economy, as well as contribute to environmental crises such as climate change. In the celebration of its coming market victory, the cheap-and-green wind version of sustainable energy development may not readily distinguish the economic/class underpinnings of its victory from those of the conventional energy regime.

Our alternative is to reject the politics of technological production

Rather than focusing on production of technology, we should embrace our ability to shape and transform our subjectivity as consumers, embracing voluntary simplicity – this debate offers a crucial moment to produce alternative knowledge about everyday living practices

Alexander ‘11

(Samuel, University of Melbourne; Office for Environmental Programs/Simplicity Institute, “

Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence”, Social Sciences Research Network, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1941087)

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

## 2

#### **Text:** The United States federal government should establish a Transferable Production Tax Credit available to American Indian tribes for four years. The United States federal government should institute a renewable portfolio standard after the lapse of the Production Tax Credit extension.

#### **Four years sufficient- wind will achieve grid parity by 2016 and it’s a long enough investment to solve predictability**

Bloomberg ‘12

Bloomberg View, Aug 21, 2012, “Extend Wind-Power Tax Credit Now, So It Can Die Later,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-08-21/extend-wind-power-tax-credit-now-so-it-can-die-later.html

Since U.S. President [Barack Obama](http://topics.bloomberg.com/barack-obama/) brought it up, repeatedly, last week during his campaign swing through [Iowa](http://topics.bloomberg.com/iowa/), wind power has emerged as one of the most clear- cut issues of the political season.¶ Obama wants to renew the technology’s soon-to-expire federal production tax credit. [Mitt Romney](http://topics.bloomberg.com/mitt-romney/), his Republican opponent, wants to let the credit lapse.¶ Yet the best way to handle this is to find an option other than all or nothing. Yes, clean wind energy should receive continued federal support, as Obama says -- especially at a time when the industry’s tens of thousands of jobs are helping the [U.S. economy](http://topics.bloomberg.com/u.s.-economy/). But wind power should also be expected to make it in the marketplace on its own one day, as Romney would have it.¶ Onshore wind power has improved to the point where it is now the most competitive of all renewable energy sources except hydropower. According to recent estimates from [Bloomberg New Energy Finance](http://bnef.com/PressReleases/view/172), it is on a path to reach “grid parity” -- the point where its cost is equal to the baseline price of power on the grid -- starting in 2016. In the long run, in other words, wind can be expected to thrive without the tax credit.¶ A clear plan to phase out the credit over the coming four years could actually be a gift to the[wind industry](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/BWIND%3AIND), which has suffered from the federal program’s unpredictability, even as it has benefited from its support. The [2.2-cent tax credit](http://energy.gov/savings/renewable-electricity-production-tax-credit-ptc), paid to [wind-energy](http://topics.bloomberg.com/wind-energy/) companies for every kilowatt-hour of power they produce, has brought the industry more than $1 billion a year, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. Yet over the two decades it has existed, Congress has allowed the credit to expire three times, and each time progress in building wind capacity has fallen precipitously.¶ With companies rushing to finish before another expiration on Dec. 31, building this year has reached a record high. About 11,800 megawatts worth of projects are expected to be completed this year, according to Bloomberg New Energy Finance. Next year, construction is expected to plummet to 1,500 megawatts if the tax credit is not renewed. Even if Congress decides after the presidential election to extend it a year, the amount of building would be well under half what is anticipated for 2012, as it would take some time for the industry to ramp up its plans.¶ Renewing the tax credit would at least enable the wind industry to return to growth, [adding 54,000 jobs](http://awea.org/newsroom/pressreleases/Navigant_study.cfm) over the next four years, according to the [American Wind Energy Association](http://www.awea.org/), an industry trade group. Letting the credit expire, on the other hand, would mean losing 37,000 jobs in the sector.¶ The job market is not the main reason wind power is worth supporting. It’s a clean energy source, with a promising economic future as the cost per turbine continues to fall. Its prospects will become even brighter if natural [gas prices](http://topics.bloomberg.com/gas-prices/), now extraordinarily low, rise in the coming years with increasing demand.¶ If Congress takes the easy route and simply extends the credits for a year or two, it would only perpetuate the wind industry’s boom-and-bust cycle. A smarter solution is to apply the longer-term planning that is critical to good [energy policy](http://topics.bloomberg.com/energy-policy/).¶ Let the wind industry know the production tax credit will eventually die out, but over four years -- so companies are able to plan their operations without the need to guess what tax support they will have.¶

#### The counterplan is popular- it creates a clear federal exit strategy from market support and short term extension is popular

Bloomberg ‘12

Bloomberg View, Aug 21, 2012, “Extend Wind-Power Tax Credit Now, So It Can Die Later,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-08-21/extend-wind-power-tax-credit-now-so-it-can-die-later.html

Even smarter would be to ultimately replace the tax credit with market-based support for wind as well as other forms of clean energy. Many states now have so-called renewable portfolio standards, which require utilities to use a certain percentage of electricity generated by wind and other kinds of renewable power. These states set a target, in other words, and the market figures out the most efficient way to reach it.¶ One very good suggestion for a federal program along these lines has been proposed by Senator [Jeff Bingaman](http://topics.bloomberg.com/jeff-bingaman/), a Democrat from [New Mexico](http://topics.bloomberg.com/new-mexico/). This year, he introduced a bill that would establish a “[clean energy standard](http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/featured-items?ID=1cac9909-e86f-4486-89d5-a13a763ad6ee),” requiring large U.S. utilities to derive an increasing share of their energy from cleaner energy sources -- not only renewables such as wind and solar but also natural gas and even coal with carbon capture and storage. No federal expenditure would be required.¶ Politicians in both parties should find that a virtue. Republicans from the Great Plains and other areas where the wind industry is growing substantially already seem disposed to extend the production tax credit. They could do far more for the U.S.’s energy future if they considered longer-lasting ways to help the wind business succeed.

## 3

#### Our link is linear—each sacred cow weakens efforts to balance the budget

Arkansas Democrat-Gazette 5/14/97

The agreement also achieves some savings in Medicaid. Just a few years ago, the so-called entitlements -- Medicare, Medicaid, and especially Social Security -- were considered politically untouchable, even if the programs themselves were in financial straits. **Each time** Congress finds the courage to rein in entitlements even a little -- and so chip away at their sacred-cow status -- the likelihood grows that Congress will eventually find the courage to really reform these programs. And reform is needed, not just to balance the federal budget but so the programs themselves can remain healthy for the long haul.

#### Each additional sacred cow undermines efforts to balance the federal budget

Sarasota Herald-Tribune 4/17/97

Paul Phillips, U.S. Air Force, retired: If they're trying to balance the budget - and that's what this CPI cut is all about - then I think **everything has to be put on the table and looked at**. That includes Social Security. And that also includes the annual cost-of-living adjustments. That doesn't bother me. What does concern me is where their figures are coming from; are they getting honest facts or just a bunch of numbers to prove what one group of congressmen or another want proved. The British prime minister, Benjamin Disraeli, in Queen Victoria's time, summed up my feelings when he said something like, there are liars and there are figures; there are also liars that figure and figures that lie.
Norval McHenry: Well, as of May 3, I will be a Social Security recipient. I think if we are going to balance the budget, there should be **no sacred cows whatever**, and that includes Social Security. A lot of people getting Social Security already have a lot of money, and some of them are downright stingy and selfish. Do I think that those with incomes over a certain amount shouldn't receive Social Security? No, nothing like that. They paid into it, and they're entitled to get their share out - they shouldn't be penalized just because they've been smart enough to invest their money and keep money coming in from other places. Like all of us, Social Security was an investment to them. I guess what I'd like to see is an actuarial table of the same money paid into Social Security but put into a portfolio of other investments over the years. Also, there has to be a better understanding of who needs what.

#### Big budget deficits crowd out investment, risk financial instability, and spillover to threaten the global economy

**Economist 11/8/03**

The economic consequences are indisputably negative. Big budget deficits reduce America's already abysmally low saving rate. As the economy's slack is worked off, Uncle Sam's demand for dollars is **likely to crowd out private investment and reduce long-term economic growth**. Even if the global capital market helps out, America is already enormously reliant on foreigners to fund its spending: the current-account deficit, the measure of annual borrowing from foreigners, is at an historic high of 5.1% of GDP. Big budget deficits will aggravate these external imbalances and so **raise the risk of financial volatility, even a dollar crisis**. Over the next few years, that is **perhaps the biggest risk** that Mr Bush's fiscal policies **pose for the world economy**. No Ronald Reagan

**Economic collapse causes extinction**

**Kerpen 8**-- vice president for policy at Americans for Prosperity

Phil, National Review Online, October 29, , Don't Turn Panic Into Depression, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/10/29/opinion/main4555821.shtml

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors - not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale. To be sure, Washington already has stoked the flames of the financial panic. The president and the Treasury secretary did the policy equivalent of yelling fire in a crowded theater when they insisted that Congress immediately pass a bad bailout bill or face financial Armageddon. Members of Congress splintered and voted against the bill before voting for it several days later, showing a lack of conviction that did nothing to reassure markets. Even Alan Greenspan is questioning free markets today, placing our policy fundamentals in even greater jeopardy. But after the elections, all eyes will turn to the new president and Congress in search of reassurance that the fundamentals of our free economy will be supported. That will require the shelving of any talk of trade protectionism, higher taxes, and more restrictive labor markets. The stakes couldn’t be any higher.

## Case

### Heg

#### It’s impossible to eliminate oil dependence – manufacturing.

Britt 8, Rayne Britt, May 12 2008, Helium Debates, Is solar energy a viable solution to reducing oil dependence?, http://www.helium.com/debates/81381-is-solar-energy-a-viable-solution-to-reducing-oil-dependence/side\_by\_side?page=2

Fuel and home energy are probably the two most known uses of oil. In those two areas, solar power could probably be helpful. But oil is also used in paving roads, something sunlight can't help with. Another use is making automobiles. Even an automobile that uses something other than oil as a fuel still requires oil for its construction. Many car parts such as bumpers include oils in their building process as it is common in plastics and plastic-based synthetic materials. Changing a vehicle to use solar energy (which has been done) only changes what powers it. It cannot change its construction. Automobiles of all kinds will always require oil to make them. And the roads that they roll on will always require oils to construct them.¶ Look also at the amount of oils used in your house for purposes other than heating. Common household items that use oils in their making are plastic containers, plastic wrap, paper cups, pipes for sinks and toilets, window frames and even your CD collection! It's in your television, stereo, Ipod, MP3 player, DVD player, DVD's, your X-Box and the games you put in it. You can't escape the need for oil.¶ Solar energy can go a long way in aiding with reducing oil as a heating source for homes. It can help in powering new vehicles. But it can't replace oil. And the more homes built, the more vehicles constructed, the more oil that will be used in manufacturing them. All these fuel alternatives that will make us less dependent on oil for gas use will only increase our oil dependency as we increase the amount of things we own.

#### Soft power fails – can’t generate results

Adelman 11 former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations and arms control director in the Reagan Ronald's administration, now heads (with his wife) Movers & Shakespeares, which teaches executive leadership to corporations and NGOs,

Ken, “Go ahead, Congress, cut away at U.S. foreign aid”, April 18, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/04/18/not\_so\_smart\_power?page=full,CMR

Besides resting on soft assumptions, emphasis on soft power may lead to soft thinking**.** Take Clinton's hallmark "three Ds" of defense, diplomacy, and development. While Americans do defense and diplomacy, they don't do development well. The United States can't be held responsible for another country doing what's needed to develop. By now, there's a checklist of how countries can go from poverty to prosperity -- low taxes, private property protected by law, restrained and limited government, solid currency, modern infrastructure, and attacks on corruption. But the State Department simply can't do much to ensure these elements are done well**.** I wish to end on a positive note, especially because Joseph Nye is such a fine person. He's contributed enormously to the United States, always asking hard questions on conventional thinking. He surely would welcome the same on today's fashionable thinking. All this may boil down to a big difference. I've come to believe that liberals focus primarily on intentions, while conservatives focus more on results. No doubt the soft-power goals of the State Department and USAID on diplomacy, foreign aid, exchange programs, and the like seem wonderful. They're peaceful, caring, intercultural, and so on. They signal the right intentions. The hard-power association with Pentagon budgets, weapons, and soldiers seems quite contrary. They signal the wrong intentions. But looking at the actual results of soft power versus hard power may yield results that make today's fashionable thinking seem soft, if not altogether squishy.

#### No other countries can influence the U.S. – heg is high and will remain that way

**Drezner 11**(Daniel Drezner, a Political Science professor at the University of Chicago. The End Of Power?, Foreign Policy. 2/8/11, NP, <http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/02/08/the_end_of_power> DM)

On the other hand, neither U.S. deterrent power nor other countries' compellence power has changed all that much, even in the economic realm.  The rest of the G-20 can scream as loud as they want, but  quantitative easing is going to continue.  China has tried to find ways to use its newly found financial muscle to force changes in the international system, to little avail.  To be sure, Russia, China and others can compel countries on their immediate periphery, but even a glance at the 2008 Russian-Georgian war suggests that even modest efforts like these are expensive and messy.  So... we live in a world in which more actors have vetoes over systemic change but no actor has the ability to truly compel change.  This leads to lots of talk about "[G-zero worlds](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/67339/ian-bremmer-and-nouriel-roubini/a-g-zero-world)" and so forth.  Just to be provocative, however, I wonder if what's truly changed is the extinction of compellence power as we know it.  The primary, ne plus ultr  tools of compellence require a willingness to kill, jail or starve a lot of people.  Recent flare-ups like Iran in 2009 and Egypt right now suggests that such actions are possible at the domestic level, but pretty damn costly; even authoritarian countries flinch at using brute force on a domestic population.  Cross-border efforts are even more expensive in terms of both material and reputational costs.  This isn't the end of power, but it might be the end of one particular dimension of power.

#### Heg solves nothing- past two decades prove

Mearsheimer 2011 (John J., R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, The National Interest, Imperial by Design, lexis)

One year later, Charles Krauthammer emphasized in "The Unipolar Moment" that the United States had emerged from the Cold War as by far the most powerful country on the planet.2 He urged American leaders not to be reticent about using that power "to lead a unipolar world, unashamedly laying down the rules of world order and being prepared to enforce them." Krauthammer's advice fit neatly with Fukuyama's vision of the future: the United States should take the lead in bringing democracy to less developed countries the world over. After all, that shouldn't be an especially difficult task given that America had awesome power and the cunning of history on its side. U.S. grand strategy has followed this basic prescription for the past twenty years, mainly because most policy makers inside the Beltway have agreed with the thrust of Fukuyama's and Krauthammer's early analyses. The results, however, have been disastrous. The United States has been at war for a startling two out of every three years since 1989, and there is no end in sight. As anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of world events knows, countries that continuously fight wars invariably build powerful national-security bureaucracies that undermine civil liberties and make it difficult to hold leaders accountable for their behavior; and they invariably end up adopting ruthless policies normally associated with brutal dictators. The Founding Fathers understood this problem, as is clear from James Madison's observation that "no nation can preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare." Washington's pursuit of policies like assassination, rendition and torture over the past decade, not to mention the weakening of the rule of law at home, shows that their fears were justified. To make matters worse, the United States is now engaged in protracted wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that have so far cost well over a trillion dollars and resulted in around forty-seven thousand American casualties. The pain and suffering inflicted on Iraq has been enormous. Since the war began in March 2003, more than one hundred thousand Iraqi civilians have been killed, roughly 2 million Iraqis have left the country and 1.7 million more have been internally displaced. Moreover, the American military is not going to win either one of these conflicts, despite all the phony talk about how the "surge" has worked in Iraq and how a similar strategy can produce another miracle in Afghanistan. We may well be stuck in both quagmires for years to come, in fruitless pursuit of victory. The United States has also been unable to solve three other major foreign-policy problems. Washington has worked overtime-with no success-to shut down Iran's uranium-enrichment capability for fear that it might lead to Tehran acquiring nuclear weapons. And the United States, unable to prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons in the first place, now seems incapable of compelling Pyongyang to give them up. Finally, every post-Cold War administration has tried and failed to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; all indicators are that this problem will deteriorate further as the West Bank and Gaza are incorporated into a Greater Israel. The unpleasant truth is that the United States is in a world of trouble today on the foreign-policy front, and this state of affairs is only likely to get worse in the next few years, as Afghanistan and Iraq unravel and the blame game escalates to poisonous levels. Thus, it is hardly surprising that a recent Chicago Council on Global Affairs survey found that "looking forward 50 years, only 33 percent of Americans think the United States will continue to be the world's leading power." Clearly, the heady days of the early 1990s have given way to a pronounced pessimism.

#### Primacy does not prevent a global nuclear exchange or create regional stability

Nina Hachiganand Monica Sutphen**,** Stanford Center for International Security, 2008, The Next American Century, p. 168-9

In practice, the strategy of primacy failed to deliver. While the fact of being the world’s only superpower has substantial benefits, a national security strategy based on suing and ratiaing primacy has not made America more secure. America’s military might has not been the answer to terrorism, disease, climate change, or proliferation. Iraq, Iran, and North Korea have become more dangerous in the last seven years, not less. Worse than being ineffec tive with transnational threats and smaller powers, a strategy of maintaining primacy is counterproductive when it comes to pivotal powers. If America makes primacy the main goal of its national security strategy, then why shouldn’t the pivotal powers do the same? A goal of primacy signals that sheer strength is most critical to security. American cannot trumpet its desire to dominate the world military and then question why China is modernizing its military.

#### U.S hegemony is unsustainable- economic problems, military overstretch, and rising powers

Snyder PhD, Professor of Public Policy at the University of Maryland 2010 – [Quddus Z. Snyder, “Systermic theory in an era of declining US hegemony,” <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/irworkshop/papers_fall09/snyder.pdf>]

At the turn of the century it appeared as if we were living through a ‘hegemonic age.’ But recent developments might justify a reevaluation of this conclusion.With its armed forces over-extended, and resources stretched, the US appears much weaker today than it did five years ago. The classic Gilpinian dilemma provides insight into the present predicament the US finds itself in: This three-way struggle over priorities (protection, consumption, and investment) produces a profound dilemma for society. If it suppresses consumption, the consequence can be severe internal social tensions and class conflict…If the society neglects to pay the costs of defense, external weakness will inevitably lead to its defeat by rising powers. If the society fails to save and reinvest a sufficient fraction of its surplus wealth in industry and agriculture, the economic basis of the society and its capacity to sustain either consumption or protection will decline. Thus far the US has maintained a massive defense budget while consumption and investment have been sustained by deficit spending. It is unclear how long this formula will work. The problem does not only stem from fact that the US is bogged down in two wars, it is also in the throes of a serious economic downturn. Of course, everyone is getting hit. Because all are suffering, the US is still a giant in terms of relative power differentials. Relative power is important, but so is the hegemon’s ability to actually do things. It is unlikely that the US will have either the political will or capability to take on major international undertakings. It is unclear when the US will fully withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan; however, these projects will gobble up massive amounts of resources and treasure at a time when America’s own recovery is being partly bankrolled by foreign powers like China.43 The point is simply that America’s unilateral assertiveness on the international scene is changing. US security guarantees may prove less credible than they once were, leading allies to enhance their own military capabilities. The US may still be a giant, but one that, for now at least, seems more bound.

### Warming

#### Indian territories don’t account for a large portion of US energy consumption – reservations account for less than 20% of total land in the US and they only account for 1.5% of total population. Aff can’t solve for any of our energy use anywhere else. No large states like California and New York even have any reservations on them.

#### No extinction – reject this environmental alarmism

Kaleita and Forbes 2007 Amy Kaleita, assistant professor of agricultural and biosystems engineering at Iowa State University) and Gregory Forbes (research analyst at the Pacific Research Institute) 2007 “Hysteria’s History” http://www.undergroundnotes.com/graphics2/Hysteria\_History.pdf

Apocalyptic stories about the irreparable, catastrophic damage that humans are doing to the natural environment have been around for a long time. These hysterics often have some basis in reality, but are blown up to illogical and ridiculous proportions. Part of the reason they’re so appealing is that they have the ring of plausibility along with the intrigue of a horror flick. In many cases, the alarmists identify a legitimate issue, take the possible consequences to an extreme, and advocate action on the basis of these extreme projections. In 1972, the editor of the journal Nature pointed out the problem with the typical alarmist approach: “[Alarmists’] most common error is to suppose that the worst will always happen.”82 But of course, if the worst always happened, the human race would have died out long ago. When alarmism has a basis in reality, the challenge becomes to take appropriate action based on that reality, not on the hysteria. The aftermath of Silent Spring offers examples of both sorts of policy reactions: a reasoned response to a legitimate problem and a knee-jerk response to the hysteria. On the positive side, Silent Spring brought an end to the general belief that all synthetic chemicals in use for purposes ranging from insect control to household cleaning were uniformly wonderful, and it ushered in an age of increased caution on the appropriate use of chemicals. In the second chapter of her famous book, Carson wrote, “It is not my contention that chemical insecticides must never be used. I do contend that… we have allowed these chemicals to be used with little or no advance investigation of their effect on soil, water, wildlife, and man himself.” In this passage, Carson seemed to advocate reasoned response to rigorous scientific investigation, and in fact this did become the modern approach to environmental chemical licensure and monitoring. An hour-long CBS documentary on pesticides was aired during the height of the furor over Silent Spring. In the documentary, Dr. Page Nicholson, a water-pollution expert with the Public Health Service, wasn’t able to answer how long pesticides persist in water once they enter it, or the extent to which pesticides contaminate groundwater supplies. Today, this sort of information is gathered through routine testing of chemicals for use in the environment. 20 V: Lessons from the Apocalypse However, there was, as we have seen, a more sinister and tragic response to the hysteria generated by Silent Spring. Certain developing countries, under significant pressure from the United States, abandoned the use of DDT. This decision resulted in millions of deaths from malaria and other insect-borne diseases. In the absence of pressure to abandon the use of DDT, these lives would have been spared. It would certainly have been possible to design policies requiring caution and safe practices in the use of supplemental chemicals in the environment, without pronouncing a death sentence on millions of people. A major challenge in developing appropriate responses to legitimate problems is that alarmism catches people’s attention and draws them in. Alarmism is given more weight than it deserves, as policy makers attempt to appease their constituency and the media. It polarizes the debaters into groups of “believers” and “skeptics,” so that reasoned, fact-based compromise is difficult to achieve. Neither of these aspects of alarmism is healthy for the development of appropriate policy. Further, alarmist responses to valid problems risk foreclosing potentially useful responses based on ingenuity and progress. There are many examples from the energy sector where, in the presence of demands for economy, efficiency, or less pollution, the marketplace has responded by developing better alternatives. That is not to say that we should blissfully squander our energy resources; on the contrary, we should be careful to utilize them wisely. But energy-resource hysteria should not lead us to circumvent scientific advancement by cherry-picking and favoring one particular replacement technology at the expense of other promising technologies. Environmental alarmism should be taken for what it is—a natural tendency of some portion of the public to latch onto the worst, and most unlikely, potential outcome. Alarmism should not be used as the basis for policy. Where a real problem exists, solutions should be based on reality, not hysteria.

#### Replacing coal can’t solve warming

Rapier 2012 (Robert Rapier, March 5, 2012, “Study: Eliminating Coal-Fired Power is Worth 0.2 Degrees in 100 Years,” Consumer Energy Report, http://www.consumerenergyreport.com/2012/03/05/study-eliminating-coal-fired-power-is-worth-0-2-degrees-in-100-years/)

The authors of this newest study modeled the replacement of coal-fired power plants with either natural gas, coal with carbon capture and storage, hydropower, solar PV, solar thermal, wind power, or nuclear power. You can see from Joe Romm’s headline how the story is being spun, but let’s break it down in a more objective fashion.¶ The following graphic from the paper tells the story. Pay particular attention to the temperature scale. The graphic indicates — as Tom Wigley’s previous paper indicated but which was only reported relative to natural gas — that in every single case, it doesn’t matter what coal-fired power plants are replaced with, the temperature is projected to increase for almost the next 40 years. This is true even in the baseline “Conservation” case, which involves merely idling the coal-fired plants and not replacing them with anything.¶ The paper projects that if coal-fired power plants continue to operate, the expected temperature rise relative to the baseline (i.e., relative to the expected temperature increase from other sources) in 50 years is 0.15 degrees C, and in 100 years is about 0.33 degrees C. If coal is phased out and replaced with natural gas, the relative 50 and 100 year temperature rise is projected to be 0.14 degrees C and 0.24 degrees C, respectively. So the paper shows slightly less warming when natural gas is used, which Climate Progress Tweeted as “Switch from coal to natural gas would have zero effect on global temperatures by 2100” and included a link to Joe’s “bombshell.” That is obviously an exaggeration, as the graphic clearly shows that the effect is not zero. If it was, the natural gas line would overlay the coal line.

#### Can’t dispatch it

Post 2012 (Willem Post, BSME New Jersey Institute of Technology, MSME Rensselaer, July 1, 2012, “Wind Energy CO2 Emissions Reductions are Overstated,” Energy Collective, http://theenergycollective.com/node/89476)

Dispatch Value, Variability and Intermittency of Wind Energy¶ ¶ Dispatch Value: Wind energy is significantly different from conventional gas, coal, nuclear and hydro energy; just ask any grid operator with significant wind energy on his grid. The latter are controllable and dispatchable on short notice, whereas wind energy is a product of weather-dependent, variable wind speeds, i.e., its supply is unpredictable and uncontrollable. Therefore, it has zero-dispatch value to a grid operator. ¶ ¶ A grid operator needs to have available an adequate mix of generating capacity to serve peak demands for long-term planning purposes. The mix varies from grid to grid. Wind turbine systems have a capacity value in this mix. ¶ ¶ Example: For summer peak capacity planning, ERCOT counts 8.7 percent of wind turbine rated capacity as dependable capacity at peak demand, in accordance with ERCOT’s stakeholder-adopted methodology. According to ERCOT, the capacity value is a statistical concept created for generator planning purposes. It is based on multi-year averages of wind energy generation at key peak demand periods. ¶ http://www.ercot.com/news/press\_releases/show/381¶ ¶ ERCOT's capacity planning value of 8.7% does not mean the ENERGY of 8.7% of wind turbine rated capacity would be available at any specified “time-ahead” period. Because of the randomness of wind speeds, no one can accurately predict available wind energy at any future time. Hence, it's not available “on-demand”, i.e., not dispatchable.