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#### ‘Restrictions’ must be direct and immediate limitations on freedom – otherwise it is simply a regulation

CJ Veeraswami (Former Chief Justice of the Madras High Court, India) 1966 “T.M. Kannappa Mudaliar And Ors. vs The State Of Madras” Majority opinion,

http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/838831/

The collection of a toll or a tax for the use of a road or for the use of a bridge or for the use of an aerodrome is no barrier or burden or deterrent to traders, who, in their absence, may have to take a longer or less convenient or more expensive route. Such compensatory taxes are no hindrance to anybody's freedom so long as they remain reasonable; but they could of course, be converted into a hindrance to the freedom of trade. If the authorities concerned really wanted to hamper anybody's trade they could easily raise the amount of tax or toll to an amount which would be prohibitive or deterrent or create other impediments which instead of facilitating trade and commerce would hamper them. It is here that the contrast, between 'freedom' (Article 301) and 'restrictions' (Articles 302 and 304) clearly appears; that which in reality facilitates trade and commerce is not a restriction, and that which in reality hampers or burdens trade and commerce is a restriction. It is the reality or substance of the matter that has to be determined. It is not possible apriori to draw a dividing line between that which would really be a charge for a facility provided and that which would really be a deterrent to a trade, but the distinction, if it has to be drawn is real and clear. For the tax to become a prohibited tax it has to be a direct tax the effect of which is to hinder the movement part of trade. So long as a tax remains compensatory or regulatory it cannot operate as a hindrance. 12. Subba Rao, J. as he then was, concurring with Das, J. took substantially the same view and observed (at page 1430);: The word ' freedom ' is not capable of precise definition, but it can be stated what would infringe or detract from the said freedom. Before a particular law can be said to infringe the said freedom, it must be ascertained whether the impugned provision operates as a restriction impeding the free movement of trade or only as a regulation facilitating the same. Restrictions obstruct the freedom, whereas regulations promote it. Police regulations, though they may superficially appear to restrict the freedom of movement, in fact provide the necessary conditions for the free movement. Regulations such as provision for lighting, speed, good condition of vehicles, timings, rule of the road and similar others, really facilitate the freedom of movement rather than retard it. So too, licensing system with compensatory fees would not be restrictions but regulatory provisions;, for without it, the necessary lines of communication such as roads, waterways and airways, cannot effectively be maintained and the freedom declared may in practice turn out to be an empty one....It is for the Court in a given case to decide whether a provision purporting to regulate trade is in fact a restriction on freedom. The further observations as to what was meant by Restrictions in Article 302 are (at page 1433): But the more difficult question is, what does the word " restrictions " mean in Article 302? The dictionary meaning of the word " restrict" is "to confine, bound, limit." Therefore any limitations placed upon the freedom is a restriction on that freedom. But the limitation must be real, direct and immediate, but not fanciful, indirect or remote....Of all the doctrines evolved in my view, the doctrine of ' direct and immediate effect' on the freedom would be a reasonable solvent to the difficult situation that might arise under our Constitution. If a law, whatever may have been its source, directly and immediately affects the free movement of trade, it would be restriction on the said freedom. But a law which may have only indirect and remote repercussions on the said freedom cannot be considered to be a restriction on it. 13. Subba Rao, J., as he then was summed up his views in the following words (at page 1436): The foregoing discussions may be summarised in the following propositions : (1) Article 301 declares a right of free movement of trade without any obstructions by way of barriers, inter-State or intra-State or other impediments operating as such barriers. (2) The said freedom is not impeded, but on the other hand, promoted by regulations creating conditions for the free movement of trade, such as, police regulations, provision for services, maintenance of roads, provision for aerodromes, wharfs, etc. with or without compensation. (3) Parliament may by law impose restrictions on such freedom in the public interest and the said law can be made by virtue of any entry with respect whereof Parliament has power to make a law. (4) The State also, in exercise of its legislative power, may impose similar restrictions, subject to the two conditions laid down in Article 304 (b) and subject to the Proviso mentioned therein. (5) Neither Parliament nor the State Legislature can make a law giving preference to one State over another or making discrimination between one State and another, by virtue of any entry in the Lists, infringing the said freedom. (6) This ban is lifted in the case of Parliament for the purpose of dealing with situations arising out of scarcity of goods in any part of the territory of India and also in the case of a State under Article 304 (h), subject to the conditions mentioned therein. And (7) the State can impose a non-discriminatory tax on goods imported from other States or the Union territory to which similar goods manufactured or produced in the State are subject. 14. It is thus well established that regulatory provisions which do not directly or immediately impede or burden the free movement of trade, commerce and intercourse but provide or intend to provide facilities for trade, commerce and intercourse are not restrictions within the meaning of Part XIII and are compatible with the freedom of trade declared by Article 301. Atiabari Tea Co., Ltd. v. State of Assam , and Automobile Transport Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan , are both cases of imposition of tax. The first was concerned with the Assam Taxation (on Goods carried by Roads or Inland Waterways) Act, 1954,, which was successfully attacked on the ground that it violated Article 301 and was not saved by Article 304 (b). The Act imposed a tax on specified goods transported by road or inland waterways in the State of Assam. The majority in that case held that the Act put a direct restriction on the freedom of trade and, since in doing so, had not complied with the provisions of Article 304 (b), it must be declared to be void. In the second case the Rajasthan Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1951, was impugned as violating Article 301. But the majority did not accept the contention on the view that the Act was merely a regulatory measure imposing compensatory taxes for the use of trading facilities. The scope of Article 301 was again in the light of the earlier decisions referred to in Khyerbari Tea Co. v. State of Assam , where the Assam Taxation (On goods carried by Roads or Inland Waterways) Act as amended after Atiabari Tea Co. Ltd. v. State of Assam , was attacked on various grounds but without success. 15. As already seen, the distinction between a restriction and a regulation is fine but real, though the dividing line is not capable in the nature of things of a comprehensive and satisfactory definition. The test, broadly speaking, is whether the impugned provisions lay a direct and immediate burden on the movement of trade, commerce and intercourse or are intrinsically beneficial to and provide, in the ultimate analysis, facilities for better conduct of trade, commerce and intercourse. Observed Das, J., in Automobile Transport Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan

#### Removing tariffs—border measures are not restrictions on production

Lothar Ehring (Assistant to Mr. Péter Balás, Deputy Director-General at the Directorate-General for Trade of the European Commission, responsible for multilateral affairs, as well as trade defence instruments and bilateral trade relations with Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Until 2008, Lothar Ehring served in the Unit of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Trade that is responsible for Legal Aspects of Trade Policy. He was the Coordinator for legal issues of multilateral trade, handled several WTO disputes and also represented the European Community in the negotiations on the reform of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding) and Gian Franco Chinale 2011 “Regulation of Energy in International Trade Law: Wto, Nafta and Energy Charter” p. 134-5

The perfect example to test and discuss this interpretation is the famous case of OPEC production quotas. These quotas. as implemented at the national levels of OPEC members, are horizontal restrictions on production. They limit exportation no more than domestic sales, and yet the argument is made time and again that they fall foul of Article XI:I of the GATT 1994.” The proponents of this thesis recognize that they are on thin ice. given that production limitations are as remote from being border measures as a restriction can possibly be. Equally clear is the fact that a production limitation definition does not discriminate against exports, neither de jure nor de facto. The proponents of the OPEC GATT-illegality attempt to overcome this conclusion with the argument that for some of the oil exporting countries in question, the near totality of the production goes to export. This. however, is legally irrelevant to the question of whether there is a discrimination against or higher burden on exports. The quantitative relationship between domestic consumption and exports can be very imbalanced for reasons of production and consumption capacities, in large part for reasons of a country’s size and the foreign demand for the product concerned. Also the conceptual argument that a restriction on production can be decomposed into a restriction on exportation as well a restriction on domestic sales is not plausible. The production restriction is precisely and inseparably both at the same time and this makes a qualitative difference that is impossible to set aside.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1. Ground – removing trade barriers lets them avoid relevant production debates and counterplans, which guts the operative topical term and grants them unpredictable external offense and disad answers.

#### 2. Limits – border policy involves a separate lit base that makes it impossible to anticipate topic evolution. Domestic topics are already complex on enough levels that adding a new foreign policy sector makes it unmanageable.

### USFG

Bureaucrats, politicians and military personnel who think that they have their hands on the levers of American power should exempt customer-generators of solar power from interconnection tariffs, institute federal interconnection standards, and give cash grants for new community and residential solar projects.

**Net benefit is death worship – two internal links**

**(A.) OMNIPRESENCE – THE PLAN TEXT ESTABLISHES THE USFG AS A UNITARY ACTOR WHO CAN IMPLEMENT THE PLAN. THIS IS IGNORANT OF CONTRADICTIONS WITHIN POLITICAL PROCESSES AND IS A REASON THEY CAN’T SOLVE**

**CLAUDE, 1988**

Inis, Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, States and the Global System, pg 18

This view of the state as an institutional monolith is fostered by the notion of sovereignty, which calls up the image of the monarch, presiding majestically over his kingdom. **Sovereignty emphasizes the singularity of the state**, its monopoly of authority, i**ts unity of command and its capacity to speak with one voice**. Thus, **France wills, Iran demands, China intends, New Zealand promises and the Soviet Union insists**. **One all too easily conjures up the picture of a single-minded and purposeful state that decides exactly what it wants to achieve, adopts coherent policies intelligently adapted to its objectives, knows what it is doing, does what it intends and always has its act together**. This view of the state is reinforced by political scientists’ emphasis upon the concept of policy and upon the thesis that governments derive policy from calculations of national interest. **We thus take it for granted that states act internationally in accordance with rationality conceived and consciously constructed schemes of action, and we implicitly refuse to consider the possibility that alternatives to policy-directed behavior may have importance** – alternatives such as random, reactive, instinctual, habitual and conformist behaviour. Our rationalistic assumption that states do what they have planned to do tends to inhibit the discovery that states sometimes do what they feel compelled to do, or what they have the opportunity to do, or what they have usually done, or what other states are doing, or whatever the line of least resistance would seem to suggest. **Academic preoccupation with the making of policy is accompanied by academic neglect of the execution of policy. We seem to assume that once the state has calculated its interest and contrived a policy to further that interest, the carrying out of policy is the virtually automatic result of the routine functioning of the bureaucratic mechanism of the state.** I am inclined to **call this the *Genesis* theory of public administration**, taking as my text the passage: ‘**And God said, Let there be light; and there was light’.** I suspect that in the realm of government, **policy execution rarely follows so promptly and inexorably from policy statement.** Alternatively, one may dub it the Pooh-Bah/Ko-Ko theory, honouring those denizens of William S. Gilbert’s Japan who took the position that when the Mikado ordered that something be done it was as good as done and might as well be declared to have been done.

**(B.) OMNIPOTENCE – THEIR USE OF THE WORD ‘GOVERNMENT’ IS SLAVESPEAK THAT MAKES THE AVERAGE CITIZEN POWERLESS IN THE FACE OF OVERARCHING SOVEREIGN POWER.**

**MANN, 1997**

Frederick, NSPIC DEBATE, http://www.mind-trek.com/reports/tl07e.htm

You might think, "So what? Why is this important?" Much of the time, it isn't. When the referent is a thing, a physical object, the distinction isn't important. But what happens when we use a word like "government?" What is the referent? The word "government" is generally used as a singular noun describing a creature that sounds like a human only much more powerful. Here are some examples from earlier articles: "Certainly the government is concerned only for itself and it's kin (politicians). Certainly the government will kill or imprison me if this is perceived to be in its interest. Certainly the government has the power to do so." ... "It may be very difficult for individual humans to be aware of the thought processes of governments..." and "Communicating with a government is not easy at all." You can easily find other examples in the newspaper or just listening to people talk, of the word "government" being used as if it refers to a single volitional entity. Who or what then, is this beast called "government?" Have you seen it? Have you spoken with it? Do you know any one who has? Even though the word "government" is often used as if the referent is a single being, it's obvious that it isn't. So what then does the word "government" refer to? Maybe nothing. No thing. Maybe there is no such THING as "government." At first, this may seem like a trivial distinction. After all, there are still policemen, judges, congressmen, IRS agents and other assorted terrocrats. Yes, there are people who call themselves "government." Some of them are very dangerous and all of them want to interfere with the lives of others. But thinking of "government" as an ill-defined, all-powerful foe, puts you in the position of a victim. How can anyone stand up to such a "government" as that? I certainly couldn't. This is a scary creature. But if I cross paths with a terrocrat or two, I can handle that. Terrocrats are human, with no magical powers. I can arrange my life to avoid or minimize contact with them. I can't defend myself against a mythical "government" beast. Terrocrats are human. I can deal with them.

**THE IMPACT IS EXTINCTION.**

**BERES, 1994**

Louis Rene, Ph.D., Professor of International Law, Purdue University - SPRING, 11 Ariz. J. Int'l & Comp. Law 1 “SELF-DETERMINATION, INTERNATIONAL LAW AND SURVIVAL ON PLANET EARTH”

With Hegel's characterization of the State as "the march of God in the world," John Locke's notion of a Social Contract -- the notion upon which the United States was founded n66 -- is fully disposed of, relegated to the ash heap of history. While the purpose of the State, for Locke, is to provide protection that is otherwise unavailable to individuals -- the "preservation of their lives, liberties and States" -- for Hegel, the State stands above any private interests. It is the spirit of the State, Volksgeist, rather than of individuals, that is the presumed creator of advanced civilization. And it is in war, rather than in peace, that a State is judged to demonstrate its true worth and potential. [\*22] How easily humankind still gives itself to the new gods. Promised relief from the most terrifying of possibilities -- death and disappearance -- our species regularly surrenders itself to formal structures of power and immunity. Ironically, such surrender brings about an enlargement of the very terrors that created the new gods in the first place, but we surrender nonetheless. In the words of William Reich, we lay waste to ourselves by embracing the "political plague-mongers," a necrophilous partnership that promises purity and vitality through the killing of "outsiders." This, then, is an altogether different kind of understanding. Rather than rescue humankind by freeing individuals from fear of death, this perspective recommends educating people to the truth of an incontestable relationship between death and geopolitics. By surrendering ourselves to States and to traditional views of self-determination, we encourage not immortality but **premature and predictable extinction**. It is a relationship that can, and must, be more widely understood. There are great ironies involved. Although the corrosive calculus of geopolitics has now made possible the deliberate killing of all life, populations all over the planet turn increasingly to States for security. It is the dreadful ingenuity of States that makes possible death in the billions, but it is in the expressions of that ingenuity that people seek safety. Indeed, as the threat of nuclear annihilation looms even after the Cold War, n71 the citizens of conflicting States

### States CP 1NC

#### The 50 United States state governments and relevant subnational actors should exempt customer-generators of solar power from interconnection tariffs, institute federal interconnection standards, and give cash grants for new community and residential solar projects.

#### States can do solar power – however status quo state approaches discourage decentralized power, meaning the plan requires preemption to solve

**Pursley and Wiseman – aff solvency advocate – 11** [Garrick, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Toledo College of Law, and Hannah, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Tulsa College of Law, “Local Energy”, Emory Law Journal, 60 Emory L.J. 877]

Currently, many states have chosen to adopt policies that empower local governments to experiment with a variety of different approaches to increase [\*949] the use of renewable energy. But they need not adopt such policies, and they may change course in the future. n381 State-level efforts like the New York, California, and Illinois incentive programs that complement local efforts and empower local governments through subsidies and other programs are laudable. n382 Existing statewide programs, however, present problems of scale and generally are not designed to foster distributed renewables in particular. n383 State renewable portfolio standards represent significant steps toward reforming the energy infrastructure but aim mainly to change the sources of power that large-scale utilities send to consumers over centralized grids. n384 Consumer-generated renewable power sold back to utilities may count toward the requirement, but distributed generation currently is insufficient to provide utilities with all of the power that they need to comply. n385 That, and the tendency for utilities and other influential interests to prefer centralized over distributed generation, make it likely that state RPS programs will drive growth in large scale renewable "farms" that can satisfy utilities' power requirements soon, and in large chunks. n386 This is an important step, but it does not directly aid the cause of distributed renewables, which we argue are a necessary component of a move toward a more sustainable energy future.¶ [\*950] To maximize the degree of location-specific variation that is so important to distributed renewables, future state actions that would diminish local discretion or, worse, contravene local decisions about distributed renewables in favor of uniform state-level solutions should be precluded. n387 State governments have a somewhat sordid history when it comes to allowing local policy preferences to stand over time. In the field of environmental regulation, states have repeatedly legislated out statewide policies that preempt more environmentally protective local rules. n388 Examples include the Massachusetts Pesticide Control Act's preemption of stricter local pesticide restrictions; n389 the California Water Equipment and Control Act's preemption of stricter local restrictions on the use of water-softening devices that increase the salinity of wastewater; n390 and multiple states' preemption of local hazardous waste rules that are more restrictive than statewide standards. n391

#### Plan’s preemption of states crushes federalism

**Pursley and Wiseman – aff solvency advocate – 11** [Garrick, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Toledo College of Law, and Hannah, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Tulsa College of Law, “Local Energy”, Emory Law Journal, 60 Emory L.J. 877]

The last twenty years have seen the Supreme Court's "federalist revival" reestablish aggressive judicial protections for state government prerogatives in a variety of contexts. n394 These decisions have reinvigorated the idea that the Constitution secures to state governments a characteristic of "sovereignty" or "autonomy" that serves as an external limitation on the powers of the federal government. n395 That is, they suggest a broad norm that courts should invalidate federal legislation, even if it is clearly permissible under one of Congress's enumerated powers, if it overly diminishes state government [\*952] prerogatives. n396 And there are cases suggesting that states' control over their internal governmental structures, including control over the existence and authority of local governments, is one aspect of state sovereignty that the federalist revival seeks to protect. n397 Thus, the federalism objection appears front and center: Constitutional federalism norms demand that state governments retain authority to either permit local governments to exercise discretion or to impose uniform statewide standards that preempt local rules. Federal action displacing any aspect of this "traditional" state power, on this view, would be an unconstitutional invasion of state "autonomy" or "sovereignty." n398

#### Key to solve tyranny

**Robinson, 06** [Nick – Yale Law School, J.DD., Fox Fellow at Jawaharal Nehru University, 40 Akron L. Rev. 647]

Second, federalism provides a check on the over-centralization of power. Federalism embraces a "conception of justice" that implies that a diffuse political ordering is both "necessary and desirable." n175 In Federalist 51, James Madison reassures his readers that a federalist [\*681] republic provides a "double security" against usurpations of power because power is not only divided between the different branches of the federal government, but also between the federal and **state** governments. n176 Justice O'Connor picks up this theme in Gregory v. Ashcroft where she remarks that "just as the separation and independence of the coordinate branches of the Federal Government serve to prevent the accumulation of excessive power in any one branch, a healthy balance of power between the **States** and the Federal Government will reduce the risk of tyranny and abuse from either front." n177 As areas of traditional local governance increasingly become objects of international concern there is an increased danger that localities will be weakened in their ability to act as a counterweight to federal and international power. Further, localities can play an active role in checking abuses of federal foreign policy in areas not traditionally associated with local governance. For example, localities may be able to resist perceived misuses of federal power that touch on foreign relations if they require the assistance of local authorities to implement. Several cities, such as San Francisco and Detroit, have passed resolutions denouncing the U.S. Patriot Act, and some cities have even gone so far as to decline to provide assistance to federal authorities in any instance where civil liberties might be jeopardized. n178 As will be discussed in the next section, localities have also taken a number of actions to oppose or attempt to change federal foreign policy, such as passing resolutions condemning the war in Iraq or adopting "Buy America" laws. These actions in and of themselves may have questionable impact on any perceived abuses of foreign policy decision-making power in Washington D.C., but they mobilize citizens around foreign policy issues at a local level. This mobilization of citizens is perhaps the **greatest check on usurpations of power** by the federal government and leads to the third justification for federalism in foreign relations: federalism creates control and independence at a local and **state** level which encourages [\*682] citizen participation and empowerment.

**The affirmatives acceptance of centralization prevents social movements by discouraging individual action—the result is extinction
Papworth 01** (John, Senior Editor @ Ecologist + Founder of Fourth World Review, Peace Through Social Empowerment, "Primary Causes," http://www.williamfranklin.com/4thworld/academicinn/jp14.html)

It is simply this; that our primary problem is not war, or the environment, or population pressures, nor the squandering of the planet's finite resources, nor the alienation from life of many millions of people; THE PRIMARY PROBLEM IS THAT OF SIZE, size developed on such a scale as to disempower people and which makes their moral judgements irrelevant to the passage of events. If we ignore that and simply focus our energies on particular abuses then, however commendable our objectives and our efforts, we are dealing with the effects of the abuses of power and ignoring their causes. It was Einstein who remarked 'You cannot solve a problem with the mindframe that has created it'. In saying as much he was pointing to the core of our problem; a 19th century mindframe which accepts, without question or challenge, giant centralised states and economic entrepreneurship global in its scope, which together have created a doomsday scenario for the human race. No body can be healthier than the cells of which it is comprised. If the cells of small-scale community life are debilitated or non-existent in the body politic then what we are confronted with is a form of social and political leukaemia, a destroyed immune system which cannot prevent multitudinous forms of life-threatening malignancy, such as monster global wars, from flourishing. We are not going to solve the problems of the 21st century with the mind-frame of the 19th. Social empowerment, involving the deliberate creation of an organic, multi-cellular structure and process of our political and economic institutions, is today the only realistic path to enduring peace and to any genuine social progress.

### Kritik

**Their depiction of an apocalypse of Nature is an obverse envisioning of humanity’s pure Eden -- we were cast out for the sin of our impurity. Their hysterical call to retreat from environmentally destructive practices foregrounds an artificially pure environmental state. Nothing could be more laughable; the natural world springs forth from chaos, and our moral regulations will never be able to restrict the desire for human consumption.**

**CRONON ‘96** [William; Frederick Jackson Turner Professor of History, Geography, and Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin at Madison; Uncommon Ground; 1996; p. 47-51]

But theme parks and shopping malls are by no means the only ways in which the virtual and the natural are converging in our time. It is well worth remembering that **some of the most dramatic environmental problems** we appear to be facing as we enter the twenty-first century **exist mainly as simulated representations in complex computer models** of natural systems. **Our awareness of the ozone hole** over the Antarctic, for instance, **depends** very much **on the ability of machines to process** large amounts of **data to produce maps of atmospheric phenomena that we ourselves could never witness at first hand.** No one has ever seen the ozone hole.However real the problem may be, our knowledge of it cannot help being virtual. **The same is** **even more** **true of** the phenomenon called **global warming, which many** people now **take to be an absolute fact of nature.** Like the ozone hole, **it too is probably real, but our knowledge** of it **could hardly be more simulated**. The computer models on which we base our **predictions** of what will happen as concentrations of greenhouse gases rise **are** in fact still **so unsophisticated that they cannot even do an accurate job of predicting past climatic change, let alone** change in **the future. Load** into them the **data for 1900, and the weather they will predict** for our present time **bears little resemblance to what we are now experiencing**. Given this rather awkward weakness in their software, the modelers have had to resort to a less trouble-some forecasting technique. They run their programs forward in time, once using the data for today's mixture of atmospheric gases, and once with doubled levels of carbon dioxide. After the computer has done its job, they compare the two runs and describe what will happen when we double the carbon dioxide. The only trouble is that this description is of the simulated doubling of a modeled gas in a virtual atmosphere, all of which bears only the most hypothetical relationship to the future world, for which we of course have no empirical data whatsoever. The model's ability to predict the future is no more assured than its proven inability to predict the past.18 But <48> because the phenomenon being predicted is so complex, because its consequences could be so catastrophic, and because we have no better way to investigate it, we have no choice but to rely on these flawed tools. In a very real sense, **global warming is the ultimate example of a virtual crisis in virtual nature—which is far from saying that it is unreal.** Instead, it is proof that **the virtual and the natural can converge in surprising ways**. None of this is very reassuring for environmentalists and others who look to nature as the ultimate foundation for their moral vision. In the face of culturally constructed landscapes and increasingly virtual experiences of the world, **many** of us **would not be at all unhappy if nature would reassert its own authority over all this** human **unreality. This may be** one reason **why environmentalists so often seem drawn to prophecies of ecological doom that offer elaborate descriptions of the disasters that will soon occur because of our misdeeds against the earth.** The genre is familiar enough to constitute yet another nature for our list. **It is the nightmare inversion of Eden** to which that eloquent U-Haul sign bore witness**: nature as demonic other**, nature as **avenging angel,** nature as **the return of the repressed. It can range from something as trivial as** those uncooperative **snails in our** Irvine **garden,** to natural disasters like earthquakes or floods, **to the hypothetical horrors of global warming.** At whatever scale we experience them, these things represent a nonhuman world that despite our best efforts **we** never quite succeed in fully controlling. Often we come close enough that we congratulate ourselves prematurely for our own triumph—and then **are surprised when** the long-silent fault or **the hundred-year flood suddenly reveals our hubris. As one man wrote to Time magazine** following the Northridge quake, "**If Mother Nature has proved one thing, it is that she can be a real ~~bitch."~~**19 Even beyond the earthquake and the fires, **California offered numerous examples of nature in apparent rebellion during our stay.** Early in the year reports surfaced of a high school in nearby Westminster where 292 **students** had been **infected with tuberculosis by a single classmate,** twelve of them with drug-resistant forms that would respond slowly to treatment if they responded at all. A little later the newspapers announced that the first **killer bees** had finally **made it to California, and** offered dire predictions of what this would mean for people who would now have to worry about being stung by them.20 More dramatically, **in April a young woman jogging near her home** in the Sierra Nevada foothills **was stalked and pulled from the trail by a female mountain lion and** then quickly **mauled to death. The lioness was hunted down and shot**, lest she kill again. **The woman left behind two small children; the lion, a seven-week-old cub. It undoubtedly says something about** people's **ideas of nature,** perhaps even their ideas of human nature, **that public appeals on behalf of these young orphans** soon **yielded $9,000 for the two children ... and $21,000 for the cub.**21**What is interesting about such events is** not that they occur. After all, what could be more natural than a mountain lion killing its prey or a great fault relieving its pent-up strain? What is really intriguing is **the meaning we** <50> **assign to them,** for we have an inveterate habit of **turning them into moral fables.** The snails in my Irvine garden become small gruesome symbols of the limits to human control. The earthquakes exemplify nature's terrifying randomness—and also people's hubris in pretending that rare, irregular events can safely be ignored simply because they cannot be predicted. **The mountain lion can serve as** a token of nature's savagery—or as the **innocent victim of human beings who** in their efforts to live closer to nature unthinkingly **invade the lion's home. Every environmental disaster,** all the way up to global warming**, stands as a potential indictment of the ignorant or culpable human actions that contributed to it. The human inclination is to transform all such events into**

stories that carry **a moral lesson.** Nature as demonic other is Job's whirlwind, the horror of random suffering that is all the more terrifying because it offers no discernible justification for the pain it inflicts on the innocent and the guilty alike. **Nature as the avenging angel is the dark side of the Eden story, the punishment** that follows **in the wake of** our having listened to **Satan's seductive advice.** It is this story that makes us shake our heads so knowingly even as we sympathize with the families that lost their homes in the Laguna Can-yon fire. It's too bad, we say, but they brought it on themselves by building there. What did they expect? After all, the fires are only natural. We do this even though we ourselves have almost surely made similar bargains with nature, whether we live in the fault zone or the floodplain or the path of great storms. When we become victims, these things are never our fault, though it is easy enough for us to see how others have foolishly placed themselves in harm's way. **People are drawn to nature as avenging angel for much the same reason that they are drawn to nature as Eden**. It should by now be clear that **the two are** in fact **opposite sides of the same moral coin. The one represents** our vision of **paradise:** the good that is so utterly compelling that we feel no hesitation in claiming nature as our authority for embracing it. **The other is our vision of hell: the place where those who transgress against nature will finally endure the pain and retribution they so justly deserve.** There is a wonderfully attractive clarity in this way of thinking about nature, for **it turns the non-human world into a moral universe** whose parables and teachings are strikingly **similar to those of a religion. We need such teachings, for they give meaning and value to our lives.** To the extent that **environmentalism serves as a kind of secular religion for many people in the modern world,** it is capable of doing great good if **it can teach us the stories**, as religions often try to do, **that will help us to live better, more responsible lives.** **And yet:** we must never forget that **these stories are ours, not nature's.** The natural world does not organize itself into parables. Only people do that, because **this is our peculiarly human method for making the world make sense.** And because people differ in their beliefs, because their visions of the true, the good, and the beautiful are not always the same, they <51> inevitably differ as well in their understanding of what nature means and how it should be used—because nature is so often the place where we go searching for the fulfillment of our desires. This points to one final vision of nature that recurs everywhere in this book: nature as contested terrain. Over and over again in these essays, we encounter the central paradox of this complex cultural construct. On the one hand, **people in Western cultures use the word "nature" to describe a universal reality, thereby implying that it is and must be common to all people. On the other hand, they also pour into that word all their most personal and culturally specific values: the essence of who they think they are, how and where they should live, what they believe to be good and beautiful, why people should act in certain ways. All these things are described as natural, even though everything we know about human history and culture flies in the face of that description. The result is a human world in which these many human visions of nature are always jostling against each other, each claiming to be universal and each soon making the unhappy discovery that even its nearest neighbors refuse to acknowledge that claim.**

**This understanding of the environment as pristine abstracts our own role in consumptive practices- divorcing political solutions from personal economic choices and re-entrenching destructive practices at the level of everyday social practices, turning case**

**SMITH ‘1** [Daniel Somers; Assistant Professor at Ramapo College, Carnegie Council Fellow; Place-Based Environmentalism and Global Warming: Conceptual Contradictions of American Environmentalism;*Ethics & International Affairs*; Volume 15, No. 2; 2001; http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php?prmTemplateID=8&prmID=108]

Given the long and continuing migration of political and economic power to urban and corporate centers, these views have had serious implications for people living in economically and politically marginal rural areas. If the best nature is pristine and endangered, then it must be "protected," which often means excluding materially productive land uses. In some cases, as in the Northern Forest, protection may also involve allowing certain prescribed land uses (usually those that are aesthetically pleasing) to continue in a similarly idealized vision of "traditional" working landscapes. Either way, the process of objectification is a form of conceptual power that helps to make this assertion of control over the places where others live politically feasible and morally palatable. This situation is by no means restricted to the United States or other developed countries. In places like the rainforests of Amazonia and Indonesia, or the Himalayas of Nepal, indigenous and other rural inhabitants who have little political clout are frequently overwhelmed by internationally funded conservation initiatives that, fueled by well-meaning desires to protect forests, mountains, and biodiversity, can be ignorant of or even hostile toward local subsistence needs and cultures[15](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php?prmTemplateID=8&prmID=108#footnote15#footnote15). Equally important is how these popular views of nature shape the awareness and definition of environmental problems. **Infatuation with wild**, **pristine nature tends to steer our attention away from our own impacts on the larger "nature" that surrounds us, especially where these impacts are indirect or subtle, as is the case with climate change.** As William Cronon points out, **"To the extent that we live in an urban-industrial civilization but** at the same time **pretend** to ourselves **that our *real* home is in the wilderness,** to just that extent **we give ourselves permission to evade responsibility for the lives we actually lead"** [2](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php?prmTemplateID=8&prmID=108#footnote2#footnote2). Thus, we "get back to nature" by driving on the interstate or flying in a plane and then using the latest high-tech outdoor gear. **We "get away from it all" by making a flurry of commercial transactions with travel agents, adventure outfitters, and ecotourism guides. Meanwhile, we define as "problems" those activities**, like development and clear-cutting, **that have obvious effects and can be attributed to others.** If our principal goal is to keep roads out of wilderness or protect scenery from rapacious timber corporations, **it becomes much easier to ignore the implications of our own personal and seemingly insignificant actions. Instead of emphasizing the role of consumer demand in driving the** degradation of wilderness, resource extraction in more mundane landscapes, and the **buildup of greenhouse gases that threaten rare and common places alike, we can point at the proximate destroyers of pristine nature** and confirm our personal sense of virtue by supporting environmental groups that seek to stop them. **Lost is consideration of the extraordinary amount of resources used and waste generated by Americans per capita.** Mathis **Wackernagel and** William **Rees** have developed a method for calculating the "ecological footprint" of individuals and communities based on the land area required to produce various goods, and including the estimated forest land that would be required to sequester carbon emitted from burning fossil fuels. They **estimate that there are approximately 1.5 hectares of productive land available for each human, and that the average North American uses the equivalent of between four and five hectares. "If everyone** on Earth **lived like the average** Canadian or **American, we would need** at least **three** such **planets to live sustainably"** [17](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php?prmTemplateID=8&prmID=108#footnote17#footnote17). Moreover, there is little reason to expect that middle- and upper-class environmentalists contribute any less to the problem than do others. Those who live in large homes on biologically impoverished suburban plots of land and travel to the mountains on weekends or to exotic "ecotourism" destinations for vacation, undoubtedly have a greater negative impact on the environment than do average citizens.

**Our criticism is the alternative -- our argument is that the 1AC's flawed approach to the politics of ecology make their speech act a step in the wrong direction. Voting negative entails an acknowledgement of the hybrid quality of ecology as interlocking form within cultural politics rather than separate from it -- their idealized mythos of nature is wholly incompatible with making cultural analysis a starting point for ecology**

**Proctor and Pincetl '96** James D Proctor, Department of Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara, and Stephanie Pincetl, independent conservation researcher. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1996, volume 14, pages 683-708 "Nature and the reproduction of endangered space: the spotted owl in the Pacific Northwest and southern California" [http://www.geog.ucsb.edu/~jproctor/pdf/E&P1996.pdf](http://www.geog.ucsb.edu/~jproctor/pdf/E%26P1996.pdf)

Our intent in this paper is to examine how **nature is being literally and figuratively constructed in the context of the nationally significant biodiversity-conservation efforts** taking place in the Far West of the USA. **These efforts are largely built on a crude realist premise that nature is some biophysical entity under siege by humans**. Yet the threads of nature and culture are somewhat more entangled than many conservationists are willing to admit; as Raymond Williams observed, "The idea of nature contains, though often unnoticed, an extraordinary amount of human history" (1980, page 67). In the last decade scholars from geography and other fields have explored the notion of nature as a social construct (Bennett and Chaloupka, 1993; Burgess, 1990; Cosgrove, 1984; Cronon, 1995; Demeritt, 1994; Evernden, 1993; FitzSimmons, 1989; Harrison and Burgess, 1994; Lynch, 1993; Milton, 1993; Oeschlaeger, 1991; Olwig, 1984; Simmons, 1993; Smith, 1990). Throughout this literature, emphasis has generally been placed on a **postempiricist epistemology, on nature as more than a set of plainly evident facts**. This position has become so diffuse in contemporary critical inquiry into questions of nature and environment that the epistemological gap between the literature of social constructivism and that of conservationism appears impossible to bridge. **Without further development the postempiricist position of social constructivism becomes problematic in its flirtation with epistemological relativism as well as in its ontological silence**. In its strong (and patently self-contradictory) form, relativism asserts that all truth is a matter of context, and that context is sufficiently heterogeneous to mitigate against any possibility of intersubjectively approved truth claims (Krausz, 1989; Margolis, 1986). Though not always explicitly addressed, **epistemological relativism is operationally denied in part, or at least cordoned off to less troublesome territory, by virtually all social theoretical accounts (save perhaps those advancing nihilist platforms).** Yet the social construction of nature literature is rarely clear in this regard. An epistemological position that is a refinement of the social construction of nature argument is Katherine Hayles's (1995) constrained constructivism. Hayles accepts social constructivism, but argues that constructivism occurs within a bounded set of possibilities, where the bounds are comprised of biophysical constraints: "No matter how gravity is conceived, no viable model could predict that when someone steps off a cliff on earth, she will remain spontaneously suspended in midair. Although the constraints that lead to this result are interpreted differently in different paradigms, they operate universally to eliminate certain configurations from the realm of possible answers" (page 52). Hayles's position provides a means to consider biophysical processes as actors in shaping knowledges of nature, and in responding to schemes of human practice based on these knowledges. Nonhuman species, for example, cannot adapt to all biodiversity-management schemes with equal success-though any judgment of success is also mediated through particular knowledges, which may highlight or obscure the status of certain species. **Biological science thus plays the paradoxical role in biodiversity conservation of interpreting the realities of threatened species and their habitats via an epistemological language of thoroughly human origin. The social construction of nature is more than an epistemological project**, of course. Differentiated human forces have transformed the earth (Turner et ai, 1990) with biophysical impacts that are increasingly becoming a focus of concern, leading to widespread conservation efforts. Yet again, **these impacts are not understood outside of socially constructed knowledges of nature**. The ontological (realitytransforming) and epistemological (knowledge-creating) dimensions of the social construction of nature are linked in complex ways. Bruno Latour (1993) weaves together these dimensions of the social construction of nature through his position that the mixing of the human and the nonhuman in reality-a process he terms 'translation'-has resulted not merely in altered 'natures' but in nature -culture hybrids, joint biophysical- human networks. **Latour cites ozone depletion as an example; this is typically considered a biophysical phenomenon of anthropogenic origin**. **His account**, however, **of the discourse surrounding ozone depletion suggests that the ontological elements of culture and nature are more inalienably interwoven**: "On page four of my daily newspaper, I learn that **the measurements taken above the Antarctic are not good this year**: the hole in the ozone layer is growing ominously larger. Reading on, I turn from upper-atmosphere chemists to Chief Executive Officers of Atochem and Monsanto, **companies** that **are modifying their assembly lines in order to replace the innocent chlorofluorocarbons, accused of crimes against the ecosphere**. A few paragraphs later, I come across **heads of state of major industrialized countries who are getting involved with chemistry, refrigerators**, aerosols and inert gases ... Toward the bottom of the page, **Third World countries and ecologies add their grain of salt and talk about international treaties, moratoriums, the rights of future generations**, and the right to development. **The same article mixes together chemical reactions and political reactions. A single thread links the most esoteric sciences and the most sordid politics, the most distant sky and some factory in the Lyon suburbs, danger on a global scale and the impending local elections or the next board meeting"** (1993, page 1). Latour argues that modernity is characterized not only by the proliferation of nature - culture hybrids, but by the contradictory epistemological practices of purification, of radical distancing of objects from subjects, of 'nature' from 'culture', thus hyperpolarizing the discourses between, for instance, the natural sciences and cultural studies: "Our intellectual life is out of kilter. Epistemology, the social sciences, the sciences of texts-all have their privileged vantage point, provided that they remain separate. If the creatures we are pursuing cross all three spaces, we are no longer understood. Offer the established disciplines some fine sociotechnological network, some lovely translations, and the first group will extract our concepts and pull out all the roots that might connect them to society or to rhetoric; the second group will erase the social the political dimensions, and purify our network of any object; the third group, finally, will retain our discourse and rhetoric but purge our work of any undue references to reality*horresco referens*-or to power play. In the eyes of our critics the ozone hole above our heads, the moral law in our hearts, the autonomous text, may each be of interest, but only separately" (1993, page 5). It is thus not surprising, following Latour's argument, that there has been so little engagement of the social-construction-of-nature thesis by natural scientists, as both sides have each attempted to stake their contrary epistemological claims on the same reality. In recent times, in fact, natural-**science-based conservationists have strongly rejected social constructivism because of what they perceive to be its nihilist leanings** (Soule and Lease, 1995). **The irony of this rejection, by some natural scientists and others, is that it is predicated on a particular social construction of nature-one which is purified of its embeddedness in cultural schemes of knowledge and transformative practices, and hence stakes out this pure nature as worthy of protection from adverse human influence**. The close association of biodiversity-protection efforts with applied natural science (for example, conservation biology), coupled with the predominant objective of these efforts in the preservation of more quintessentially natural places, is thus understandable in this light.

### Wall Street

#### Concentration of wealth in the hand of several elites is good – it causes economic collapse

**Kotz, 02** [David M. – Department of Economics and Political Economy, Research Institute, “Rethinking Marxism”] pg. 64-79

Neoliberalism appears to be problematic as a dominant theory for contemporary capitalism. The stability and survival of the capitalist system depends on its ability to bring vigorous capital accumulation, where the latter process is understood to include not just economic expansion but also technological progress. Vigorous capital accumulation permits rising profits to coexist with rising living standards for a substantial part of the population over the long-run. 2 However, it does not appear that neoliberalism promotes vigorous capital accumulation in contemporary capitalism. There are a number of reasons why one would not expect the neoliberal model to promote rapid accumulation. First, it gives rise to a problem of insufficient aggregate demand over the long run, stemming from the powerful tendency of the neoliberal regime to lower both real wages and public spending. Second, the neoliberal model creates instability on the macroeconomic level by renouncing state counter-cyclical spending and taxation policies, by reducing the effectiveness of Aautomatic stabilizers@ through shrinking social welfare programs,3 and by loosening public **regulation of the financial sector. This renders the system more vulnerable to major financial crises and depressions**. Third, the neoliberal model tends to intensify class conflict, which can potentially discourage capitalist investment. 4 The historical evidence confirms doubts about the ability of the neoliberal model to promote rapid capital accumulation. We will look at growth rates of gross domestic product (GDP) and of labor productivity. The GDP growth rate provides at least a rough approximation of the rate of capital accumulation, while the labor productivity growth rate tells us something about the extent to which capitalism is developing the forces of production via rising ratios of means of production to direct labor, technological advance, and improved labor skills.

#### Movements to localize civilization and end ecological destruction are rapidly gaining strength; global economic collapse is the critical mass for achieving dedevelopment

Ted **Trainer**, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, Modified 5/29/20**03**, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D24TheTransIsUnderway.html

Although a minor phenomenon at present, it can be confidently predicted that this paradigm shift will accelerate in coming years given the pace at which the globalisaztion of the economy will make it painfully obvious to more and more people that the old values and systems will not provide well for all. Building new systems. Much more impressive than the evidence of a change in world view is the growth of alternative settlements and systems. As Ife says, "At the grassroots level...increasing numbers of people in different countries are experimenting with community-based alternatives, such as local economic systems, community-based education, housing co-operatives...a community-based strategy based on principles of ecology and social justice is already emerging, as a result of the initiative of ordinary people at grass-roots level, who are turning away from mainstream structures..." (Ife, 1995, p. 99.) According to Norberg-Hodge, "Around the world, people are building communities that attempt to get away from the waste, pollution, competition, and violence of contemporary life. (Norberg-Hodge, 1996, p. 405.) The agency she has founded, the International Society for Ecology and Culture, works in Ladakh to reinforce local economies and its video Local Futures, is an inspiring illustration of what is being done in many parts of the world. The New Economic Foundation in London works to promote local economic development, with a special interest in bujilding local quality of life indicators and in establishing local currencies. Schroyer"s book Towards a World That Works (1997) documents many alternative community initiatives. "Everywhere people are waking up to the realities of their situation in a globalising economy and are beginning to recognise that their economies’ resources and socio-political participations must be regrounded in their local and regional communities." (p. 225) "Everywhere social and economic structures are re-emerging in the midst of the market system that are spontaneously generated social protections to normatively re-embed the market..." "It is no exaggeration to say that local communities everywhere are on the front lines of what might well be characterised as World War III." (p. 229.) "It is a contest between the competing goals of economic growth to maximise profits for absentee owners vs creating healthy communities that are good places for people to live." (p. 230.) "In Britain, over 1.5 million people now take regular part in a rainbow economy of community economic initiatives." (New Internationalist, 1996, p. 27.) Friberg and Hettne (1985) argue that two main groups are behind the emergence of self reliant communities, viz., those holding "post materialist" values, and those who have been marginalised, such as the unemployed and the Third World poor. In Living Lightly Schwarz and Schwarz discuss the many alternative settlements they visited on a recent world tour. They say that these people "...hope that the tiny islands of better living which they inhabit will provide examples which will eventually supplant the norms of unfettered capitalism which rule us today. Their hope is not in revolution but in persuasion by example." ( p. 2.) "What is new is that small groups of Living Lightly people are now part of an articulate and increasingly purposeful global culture which promotes values that run counter to those of the mainstream." (p. 2.) "They think the empire will eventually disintegrate...In anticipation of that collapse islands of refuge must be prepared." (p. 3.) Living Lightly people "...can only hope to prevail through their own example and the gradual erosion of the dominant system through local initiatives that exchange high living standards for a high quality of life." (p. 165.) Living Lightly people "...are in revolt against the emerging global economy and want to set up viable local alternatives." (p. 150.)

#### Every day of delay risks death

**McPherson 10** [Guy McPherson is professor emeritus of natural resources and the environment at the University of Arizona, where he taught and conducted research for 20 years. His scholarly efforts have produced nine books and well over 100 articles, and have focused for many years on conservation of biological diversity, 8-16-10, “A review before the exam,” <http://guymcpherson.com/2010/08/a-review-before-the-exam/>]

I’ve written all this before, but I have not recently provided a concise summary. This essay provides a brief overview of the dire nature of our predicaments with respect to fossil fuels. The primary consequences of our fossil-fuel addiction stem from two primary phenomena: peak oil and global climate change. The former spells the end of western civilization, which might come in time to prevent the extinction of our species at the hand of the latter.

Global climate change threatens our species with extinction by mid-century if we do not terminate the industrial economy soon. Increasingly dire forecasts from extremely conservative sources keep stacking up. Governments refuse to act because they know growth of the industrial economy depends (almost solely) on consumption of fossil fuels. Global climate change and energy decline are similar in this respect: neither is characterized by a politically viable solution.

There simply is no comprehensive substitute for crude oil. It is the [overwhelming fuel of choice for transportation](http://www.jeffrubinssmallerworld.com/2010/08/11/boone-pickens%E2%80%99s-plan-full-of-hot-air/), and there is no way out of the crude trap at this late juncture in the industrial era. We passed the world oil peak in 2005, which led to near-collapse of the world’s industrial economy several times between September 2008 and May 2010. And we’re certainly not out of the economic woods yet.

Crude oil is the master material on which all other depend. Without abundant supplies of inexpensive crude oil, we cannot produce uranium (which peaked in 1980), coal (which peaks within a decade or so), solar panels, wind turbines, wave power, ethanol, biodiesel, or hydroelectric power. Without abundant supplies of inexpensive crude oil, we cannot maintain the electric grid. Without abundant supplies of inexpensive crude oil, we cannot maintain the industrial economy for an extended period of time. Simply put, abundant supplies of inexpensive crude oil are fundamental to growth of the industrial economy and therefore to western civilization. Civilizations grow or die. Western civilization is done growing.

Not only is there no comprehensive substitute for crude oil, but partial substitutes simply do not scale. Solar panels on every roof? It’s too late for that. Electric cars in every garage? It’s too late for that. We simply do not have the cheap energy requisite to propping up an empire in precipitous decline. Energy efficiency and conservation will not save us, either, as demonstrated by the updated version of Jevons’ paradox, the [Khazzoom-Brookes postulate](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khazzoom%E2%80%93Brookes_postulate).

Unchecked, western civilization drives us to one of two outcomes, and perhaps both: (1) Destruction of the living planet on which we depend for our survival, and/or (2) Runaway greenhouse and therefore the near-term extinction of our species. Why would we want to sustain such a system? It is immoral and omnicidal. The industrial economy enslaves us, drives us insane, and kills us in myriad ways. We need a living planet. Everything else is less important than the living planet on which we depend for our very lives. We act as if non-industrial cultures do not matter. We act as if non-human species do not matter. But they do matter, on many levels, including the level of human survival on Earth. And, of course, there’s the matter of ecological overshoot, which is where we’re spending all our time since at least 1980. Every day in overshoot brings us **205,000 people** to deal with later. In this case, “deal with” means murder.

Shall we reduce Earth to a lifeless pile of rubble within a generation? Or shall we heat the planet beyond human habitability within two generations? Or shall we keep procreating as if there are no consequences for an already crowded planet? Pick your poison, but recognize it’s poison. We’re dead either way.

Don’t slit those wrists just yet. This essay bears good news.

Western civilization has been in decline at least since 1979, when world per-capita oil supply peaked coincident with the Carter Doctrine regarding oil in the Middle East. In my mind, and perhaps only there, these two events marked the apex of American Empire, which began about the time Thomas Jefferson — arguably the most enlightened of the Founding Fathers — said, with respect to native Americans: “In war, they will kill some of us; we shall destroy all of them.” It wasn’t long after 1979 that the U.S. manufacturing base was shipped overseas and we began serious engagement with Wall Street-based casino culture as the basis for our industrial economy. By most economic measures, we’ve experienced a lost decade, so it’s too late for a fast crash of the industrial economy. We’re in the midst of the same slow train wreck we’ve been experiencing for more than a decade, but the train is teetering on the edge of a cliff. Meanwhile, all we want to discuss, at every level in this country, is the quality of service in the dining car.

When the price of crude oil exhibits a price spike, an economic recession soon follows. Every recession since 1972 has been preceded by a spike in the price of oil, and direr spikes translate to deeper recessions. Economic dominoes began to fall at a rapid and accelerating rate when the price of crude spiked to $147.27/bbl in July 2008. They haven’t stopped falling, notwithstanding economic cheerleaders from government and corporations (as if the two are different at this point in American fascism). The reliance of our economy on derivatives trading cannot last much longer, considering the value of the derivatives — like the U.S. debt — greatly exceeds the value of all the currency in the world combined with all the gold mined in the history of the world.

Although it’s all coming down, as it has been for quite a while, it’s relatively clear imperial decline is accelerating. We’re obviously headed for full-scale collapse of the industrial economy, as indicated by these [40 statistics](http://www.pakalertpress.com/2010/08/10/40-bizarre-statistics-that-reveal-the-horrifying-truth-about-the-collapse-of-the-u-s-economy/). Even Fortune and CNN agree [economic collapse will be complete soon](http://money.cnn.com/2010/08/11/news/economy/economic_collapse_GDP_unemployment.fortune/index.htm), though they don’t express any understanding of how we arrived at this point or the hopelessness of extracting ourselves from the morass.

#### Tech fixes without decreasing consumption risk extinction – don’t address the root cause of climate change and other environemtn diassters

**Godhaven 9** (Merrick, environmental writer and activist, “Swapping technologies fails to address the root causes of climate change,” July 15, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/cif-green/2009/jul/15/technofix-climate-change)

Technology is part of the solution to climate change. But only part. Techno-fixes like some of those in the Guardian's Manchester Report simply cannot deliver the carbon cuts science demands of us without being accompanied by drastic reductions in our consumption. That means radical economic and social transformation. Merely swapping technologies fails to address the root causes of climate change. We need to choose the solutions that are the cheapest, the swiftest, the most effective and least likely to incur dire side effects. On all counts, there's a simple answer – **stop burning the stuff** in the first place. **Consume less.** There is a certain level of resources we need to survive, and beyond that there is a level we need in order to have lives that are comfortable and meaningful. It is far below what we presently consume. Americans consume twice as much oil as Europeans. Are they twice as happy? Are Europeans half as free? Economic growth itself is not a measure of human well-being, it only measures things with an assessed monetary value. It values wants at the same level as needs and, while it purports to bring prosperity to the masses, its tendency to concentrate profit in fewer and fewer hands leaves billions without the necessities of a decent life. Techno-fixation masks the incompatibility of solving climate change with unlimited economic growth. Even if energy consumption can be reduced for an activity, ongoing economic growth eats up the improvement and overall energy consumption still rises. We continue destructive consumption in the expectation that new miracle technologies will come and save us. The hope of a future techno-fix feeds into the pass-it-forward, do-nothing-now culture typified by targets for 2050. Tough targets for 2050 are not tough at all, they are a decoy. Where are the techno-fix plans for the peak in global emissions by 2015 that the IPCC says we need? Even within the limited sphere of technology, we have to separate the solutions from the primacy of profit. We need to choose what's the most effective, not the most lucrative. Investors will want the **maximum return** for their money, and so the benefits of any climate technologies will, in all likelihood, be sold as carbon credits to the polluter industries and nations. It would not be done in tandem with emissions cuts but instead of them, making it not a tool of mitigation but of exacerbation. Climate change is not the only crisis currently facing humanity. **Peak oil** is likely to become a major issue within the coming **decade.** Competition for land and water, soil fertility depletion and collapse of fisheries are already posing increasing problems for food supply and survival in many parts of the world. Technological solutions to climate change fail to address most of these issues. Yet even without climate change, this systemic environmental and social crisis threatens society, and requires deeper solutions than new technology alone can provide. Around a fifth of emissions come from deforestation, more than for all transport emissions combined. There is no technological fix for that. We simply need to consume less of the forest, that is to say, less meat, less agrofuel and less wood. Our level of consumption is inequitable. Making it universal is simply impossible. The scientist Jared Diamond calculates that if the whole world were to have our level of consumption, it would be the equivalent of having 72 billion people on earth. With ravenous economic growth still prized as the main objective of society by all political leaders the world over, that 72 billion would be just the beginning. At 3% annual growth, 25 years later it would be the equivalent of 150 billion people. A century later it would be over a trillion. Something's got to give. And indeed, it already is. It's time for us to call it a crisis and respond with the proportionate radical action that is needed. We need profound change – not only government measures and targets but financial systems, the operation of corporations, and people's own expectations of progress and success. Building a new economic democracy based on meeting human needs equitably and sustainably is at least as big a challenge as climate change itself, but if human society is to succeed the two are inseparable. Instead of asking how to continue to grow the economy while attempting to cut carbon, we should be asking why economic growth is seen as more important than survival.

#### Growth causes war – increases resolve of leaders

**Boehmer 10** (Charles, professor of political science at the University of Texas – El Paso and Ph.D. in Political Science from Pennsylvania State University, “Economic Growth and Violent International Conflict: 1875-1999,” Defence and Peace Economics, June, Vol. 21, Issue 3, pg. 249-268)

The theory set forth earlier theorizes that economic growth increases perceptions of state strength, increasing the likelihood of violent interstate conflicts. Economic growth appears to increase the resolve of leaders to stand against challenges and the willingness to escalate disputes. A non-random pattern exists where higher rates of GDP growth over multiple years are positively and significantly related to the **most severe** international conflicts, whereas this is not true for overall conflict initiations. Moreover, growth of military expenditures, as a measure of the war chest proposition, does not offer any explanation for violent interstate conflicts. This is not to say that growth of military expenditures never has any effect on the occurrence of war, although such a link is not generally true in the aggregate using a large sample of states. In comparison, higher rates of economic growth are significantly related to violent interstate conflicts in the aggregate. States with growing economies are more apt to reciprocate military challenges by other states and become involved in violent interstate conflicts. The results also show that theories from the Crisis-Scarcity perspective lack explanatory power linking GDP growth rates to war at the state level of analysis. This is not to say that such theories completely lack explanatory power in general, but more particularly that they cannot directly link economic growth rates to state behavior in violent interstate conflicts. In contrast, theories of diversionary conflict may well hold some explanatory power, although not regarding GDP growth in a general test of states from all regions of the world across time. Perhaps diversionary theory better explains state behaviors short of war, where the costs of externalizing domestic tensions do not become too costly, or in relation to the foreign policies of particular countries. In many circumstances, engaging in a war to divert attention away from domestic conditions would seemingly exacerbate domestic crisis conditions unless the chances of victory were practically assured. Nonetheless, this study does show that domestic conflict is associated with interstate conflict. If diversionary conflict theory has any traction as an economic explanation of violent interstate conflicts, it may require the study of other explanatory variables besides overall GDP growth rates, such as unemployment or inflation rates. The contribution of this article has been to examine propositions about economic growth in a global study. Most existing studies on this topic focus on only the United States, samples of countries that are more developed on average (due to data availability in the past), or are based on historical information and not economic GDP data. While I have shown that there is no strong evidence linking military expenditures to violent interstate conflicts at the state level of analysis, much of the remaining Growth-as-Catalyst perspective is grounded in propositions that are not directly germane to questions about state conflict behavior, such as those linking state behavior to long-cycles, or those that remain at the systemic level. What answer remains linking economic growth to war once we eliminate military expenditures as an explanation? Considering that the concept of foreign policy mood is difficult to identify and measure, and that the bulk of the literature relies solely on the American historical experience, I do not rely on that concept. It is still possible that such moods affect some decision-makers. Instead, similar to Blainey, I find that economic growth, when sustained over a stretch of years, has its strongest effect on states once they find themselves in an international crisis. The results of this study suggest that states such as China, which have a higher level of opportunity to become involved in violent interstate conflicts due to their capabilities, geographic location, history of conflict, and so on, should also have a higher willingness to fight after enjoying multiple years of recent economic growth. One does not have to assume that an aggressive China will emerge from growth. If conflicts do present themselves, then China may be more likely to escalate a war given its recent national performance.

#### No spillover – Obama’s inevitably going to support imperialism, neoliberalism, and other systems of oppression in other circumstances

**Hossein-zadeh 11** [Ismael, professor of economics at Drake University, Asia Times, Feb. 3, 2011, “Obama: The closet president”]

President Ronald Reagan did not make any bones about his intention to reverse the New Deal economics when he set out to promote Neoliberal economics. Likewise, president George W Bush did not conceal his agenda of aggressive, unilateral militarism abroad and curtailment of civil liberties at home. There is a major similarity and a key difference between these two presidents, on the one hand, and President Barack Obama, on the other. The similarity lies in the fact that, like his predecessor, Obama faithfully, and indeed vigorously, carries out both the Neoliberal and militaristic policies he inherited. The difference is that while Reagan and Bush were, more or less, truthful to their constituents, Obama is not: while catering to the powerful interests vested in finance and military capitals, he pretends to be an agent of "change" and a source of "hope" for the masses. There has been a wide-ranging consensus that the excessive financial/economic deregulations that started in the late 1970s and early 1980s played a critical role in both the financial bubble that imploded in 2007-2008 and the continuing persistence of the chronic recession, especially in the labor and housing markets. Prior to his recent u-turn on the regulation-deregulation issue, Obama shared this near unanimous view of the destructive role of the excessive deregulation of the past several decades and, indeed, strongly supported the need to bolster regulation: "It's time to get serious about regulatory oversight," Obama argued as the Democratic nominee for president; and again, "... this crisis has reminded us that without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control", as he stated in his inaugural speech. Expressions of such pro-regulation sentiments were part of his earlier promises of "hope" and "change" in a new direction. Back then, that is, before showing his Neoliberal hand, the majority of the American people believed him - the middle, lower-middle, poor and working people who were tired of three decades of steady losses of economic security were desperately willing to believe a charismatic leader who peddled hope and change in their favor. Recently, however, the president seems to have had a change of heart, or perhaps an epiphany, regarding the regulation-deregulation debate: he now argues that protracted recession and persistent high levels of unemployment are not due to excessive deregulation but to overregulation! Accordingly, he issued an executive order on January 18 this year that requires a comprehensive review of all existing government regulations. On the same day, the president wrote an op-ed piece for the Wall Street Journal in which he argued that the executive order was necessary in order "to remove outdated regulations that stifle job creation and make our economy less competitive". The president further argued that "Sometimes, those [regulatory] rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business - burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect on growth and jobs. ... As the executive order I am signing makes clear, we are seeking more affordable, less intrusive means to achieve the same ends - giving careful consideration to benefits and costs." Stripped from its Orwellian language, this "cost-benefit" approach to health, safety and environmental standards is clearly the familiar Neoliberal rhetoric that is designed to help big business and their lobbies that have been working feverishly to stifle the widespread pro-regulation voices that have grown louder since the 2007-08 financial meltdown. Indeed, the president's recent agenda of further deregulation has already born fruits for big business. The Wall Street Journal reported on January 20: A day after President Barack Obama ordered the government to get rid of burdensome rules, two federal agencies backed down from proposals that had drawn jeers from businesses. ... The Labor Department said it was withdrawing a proposal on noise in the workplace that could have forced manufacturers to install noise-reducing equipment. And the Food and Drug Administration retreated from plans to tighten rules on medical-device approvals, postponing a proposal that would have given the FDA power to order additional post-market studies of devices. ... Industry leaders praised the moves, while consumer advocates expressed disappointment. ... 'This is a very positive step forward,' said Bill Hawkins, chief executive of medical-devices heavyweight Medtronic Inc. How is the president's sharp turnaround on the regulation-deregulation debate to be explained? What "outdated deregulation" is he talking about? How could deregulation, which is widely believed to have been the problem, also be the solution? Why this sudden u-turn? The change in the president's view from the need for regulation to that of further deregulation can be explained on a number of planes. On a narrow, personal and (perhaps) simplistic level, it can be argued that the president's about-face on the issue of deregulation should not really be surprising; the turnaround represents quintessential Obama: spineless and/or unscrupulous, if you are a critic of the president; pragmatic and/or complex, if you are an apologist or defender of him. There are also, of course, re-election considerations here. And here it seems that the president's team is pinning his chances for re-election on big business and big media; confident that once he is able to win their hearts and minds, they will, in turn, be able to manipulate the public to vote for him - just as they did in the 2008 election. On a deeper (but still personal) level, that is, on a philosophical or ideological level, it can be argued that the president has always been a Neoliberal thinker, albeit a stealth Neoliberal, who is coming out of the closet, so to speak, carefully and gradually. Evidence of his being ideologically more a partisan of Neoliberal than New Deal economics is overwhelming (see, for example, the writings of economist Alan Nasser, professor emeritus at The Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington). It is necessary to point out that although the stealth Neoliberal president has been taking baby steps out of the closet, he always stays by the entrance: as long as there is no popular anger or pressure against his Neoliberal policies, he stays on the outside; at the first signs of a threatening pressure from the grassroots, however, he crawls back inside the closet, and begins preaching populism or uttering ineffectual, benign corporate-bashing rhetoric. This is his mission and his political forte - a master demagogue. And this is why the politico-economic establishment promoted him to the presidency, as they found him the most serviceable candidate. None of his presidential rivals could have served the tycoons of the finance world and the kings of Wall Street as well as he has. On a more fundamental level, Obama's reversal of his view from the need for rigorous regulation to the need for further deregulation, and his economic policies in general, show that while the politics and personalities of a president ought not be ignored, presidential economic policies cannot be explained by purely personality issues such as a failure of nerve, conviction, or ideas. The more crucial determinants of national economic policies are often submerged: the balance of social forces and the dominant economic interests that shape such policies from behind the scene. Stabilization, restructuring or regulatory policies are often subtle products of the outcome of the class struggle. Thus, when the balance of social forces is tilted in favor of the rich and powerful, crisis-management economic policies are crafted at the expense of the working people and other grassroots. In other words, as long as the costly consequences of the brutal Neoliberal restructuring policies (in terms of job losses, economic insecurity, and environmental degradation) are tolerated, business and government leaders, Republican or Democrat, do not hesitate to put into effect draconian measures to restore conditions of capitalist profitability at the expense of the impoverishment of the public. On the other hand, when crisis periods give rise to severe resistance from the people to cuts in social spending, such crisis-management policy measures could also benefit the public. A comparison/contrast of policy responses to major economic crises in the United States clearly supports this point. Economic historians have identified four major economic crises in the past 150 years or so: The First Great Depression (1873-97), The Second Great Depression (1929-37), the long recession of 1973-83 (also known as the stagflation of the 1970s), and the current long recession that started in 2007-08. Since there was no compelling grassroots pressure in response to either the First Great Depression of 1873-97 or the long recession of the 1970s, crisis management policies in both instances were decisively of the Neoliberal, supply-side type: suppression of trade unions and curtailment of wages and benefits; promotion of mergers, concentrated industries and big business; extensive deregulation and generous corporate welfare plans; in short, huge transfers of income from labor to capital. Likewise, a glaring lack of grassroots resistance in the face of the present long recession has allowed the ruling kleptocracy (both in the US and beyond) to adopt similarly brutal austerity policies that are gradually reviving financial/corporate profitability at the expense of the poor and working people. By contrast, in response to the Great Depression of the 1930s, workers and other popular forces achieved employment and income security as a result of a sustained pressure from "below". The contrast between these two entirely different types of restructuring strategies shows that, as Mark Vorpahl, a union steward, recently put it, "Working people and the unemployed cannot rely on the politicians to get the change we need. We can only rely on our own collective strength. That is, we need to organize and mobilize as a united, massive, powerful force that cannot be ignored by those more intent to do Wall Street's bidding." Only the threat of revolution can force people-friendly reform on the ruling kleptocracy.

#### No genocide impact

### Fossil

#### Only encouraging solar fails – creates a new hegemonic energy that preserves the same violence and war

**Bookchin ‘80**

(Murray, Noted Social Philosopher, Toward an Ecological Society, Pg. 91-92)

To make solar energy alone, or wind power alone, or methane alone the exclusive "solution" to our energy problems would be as regressive as adopting nuclear energy. Let us grant that solar energy, for example, may prove to be environmentally far less harmful and more efficient than conventional forms. But to view it as the exclusive source of energy presupposes a mentality and sensibility that leaves untouched the industrial apparatus and the competitive, profit oriented social relations that threaten the viability of the biosphere. In all other sphere's of life, growth would still be pursued for its own sake, production for its own sake, and consumption for its own sake, followed eventually by the simplification of the planet to a point which would resemble a more remote geological age in the evolution of the organic world. Conceptually, the beauty of "alternate energy" has been not merely its efficiency and its diminution of pollutants, but the ecological interaction of solar collectors, wind generators, and methane digesters with each other and with many other sources of energy including wood, water - and yes, coal and petroleum where necessary-to produce a new energy pattern, one that is artistically tailored to the ecosystem in which it is located. Variety would be recovered in the use of energy just as it would be in the cultivation of the soil, not only because variety obviates the need to use harmful "buffers," but because it promotes an ecological sensibility in all spheres of technology. Without variety and diversity in technology as a whole, solar energy would merely be a substitute for coal, oil, and uranium rather than function as a stepping stone to an entirely new way of dealing with the natural world and with each other as human beings.

## 2nc

### AT: Solvency

**STAR THIS CARD – EVEN A POINT ONE PERCENT RISK OF SOLVENCY JUSTIFIES A NEGATIVE BALLOT.**

**MANN, 1997**

Frederick, NSPIC DEBATE, http://www.mind-trek.com/reports/tl07e.htm

FM: You still don't know what this debate is about. It's not really about the "nature of government" -- it's about your hallucination: the De Rivaz Hallucination -- DRH. DRH is at the root of the "government" problem. If even 0.1 percent (one in a thousand) of freedom-lovers were to cure themselves of DRH and learn to communicate about it effectively, the cure would start spreading more rapidly. This would greatly accelerate the solution of the "government" problem. Even if only one percent of readers could fairly quickly understand this debate, it will probably induce a further 5-10 percent to start thinking and questioning. Some will also realize the profound increase in personal power that comes with transcending DRH. JDR quoting Shakespeare: "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers." - Henry VI FM: No, John/Shakespeare. You got it horribly wrong. The first thing we do, let's kill all the hallucinations in our heads -- particularly the hallucination that the lawyers' noises and scribbles constitute "the law."

### USFG PIC Solvency

**THE COUNTERPLAN SOLVES BY RECOGNIZING THE GOVERNMENT AS NOTHING BUT AN AMALGAMATION OF INDIVIDUALS.**

**LUNDY, 2007**

Tom, best-known authority on jury instructions in California and criminal appellate practitioner since 1974, Posted in response to A Fiscal ‘Tsunami’ http://www.newsweek.com/id/70378/output/comments

Ron Paul "and those like him" understand human nature much better than you seam to. People always act in their own self interest. Like it or not that is life. Arguing otherwise is what got us in this mess.. But the major point is this...Instead of using the word government use the words politicians and bureaucrats, which is what government really is, and see if it still makes sense hiring politicians and bureaucrats to be the watchdog and caretaker of the masses. Politicians and bureaucrats couldn't even be the watchdog caretakers for one lousy city, New Orleans. Did you forget what a fine job the politicians and bureaucrats did there?

### A/T Pics Bad

1. Word pics are key to education and completely fair – even though there is a material reality, language is the only way we give and understand meaning of that reality – proves our education is more important

**Doty** 19**96**  (Roxanne Lynn Assistant Professor Of Political Science At Arizona State University,, Imperial Encounters, P. 5-6, BB)

This study begins with the premise that representation is an in­herent and important aspect of global political life and therefore a critical and legitimate area of inquiry. International relations are in­extricably bound up with discursive practices that put into circula­tion representations that are taken as "truth." The goal of analyz­ing these practices is not to reveal essential truths that have been obscured, but rather to examine *how* certain representations under­lie the production of knowledge and, identities and how these repre­sentations make various courses of action possible. As Said (1979: 21) notes, there is no such thing as a delivered presence, but there is *a re-presence,* or representation. Such an assertion does not deny the existence of the material world, but rather suggests that material objects and subjects are constituted as such within discourse. So, for example, when U.S. troops march into Grenada, this is certainly "real," though the march of troops across a piece of geographic space is in itself singularly uninteresting and socially irrelevant out­side of the representations that produce meaning. It is only when "American" is attached to the troops and "Grenada" to the geo­graphic space that meaning is created. What the physical behavior itself is, though, is still far from certain until discursive practices con­stitute it as an "invasion," a "show of force," a "training exercise," a "rescue," and so on. What is "really" going on in such a situation is inextricably linked to the discourse within which it is located. To at­tempt a neat separation between discursive and nondiscursive prac­tices, understanding the former as purely linguistic, assumes a series of dichotomies—thought/reality, appearance/essence, mind/matter, word/world, subjective/objective—that a critical genealogy calls into question. Against this, the perspective taken here affirms the mater­ial and'performative character of discourse.' In suggesting that global politics, and specifically the aspect that has to do with relations between the North and the South, is linked to representational practices I am suggesting that the issues and con­cerns that constitute these relations occur within a "reality" whose content has for the most part been defined by the representational practices of the “first world”. Focusing on discursive practices enables one to examine how the processes that produce "truth" and "knowledge" work and how they are articulated with the exercise of political, military, and economic power.

**Understanding word choice is a political and ethical issue – it’s a necessary literacy skill and can protect against sexist usage and propaganda.**

Coe 93 (Richard, Professor of English at Simon Fraser University and author of multiple books on rhetoric, Rhetoric Review, Vol. 27 Iss. 1, “Beyond Diction”, March 1, JSTOR)

In writing classes our discussion of words is all too often based in reductively narrow, dichotomized conceptions of style and diction. We will do well to let Burke remind us words are more important than that, to remind us how wording can constitute knowledge and power. We should demonstrate to our students-while treating such important practices as the use and abuse of jargon, nominalization, passive voice, tropes, public doublespeak, sexist usage-both the cognitive and the political power of naming and renaming. Burke's theory of entitlement consti-tutes a rhetorical method for demonstrating how word choice and world view intermesh, make each other (and us), how renaming can be a way of reinventing, why terminology matters, how it is social (how it constitutes the ultimate rhetoric: persuasion without argument). A New Rhetorical understanding of how words work can help people become better writers and readers, make them more literate, help them protect themselves from various forms of verbal abuse (e.g., public doublespeak). Beyond its practical benefits, it can humanize our composition courses. To use Burke's rhetoric is to take seriously James Raymond's argument that rhetoric is the methodology of the humanities, and more. It is to remember that rhetoric is the methodology of human decisions, of practical politics and real-world ethics.

**Demands for a ‘solvency advocate’ stifle innovation and new solutions, fostering cronyism and a bankrupt research system**

MacNab and Thomas 07 (Natasha and Gary, “Quality in Educational Research” Building Research Capacity Issue 12, June, [http://www.facebook.com/l/29549;www.tlrp.org/capacity/issue12.pdf](http://www.facebook.com/l/29549%3Bwww.tlrp.org/capacity/issue12.pdf))

But there are problems in using such criteria as general markers for quality. One needs first to ask ‘Quality for whom?’ - for the funder and the university researcher will surely rank any such criteria differently. The academic may question the value of research that is specifically directed toward questions that are considered to be significant, and may point to the plethora of scientific discoveries deriving from serendiptous events, often accidental artifacts of the ostensible purpose of any inquiry (see Roberts, 1989; Thagard, 1998). Indeed, it sometimes seems that the great majority of significant advance in scientific research derives from these quasi-random assays into inquiry. The academic may also point to the compromises enjoined on research that is not entirely curiosity- driven. Further, there will even be major areas of disagreement among individual researchers. Education sits in an unusual position in a disciplinary sense, drawing as it does from a variety of methodological traditions and with particular expectations of an articulation between research, theory and practice. This makes the general definition of quality peculiarly difficult as each tradition stresses different parameters and conditions for quality, with very little shared in world-view. There are also more general concerns about attempts to define quality that are articulated across all academic disciplines. The concern here is that any stress on quality is accompanied by conservatism and defensiveness in any community of assessors with the possibilities that innovation in the use of method is inhibited and that unoriginal work is encouraged. This concern about conservatism is at the root of much criticism of peer review itself, which is said to foster cronyism, block innovation and creativity, and favour ‘projects with predictable outcomes and usually rejects novel higher risk proposals’ (Berezin, 2001). It is a system that Berezin (2001) says encourages researchers to produce work that is safe and has been done before, promoting ‘mediocrity and triviality rather than true innovation’ (p.97).

### A/T Perm Do CP

2. word choice is not a mere accident – it’s a reflection of ideology

Wenden, 2003 (Anita L., Professor Emerita of Research and Academic Writing and Professor Emerita of cultural Diversity at York College, “Achieving a Comprehensive Peace,” April, Peace and Change, Vol. 28, No. 2)

The reality we experience can be referred to in any number of different ways. We consciously or unconsciously may choose from among several words to refer to the same persons, groups, social relations, events, or social issues. For example, noncitizens who leave their countries and enter the United States with the intent of taking up residence but who do not have appropriate documentation may be referred to as Òeconomic refugeesÓ or Òillegal aliensÓ or Òundocumented immigrants.Ó A lexical choice, in effect, categorizes the group or issue in terms of those features selected as salient on the basis of oneÕs particular value system or ideological stance. Groups who support abortion refer to themselves as Òpro-choice,Ó highlighting the importance of a womanÕs right to choose, while those who oppose it designate themselves as Òpro-lifeÓ to emphasize the fact that an abortion destroys a human life. Through word choice, persons in a discourse, activities in which they engage, and events for which they are responsible may be characterized so as to give a positive representation of the in-group and a negative representation of the other, such as power-hungry Jews, uncivilized black Africans, or Asians desiring an unfair share.31 A lexical choice also can frame a whole discourse determining how participants are to think and to talk about the topic under discussion. For example, Brien Hallett and Ralph Summy (this issue) argue that the use of the term ÒweaponÓ in referring to the nuclear bomb allows those who advocate its development and possible use to portray it as a legitimate and effective instrument of power. In sum, lexicalization has very practical consequences. Implicit in the word we choose to label a reality is a belief system that will determine how we are to think and to act vis-.-vis the persons, groups, social events, and issues the word represents. Thus, it is another linguistic means for communicating ideology through text or talk.

### Framework

**The topic is about hypothetical government change**

**Ericson 3** (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow should in the should-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase free trade, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the affirmative side in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

### Case D

#### Social Movements Fail to spillover globally

**Barnhizer, 6** David, Prof of Law, Cleveland State U, ‘Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream”,’ Geo Int’l Envtl L Rev, pg. l/n

Devotees of sustainability pin their hopes on an awakening by an enlightened populace that will rise up and insist that business and government behave in ways that reflect the idea that "[a] sustainable society is one that can persist over generations, one that is far-seeing enough, flexible enough, and wise enough not to undermine either its physical or its social systems of support." [n81](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.714257.8466500462&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1231738964826&returnToKey=20_T5507732879&parent=docview#n81) This awakening is not going to happen. There will never be a populist revolution in the way humans value the environment, social justice, and other matters of moral consequence. We frequently "talk the talk," but rarely "walk the walk." [n82](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.714257.8466500462&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1231738964826&returnToKey=20_T5507732879&parent=docview#n82) This discrepancy is partly an individual failure, but it is even more a result of the powerful forces that operate within our culture. Residents of Western cultures are shaped by the system in which they live. They will never possess either the clarity of agenda or the political will essential to a coherent and coordinated shift in behavior due to a combination of ignorance, greed, sloth, and inundation by political and consumerist propaganda. This combination means there will be no values shift welling up from the people and demanding the transformation of our systems of production and resource use. Paul Tournier captured the essence of the cultural forces when he observed: [People] have become merely cogs in the machine of production, tools, functions. All that matters is what they do, not what they think or feel. . . . [T]heir thoughts and feelings are . . . molded by propaganda, press, cinema and radio. They read the same newspaper each day, hear the same slogans, see the same advertisements. [n83](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.714257.8466500462&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1231738964826&returnToKey=20_T5507732879&parent=docview#n83)Feeling helpless in the face of inordinate complexity and vast impersonal forces causes us to flee from our personal responsibility and become absorbed into the systems of institutions. The price of the required allegiance includes accepting (or appearing to accept) the institution's values as our own. We become a contributing part of the same system that oppresses us and steals our humanity and idealism. This assimilation allows us to avoid the harshest application of the system's power while reaping the rewards of collaboration. We become, in the  [\*629]  words of Pink Floyd, "just another brick in the wall." [n84](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.714257.8466500462&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1231738964826&returnToKey=20_T5507732879&parent=docview#n84) When we attempt to talk about the need to do such things as internalize costs that are now allowed to remain external to the entities generating the harms and shifting to a system of low or no impact on the Earth's natural systems, we are talking about fundamental, non-voluntary changes in entitlements and lifestyle. Even Alan Greenspan drew severe criticism when he recently suggested that social security benefits should be reduced. [n85](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.714257.8466500462&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1231738964826&returnToKey=20_T5507732879&parent=docview#n85)Jacques Chirac's party in France has seen its public support plummet due to efforts to reduce social spending. [n86](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.714257.8466500462&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1231738964826&returnToKey=20_T5507732879&parent=docview#n86) Germans have taken to the streets in the hundreds of thousands to protest their leaders' efforts to develop plans to gain control of the German welfare state. [n87](http://www.lexisnexis.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.714257.8466500462&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1231738964826&returnToKey=20_T5507732879&parent=docview#n87) It is impossible to generate the political will that would be required to change the system we have constructed into one that satisfies the demands of sustainability. This is not surprising because the clear message is that we need economic growth. The situation we face is akin to Bangladesh where I was part of a group urging the country's Planning Minister to take potential environmental harms and ecosystem impacts into greater account in his planning. He responded that the ideas were admirable in theory but that he had to worry about generating jobs and food for 160 million people. He indicated that while he respected the arguments for sustainability his more immediate needs were to ensure jobs and food for Bangladeshis. In a similar context, while teaching international environmental law in St. Petersburg, Russia, my discussion with Russian academic colleagues related to water pollution in the area, radioactive materials dumping, and the raw air pollution from Lada cars running on 76 octane gasoline and other uncontrolled emitters of air pollution that fouled the air of this most beautiful city. At the end of the course one of my Russian colleagues said, "I found it all fascinating. But you know we have other problems with which we must deal before we can begin to worry about the environment. Perhaps in fifteen years or so we will be ready." I found myself unable to disagree with the speakers in either Bangladesh or Russia. Return to the idea of our inability to generate the political will that would be required to achieve fundamental change if we decided that the Agenda 21 type of sustainable development ideas were good social and economic strategies. Even if  [\*630]  they were desirable, they are "impossible dreams" because the people and institutions who set policy and decide on actions in the business and governmental arenas will never accept them as guides for behavior or as requirements for decisionmaking. This impossibility exists because we are not free and independent individuals but creatures of habit, dominated by the culture in which we exist. We desire to behave according to the dictates of the powerful systems that govern our lives and culture.

### Dedev Links

#### Renewable energy delays the transition

Ted **Trainer**, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, January 20**07**, Renewable Energy: No Solution for Consumer Society, The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY, vol.3, no.1

For instance, it means that a good society cannot be an affluent society. Marxists as much as free-marketers have been mistaken about this. It means that globalization is over. It means that industrialization is not the future (… indeed the dominant mode of production will probably be craft.) It means that viable settlements in an era of scarcity must be run on anarchist principles; they will not be able to meet their needs from local resources via systems they have to run for themselves unless they are highly participatory and equalitarian.¶ 4. The answer? ¶ **The only way out of this** alarming and **rapidly deteriorating situation is to move to some kind of Simpler Way**, which Chapter 11 of Renewable Energy discusses at length. This must involve non-affluent (but quite sufficient) material living standards, mostly small, highly self-sufficient local economies. Economic systems under social control and not driven by market forces or the profit motive and highly cooperative and participatory systems. Obviously, such radical systemic changes could not be made without profound change in values and world view, away from some of the most fundamental elements in Western culture, especially to do with competitive, acquisitive individualism. ¶ There are good reasons for thinking that we have neither the wit nor the will to face up to changes of this order, especially given that they are not on the agenda of official or public discussion. **A major factor** that has kept them off the agenda has been the strength of the assumption all wish to believe, **that renewable energy sources can substitute for fossil fuels and therefore can sustain consumer-capitalist society.**

#### Centralization of energy is inevitable – guarantees quick collapse

**Scheer 2K2**

(Hermann, Fmr. Asst. Prof. of Economics @ Technical Univ. of Stuttgart, Member of German Parliament, General Chairman of the World Council for Renewable Energy, President of EUROSOLAR, The Solar Economy: Renewable Energy for a Sustainable Global Future, Pg. 45)

Unlike all other industries, in the minerals and energy industries the pressure for increased industrial concentration derives directly from their business models. It is by no means simply a product of the pursuit of increased productivity through greater business scale, but the result of extended global resource supply chains. By driving globalization and industrial concentration in the energy and commodities business, global resource supply chains have also given a decisive impetus to industrial concentration processes in the economy at large. If it were not for the highly concentrated availability of whole­sale energy supplies, merger *activity* would probably have followed a lower-key, more differentiated course. ¶ The high cost of prospecting alone, requiring countless geological *surveys* and test drillings, can be borne only by capital-rich firms. Only wholesale investors with guaranteed long-term sales can afford investments with such lengthy amortization periods. The same applies to the use of modern extraction techniques, the construction of pipelines and the provision of large-scale freight capacity. For oil, coal and ore shipments, freighters with up to 800,000 tonnes carrying capacity are used; for gas shipments, capacities run to 200,000 cubic metres of liquid gas. Such large deliveries necessitate large refineries and high storage capacity, which means central­ized plant and high-volume storage. Processed materials and energy are shipped onwards to equally large power and smelt­ing plants, for the same reasons of economic scale.

#### Decentralization is key to effective solar power – displaces fossil fuels for a little bit

**Scheer 2K2** (Hermann, Fmr. Asst. Prof. of Economics @ Technical Univ. of Stuttgart, Member of German Parliament, General Chairman of the World Council for Renewable Energy, President of EUROSOLAR, The Solar Economy: Renewable Energy for a Sustainable Global Future, Pg. 168-169)

Putting energy generation in the hands of the people, on the other hand, would have no appreciable negative effects. Individual freedom and collective social responsibility for the future are not mutually exclusive, but rather go hand in hand. What technology could be more desirable than one whose cleans the environment rather than damaging it? In order for individual energy production to become truly popular, it must also bring tangible advantages in terms of freedom and opportunities, which means the switch must simplify rather than complicate matters.¶ Solar power is currently still laborious because there has been a lack of suppliers, sources of information and advice, because there are still numerous bureaucratic obstacles, and because the entrepreneurial, technical, and personnel infrastructure remains inadequate. Further complications arise because most individual systems are still only partial solutions, which exist alongside nuclear and fossil fuel energy rather than fully replacing them. Most solar collectors installed on houses only supply part of the housing need, and most PV installations only satisfy part of the need for electricity. The operations of such systems thus have to work with both conventional and alternative systems simultaneously, incurring costs for separate supply systems. Even the personal computer would not have been introduced so quickly and on such a large scale if it had not been able to fully replace and improve on a typewriter.¶ This is another reason why the fossil energy industry has been able to rely on its claim of irreplaceability. It offers free home delivery, thus concealing the greater complexity of its supply system from the end-user. The more that practical obstacles facing solar energy can be removed, the faster the psychological hurdles will fail – perhaps swifter than was the case with decentralized mobility and IT. Solar technology has no negative environmental consequences to trouble users' consciences. Once the fear of the small scale has been dispelled, once renewable energy has demonstrated that it can replace fossil fuels.

#### Centralization makes the electricity grid inherently vulnerable –the Number of potential failures makes blackouts and shortages inevitable

Amory Lovins, Rocky Mountain Institute 2003 [The Globe and Mail, , “Towering design flaws; https://www.rmi .org /images/PDFs/EnergySecurity/E03-06\_TowerDsnFlaws.pdf August 21]

The usual suspects — politicians, regulators, deregulators, utilities, and environmentalists — were promptly rounded up when the Aug. 14 blackout lost 61 billion watts of capacity in nine seconds. Yet the real culprit was none of the above — just as in 1965, 1977, and other regional blackouts that I described in a 1981 report for the Pentagon, Brittle Power: Energy Strategy for National Security (see: www.rmi.org/sitepages/pid533.php). The real cause is the overcentralized power grid. Its giant machines spin in exact synchrony across half a continent, co-ordinated by frail aerial arteries and continuous, precise technical controls. Usually, it works well. But every few years by mishap, or anytime by malice, it can fail catastrophically. A fixed-wing aircraft can glide to a safe landing without engines, but without instantaneous active control and a tail rotor, a helicopter drops like a stone. The grid is more like a heliconpter. Seeing this demonstrated may inspire terrorists to make it happen more often. After previous major blackouts, more giant power plants were linked by more, longer, and heftier transmission lines. Some of these changes relieved local power shortages, but most were unhelpful. Ontario's latest power woes were prolonged because nuclear plants dislike sudden shutdowns and don't restart gracefully: They're the opposite of a plant providing power at peak times — guaranteed unavailable when most needed. New power lines, plus wholesale competition, have also spawned huge new long-distance power sales. That much power traveling that far can slosh around uncontrollably if a local mishap roils the flow and circuit breakers don't instantly open. But the unimaginably complex grid's "fault tree" of potential failure modes is growing new branches faster than we lop off old ones. The well-meaning operators are always surprised — but if they keep building the same architecture, it will keep failing for the same basic reason.

#### Blackout vulnerability crushes the US economy due to the frailty of digital age industry.

Guy Warner, 2007. CEO of Pareto Energy LTD [“Taking Control of the Power Grid,” January 1, http://www.paretoenergy.com/about/press/2007-01-EPM-Warner-Energy-Districts.pdf]

In the last 50 years, the U.S. electric power industry has seen few changes in technology and virtually no improvement in delivered efficiency. Increasing returns to scale that made continual expansion of the central power grid worthwhile do not pertain any longer. Even if new investment in huge generating plants and transmission lines made economic sense, local aversion to air emissions, water pollution, and land use as well as global concern about climate change make expansion of the central power grid environmentally untenable. Assuming that the power grid could overcome economic and environmental barriers to expansion, American high-tech companies have lost faith in its ability to deliver the power needed for digital-age commerce. The 2006 SteelEye Technology Business Continuity Index suggests that almost half of American IT companies identify power outages as likely to have a maximum impact on their businesses. By comparison, just 1% of American businesses surveyed by SteelEye designated terrorism as a concern for IT downtime. In digitally inclined businesses, even a few seconds of fluctuating power can wreak real economic havoc. A recent U.S. Department of Energy survey found that a particular brokerage operation lost $6.8 million for each hour of power outage. Hewlett-Packard reported that a 20-minute outage at a circuit-fabrication plant would result in a production loss of $30 million. The costs when a hospital or an assisted living facility loses power or experiences poor power quality have a very human face. Decreasing returns to scale, public aversion to further environmental damage, loss of corporate faith in the system … **all suggest that the time may be ripe for the rapid adoption of smaller, decentralized and more efficient electric power technologies.** Electric power may be poised to follow similar technology trends towards smaller local units that occurred in computing and telecommunications over the last 20 years. It is worth considering, therefore, the kinds of conditions that will trigger a tipping point for similar disruptive innovations in electric power.

#### Vulnerability ensures that a grid failure will cascade to a total collapse of all of our critical infrastructures and economic well being

Massoud Amin 2005 Professor of electrical engineering Univ of Minnesota. [“Infrastructure Security: Reliability and Dependability of Critical Systems.” Security and Privacy. IEEE Computer Society. http://www.computer. org/portal/site/security/menuitem.6f7b2414551cb84651286b108bcd45f3/index.jsp?&pName=security\_level1\_article&TheCat=1015&path=security/v3n3&file=gei.xml&]

Network failures The potential ramifications of network failures have never been greater: most of our critical infrastructures depend on national power grids to energize and control their operations. Secure and reliable operation of these networks is fundamental to national and international economy, security, and our quality of life. Electrical Of particular importance is the reliable availability of inexpensive, secure, high-quality electrical power and high-performance communication net­works. The Northeast/Canadian blackout of August 2003, European outages in summer 2003, the Western US states’ power crisis from 2000 to 2001, and the growing prevalence of Internet hacker attacks and email viruses demonstrate that these key infrastructures are highly vulnerable to either accidental or intentional failure. The North American power network could realistically be considered the largest and most complex machine in the world—its transmission lines connect all electric generation and distribution on the ­continent. In that respect, it exemplifies many of the complexities of electric power infrastructure and how technological innovation, combined with efficient markets and enabling policies, can address them. The US National Academy of Engineering has declared the North American electrical grid to be the supreme achievement of the 20th century. However, the interconnected nature of networks means that single, isolated disturbances can cascade through and between networks with potentially disastrous consequences. Because the electric power infrastructure underpins all other critical infrastructures, it’s particularly vulnerable to deliberate as well as accidental disturbances. Both the importance and difficulty of protecting power systems has long been recognized. In 1990, the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) of the US Congress issued a detailed report, Physical Vulnerability of the Electric System to Natural Disasters and Sabotage, concluding, “Terrorists could emulate acts of sabotage in several other countries and destroy critical [power system] components, incapacitating large segments of a transmission network for months. Some of these components are vulnerable to saboteurs with explosives or just high-power rifles.”1 The report also documented the potential cost of widespread electrical outages; in the New York City outage of 1977, for example, damage from looting and arson alone cost near US$155 million—roughly half of the outage’s total cost.

### Delay/Linear Link 2NC

#### Delay bad—collapse now key to stop extinction

**Barry 8** — President and Founder of Ecological Internet. Ph.D. in "Land Resources" from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a Masters of Science in "Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development" also from Madison, and a Bachelor of Arts in "Political Science" from Marquette University (Glen, Economic Collapse and Global Ecology, 14 January 2008, http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm)

Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life. With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later. Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products. Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration. This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption. We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured. Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil. Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon. A successful revolutionary response to imminent global ecosystem collapse would focus upon bringing down the Earth's industrial economy now. As society continues to fail miserably to implement necessary changes to allow creation to continue, maybe the best strategy to achieve global ecological sustainability is economic sabotage to hasten the day. It is more fragile than it looks.

### AT: No Dedev

**Don’t take the chance—we only need to win a small risk of our turns**

**Meyercord 1** (Ken, The Ethic of Zero Growth, http://www.zerogrowth.org/ZeroGrowth.htm)

Do we need an alternative to growth? Many signs - from ozone depletion through land degradation to declining sperm counts - suggest we do. But a faith in growth is so intrinsic a part of our psyches we would have to be "born again" to abandon it. Our political-economic entities and personalities make such an icon of it, the most profound revolution in human history would be necessary to redirect our societies. On the other hand, the unimaginably high stakes in the worst case scenario - the very survival of our species - cry out that, if an error is to be made in choosing between continued growth and an end to growth, we should err on the side of caution. The doomsayers, after all, only have to be right once.

**Extinction impacts come first**

**Bostrom 7** – Oxford philosophy professor (Nick, April, Humanity's biggest problems aren't what you think they are, transcribed from video 5:22 to 5:52, http://www.ted.com/index.php/talks/view/id/44, AG)

Then, even a one-percentage-point reduction in the extinction risk could be equivalent to this astronomical number, ten to the power of thirty two. So if you take into account future generations as much as our own, every other moral imperative or philanthropic cause just becomes irrelevant. The only thing you should focus on would be to reduce existential risk, because even a tiniest decrease in existential risk would just overwhelm any other, um, benefit you could hope to achieve.

#### Behavior psychology proves—sustained downturns empirically decrease consumption and greed

**Foroohar 2010 –** deputy editor in charge of international business and economics coverage for Newsweek, awarded the German Marshall Fund's Peter R. Weitz Prize, edits columns by Morgan Stanley emerging markets head Ruchir Sharma, Yale professor Jeffrey Garten and PIMCO CEO Mohamed El-Erian (1/8, “The Recession Generation,” http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2010/01/08/the-recession-generation.html)

We all know the type of person who came of age in the Great Depression. They are the grandmothers and grandfathers who can't use a tea bag too many times, yet are enjoying comfortable retirements in warm climates. And we know what the children of the 1950s are all about. They are the optimistic boomers who embodied an age of continual upward mobility and possibility. They have often spent more than they earned, because for them it has been a truism that times can only get better. It's no accident that the psychology of entire generations is shaped by the milieu in which they grew up; economic research tells us that our lifelong behaviors are determined in large part by the seismic events—good or bad—of our youth. So, given that we have just experienced the worst economic period in 70 years, it's no surprise that people have begun to wonder what sort of consumers, investors, and citizens will be bred by the Great Recession. Will there be, in effect, a "Generation Recession" of young people whose behaviors will be permanently shaped by the downturn?

Some optimists—pointing to a recent spate of positive economic data, including increases in car sales, upticks in factory production, and a robust stock market, say no: the downturn simply hasn't been bad enough, for long enough, to create the next Depression generation. Yet there is powerful evidence that belies this argument; a National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) paper released this past September looking at data from 1972 to 2006 shows that even one really tough year experienced in early adulthood is enough to fundamentally change people's core values and behaviors. Meanwhile, there's an entire body of research to show that recession babies not only invest more conservatively, they tend to make less money, choose safer jobs, and believe in wealth redistribution and more government intervention. Yet paradoxically, they are also more cynical about public institutions and, arguably, about life, embracing the European notion that success is more about luck than effort. To the extent that they grapple with unemployment, they are more likely to be more depressed and disconnected from their communities. Politically, they can skew either left or right, depending on the cultural zeitgeist and the leaders who seize the moment. Economic downturns, after all, not only created the New Deal, but also the Third Reich.

We have now technically emerged from recession. But there's a broad feeling that Americans' psyches and behaviors will be somehow permanently altered by the crisis. There's now a booming cottage industry among consultants and investment managers to describe and capitalize on "the New Normal," which will likely be the opposite of the hypercapitalist market culture of the past 25 years. That moment was perhaps most eloquently captured by former Clinton labor secretary Robert Reich in his 2007 book, Supercapitalism, and it's fitting that he is now working on a book titled Aftershock. "Every time we've had a major downturn, there have been predictions that Americans will permanently change their ways and embrace frugality," says Reich, now a professor at the University of California, Berkeley. "Since World War II, it hasn't happened." Yet Reich and many other respected academics, economists, and investors—from George Soros to Pimco's Bill Gross to Goldman Sachs's chief economist Jim O'Neill—say that it will happen this time, not only because of the megashock of the financial crisis, but also because the global landscape has simply shifted in such a way that the American consumer will no longer be the single dominant force in the world, even if the U.S. economy continues to recover. Rather, the key emerging markets (read: China, India, Brazil, and others) will continue to emerge and become more powerful; the dollar will continue to weaken; American labor will continue to face more and more competition from abroad; and, thanks to a new era of big government, reregulation, and (possibly) protectionism, money flows will stay tight. Throw in the probable rise in inflation and you've got an inevitably slower-growth future in which Americans will also have to come to grips with average unemployment levels that will likely stay much higher than they've been in decades*.*

Unemployment and the specter of instability it creates will really shape the behavior of Generation Recession. A weaker dollar will make all Americans feel poorer by raising the cost of goods, but the young generation graduating and going to work now may actually end up poorer in real terms. Unemployment among 20- to 24-year-olds in the U.S. is more than 15 percent, compared with the nationwide average of 10 percent, and statistics show that for every percentage point in higher unemployment, new graduates take a 6 percent pay cut—an effect that lasts for decades. Skills loss could be a huge issue, too, especially because the average duration of unemployment has increased. Although wages in the U.S. have been relatively flat since the 1970s, Generation Recession may be the first in 30 years to see theirs actually fall.

#### Trauma forces large-scale behavioral change

**Djordjevic 98** (Johnny, March, “Sustainability,” http://www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html)

Max Weber believed in the power of an idea. This political theorist discussed how Calvinism was one idea that perpetuated the rise of capitalism. Few people ever examine the power of an idea, but if one examines and contemplates this theory, a realization comes across: that ideas drive society. The key premise is that some values of our society must be altered in order to avert catastrophic consequences. The way of life in developed countries is "the origin of many of our most serious problems"(Trainer, 1985). Because developed countries have high material living standards and consume massive quantities of all resources, "hundreds of millions of people in desperate need must go without the materials and energy that could improve their conditions while these resources flow into developed countries, often to produce frivolous luxuries"(Trainer, 1985). People's way of life seems to be a glaring example of values leading to high rates of personal consumption of resources and the waste of these same materials. In addition to overconsumption, the services used to supply our society with goods, (examples of these goods would be food, water, energy, and sewage services.) tends to be wasteful and expensive. Production is organized in such a way, (usually highly centralized) that travel becomes an enormous burden. Another consideration is that our population is expected to increase to rise to eleven billion within the next half century. Considering the mineral and energy resources needed in the future, these estimates must also include the consumption of a population almost doubled from its current status and these same figures must include an expected increase in the affluence of developed countries. "If we are willing to endorse an already affluent society in which there is continued growth on this scale,(american resource use increasing 2% each year), then we are assuming that after 2050 something like 40 times as many resources can be provided each year as were provided in the 1970's, and that it is in order for people in a few rich countries to live in this superaffluent way while the other 9.5 billion in the world do not"(Trainer, 1985). The environment is in danger from our pursuit of affluence. Serious worries come from predictions about the atmosphere. The burning of fossil fuels will raise temperatures and result in climatic effects. Rising temperatures could have horrific effects. First of all, food production could seriously be imperiled even by increases of only one degree celcius. If the temperature should increase by five degrees scientists predict the coastal island nations would be submerged and possibly trigger the next ice age. Another environmental concern deals with the soil. Our agricultural practices disregard the value of recycling food waste. Also, the use of pesticides and chemicals in agriculture lead to the poisoning of the soil and topsoil loss through erosion. Yields per acre for grain are falling and "we do not produce food in ways that can be continued for centuries"(Trainer, 1985). Even more disturbing is the deforestation of rainforests. This results in the extinction of many species, concentration of carbon dioxide, the loss of many potential medical breakthroughs, and possibly the disruption of rainfall. Opponents of the deforestation fail to realize that our expensive way of life and greedy economic system are the driving forces. "Nothing can be achieved by fighting to save this forest or that species if in the long term we do not change the economic system which demands ever-increasing production and consumption of non-necessities"(Trainer, 1985). There also lies a problem in the Third World. Developed countries high living standards and quest for an ever-increasing quality of life lead to Third World poverty and the deprivation of the Third World's access to its own resources. As Third World countries get deprived of materials, the developed world consumes and imports over half of their resources. A few developed countries seem to be consuming the globe's resources and this consumption rate is always increasing. "The rich must live more simply that the poor may simply live"(Trainer, 1985). The Third World is exploited in many ways. One way is that the best land in a developing country is used for crops exported to developed countries, while citizens of the Third World starve and suffer. Another way is the poor working conditions of the Third World. A third exploitation can be overlooked but no less disgusting; "The world's greatest health problem could be simply by providing water for the perhaps 2.000 million people who now have to drink form rivers and wells contained by human and animal wastes. Technically it is a simple matter to set up plants for producing iron and plastic pipes. But most of the world's iron and plastic goes into the production of luxurious cars, soft-drink containers, office blocks and similar things in rich countries"(Trainer, 1985). The threat of nuclear war and international conflict rises with countries of all kinds entranced with the logic and idea of materialism. Perhaps the most dangerous and likely chances for a nuclear conflict arise from the competition for dwindling resources by developed countries. Similar events can be seen all across the globe. Major superpowers get themselves involved in domestic matters not concerning them, providing arms and advice to try and obtain the inside track on possible resources. International tension will rise in the competition for resources and so will the "ever-increasing probability of nuclear war"(Trainer, 1985). As developed countries pursue affluence they fail to see the inherent contradiction in this idea; as growth is the quest, the quality of life will decrease. For a healthy community, there exists a list of non-material conditions which must be present, "a sense of purpose, fulfilling work and leisure, supportive social relations, peace of mind, security from theft and violence, and caring and co-operative neighborhoods"(Trainer, 1985). And as developed countries think their citizens are the happiest in the world, "In most affluent societies rates of divorce, drug-taking, crime, mental breakdown, child abuse, alcoholism, vandalism, suicide, stress, depression, and anxiety are increasing"(Trainer, 1985). Despite all the gloomy facts and sad stories, there is a solution, to create a sustainable society. Rather than being greedy and only thinking about the self, each individual must **realize the impacts** of his/her selfish tendencies, and disregard their former view of the world. One must come into harmony with what is really needed to survive, and drawn a strict distinction between what is necessity and what is luxury. Not every family needs three cars, or five meals a day or four telephones and two refrigerators.Countries do not need to strive for increasing growth, less materials could be imported/exported and international tension could be greatly reduced. The major problems seem not to step from the determination of what a sustainable society is, but on how to get people to change their values. This task is not an easy one. People must be **forced to realize** the harmful and catastrophic consequences lie in their meaningless wants and greed. The problem of cognitive dissonance is hard to overcome, but it is not impossible. The solution to this dilemma lies in castastrophe. The only event that changes people's minds is social trauma or harm. The analogy is that a person who refuses to wear a seat belt and one day gets thrown through his/her windshield will remember to wear the seat belt after the accident. The logic behind this argument is both simple and feasible. So the question of dissonance is answered in part, but to change a whole society obviously takes a bigger and more traumatic event to occur. An economic collapse or ice age would trigger a new consciousness leading to a sustainable society.

#### Collapse galvanizes movements

**Speth 8** — Served as President Jimmy Carter’s White House environmental adviser and as head of the United Nations’ largest agency for international development Prof at Vermont law school. Former dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University . Former Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, teaching environmental and constitutional law. .Former Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President. Co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council. Was law clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black JD, Yale. (James Gustave, The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability, 83)

The seriousness of looming environmental threats is slowly sinking in, driven largely by the climate issue but also informed by the outpouring of serious books and articles pointing out that various breakdowns and collapses are actually possible. In the right hands, crises and calamities related to environment can generate positive change, as Hurricane Katrina could have. We can also see the beginnings of social change in the efforts of some consumers to downshift and go green, in the anti-corporate-abuse stirrings of some communities, and in the proliferation of initiatives involving new forms of business ownership and management. **Polls suggest** that the public is distressed by runaway materialism, and there are signs that student activism is reawakening and that faith communities are taking up environmental causes. Religion can help us see that the challenges we face are moral and spiritual and that sin is not strictly individual but is also social and institutional, and it can call us to reflection, repentance, and resistance.

And there is growing strength in the worldwide social movement described by Paul Hawken in Blessed Unrest. From huge nonprofits to home-based causes, the groups in this movement are emerging as a creative and **influential global force**. And, of course, there is the hope that springs from today’s young people. We see their commitment in the demand for the greening of our colleges and universities and in the growing student activism and political mobilization. Concerns have been expressed that they are the “quiet generation,” too on-line, but climate threats and social justice issues are now spurring a new, activist youth-led movement for change.

### AT: T/War

**Unsustainable consumer spending prevents the development of an elite class powerful enough to generate war**

William Ophuls, Professor of Political Science at Northwestern, 1997, Requiem For Modern Politics, p. 129

This used to be a problem mainly for the privileged few who found that they could not afford to duplicate the same level of “gracious living” enjoyed by their parents—and, even more so, by their grandparents—because the cost of gracious living has increased faster than real incomes. As more and more people become affluent and able to afford the so-called finer things in life, they bid up the marginal price of luxuries-meals in good restaurants, opera tickets, summer cottages, live-in help, private education, and custom-designed houses, to mention some of the most obvious. Conversely, when certain experiences are enjoyed by too many people, their worth declines, not just in terms of status but in actuality. For example, as more and more people attend university, the degree no longer means what it once did—and is valued accordingly. That is, when ‘everybody” has one, the degree declines not only in relative value but also in absolute value, both because the supply has increased relative to demand and because university education has to be watered down to make it accessible to ‘everybody.” Similarly, mass tourism has degraded the experience of going on safari in Kenya or viewing Buddhist temples in Kyoto or seeing the artistic treasures of Florence. In consequence, the well off are not as affluent as they once were: the standard of living of the richest doctor or professor of today is in many respects not as high at that of the average doctor or professor of yesteryear—just in material terms, not to mention prestige and other intangibles—because his income buys less of these finer things. Those with pleasant memories of a bygone age of privilege are therefore likely to feel impoverished by comparison, no matter how high their income or how many technological toys they possess.

#### Collapse of capitalism prevents lashout – no one will be the foot soldiers without pay

Chris H. Lewis, Professor of American Studies at the University of Colorado-Boulder, 1998, in The Coming Age of Scarcity, ed Dobkowski and Wallimann, p 56-57

It is also entirely possible that the global economy is already so fragile that developed countries cannot afford to engage in these neocolonial wars, especially if they do not do it as a global block of developed nations through the United Nations. The desperate struggle among competing modern empires to maintain their resource pipelines into the underdeveloped world will only further undermine global civilization. Warring nations’ attempts to cripple their enemies by denying access to their economies and resources will only hasten the collapse of the global economy. No matter how it collapses, through economic collapse and the development of local and regional economies or through a global military struggle by the First World to maintain its access to Third World resources, or both modern industrial civilization will collapse because its demands for energy, natural resources, and ecosystem services are not sustainable. The current collapse of economies and states in Africa, Latin America, and the former Soviet Union demonstrate that this global collapse is already occurring. The inability of the United States and the United Nations in the 1990s to solve the economic and political problems that exacerbate conflicts in Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union demonstrate that the developed countries might be under such economic and political stress that they cannot afford to use the political or military capital necessary to force recalcitrant nations and peoples to remain within the global industrial economy. Although many would argue that the massive death and suffering caused by these conflicts must be stopped, it could be that this death will be less than if the First World intervened and tried to force Third World countries to remain within global civilization. Attempts to intervene in these growing regional conflicts, on the basis of liberal internationalism and global civilization, will backfire and cause only more suffering. In fact, these interventions will further accelerate the collapse of global civilization.

### AT: Sustainable

#### Growth unsustainable because resource depletion from water to minerals to oil – tech can’t solve

**Trainer 11** [real-world economics review, issue no. 57 “The radical implications of a zero growth economy”, Ted Trainer, Lecturer, University of New South Wales, Australia, 2011]

Before offering support for these claims it is important to sketch the general “limits to growth” situation confronting us. The magnitude and seriousness of the global resource and environmental problem is not generally appreciated. Only when this is grasped is it possible to understand that the social changes required must be huge, radical and far reaching. The initial claim being argued here (and detailed in Trainer 2010b) is that consumer-capitalist society cannot be reformed or fixed; it has to be largely scrapped and remade along quite different lines. The “limits to growth” case: An outline The planet is now racing into many massive problems, any one of which could bring about the collapse of civilization before long. The most serious are the destruction of the environment, the deprivation of the Third World, resource depletion, conflict and war, and the breakdown of social cohesion. The main cause of all these problems is over-production and over-consumption – people are trying to live at levels of affluence that are far too high to be sustained or for all to share. Our society is grossly unsustainable – the levels of consumption, resource use and ecological impact we have in rich countries like Australia are far beyond levels that could be kept up for long or extended to all people. Yet almost everyone’s supreme goal is to increase 1 material living standards and the GDP and production and consumption, investment, trade, etc., as fast as possible and without any limit in sight. There is no element in our suicidal condition that is more important than this mindless obsession with accelerating the main factor causing the condition. The following points drive home the magnitude of the overshoot. • If the 9 billion people we will have on earth within about 50 years were to use resources at the per capita rate of the rich countries, annual resource production would have to be about 8 times as great as it is now. • If 9 billion people were to have a North American diet we would need about 4.5 billion ha of cropland, but there are only 1.4 billion ha of cropland on the planet. • Water resources are scarce and dwindling. What will the situation be if 9 billion people try to use water as we in rich countries do, while the greenhouse problem reduces water resources. • The world’s fisheries are in serious trouble now, most of them overfished and in decline. What happens if 9 billion people try to eat fish at the rate Australian’s do now? • Several mineral and other resources are likely to be very scarce soon, including gallium, indium, helium, and there are worries about copper, zinc, silver and phosphorous. • Oil and gas are likely to be in decline soon, and largely unavailable in the second half of the century. If 9 billion were to consume oil at the Australian per capita rate, world demand would be about 5 times as great as it is now. The seriousness of this is extreme, given the heavy dependence of our society on liquid fuels. • Recent "Footprint" analysis indicates that it takes 8 ha of productive land to provide water, energy, settlement area and food for one person living in Australia. (World Wildlife Fund, 2009.) So if 9 billion people were to live as we do about 72 billion ha of productive land would be needed. But that is about 10 times all the available productive land on the planet. • The most disturbing argument is to do with the greenhouse problem. It is very likely that in order to stop the carbon content of the atmosphere rising to dangerous levels CO2 emissions will have to be totally eliminated by 2050 (Hansen says 2030). (Hansen, 2009, Meinschausen et al., 2009.) Geosequestration can’t enable this, if only because it can only capture about 85% of the 50% of emissions that come from stationary sources like power stations. These kinds of figures make it abundantly clear that rich world material “living standards” are grossly unsustainable. We are living in ways that it is impossible for all to share. We are not just a little beyond sustainable levels of resource consumption -- we have **overshot by a factor of 5 to 10**. Few seem to realise the magnitude of the overshoot, nor therefore about the enormous reductions that must be made.

#### Tech fixes without decreasing consumption risk extinction – don’t address the root cause of climate change and other environemtn diassters

**Godhaven 9** (Merrick, environmental writer and activist, “Swapping technologies fails to address the root causes of climate change,” July 15, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/cif-green/2009/jul/15/technofix-climate-change)

Technology is part of the solution to climate change. But only part. Techno-fixes like some of those in the Guardian's Manchester Report simply cannot deliver the carbon cuts science demands of us without being accompanied by drastic reductions in our consumption. That means radical economic and social transformation. Merely swapping technologies fails to address the root causes of climate change. We need to choose the solutions that are the cheapest, the swiftest, the most effective and least likely to incur dire side effects. On all counts, there's a simple answer – **stop burning the stuff** in the first place. **Consume less.** There is a certain level of resources we need to survive, and beyond that there is a level we need in order to have lives that are comfortable and meaningful. It is far below what we presently consume. Americans consume twice as much oil as Europeans. Are they twice as happy? Are Europeans half as free? Economic growth itself is not a measure of human well-being, it only measures things with an assessed monetary value. It values wants at the same level as needs and, while it purports to bring prosperity to the masses, its tendency to concentrate profit in fewer and fewer hands leaves billions without the necessities of a decent life. Techno-fixation masks the incompatibility of solving climate change with unlimited economic growth. Even if energy consumption can be reduced for an activity, ongoing economic growth eats up the improvement and overall energy consumption still rises. We continue destructive consumption in the expectation that new miracle technologies will come and save us. The hope of a future techno-fix feeds into the pass-it-forward, do-nothing-now culture typified by targets for 2050. Tough targets for 2050 are not tough at all, they are a decoy. Where are the techno-fix plans for the peak in global emissions by 2015 that the IPCC says we need? Even within the limited sphere of technology, we have to separate the solutions from the primacy of profit. We need to choose what's the most effective, not the most lucrative. Investors will want the **maximum return** for their money, and so the benefits of any climate technologies will, in all likelihood, be sold as carbon credits to the polluter industries and nations. It would not be done in tandem with emissions cuts but instead of them, making it not a tool of mitigation but of exacerbation. Climate change is not the only crisis currently facing humanity. **Peak oil** is likely to become a major issue within the coming **decade.** Competition for land and water, soil fertility depletion and collapse of fisheries are already posing increasing problems for food supply and survival in many parts of the world. Technological solutions to climate change fail to address most of these issues. Yet even without climate change, this systemic environmental and social crisis threatens society, and requires deeper solutions than new technology alone can provide. Around a fifth of emissions come from deforestation, more than for all transport emissions combined. There is no technological fix for that. We simply need to consume less of the forest, that is to say, less meat, less agrofuel and less wood. Our level of consumption is inequitable. Making it universal is simply impossible. The scientist Jared Diamond calculates that if the whole world were to have our level of consumption, it would be the equivalent of having 72 billion people on earth. With ravenous economic growth still prized as the main objective of society by all political leaders the world over, that 72 billion would be just the beginning. At 3% annual growth, 25 years later it would be the equivalent of 150 billion people. A century later it would be over a trillion. Something's got to give. And indeed, it already is. It's time for us to call it a crisis and respond with the proportionate radical action that is needed. We need profound change – not only government measures and targets but financial systems, the operation of corporations, and people's own expectations of progress and success. Building a new economic democracy based on meeting human needs equitably and sustainably is at least as big a challenge as climate change itself, but if human society is to succeed the two are inseparable. Instead of asking how to continue to grow the economy while attempting to cut carbon, we should be asking why economic growth is seen as more important than survival.

**Growth is unsustainable –**

**1. Resources – cropland, water resources, minerals such as phosphorous, gallium, and helium, not to mention oil and natural gas, are all hitting their peak – as the third world grows in size and demands to use energy more like the first world, supply will overshoot demand by a magnitude of 5 – that’s Trainer**

**2. Political stability—rampant social polarization and rising powers make unfettered unipolarity impossible, so nobody will be able to manage the global system and synchronize business cycles – that’s McPherson**

**3. Discontent—widespread working class dissatisfaction coupled with globalization makes it harder to impose growth regimes and exhausted range of solutions makes it impossible to continue growth – that’s Trainer and McPherson**

**4. Empirics—past civilizations prove bureaucracy requires more and more inputs which becomes untenable. Zero percent success rate.**

**Physical limits trump economic theory**

**Heinberg 10** — journalist, teaches at the Core Faculty of New College of California, on the Board of Advisors of the Solar Living Institute and the Post Carbon Institute (Richard Life After Growth, 04 March 2010, http://www.countercurrents.org/heinberg040310.htm)

In nature, growth always slams up against non-negotiable constraints sooner or later. If a species finds that its food source has expanded, its numbers will increase to take advantage of those surplus calories—but then its food source will become depleted as more mouths consume it, and its predators will likewise become more numerous (more tasty meals for them!). Population "blooms" (that is, periods of rapid growth) are always followed by crashes and die-offs. Always.

Here's another real-world example. In recent years China's economy has been growing at eight percent or more per year; that means it is more than doubling in size every ten years. Indeed, China consumes more than twice as much coal as it did a decade ago—the same with iron ore and oil. The nation now has four times as many highways as it did, and almost five times as many cars. How long can this go on? How many more doublings can occur before China has used up its key resources—or has simply decided that enough is enough and has stopped growing?

It makes sense that economies should follow rules analogous to those that govern biological systems. Plants and animals tend to grow quickly when they are young, but then they reach a more or less stable mature size. In organisms, growth rates are largely controlled by genes. In economies, growth seems tied to factors such as the availability of resources—chiefly energy resources ("food" for the industrial system). During the 20th century, cheap and abundant fossil fuels enabled rapid economic expansion; at some point, therefore, fossil fuel depletion could put a brake on growth. It is also possible that industrial wastes could accumulate to the point that the biological systems that underpin economic activity (such as forests, crops, and human bodies) begin to fail.

But **economists generally don't see things this way**. That's probably because most current economic theories were formulated during an anomalous historical period of sustained growth. Economists are merely generalizing from their experience: they can point to decades of steady growth in the recent past, and so they simply project that experience into the future. Moreover, they have ways to explain why modern market economies are immune to the kinds of limits that constrain natural systems; the two main ones concern substitution and efficiency.

If a useful resource becomes scarce, its price will rise, and this creates an incentive for users of the resource to find a substitute. For example, if oil gets expensive enough, energy companies might start making liquid fuels from coal. Or they might develop other energy sources undreamed of today. Economists theorize that this process of substitution can go on forever. It's part of the magic of the free market.

Increasing efficiency means doing more with less. In the U.S., the number of inflation-adjusted dollars generated in the economy for every unit of energy consumed has increased steadily over recent decades (the amount of energy, in British Thermal Units, required to produce a dollar of GDP has been dropping steadily, from close to 20,000 BTU per dollar in 1949 to 8,500 BTU in 2008). That's one kind of economic efficiency. Another has to do with locating the cheapest sources of materials, and the places where workers will be most productive and work for the lowest wages. As we increase efficiency, we use less—of either resources or money—to do more. That enables more growth.

Finding substitutes for depleting resources and upping efficiency are undeniably effective adaptive strategies of market economies. Nevertheless, the question remains open as to how long these strategies can continue to work in the real world—which is governed less by economic theories than by the laws of physics. In the real world, some things don't have substitutes, or the substitutes are too expensive, or don't work as well, or can't be produced fast enough. And efficiency follows a law of diminishing returns: the first gains in efficiency are usually cheap, but every further incremental gain tends to cost more, until further gains become prohibitively expensive.

Unlike economists, most physical scientists recognize that growth within any functioning, bounded system has to stop sometime.

**New tech is a force multiplier since it ignores externalities. Efficient sources will be offset by increased use and clean energy just gives us unlimited power to tear up the planet**

**Trainer 2007** – senior lecturer at the University of New South Wales (Ted, “Renewable energy cannot sustain a consumer society”, pages 116-7)

Along with the powerful but unexamined general assumption that renewable energy can save consumer-capitalist society, there is the equally taken-for-granted assumption that technical advances and greater conservation effort can greatly reduce the need for energy. These assumptions are core elements in the basic “technical fix” view which shores up the conviction that no change from consumer-capitalist society is needed. It is not difficult to show how seriously mistaken this general position is. The magnitude of the problems, the overshoot, is far too great. There is no doubt that the potential for energy saving is large, both in terms of wasteful practices and the potential for developing much more energy-efficient devices. A common claim is that energy use can be cut by 50%, by eliminating waste and designing more efficient machines and ways. This is plausible. Amory Lovins has argued that a “Factor Four “ reduction is achievable, i.e., halving resource and environmental loads while doubling GDP.4 Most of Lovins’ (valuable) arguments and cases indicate 50–75% reductions. For instance the hybrid car could cut petrol consumption in half and Lovins’ discusses future possibilities which might halve that again. So why can’t we solve the problem if we just keep up this effort? We should note firstly that not everyone agrees with Lovins regarding the scale of the possible reductions. The Australian Bureau of Agricultural Economics (2006) offers an estimate of the overall probable conservation achievement by 2050 which is much lower than the expectation often encouraged by tech-fix opti- mists offering theoretical analyses of what might be done. It estimates that we are on a path to a total global carbon emission rate p.a. in 2050 that is an alarming 2.6times as high as it is now, and that conservation effort will reduce the result- ing 15 GT figure by only 23%. (In Chapter 1 the safe emission limit seemed to bearound 1 GT/y.) Optimists point to the much lower energy use rates in Europe and Japan than inAustralia and the US, but those countries are far smaller and have much higher population densities, meaning shorter travel and transport and that public transport is more economically viable. Easily overlooked is the fact that we are in an era when the easiest conservation gains are being made. We are “picking the low hanging fruit”. US oil intensity fell in the 1985–2005 period at half the rate that it fell in the previous 15 years (Lovins, et al., 2005, p. 43). Gains in aircraft flight distance per litre of fuel are falling, because the easiest gains have been made (Lovins, et al., 2005, p. 80). Another point enthusiasts about conservation and technical advance easily over- look is the “Jeavons “ or “rebound” effect. Often technical advances enable savings in energy and therefore reductions in the price, which promptly leads to greater consumption. This has to be understood in relation to the fundamental imperative in a consumer-capitalist society, to maximise output, wealth, consumption and GDP all the time. Any firm that finds its energy costs cut by better technology will immedi- ately increase production of cheaper goods, or pass the saving to customers who will have more money to spend on something else. If we find we can travel for half the cost, we are likely to double our travelling. The costs of savings also have to be accounted. Often there is a significant net gain, as with insulating a house. However, although very light cars use less energy the materials they are made from are energy intensive to produce. In fact Mateja (2000) reports that mainly because of their sophisticated electrical systems, hybrid vehicles take 30% more energy than the average car to produce, and in some cases five times as much. The popular Prius takes 142% more energy than the average car. Newman (2006) says “...over the lifetime of a vehicle...hybrids actually consume a lot more energy than even big SUVs.” He reports the Prius lifetime energy cost per mile at 1.4 times that of the US car fleet average. Also the full balance sheet needs to be filled out. For instance energy used in US corn production fell 15% between 1959 and 1970, but that was only energy used on the farm. When all inputs were taken into account energy use actually rose 3% (Heinberg, 2003, p. 162). Some seemingly notable energy reducing achievements of corporations have simply been due to either getting out of production of energy-intensive lines, or transferring these to sub-contractors in the Third World where energy use is boom- ing and there is less pressure to minimise energy or environmental costs. If the magnitude of our overshoot were not so great, these often remarkable conservation and efficiency efforts might be capable of solving the problem, but we have to make perhaps 90% reductions. Let us assume that energy use and other resource and environmental impacts must only be halved (...although solving the greenhouse problem would require a far bigger reduction.) Now as has been explained, if by 2070 we have 9 billion people on the “living standards” we in Australia would have by then given 3% growth, total world economic output would be 60 times as great as at pre- sent. How plausible is it that by then we can also reduce impacts by 50%, meaning a Factor 120 reduction in the rate of impact per unit of GDP, not a Factor 4 reduction? Clearly system change is needed. The problems cannot be solved by more conservation effort on the part of individuals and firms within consumer-capitalist society. They are being caused by an overshoot that is far too big for that, and they are being caused by some of the fundamental structures of this society. Consequently much of what is said under the heading of “sustainability” is nonsense and much of the effort being made to “save the planet” is a waste of time. Most irritating are the “What you can do in your own home” campaigners. “Buy biodegradable wash up liquid, use a low-flow shower head, recycle your bottles, buy a smaller car, etc.” Such efforts can make no more than a negligible difference to household impact, when we need something like a 90% reduction in national consumption. Nothing remotely like this is possible within a consumer-capitalist society committed to affluent lifestyles and limitless economic growth. It is only possible through dramatically reducing the volume of production and consumption and therefore by changing fromsuch a society to one that is about frugal but adequate “living standards”, as little production and consumption as possible and a stable economy.

**Renewable energy doesn’t address demand, it just enables it**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 128-29)

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that whether or not renewable energy can sustain consumer-capitalist society is not a matter of whether it can meet present energy demand. The essential question is whether it can enable constant increase in the volume of goods and services being consumed and the associated increase in energy demand. Energy demand is rising significantly, although estimates of future demand vary. ABARE’s Energy Outlook 2000shows that the average annual rate of growth in energy use in Australia over the decade of the 1990s was around 2.5% p. a. The Australian Yearbook shows that between 1982 and 1998 Australian energy use increased 50%, an arithmetical average growth rate of 3.13% p.a., and the rate has been faster in more recent years. (Graph 5.12.) However ABARE estimates that Australian energy demand will slow, reaching about 1.9% p.a. by 2040, meaning more than a doubling in annual use by then. In July 2003 Australian electricity authorities warned that blackouts are likely in coming years due to the rapid rate of increase in demand, estimated at almost 3% pa for the next five years. (ABC News, 31 July.) Robbins (2003) reports NEMMCO predicting electricity growth over the next 10 years in NSW, Queensland and Victoria as 3.1%, 3.5% and 2.6% p.a. respectively. Poldy (2005) shows that over the past 100 years Australian energy consumption has followed GDP growth closely, and he estimates that in recent years it has approximated a growth rate of 3.6% p.a. In 2004 world energy use jumped, growing at 4.3% p.a. (Catan, 2005.) Thus the commitment to growth greatly exacerbates the problem, and in turn all of the other resource supply problems, because all involve an energy component. For instance if the cost of fuel increases significantly, then so will the cost of food and minerals, and even university courses, because fuel is needed to produce them. It has been argued above that renewables are not likely to be capable of meeting present electricity and liquid fuel demand, but given the inertia built into growth trends, the demand to be met will probably be three or four times as big as it is now by mid century...and doubling every approximately 35 years thereafter. To summarise regarding Fault 1, consumer-capitalist society is obviously grossly unsustainable. We have far overshot levels of production, consumption, resource use and affluence that are sustainable for ourselves over a long period of time, let alone extended to all the world’s people. Yet our top priority is to increase them continuously, without limit. This is the basic cause of the many alarming sustainability problems now threatening our survival.

### Democracy Checks

**No genocide impact**

**O’Kane, 97** (“Modernity, the Holocaust, and politics”, Economy and Society, February, ebsco)

Chosen policies cannot be relegated to the position of immediate condition (Nazis in power) in the explanation of the Holocaust. Modern bureaucracy is not ‘intrinsically capable of genocidal action’ (Bauman 1989: 106). Centralized state coercion has no natural move to terror. In the explanation of modern genocides it is chosen policies which play the greatest part, whether in effecting bureaucratic secrecy, organizing forced labour, implementing a system of terror, harnessing science and technology or introducing extermination policies, as means and as ends. As Nazi Germany and Stalin’s USSR have shown, furthermore, those chosen policies of genocidal government turned away from and not towards modernity. The choosing of policies, however, is not independent of circumstances. An analysis of the history of each case plays an important part in explaining where and how genocidal governments come to power and analysis of political institutions and structures also helps towards an understanding of the factors which act as obstacles to modern genocide. But it is not just political factors which stand in the way of another Holocaust in modern society. Modern societies have not only pluralist democratic political systems but also economic pluralism where workers are free to change jobs and bargain wages and where independent firms, each with their own independent bureaucracies, exist in competition with state-controlled enterprises. In modern societies this economic pluralism both promotes and is served by the open scientific method. By ignoring competition and the capacity for people to move between organizations whether economic, political, scientific or social, Bauman overlooks crucial but also very ‘ordinary and common’ attributes of truly modern societies. It is these very ordinary and common attributes of modernity which stand in the way of modern genocides.

### Solar Adv

#### Specific sustainable techs like solar preclude interrogating consumption and unequally spread technology – turns their democracy advantage

**Byrne et. al. 2K6**

 (John, Distinguished Professor of Public Policy & Director of Center for Energy and Environmental Policy @ U. Delaware, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse,” 2006)

While moderns usually declare strong preferences for democratic governance, their preoccupation with technique and efficiency may preclude the achievement of such ambitions, or require changes in the meaning of democracy that are so extensive as to raise doubts about its coherence. A veneration of technical monuments typifies both conventional and sustainable energy strategies and reflects a shared belief in technological advance as commensurate with, and even a cause of, contemporary social progress. The modern proclivity to search for human destiny in the march of scientific discovery has led some to warn of a technological politics (Ellul, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c; Winner, 1977, 1986) in which social values are sublimated by the objective norms of technical success (e.g., the celebration of efficiency in all things). In this politics, technology and its use become the end of society and members have the responsibility, as rational beings, to learn from the technical milieu what should be valorized. An encroaching *autonomy of technique* (Ellul, 1964: 133 – 146) replaces critical thinking about modern life with an awed sense and acceptance of its inevitable reality. From dreams of endless energy provided by Green Fossil Fuels and Giant Power, to the utopian promises of Big Wind and Small-Is-Beautiful Solar, technical excellence powers modernist energy transitions. Refinement of technical accomplishments and/or technological revolutions are conceived to drive social transformation, despite the unending inequality that has accompanied two centuries of modern energy’s social project. As one observer has noted (Roszak, 1972: 479), the “great paradox of the technological mystique [is] its remarkable ability to grow strong by chronic failure. While the treachery of our technology may provide many occasions for disenchantment, the sum total of failures has the effect of increasing dependence on technical expertise.” Even the vanguard of a sustainable energy transition seems swayed by the magnetism of technical acumen, leading to the result that enthusiast and critic alike embrace a strain of technological politics. Necessarily, the elevation of technique in both strategies to authoritative status vests political power in experts most familiar with energy technologies and systems. Such a governance structure derives from the democratic-authoritarian bargain described by Mumford (1964). Governance “by the people” consists of authorizing qualified experts to assist political leaders in finding the efficient, modern solution. In the narratives of both conventional and sustainable energy, citizens are empowered to consume the products of the energy regime while largely divesting themselves of authority to govern its operations. Indeed, systems of the sort envisioned by advocates of conventional and sustainable strategies are not governable in a democratic manner. Mumford suggests (1964: 1) that the classical idea of democracy includes “a group of related ideas and practices... [including] communal self-government... unimpeded access to the common store of knowledge, protection against arbitrary external controls, and a sense of moral responsibility for behavior that affects the whole community.” Modern conventional and sustainable energy strategies invest in external controls, authorize abstract, depersonalized interactions of suppliers and demanders, and celebrate economic growth and technical excellence without end. Their social consequences are relegated in both paradigms to the status of problems-to-be-solved, rather than being recognized as the emblems of modernist politics. **As a result, modernist democratic practice becomes imbued with an authoritarian quality, which “deliberately eliminates the whole human personality, ignores the historic process, [and] overplays the role of abstract intelligence, and makes control over physical nature, ultimately control over ~~man~~ himself, the chief purpose of existence”** (Mumford, 1964: 5). Meaningful democratic governance is willingly sacrificed for an energy transition that is regarded as scientifically and technologically unassailable.

#### Must challenge consumption ethic at its root – cannot use incremental reforms to solve for energy regimes.

**Byrne et. al. 2K6**

 (John, Distinguished Professor of Public Policy & Director of Center for Energy and Environmental Policy @ U. Delaware, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse,” 2006)

When measured in social and political-economic terms**,** the current energy discourse appears impoverished. Many of its leading voices proclaim great things will issue from the adoption of their strategies (conventional or sustainable), yet inquiry into the social and political-economic interests that power promises of greatness by either camp is mostly absent. In reply, some participants may petition for a progressive middle ground, acknowledging that energy regimes are only part of larger institutional formations that organize political and economic power. It is true that the political economy of energy is only a component of systemic power in the modern order, but it hardly follows that pragmatism toward energy policy and politics is the reasonable social response. Advocates of energy strategies associate their contributions with distinct pathways of social development and define the choice of energy strategy as central to the types of future(s) that can unfold. Therefore, acceptance of appeals for pragmatist assessments of energy proposals, that hardly envision incremental consequences, would indulge a form of self-deception rather than represent a serious discursive position. An extensive social analysis of energy regimes of the type that Mumford (1934; 1966; 1970), Nye (1999), and others have envisioned is overdue. The preceding examinations of the two strategies potentiate conclusions about both the governance ideology and the political economy of modernist energy transitions that, by design, leave modernism undisturbed (except, perhaps, for its environmental performance).
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Including regulations is a limits disaster

Doub 76

 Energy Regulation: A Quagmire for Energy Policy
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FERS began with the recognition that federal energy policy must result from concerted efforts in all areas dealing with energy, not the least of which was the manner in which energy is regulated by the federal government. Energy selfsufficiency is improbable, if not impossible, without sensible regulatory processes, and effective regulation is necessary for public confidence. Thus, the President directed that "a comprehensive study be undertaken, in full consultation with Congress, to determine the best way to organize all energy-related regulatory activities of the government." An interagency task force was formed to study this question. With 19 different federal departments and agencies contributing, the task force spent seven months deciphering the present organizational makeup of the federal energy regulatory system, studying the need for organizational improvement, and evaluating alternatives. More than 40 agencies were found to be involved with making regulatory decisions on energy. Although only a few deal exclusively with energy, most of the 40 could significantly affect the availability and/or cost of energy. For example, in the field of gas transmission, there are five federal agencies that must act on siting and land-use issues, seven on emission and effluent issues, five on public safety issues, and one on worker health and safety issues-all before an onshore gas pipeline can be built. The complexity of energy regulation is also illustrated by the case of Standard Oil Company (Indiana), which reportedly must file about 1000 reports a year with 35 different federal agencies. Unfortunately, this example is the rule rather than the exception.

Precision: Only direct prohibition is a restriction – key to predictability

Sinha 6

<http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/437310/>

 Supreme Court of India Union Of India & Ors vs M/S. Asian Food Industries on 7 November, 2006 Author: S.B. Sinha Bench: S Sinha, Mark, E Katju CASE NO.: Writ Petition (civil) 4695 of 2006 PETITIONER: Union of India & Ors. RESPONDENT: M/s. Asian Food Industries DATE OF JUDGMENT: 07/11/2006 BENCH: S.B. Sinha & Markandey Katju JUDGMENT: J U D G M E N T [Arising out of S.L.P. (Civil) No. 17008 of 2006] WITH CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4696 OF 2006 [Arising out of S.L.P. (Civil) No. 17558 of 2006] S.B. SINHA, J :

 We may, however, notice that this Court in State of U.P. and Others v. M/s. Hindustan Aluminium Corpn. and others [AIR 1979 SC 1459] stated the law thus:

"It appears that a distinction between regulation and restriction or prohibition has always been drawn, ever since Municipal Corporation of the City of Toronto v. Virgo. Regulation promotes the freedom or the facility which is required to be regulated in the interest of all concerned, whereas prohibition obstructs or shuts off, or denies it to those to whom it is applied. The Oxford English Dictionary does not define regulate to include prohibition so that if it had been the intention to prohibit the supply, distribution, consumption or use of energy, the legislature would not have contented itself with the use of the word regulating without using the word prohibiting or some such word, to bring out that effect."

#### they are not a restriction on energy production – just trade – these are distinct and they unlimit

**EAUC, ’10** (Economic Administration University of China, 27 January 2010, “Chapter 12: International Logistics,” http://www.eauc.hk/show.asp?id=76)//CC

What are some key political restrictions on cross-border trade? Many nations ban certain types of shipments that might jeopardize their national security. Likewise, individual nations may band together to pressure another country from being an active supplier of materials that could be used to build nuclear weapons. Some nations restrict the outflow of currency because a nation’s economy will suffer if it imports more than it exports over a long term. A relatively common political restriction on trade involves tariffs or taxes that governments place on the importation of certain items. Another group of political restrictions can be classified as nontariff barriers, which refer to restrictions other than tariffs that are placed upon imported products. Another political restriction involves embargoes, or the prohibition of trade between particular countries.

#### “And/or” means both – they only meet half of the resolution

Words & Phrases, 2007 (Permanent Edition, 2007, vol 3A, p.220)

N.D.Cal. 1942. Under livestock transit policy covering livestock while stopped in transit at feeding station to comply with the law, but not while "stoppage and/or detention" are pursuant to direction of insured or his representative, and rider limiting liability for loss of lambs to period of 12 hours after arrival for feeding in transit yards, insurer was not liable for loss of lambs by fire in feeding in transit yard 25 hours after they were unloaded and after consignee changed their destination, on ground that it was necessary that the word "and" alone should be read into the phrase "and/or" and the "or" excluded. —McPherrin v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co., 44 F.Supp. 674.—Insurance 2160(3).

#### All our offense above applies as well as a limits disad – Precise limits for this term are crucial to informed analysis

Eric Heinze (Senior Lecturer in Law, University of London, Queen Mary. He has held fellowships from the Fulbright Foundation and the French and German governments. He teaches Legal Theory, Constitutional Law, Human Rights and Public International Law. JD Harvard) 2003 “The Logic of Liberal Rights A study in the formal analysis of legal discourse” http://mey.homelinux.org/companions/Eric%20Heinze/The%20Logic%20of%20Liberal%20Rights\_%20A%20Study%20in%20%20%28839%29/The%20Logic%20of%20Liberal%20Rights\_%20A%20Study%20in%20%20-%20Eric%20Heinze.pdf

Variety of ‘restrictions’

The term ‘restriction’, defined so broadly, embraces any number of familiar concepts: ‘deprivation’, ‘denial’, ‘encroachment’, ‘incursion’, ‘infringement’, ‘interference’, ‘limitation’, ‘regulation’. Those terms commonly comport differences in meaning or nuance, and are not all interchangeable in standard legal usage. For example, a ‘deprivation’ may be distinguished from a ‘limitation’ or ‘regulation’ in order to denote a full denial of a right (e.g. where private property is wholly appropriated by the state 16 Agents without compensation) as opposed to a partial constraint (e.g. where discrete restrictions are imposed on the use of property which nonetheless remains profitably usable). Similarly, distinctions between acts and omissions can leave the blanket term ‘restriction’ sounding inapposite when applied to an omission: if a state is accused of not doing enough to give effect to a right, we would not colloquially refer to such inaction as a ‘restriction’. Moreover, in a case of extreme abuse, such as extrajudicial killing or torture, it might sound banal to speak merely of a ‘restriction’ on the corresponding right. However, the term ‘restriction’ will be used to include all of those circumstances, in so far as they all comport a purpose or effect of extinguishing or diminishing the right-seeker’s enjoyment of an asserted right. (The only significant distinction which will be drawn will be between that concept of ‘restriction’ and the concept of ‘breach’ or ‘violation’. The terms ‘breach’ or ‘violation’ will be used to denote a judicial determination about the legality of the restriction.6) Such an axiom may seem unwelcome, in so far as it obliterates subtleties which one would have thought to be useful in law. It must be stressed that we are seeking to eliminate that variety of terms not for all purposes, but only for the very narrow purposes of a formal model, for which any distinctions among them are irrelevant.

**Limits are a vital internal link to pedagogical depth --- key to assess political outcomes, concrete democracy education and an actively engaged citizenry**

**PGE, No Date** [PG Exchange is an initiative of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation. an initiative of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation. The website is a part of CIVICUS’ work on increasing the influence of citizens and civil society organizations in governance processes. The Participatory Governance Project of CIVICUS works to enhance the capacity of targeted southern-based civil society and government actors to promote participatory and accountable governance of public institutions at local and national levels. The project does so through a multi-dimensional capacity-building strategy focusing on, “Education & Deliberation” [http://pgexchange.org/images/toolkits/PGX\_B\_Education%20&%20Deliberation.pdf](http://pgexchange.org/images/toolkits/PGX_B_Education%20%26%20Deliberation.pdf)]

Civic education, also known as citizen education or democracy education is aimed to equip and empower citizens to participate in democratic processes and support democratic and participatory governance. Through civic education, not only a demand for good governance can be created but also a citizenry that is informed and engaged in a deliberative process in the public sphere. Civic education acts as the precursor for deliberative forms of participation by preparing the citizens young and old alike with the appropriate civic values, skills, attitudes and dispositions thus enhancing their capacity to be „empowered and deliberative citizens. A crucial difference between deliberative forms of public participation and the conventional forms of “consultation” such as surveys, public hearings and public comment periods used by the government is that deliberation emphasises information processing, i.e. “meaning-making” over mere information exchange. The deliberation tools not only provide citizens with objective information and enable them to understand the benefits and trade-offs between various policy choices but also facilitate structured dialogue to help clarify their values and priorities, assess a range of policy alternatives and express an informed preference. Deliberative tools envisage varying degrees and levels of citizen involvement some of which border on information exchange and consultation approaches while others are more “empowering” methods in which citizens are vested with necessary rights and authority to make the final decision. **Benefits** The benefits of educative and deliberative methods of participatory governance include:  Knowledgeable, capable, deliberative and active citizens with a huge long term potential for increased levels of civic engagement and political participation;  Creation of opportunities for citizens to shape and, in some cases, determine public policy;  Increased public ownership of the policy development process resulting in shared policy preferences across groups/different sections of society thus minimizing friction between interests and maximizing acceptance of the policy and its effective implementation; and  Well informed, robust and equitable public policies and programs  Enhanced public trust in the government and synergy between the state and civil society; PG Exchange Tool Category: Education & Deliberation 2 LessonsEducative and deliberative methods allow groups of citizens to come together to learn, discuss, and develop a shared understanding on an issue through consideration of relevant facts from various viewpoints. They favour experience based knowledge over “expert knowledge” to help shape public policies and programs. They seek to foster deeper levels of knowledge among citizens about a particular policy or program issue, and frequently emphasise quality and depth of that knowledge over the breadth and frequency of deliberation. At the same time however, like most participatory governance approaches, deliberative methods are most effective when institutionalised and implemented in a frequent and continuous basis.

#### Limits key to v2l

**Ramaekers 1** [Stefan, “Teaching to lie and obey: Nietzsche and Education”, Journal of Philosophy of Education 35.2]

The nature of morality inspires us to stay far from an excessive freedom and cultivates the need for restricted horizons. This narrowing of perspective is for Nietzsche a condition of life and growth. It is interesting to see how this is prefigured in Nietzsche's second Unfashionable Observation (On the Utility and Liability of History for Life). The cure for what he there calls ‘the historical sickness’, i.e. an excess of history which attacks the shaping power of life and no longer understands how to utilise the past as a powerful source of nourishment, is (among others) the ahistorical: "the art and power to be able to forget and to enclose oneself in a limited horizon. Human beings cannot live without a belief in something lasting and eternal. Subordination to the rules of a system of morality should not be understood as a deplorable restriction of an individual's possibilities and creative freedom: on the contrary, it is the necessary determination and limitation of the conditions under which anything can be conceived as possible. Only from within a particular and arbitrary framework can freedom itself be interpreted as freedom. In other words, Nietzsche points to the necessity of being embedded in a particular cultural and historical frame. The pervasiveness of this embeddedness can be shown in at least four aspects of Nietzsche's writings.