**T Ans: Production = Not Extraction 2AC**

**1. Energy production of oil is drilling—we meet**

**Moore 11** (Richard, investigative reporter, 5/6/11, “Gas prices soar to near record levels across Wisconsin, Midwest” The Lakeland Times) http://www.lakelandtimes.com/main.asp?SubSectionID=9&ArticleID=13131&SectionID=9

These Republicans revert to the law of **supply** and demand, which they say **can be bolstered by increasing domestic energy production of oil by drilling** in Alaska and by resuming Gulf oil drilling. Already, they observe, Gulf of Mexico oil output will decline by 190,000 barrels per day in 2011, according to the Energy Department.

**2. Counter-interpretation: production in the context of oil means drilling**

**US EIA no date**[Glossary, http://205.254.135.7/tools/glossary/index.cfm?id=A]

Conventional **oil** and natural gas **production: Crude oil** and natural gas that **is produced by a well drilled into a geologic formation in which the reservoir and fluid characteristics permit the oil** and natural gas **to readily flow to the wellbore**.

**Energy production must be defined in context**

**EIA, no date**

[Energy Information Administration, Glossary, “P”, http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm?id=P, accessed 5-20-12, AFB]

**Production: See production terms associated with specific energy types.**

**Energy production is extraction**

**DOCC 8** (Australian Government’s Department of Climate Change, “National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Guidelines,” http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/~/media/publications/greenhouse-report/nger-reporting-guidelines.ashx)

Energy Production ‘Energy production’ is defined in r. 2.23: Production of energy, in relation to a facility, means any one of the following: a. the extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in operation of the facility; 11 b. the manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility. *Energy consumption* ‘Energy consumption’ is defined in r. 2.23: Consumption of energy, in relation to a facility, means the use or disposal of energy from the operation of the facility including own-use and losses in extraction, production and transmission.

**D. They assume energy production FROM oil, not OF oil**

**Merriam-Webster no date** “of” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/of

a —**used as a function word to indicate the object of an action** denoted or **implied by the preceding noun** <love of nature> b —used as a function word to indicate the application of a verb <cheats him of a dollar> or of an adjective <fond of candy>

**T Ans: In = Throughout 2AC**

**TWO, In means within – this is the core meaning**

**Encarta** World English Dictionary, **7** (“In (1)”, 2007, http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861620513)

**in** [ [in](http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/Pronounce.aspx?search=in) ] **CORE MEANING: a grammatical word indicating that something or somebody is within or inside something**.

Enviro Adv: Add-On—Oxygen

#### Methane seeps deplete the ocean’s oxygen

**Hoffman 10** (Doug, American businessman, accountant and former congressional candidate, 5/23/10, “Crude Facts About Offshore Drilling” The Resilient Earth) http://theresilientearth.com/?q=content/crude-facts-about-offshore-drilling

A recent assessment of oil sources to the ocean revealed that natural seepage accounts for nearly half of all input. Oil seeps occur in a range of environments from the continental shelves, to continental slopes, and deep basins. Satellite imagery from the northwest Gulf of Mexico suggests ~1,900 km of persistent natural oil slicks at the sea surface in that region alone, with many other seep regions dispersed globally. Oil seeps also typically release large quantities of methane, a potent greenhouse gas. The co-occurrence of oil and gas at seeps is thought to increase the atmospheric methane flux through the formation of protective surface coatings on gas bubbles, but significant fractions of methane still dissolve into the water; for example, approximately half the methane emitted by the seeps at Coal Oil Point, California, dissolves in the water column When methane dissolves into the ocean it depletes the water's oxygen content, which is why investigators on the scene of the current Gulf spill have noticed the oxygen content of the surrounding water dropping. This is obviously a threat to any sea life in the area. In California, where being green is almost a requirement of residency, offshore drilling has been suppressed for years even though it probably does no good. Valentine et al. explain: “The timing and volume of erupted hydrocarbons from the asphalt structures can explain some or all of the documented methane release and tar accumulation in the Santa Barbara basin during the Pleistocene.”

#### Extinction

**Bryant 03** - Donald A. Bryant, Dep. Biochem @ Penn. State, 2003, “The Beauty in small things revealed,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, http://www.pnas.org/content/100/17/9647.full

Oxygenic photosynthesis accounts fornearly all the primary biochemical production of organic matter on Earth. The byproduct of this process, oxygen, facilitated the evolution of complex eukaryotes and supports their/our continuing existence. Because macroscopic plants are responsible for most terrestrial photosynthesis, it is relatively easy to appreciate the importance of photosynthesis on land when one views the lush green diversity of grasslands or forests. However, Earth is the “blue planet,” and oceans cover nearly 75% of its surface. All life on Earth equally depends on the photosynthesis that occurs in Earth's oceans. A rich diversity of marine phytoplankton, found in the upper 100 m of oceans, accounts only for ≈1% of the total photosynthetic biomass, but this virtually invisible forest accounts for nearly 50% of the net primary productivity of the biosphere (1). Moreover, the importance of these organisms in the biological pump, which traps CO2 from the atmosphere and stores it in the deep sea, is increasingly recognized as a major component of the global geochemical carbon cycle (2). It seems obvious that it is as important to understand marine photosynthesis as terrestrial photosynthesis, but the contribution of marine photosynthesis to the global carbon cycle was grossly underestimated until recently. Satellite-based remote sensing (e.g., NASA sea-wide field sensor) has allowed more reliable determinations of oceanic photosynthetic productivity to be made (refs. 1 and 2; see Fig. 1).

Econ Adv: California Low Ext

**California economy sputtering now—only slow growth is possible—plan is key to recovery by creating necessary jobs**

Don **Walters, 3/24**/13 California's economic challenge in a nutshell, <http://www.sacbee.com/2013/03/24/5288075/dan-walters-californias-economic.html>

Coincidentally, **three otherwise unrelated events last week framed California's somewhat clouded economic situation**. **One was a revelation that the state now is tied with for the nation's highest unemployment rate, 9.8 percent**. Although employment surged in California last year, with about a quarter-million new jobs, and the jobless rate had dropped by more than two percentage points from its high-water mark, **more than 1.8 million workers are still without jobs**. And outside the immediate Bay Area the picture is especially grim, with jobless rates hitting nearly 30 percent in some rural counties. **The second event was release of a study** by researchers at the University of Southern California **on the state's potentially huge deposits of** shale **oil that**, they said, **could spark an economic boom** in the state, as it has in other states. **Exploiting** shale **oil could create** from a half-million to **more than 2 million jobs, increase personal income sharply and spark a multi-billion-dollar surge in tax revenues** the study said. The third was release of the latest annual update of the Tax Foundation's state-by-state comparisons of tax burdens, indicating that Californians are bearing some of the nation's highest taxation loads. We were fourth highest at 11.2 percent of personal income in 2010 and since then, we've hiked sales and income taxes that would add nearly another half a point to that rate. Yet, despite those heavy taxes, state and local governments continue to struggle with chronic budget deficits and long-term obligations for pensions, retiree health care and bonded debt. And there it is. **After three booms (defense, technology and housing) and three busts in the last three decades, California's economy continues to sputter. Two new economic forecasts**, one from UCLA's Anderson School and another from California Lutheran University, **see only incremental and slow recovery from what had been the worst recession since the Great Depression, with relatively high joblessness for years to come. Meanwhile, we're seeing a strong outflow of job-seeking Californians to other states, especially those whose economies are humming, such as Texas, thus reducing our stock of educated and high-skill workers**. It's not a pretty picture, and while Gov. Jerry Brown dismisses those who question the state's prospects as "declinists," he and other Capitol politicians pay nothing more than lip service to making the state a more attractive venue for job- creating investment. **The oil shale situation is a big test. Are we willing to exploit – albeit with appropriate environmental safeguards – our vast reserves of oil, or will we continue to cross our fingers and hope that somehow, some way, California will recapture prosperity by osmosis?**

**Econ Adv: A2 “Decoupling”**

**No decoupling**

Clyde **Prestowitz**, President, Economic Strategy Institute, "The End of Decoupling," FOREIGN POLICY, 7--19--**12**, http://prestowitz.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/07/19/the\_end\_of\_decoupling

For the past week, I've been participating in conferences in Singapore, Nanning, and Hong Kong on the future of China and the Asian economies in which I have been subjected to endless repetition of a mantra. Speaker after speaker has risen to declare that China is her or her country's largest trading partner. Left unspoken but understood by all is the fact that just a few years ago the largest trading partner of all these countries was either the United States or the EU. So the clear understanding is that China has displaced America and Europe as the main customer and engine of growth. The declaration is often made with a certain air of excitement, almost as if many of the speakers can't quite believe what they are saying. And the truth is that they shouldn't. Even as we discussed these trade numbers at the Pan Beibu Gulf conference in Nanning, the **Chinese** government released its latest **growth figures show**ing a **dramatic slowdown** to 7.6 percent of GDP which was somewhat below the already lowered target. This slowdown is **occurring in large part because China's exports are performing poorly in the face of th**e Euro crisis and a relentlessly **slowing U.S. economy**. China's growth is also slowing because the enormous stimulus spending the country undertook to offset the impact of the recent Great Recession created its own inflationary and excess debt and capacity problems that Beijing has been trying to control by cutting back on the stimulus. This is the subject of a second mantra which is that China is rebalancing by shifting away from investment and export led growth to domestic consumption led growth. So the hope has been that structural reform will make China a major end consumer and that consumption led growth will take up the slack of relatively declining export led growth. Well, none of it is happening. Or, at least, it's not happening fast enough. The truth is that China is only the largest trading partner of many Asian countries in the sense that they ship goods to China. But **China is merely a stop on the supply chain that eventually ends in the United States o**r Europe or, sometimes, in Japan. It is not usually the end customer unless the goods being shipped are raw materials, oil, and agricultural commodities. Most of what is happening is the shipment of parts and components from an Asian country to China where they are assembled into final products and then shipped on to the final U.S. and European customers. The weaknesses of the whole global system are now becoming excruciatingly apparent. China has been urged by the G-20 and has committed to rebalancing and focusing on domestic consumption led growth. But consumption accounts for only 35 percent of China's GDP and is not large enough to be an engine of growth in the short term. As growth has slowed dramatically, Chinese officials are talking more and more of another round of investment and infra-structure stimulus. Understandable as a short run measure, this only threatens to exacerbate the longer run problems. Moreover, another round is unlikely to be as effective as the first round was because of the unresolved distortions remaining from that effort. In any case, reform looks like it will not happen quickly if at all. Further, China has backed away from allowing the yuan to strengthen and has put renewed effort behind exports, but the crisis in Europe and the **slowing of the U.S. economy are having a huge negative impact and belying all the happy talk of decoupling**. Meanwhile, Europe seems determined to commit suicide by austerity and the death of a thousand all night Brussels summits. The Euro-zone needs some kind of growth agreement to complement the new fiscal pact as well as a banking union and some degree of common debt sharing through Eurobonds. But all this is unlikely, and certainly unlikely in the required time frame in the face of German opposition. The U.S. situation is objectively the least dire in that its enormous trade deficit gives it the potential to grow by importing relatively less and producing and exporting relatively more. But no serious effort is being made in this direction, and political gridlock and the looming debt cliff are likely to continue to erode confidence and U.S. growth prospects. The consequences of all this are that there is not going to be a global growth engine in the foreseeable future. **China is not likely to rebalance by making the shift from investment and export led growth to consumption led growth**, and the collapse of the euro and break-up of the EU is becoming a reasonable bet. Aside from that, everything's okay. Have a good day.

**Energy K 2AC**

**Perm do both**

**Extinction outweighs**

Anders **Sandberg** et al., James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University, "How Can We Reduce the Risk of Human Extinction?" BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, 9-9-**08**, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction, accessed 5-2-10.

Such remote risks may seem academic in a world plagued by immediate problems, such as global **poverty, HIV, and climate change**. But as intimidating as these problems are, they **do not threaten human existence**. In discussing the risk of nuclear winter, Carl Sagan emphasized the astronomical toll of human extinction: A nuclear war imperils all of our descendants, for as long as there will be humans. Even if the population remains static, with an average lifetime of the order of 100 years, over a typical time period for the biological evolution of a successful species (roughly ten million years), we are talking about some 500 trillion people yet to come. By this criterion, **the stakes are one million times greater for extinction than for the more modest nuclear wars** that kill "only" hundreds of millions of people. **There are many** other possible **measures of the potential loss**--including **culture and science**, the evolutionary history of the planet, and the significance of the lives of all of our ancestors who contributed to the future of their descendants. **Extinction is the undoing of the human enterprise. There is a discontinuity between risks that threaten 10 percent or even 99 percent of humanity and those that threaten 100 percent. For disasters killing less than all humanity, there is a good chance that the species could recover. If we value future human generations, then reducing extinction risks should dominate our considerations**. Fortunately, most measures to reduce these risks also improve global security against a range of lesser catastrophes, and thus deserve support regardless of how much one worries about extinction.

**All lives are valuable – means you should prefer util**

**Cummisky 96** (David, professor of philosophy at Bates, “Kantian Consequentialism”, p. 131)

Finally, **even if one grants that saving two persons with dignity cannot outweigh and compensate for killing one—because dignity cannot be** added and **summed in this way—this** point **still does not justify deontological constraints**. On the extreme interpretation, **why would not killing one person be a stronger obligation than saving two persons? If I am concerned with the priceless dignity of each, it would seem that I may still save two**; it is just that my reason cannot be that the two compensate for the loss of the one. Consider Hill's example of a priceless object: If I can save two of three priceless statutes only by destroying one, then I cannot claim that saving two makes up for the loss of the one. But similarly, the loss of the two is not outweighed by the one that was not destroyed. Indeed, **even if dignity cannot be simply summed up**, how is the extreme interpretation inconsistent with the idea **that I should save as many priceless objects as possible**? Even if two do not simply outweigh and thus compensate for the loss of the one, **each is priceless; thus, I have good reason to save as many as I can**. In short, it is not clear how the extreme interpretation justifies the ordinary killing/letting-die distinction or even how it conflicts with the conclusion that the more persons with dignity who are saved, the better.8

**Growth produces tech, solving any pollution it creates**

**Zey 98** - Michael Zey, Montclair University, SEIZING THE FUTURE, 1998, p. 36-37.

**Once we discover new capacities, both tech**­nological **and human, we are set off in novel directions, crossing boundaries** and exploring frontiers **we never thought existed**. The Spanish explored the New World in order to extract natural resources such as gold from the Earth and spread Christianity. Many English settlements were established by people simply trying to escape religious intolerance. None could have guessed that their expression of progress circa 1600 would lead to the birth of an independent nation that became the crucible for personal liberation and technological innovation. The fact that progress itself leads to new definitions of human growth also explains the West’s faith in progress. Our **accomplishments consis­tently exceed our wildest dreams**. Regardless of the stated purpose of a technology, the applications usually exceed such purposes. The auto­mobile became important as a means of redistributing the population from cities to the suburbs; the discovery of the steam engine revolution­ized industry and the very concept of abundance. Third, **growth** itself **contains** to their economic woes. hence, he concludes that in order to ensure **the solutions to the problems it produces**. Supporting this principle is the World Bank’s 1992 report “De­velopment and the Environment,” which blatantly states that **growth is a powerful antidote to** a number of **ills plaguing Third World countries, including** the **pollution** that growth supposedly generates. The report thus contends that eliminating poverty should remain the top goal of world policymakers. **Although economic growth can initially lead to** such **problems** as pollution and waste, **the resulting prosperity** also **facilitates the developments of tech**nologies **that lead to cleaner air and water**. In fact, **once a nation’s per capita income rises to** about **$4000** in 1993 dollars, **it** produces less of some pollutants per capita, mainly due to the fact that it **can afford tech**nology like catalytic converters and sewage sys­tems **that treat** a variety of **wastes**. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, “We **consider any** kind of **environmental damage to result from mismanagement of the economy**.” He claims that the **pollution problems of poorer regions such as eastern europe can be traced to their economic woes**. Hence, he concludes that **in order to ensure environmental safety “we need a sound economy on a global basis**.” so **the answer to pollution, the supposed outgrowth of progress, ought to be more** economic **growth**.

**Economic rationality is good**

**Avent 11** (Ryan, author of The Gated City, “Economic Science” 3/17//11, The Bellows) http://www.ryanavent.com/blog/?p=2380

Is economics a science? Let me first associate myself with Adam Ozimek’s comments here. If you want to say that economics isn’t a “hard science”, that might be all right, depending on just what you mean by it. If you mean that economists can’t run lab experiments and can’t predict outcomes as accurately as, say, chemists, then that’s acceptable to me**. If you mean that economists have no experiments, or don’t use the scientific method, or something of that nature, then you’re dead wrong. The currency of the economics realm is evidence. When economists do research they form hypotheses, build models, gather data, test the models against the data, and publish their conclusions. If other economists try to get similar results and fail, the original result is called into question. Economics is quite often effectively predictive. If the supply of one good is disrupted, economists can tell you with great certainty what will happen to demand for complementary goods and substitutes**. If supply levels are known and research establishing elasticities has been done, they can tell you even more about what will happen**. Their predictions will nearly always be right.** And **this is true for many aspects of economics.** It’s important to note that because economists can’t always run their own experiments, there will tend to be more confidence about theories that focus on things which occur very often. Prices shift constantly, and economists consequently know a LOT about prices. Massive, global economic recessions occur about once a century. There is obviously a lot more uncertainty regarding the theories that describe these events. Economics struggles with limited data at times. Economists could substantially increase their macroeconomic sample sizes if they had good data on economic activity for all of human history, but unfortunately governments haven’t been collecting data all that long. (Though economic historians have put together respectable careers carefully assembling historical data sets.) The Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey, which has been the subject of intense study in this recession, only goes back to 2000. But much of **the progress of “hard” science has been about improving the available data. These limitations don’t detract from the scientific endeavor at the heart of the economics discipline. Economics is not empty philosophizing or groping in the dark.**

**Rationality is self-correcting—prefer it**

**Krebs 10** - Principal of Jesus College, Oxford (John, 2/8/2011, “We might err, but science is self-correcting”, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest\_contributors/article7018438.ece) MH

**This philosophy of science was formally instituted 350 years ago** in London by the small band of men, including Christopher Wren and Robert Boyle, who founded the Royal Society, the world’s oldest national academy of science. **Their motto**, Nullius in verba (“**Take nobody’s word for it”)** embodies the Royal Society’s founding principle of basing conclusions on observation and experiment rather than the voice of authority. **Scientists don’t have all the answers, but they do have a way of finding out, and the fact that our lights come on,** our computers compute and our mobile phones phone **are among the myriad daily reminders that the scientific way works**. You might retort that science and scientists often don’t live up to this ideal. And you would be right. **Scientists, like everyone else, have human frailties and are susceptible to fashion and orthodoxy**. Nevertheless, over time, **science is self-correcting because someone will have the courage to challenge the prevailing view and win the argument, provided he or she has sufficient evidence. There is**, of course, **no excuse for scientists who** over-egg or **massage their results**, or who underplay the uncertainties in their conclusions. **The prevailing view in many areas of science will include significant uncertainties** (as with climate change), so challenge is central to the progress of understanding. **The claim that Himalayan glaciers would melt in the next 30 years is an example of this self-correction. It was debunked from within the scientific community and not by outside commentators, it does not undermine the core conclusions about man-made global warming,** and the mistake that the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change made was to dismiss this challenge without studying the evidence. **Scepticism is fine but science is not a free-for-all.** Whether or not you accept the sceptics’ view should depend on careful weighing of the evidence. **Dr Wakefield had no good evidence to support his claim of a link between the MMR vaccine and autism. Equally, the Department of Health’s claim that the “MMR vaccine is perfectly safe” is wrong. No vaccine is perfectly safe, but not vaccinating your children exposes them to a far bigger risk than the tiny risk associated with the vaccine.** Given what I have said, it is not surprising that the interaction between science and government can be edgy. Ministers look to their expert advisers for clear-cut answers, a unanimous view, and preferably one that is politically convenient. Scientific advisers are prone to disappoint on all fronts. “I am sorry minister, but science is not clear-cut, what is more, different experts take a different view, and our best advice is to do X” (where X is not a vote winner). When I was asked to advise, in 1996, on whether or not to kill badgers as a way of controlling bovine tuberculosis, I said that without a proper experiment it is not possible to tell whether or not the policy would work. To its credit, the Ministry of Agriculture set up what was perhaps the largest ecological experiment ever carried out in this country. The result showed that killing is not a cost-effective policy, and disappointed farmers. Last year David Nutt, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Misuse of Drugs, was sacked by the Home Secretary for being too outspoken about the Government’s rejection of his committee’s advice on the classification of cannabis and Ecstasy. If ministers are going to reject expert advice, they should explain why. What they should definitely not do, as both the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary did in this case, is to announce, before they have received the expert advice, that they have made up their mind. Equally, independent experts should not be gagged by ministers, even if their views are inconvenient. **Science, warts and all, is still the best way of finding out, and is absolutely vital in informing government policy.** That is why the Government must strongly reaffirm its commitment to freedom of expression for independent scientific advisers. At the same time, if scientists have a right to be heard, they have a responsibility to be scrupulously honest and not to claim more than is justified by the evidence.

**Method doesn’t come first**

Friedrich **Kratochwil**, Professor of International Relations, European University Institute, “Ten points to ponder about pragmatism: some critical reflections to knowledge generation in the social sciences,” PRAGMATISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, eds. Harry Bauer and Elisabetta Brighi, 20**09**, p. 12-13.

To that extent, the argument for a pluralism of methods and approaches follows from the fact that all knowledge is always part of a certain perspective, and that direct tests against 'reality' are not available. Consequently, the orthodox notion that scientific 'progress\* consists in coming nearer and nearer to the truth shows its ideological character. For one, it is on all fours with the empirical evidence of how the scientific enterprise developed. Thus the notion of a simple accumulation was not only debunked by Kuhn and the general criticisms developed by the history of science (Kuhn 1970) but, more importantly, involves us in a logically untenable contradiction. **Without knowing 'reality' independently of our specific theoretical inquiries, we can never know whether we are 'nearer\* to the "truth\* (rather than** being simply **'somewhere else'**). Otherwise we would need to argue that we can determine that we are nearer to the 'goal', even if we have no goal line against which we can make that assessment.2 **This recognition puts a premium on 'dialogue\* among practitioners utilizing competing theories rather than on the idea of 'demonstration\* that speaks for itself. Analytical and methodological eclecticism recommends itself precisely because in practical contexts we cannot wait until we know 'the truth**', whatever it might be. To that extent, **insisting on methodological purity seems a problematic regulative idea**. Instead, what **we need** is **a self-conscious 'trespassing'**, a la Hirschman, of various research traditions, **and a flexible utilization of their contribution to the problem at hand** (Hirschman 1981). Trusting 'paradigms' might hinder rather than help with diagnosing the problem. Similarly, a blind reliance on methods in the sense "one size fits all' is unlikely to deliver the desired 'data\* (King el al. 1994). What is needed is a careful combination of methods and approaches that understands and respects the strengths and limitations of different research traditions and methods, and that combines and adapts (through 'translation' and other techniques) the different parts, while being fully attentive lo their moorings in different descriptions of the world.

**Ecofem marginalizes women by embracing patriarchal norms**

**Biehl 91** – Janet, Social ecology activist and the author of Rethinking Eco-feminist Politics, “Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics,” p. 15-6

Although most political movements might feel the need to sort out these differences and their theorists might argue for and against them, producing a healthy debate, ecofeminists rarely confront each other en the differences in these writings. **Ecofeminists** who even acknowledge the existence of serious contradictions **tend**, in fact, **to pride themselves on the contradictions in their works as a healthy sign of "diversity"**-**presumably in contrast to "dogmatic,"** fairly consistent, **and presumably "male" or "masculine" theories. But dogmatism is clearly not the same thing as coherence, clarity, and at least a minimum level of consistency**. **Ecofeminism**, far from being healthily diverse, **is so blatantly self-contradictory as to be incoherent**. As one might expect, at least one ecofeminist even rejects the very-notion of coherence itself, arguing that coherence is "totalizing" and by inference oppressive. Moreover, because ecofeminists rarely debate each other, it is nearly impossible to glean from their writings the extent to which they agree or disagree with each other. The reader of this book should be wary of attributing the views of anyone ecofeminist, as they are presented here, to all other ecofeminists. But **ecofeminists' apparent aversion to sorting out the differences among themselves leaves the critical observer no choice but to generalize**. **The self-contradictory nature of ecofeminism raises further problems** as well. Some **ecofeminists literally celebrate the identification of women with nature as an ontological reality. They thereby speciously biologize the personality traits that patricentric society assigns to women**. **The implication of this position is to confine women to the same regressive social definitions from which feminists have fought long and hard to emancipate women**. Other ecofeminists reject such biologizations and rightly consider what are virtually sociobiological definitions of women as regressive for women. But **some of the same ecofeminists who reject these definitions nonetheless favor using them to build a movement**.

**Ledge DA—Changing consumption patterns only allow the perpetuation of all their impacts—we should instead overconsume, run out of resources, and FORCE the world to change.**

Levi **Bryant**, Professor of Philosophy, Collin College, “Black Ecology: A Pessimistic Moment,” LARVAL SUBJECTS, October 4, 20**12**, http:// http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/03/19/black-ecology-a-pessimistic-moment/.

So why is this an issue? It’s an issue because **while environmentalists prescribe all sorts of action** we need to take to avert the climate catastrophe, it seems to me that **in failing to engage in an ecology of social and political institutions they are whistling past the graveyard by failing to address the question of the conditions under which action is possible**. Here’s the part where everyone gets angry with me. **Given the way in which government and corporations are today intertwined, I don’t think there’s much we can do to avert the coming catastrophe**. As Morton says, referring to logical time, “the catastrophe has already happened”. So what would it mean, I wonder, to take Morton’s thesis seriously? Here I know Tim will disagree with me. When I look at environmental discussions in popular media and from many around me, I see the discussion revolving almost entirely around consumers. **We’re told that we have to consume differently to solve this problem**. I agree that we need to consume differently, but **I don’t see any feasible way in which driving fuel efficient cars, using less heat and AC, eating less meat, etc will solve these problems. This is because the lion’s share of our climate change problems arise from the production and distribution end of the equation, rather than the consumption end. They are problems arising from agricultural practices, factories, and how we ship goods throughout countries and the world**. The problem is that given the way in which governments and corporations are intertwined with one another, and given the way in which third world countries are dependent on fossil fuels for their development, and given the fact that only governmental solutions can address problems of production and distribution, we’re left with no recourse for action. We can only watch helplessly while our bought and sold politicians continue to fiddle as the world burns. All of this leads me to think that **green consumerism is a horrible symptom of our inability to act that actually exacerbates our problems by prolonging our confrontation with the reality we’re facing**. And here’s the horrible thought that occurs to me in dark moments that everyone will slap me for: perhaps **the truly ethical and right political response** to climate change **is not to jump on the green bandwagon and change all our consumption habits, but rather to consume as much as possible, especially with respect to energy**. I just don’t see how there’s any feasible way we can get governments and industry to respond to these problems given the current governmental and economic ecologies. This seems to suggest that **the only possible solution is to push ourselves over the ledge where fossil fuels are no longer available and where governments and industry are thereby forced to change**. That’s my pessimistic thought for the evening. Let the demands for me to done a hair shirt commence.

**CP Ans: States 2AC**

**Perm do both**

**CP does nothing—states can’t lift federal restrictions, and the OCS is federal jurisdiction exclusively**

**Engerrand 05** (Kenneth, Shareholder, Brown Sims, Spring 2005, “Primer of Remedies on the Outer Continental Shelf” Loyola Maritime Law Journal, Lexis)

**The outer Continental Shelf is a federal enclave which Congress stated should be treated like an area of "exclusive Federal jurisdiction" n240 after ceding the submerged lands to the states in the Submerged Lands Act.** n241 Being require to choose the law to apply to this area, Congress decided to extend the laws of the United States. Consequently, the application of federal law to the outer Continental Shelf does not occur because that law applies in its own force, but because the OCSLA extends that law to the area and to the devices described in Section 1333(a)(1).

**50 state fiat is a voting issue – no decision makers controls state policy, kills logic and decisionmaking which is the only portable skill – no solvency advocate kills fairness and undermines core research skills – kills real world education**

**States do not have the capacity to do the plan**

**Salcido 08** (Rachael, Associate Professor of Law, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law, “Offshore Federalism and Ocean Industrialization” Tulane Law Review Association, Lexis)

While the EPA of 2005 retreated from cooperative federalism, a different approach would be to move towards increased state influence and management of offshore developments. n422 **Delegating certain offshore development responsibilities to the states has been explored** [\*1420] by different policymakers and scholars. n423 **Proposals** to increase state control over offshore areas **face significant challenges** on several fronts. First, **proposals face challenges at an institutional capacity level. It is well-recognized that states have limited financial resources and staff in coastal positions to address the potential regulatory processes needed to facilitate offshore development within the EEZ.** n424 These institutional capacity concerns go beyond purely economic considerations. As the Supreme Court notedin the earliest of tidelands disputes, United States v. California, **"**the state is not equipped in our constitutional system with the powers or the facilities for exercising the responsibilities which would be concomitant with the dominion which it seeks." n425

**CIR 2AC**

**Won’t pass, multiple issues thump**

Alex **Altman,** "Four Hurdles that Could Block Immigration Reform," TIME, **3--20**--13,

http://swampland.time.com/2013/03/20/four-hurdles-that-could-block-immigration-reform/

The next few months offer the best chance in a generation for the two parties to solve a problem that has bedeviled Congress like few others. Both sides agree the U.S. immigration system is broken. Both would seem to gain from a deal that clears a pathway out of legal oblivion for the nation’s 11 million illegal immigrants. Support is building for a landmark pact. But while negotiations are progressing in both the House and Senate, an agreement is a long way off.As the talks grow more detailed, **obstacles**to a deal may begin to **emerge**: Problem #1: **The Gang of Eight** The first snag lurks in the Senate, where the so-called Gang of Eight has huddled privately since the election in hopes of hammering out a bill. Members have crafted a set of measures that would create a pathway to citizenship for the nation’s estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants within about 13 years while requiring them to register with federal authorities, pay back taxes and fines, learn English and undergo background checks. The deal, both sides agree, would also beef up border security and determine how the future flow of immigrants will be regulated to match the needs of the economy. The Gang’s closed conclaves have been marked by Vatican-style secrecy, often a sign of progress in a town where silence is rare. The Gang’s members – Republicans Marco Rubio, Lindsey Graham, John McCain and Jeff Flake, and Democrats Chuck Schumer, Dick Durbin, Bob Menendez and Michael Bennet – have, by all accounts, developed a rapport. “You can tell by the tone of their voices,” says an elected Democrat briefed on the progress of the private talks. But the broad themes are the**easy** part. The full bill willstretch to **hundreds of** pages, each peppered with detailed**provisions** *that* **could spike it. Members bring clashing** political imperatives and **ideologies** to the talks. Rubio, for example, is trying to repair the GOP’s tattered image with Hispanic voters without sparking a backlash among the movement conservatives he’d need in a presidential bid. Graham, who faces a probable primary challenge in 2014, has a habit of basking in the bipartisan spotlight before bolting when negotiations intensify. The measure of the Gang of Eight’s success isn’t whether they are aligned at the start of their talks. It’s whether they are all aligned at the end. Problem #2: **The Lobbyists A** few years ago, an impasse between the leaders of the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO helped scupper an immigration-reform bill backed by President George W. Bush. At that time, business and labor could not agree on how many visas to grant low skilled workers who make the construction, agriculture and hotel and restaurant industries hum. The Chamber wanted cheap labor, but didn’t want workers to stay; unions were concerned about protecting citizens’ jobs. Soon after, reform collapsed. This time the two groups have nurtured an unlikely alliance. “There has been a sea change,” says a labor source close to the discussions. Nudged by Graham and Schumer, the two lobbies released a set of shared principles, including one stating that Americans should get “first crack” at available jobs and that businesses should have the flexibility to hire to meet the demands of the market. But history could repeat itself again. The **two sides** call for a new federal agency charged with setting visa levels, but they **have yet to agree on who’s eligible** or how the new bureau will work. The issue of future flow has been a stubborn sticking point before. And it is as easy to imagine conservatives balking at efforts to create a new government agency as it is to foresee unions drawing a line at a small number of foreign workers. Problem #3: House Republicans Even if Senate negotiators can come up with a package to get 60 votes in the upper chamber, “the question continues to be, **how does it get through the House**?” says Frank Sharry, an expert on immigration reform. As in the Senate, a bipartisan cluster of eight representatives from across the ideological spectrum have been secretly meeting for months. Congressman Luis Gutierrez, an Illinois Democrat who has long been a leader on immigration reform, is full of praise for the new tack taken by his Republican counterparts. But, he acknowledges, “You still have to put those votes on the board, and that’s going to be a real, real test in the House of Representatives.” For their part, Republicans say the party’s old dogma, which held that illegal immigrants should self-deport and then go to the back of the line, is not viable policy. Even many immigration hard-liners say they want to help shape comprehensive reform. “It’s time for us to belly up to the bar,” says Ted Poe, the Texas Republican who chairs the House immigration reform caucus. But for conservatives, **amnesty remains a dirty word. “**A bill that’s basically amnesty, that says you’re here and you’re going to be a citizen — those two things are not going to come out of this conservative House,” says Poe. Even citizenship is charged enough that Republican Senator Rand Paul, who gave a speech March 19 backing a path to legalization for undocumented immigrants, avoided using the term. Many House **Republicans,** including several in the Judiciary Committee through which a bill must pass, **have a long history of antipathy to amnesty, and** only **a grassroots rebellion to fear as** next year’s **primaries approach**. Then there is the reality that even if Republicans were to be widely supportive of amnesty, very few of those new citizens are likely to abandon the Democratic Party anytime soon. “Republicans face a choice: do they ditch their principles and go all out in a failing attempt to outpander Democrats?” asks Rosemary Jenks, director of government relations at NumbersUSA, which advocates for lower immigration levels. “It’s becoming very clear to Republicans in Congress that this is not going to get them the Hispanic vote.” Problem #4: The Democrats Little discussed but also looming is the possibility that **Democrats drag their feet** on reform. **Liberals will balk if the path** to citizenship **is too long** or too onerous, **or** if **enforcement** provisions are **too rigid**. Many conservatives also suspect that **Democratic** power **brokers**, despite their daily hammering of Republicans to get moving on immigration reform, would privately **prefer to keep the issue as a cudgel than** actually **pass a law.** Barack Obama “wants to make a bill come out of the Senate that is so far out there that it would never pass, so that he can blame us for not being compassionate and use the issue to take back the House in 2014,” says a House Republican. Even some liberals see this as a plausible scenario. “There’s always a lingering doubt in my mind,” admits one House Democrat. Obama knows that putting his fingerprints on the deal is an easy way to kill it; when a draft of his proposal leaked in the press, he called Republican negotiators individually to apologize. But if negotiations in Congress bog down, he may not be so hands off. By all accounts, negotiators are making genuine progress toward a landmark deal that builds on a foundation laid during its last fumbled attempts. But lawmakers still have to thread a bill through a thicket of obstacles in a bitterly divided Congress. Sources close to the negotiations say they expect both **chambers** to **introduce legislation in** early **April, giving** Congress **several months to haggle** out a pact before members scatter for their summer recess. It sounds like plenty of time, but it’s not. **Immigration will have to jockey for attention** this spring **with gun control, budgets and** a potential grand bargain on **tax and entitlement reform**. Meanwhile, the human cost of the political stalemate is high. Each day, 1,400 undocumented immigrants are deported.

**Not top of docket, no pass, Obama's not pusing**

Kathleeen **Hennessey,** "Obama Tries to Push Stalled Immigration Talks Forward," LOS ANGELES TIMES, **3--25**--13, www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-obama-stalled-immigration-talks-20130325,0,7503326.story

In January, Obama threatened to send his own bill to Congress if the group did not produce a proposal “in a timely fashion.” His remarks Monday suggest the White House is willing to give the group more time to work before it takes that step. “I expect the debate to begin next month. I want to sign that bill into law as soon as possible,” he said. “We know that real reform means continuing to strengthen our border security and holding employers accountable. … Let’s get this done.” **Obama’s time frame may be tough for senators to reach**. U.S. Sen. Patrick J. **Leahy** (D-Vt.), chairman of the judiciary committee, already **has cast doubt on** the chances of **getting a bill through** his committee by the end of April**.Even if the bill comes to the floor** next month **a vote would not necessarily follow** quickly. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) has said he plans to let senators debate the legislation at length, and **there remains no clear path for the bill through the** Republican-led **House**. The **senators remain deadlocked** over several issues, including the details of a guest-worker program and how the legislation will implement and define security at the border. **Obama has** largely **steered clear of** the **talks**, instead offering broad elements he wants to see included. The president on Monday used the platform to revive his call for a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants, the key requirement for any bill.

#### California offshore drilling is an olive branch

**Baker 10** (David, staff writer, 4/1/10, "No California offshore drilling for now" San Francisco Gate) www.sfgate.com/green/article/No-California-offshore-drilling-for-now-3268762.php

Some oil industry leaders on Wednesday called Obama's plan a good first step that didn't go far enough. Catherine Reheis-Boyd, president of the Western States Petroleum Association, said she hopes the administration will eventually allow new drilling off the California coast. The seabed along the state could hold more than 10 billion barrels of oil, according to federal estimates. For comparison, the nation consumes 7.14 billion barrels a year. "We are disappointed," Reheis-Boyd said. "When you look at the resources here, they're considerable." Drilling along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts had been banned since 1981, protected by a congressional moratorium. But as gasoline prices soared above $4 per gallon in 2008, Congress let the moratorium expire. Meanwhile, oil platforms built along the Southern California coast before the moratorium are operating, and produced 35.2 million barrels of oil last year. Obama's move puts some of his staunchest supporters in a bind. On Wednesday, he cast offshore drilling as one piece of a broader energy policy that also includes expanding the use of renewable power and alternative fuels, and improving the fuel efficiency of cars. Wooing Republicans Much like his support for new nuclear plants, drilling represents one way for Obama to woo Republicans when the Senate begins debating a comprehensive energy and climate-change bill. Legislation developed by Sens. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., John Kerry, D-Mass., and Joe Lieberman, independent-Conn., could be unveiled this month. "It's an olive branch," said Whitney Stanco, energy analyst for research firm Concept Capital. "The question is whether the olive branch works."

**Expanding oil production is key to get GOP support for Obama’s agenda**

David **Grant**, staff writer, **1/20**/13, “Obama’s second term: Can he work with Congress? (+video)”, Christian Science Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0120/Obama-s-second-term-Can-he-work-with-Congress-video, acc. 1/25/13

And **the president could** perhaps **turn down the bellicosity on the Hill by working with some of his loudest critics** (though risking the ire of environmentalists in his political base) **in one area** that **the** deeply-red **right and the president could agree: energy policy**. “We were encouraged by President Obama’s 2012 campaign comments supporting an all-of-the-above agenda on energy, and his statements outlining support for oil and natural gas,” said Jack Gerard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, the oil and gas industry’s powerful trade association, in his annual State of American Energy address in Washington earlier this month. But **Republicans rage about a disconnect between what the president** and members of his administration **say** they favor **and** what Republicans say is **foot-dragging in** building the Keystone XL pipeline, exporting natural gas, or **freeing up more offshore areas for energy exploration. If the president were to get behind any of these initiatives he’d** likely **have plenty of GOP support** – but that remains a large “if.”

**GOP support is key to the agenda**

David **Grant**, staff writer, **1/20**/13, “Obama’s second term: Can he work with Congress? (+video)”, Christian Science Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0120/Obama-s-second-term-Can-he-work-with-Congress-video, acc. 1/25/13

But **if the president is going to pass legislative fixes for weighty issues like immigration** reform, changes to the nation’s gun laws, and the nation’s troubled fiscal situation, **he’s going to need to work with the body he spent** much of **his reelection campaign railing against.**

**Democrats inevitably support Obama**

David **Grant**, staff writer, **1/20**/13, “Obama’s second term: Can he work with Congress? (+video)”, Christian Science Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0120/Obama-s-second-term-Can-he-work-with-Congress-video, acc. 1/25/13

And then **there’s always the Democrats**. In assessing **the president’s** relationship with Congress, it’s worth remembering that he’s **gotten great compliance among his Democratic allies** to date. In the House, particularly, **Democrats have been a rock-solid voting bloc capable of providing the lion’s share of votes to pass key legislation** from a debt ceiling increase, the fiscal-cliff solving tax deal, or aid for areas affected by hurricane Sandy.

**Oil lobbies control Congress**

Dan **Froomkin**, contributing editor of Nieman Reports, “How the Oil Lobby Greases Washington’s Wheels,” HUFFINGTON POST, 4-6-**11**, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/06/how-the-oil-lobby-greases\_n\_845720.html, accessed 6-2-12

With so much public opposition, **why do subsidies remain?** You might as well ask **why there is no carbon tax,** or why there was no significant reform legislation passed after **the** BP **oil** spill. The answer is that **one of the many things the industry can do with its fat pocketbook is hire a veritable army of sharp lobbyists and back them up with big wads of cash in the form of campaign donations and spending**. The end result is that **the industry has a remarkable ability to get its way on Capitol Hill**. According to the Center for Responsive Politics' website, **the oil and gas industry has spent more than $1 billion on lobbying** since 1998, **including a jaw-dropping $147 million just last year.** For comparison's sake, $147 million is about **equivalent to the total budget of 100 congressional offices.** **That's more than the** $103 million spent in 2010 by the **financial service industry**, another potent lobbying force -- but considerably less than the $240 million spent by the pharmaceutical industry. Among major industries, Opensecrets.org ranked Big Oil fifth in terms of lobbying dollars spent, **behind only Big Pharma, electric** utilities, **business associations and insurance. The oil** and gas **industry** used its $147 million to **employ 788 individual lobbyists** in 2010 -- **some** **500** (or almost two thirds) **of whom**, according to Opensecrets.org, **are former federal employees who came through the revolving door particularly well versed in the ways of government**. All told, **that's well more than one oil and gas lobbyist per member of Congress** out there on the Hill **arming allies with talking points and briefing books, spinning the undecided and pressuring the opposition**.

Defense: Terror--Nuclear—1NC

#### no theft or impact

Francis **Gavin**, Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs, Univeristy of Texas at Austin, "Same As It Ever Was: Nuclear Alarmism, Proliferation, and the Cold War," INTERNATIONAL SECURITY v. 34 n. 3, Winter 2009/20**10**, p. 19-20.

Experts disagree on whether nonstate actors have the scientiªc, engineering, ªnancial, natural resource, security, and logistical capacities to build a nuclear bomb from scratch. According to terrorism expert Robin Frost, the danger of a “nuclear black market” and loose nukes from Russia may be overstated**. Even if a terrorist** group **did acquire a nuclear weapon, delivering and detonating it** against a U.S. target **would present tremendous** technical and logistical **difficulties.**51 Finally**,** the feared nexus between terrorists and rogue regimes may be exaggerated.As nuclear proliferation expert Joseph Cirincione argues, states such as Iran and North Korea are **“not** the most **likely sources for terrorists since their stockpiles, if any, are small** and exceedingly **precious, and hence well-guarded.”**52 Chubin states that there “is no reason to believe that Iran today, any more than Sadaam Hussein earlier, would transfer WMD [weapons of mass destruction] technology to terrorist groups like al-Qaida or Hezbollah.”53

1AR

**Ei diversionary theory wrong, internal instability causes nuke war, specifically in this recession—stats prove**

**Ockham Research 08** (Ockham Research, Economic Distress and Geopolitical Risks by: Ockham Research, Ockham Research Staff November 18, 2008????Ockham Research Ockham Research is an independent research provider based in Atlanta, Georgia providing security analysis)

The hardship and turmoil which impacted the world during the Great Depression provided fertile ground for the rise of fascist, expansionist regimes in Germany, Italy and Japan.?Hard times also precluded the Western democracies from a more muscular response in the face of growing belligerence from these countries.?The United States largely turned inward during the difficult years of the 1930s.?**The end result was** a **global war** of a size and scale never seen by man (SIC) either before or since.?**Economic hardship** is distracting. It **can cause nations to turn their focus inward with** little o**r no regard for rising global threats** that inevitably build in tumultuous times.?Authoritarian regimes invariably look for scapegoats to blame for the hardship affecting their populace.?This enables them to project the anger of their citizenry away from the regime itself and onto another race, country, ideology, etc.??Looking at the world today**,** one can certainly envision numerous potential flashpoints that could become problematic in a protracted economic downturn.?**Pakistan**, **already a hotbed of Islamic extremism and armed with atomic weapons,** has been particularly hard hit by the global economic crisis.?An increasingly impoverished Pakistan will be harder and harder for its new and shaky democratically-elected government to control.?**Should** Pakistan’s **economic troubles** causeits political situation, always chaotic, to **spin out of control, this would be a major setback, in the** global **war on terror.**??**Russia**, whose economy, stock markets and financial system have literally imploded over the past few months**, could become increasingly problematic** if faced with a protracted economic downturn**.**?The increasingly authoritarian and aggressive Russian regime is already showing signs of anger projection. Its invasion of Georgia this summer and increasing willingness to confront the West reflect a desire to stoke the pride and anger of its people against foreign powers?particularly the United States. It is no accident that the, **Russians, announced a willingness to deploy tactical missile systems**?**t**o Kaliningrad the day after Barack Obama?s election in the U.S.?This was a clear ?shot across the bow? of the new administration and demonstrates Russian willingness to pursue a much more confrontational foreign policy going forward. Furthermore, the collapse in the price of oil augers poorly for Russia?s economy. The Russian budget reputedly needs oil at $70 per barrel or higher in order to be in balance. Russian foreign currency reserves, once huge, have been depleted massively over the past few months by ham-fisted attempts to arrest the slide in both markets and the financial system.Bristling with nuclear weapons and nursing an ego still badly bruised by the collapse of the Soviet Union and loss of superpower status, an impoverished and unstable Russia would be a dangerous thing to behold.??**China too is threatened by the global economic downturn**.?There is no doubt that China has emerged during the past decade as a major economic power. Parts of the country have been transformed by its meteoric growth. However, in truth, only about a quarter of the nation’s billion plus inhabitants?those living in the thriving cities on the coast and in Beijing, have truly felt the impact of the economic boom. Many of these people have now seen a brutal bear market and are adjusting to economic loss and diminished future prospects.?However, the vast majority of China?s population did not benefit from the economic boom and could become increasingly restive in an economic slowdown.?**Enough economic hardship could** conceivably **threaten the stability of the regime and would** more than likely **make China more bellicose and unpredictable** in its behavior, **with dangerous consequences** for the U.S. and the world.

#### Prefer reasoned analysis, even if it comes from a bad source—all studies are biased which is why they have to disprove our argument first

**Lynch 12** (Michael, president and director of global petroleum service at Strategic Energy & Economic Research, 5/10/12, “Beware the Green Energy Bias” US News) http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/on-energy/2012/05/10/beware-the-green-energy-bias

Anyone who has worked in policy analysis knows that all studies have to be taken with enough salt to kill a Buddhist, but also that advocates nearly always accept conclusions that confirm their own biases without questioning. Conservatives tend to promote industry studies, liberals embrace environmental organizations' analysis, and both will slam the other for bias. The reality, naturally, is that we are all biased and no one's work should be accepted without scrutiny. But policy decisions should not be made on the basis of our biases, especially where they conflict with reasoned, valid analysis. Don't believe me? Well, the most extreme example was a case of research results by Nazi scientists that was ignored because of its source: that cigarette smoking causes cancer.

Perm

#### Refusal to participate in the modern energy economy leads to market driven failure – engagement key to solve the K.

William E. **Connolly**, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, “Steps toward an Ecology of Late Capitalism,” Theory & Event, Vol. 15, Issue 1, 20**12**, Muse.

The democratic state, while it certainly cannot alone tame capital or reconstitute the ethos of consumption, must play a significant role in reconstituting our lived relations to climate, weather, resource use, ocean currents, tectonic instability, glacier flows, species diversity, work, local life, consumption, and investment, as it responds favorably to pressures to forge a new ethos. A New, new democratic Left will thus experimentally enact new intersections between role performance and political activity, outgrow its old disgust with the very idea of the state, and remain alert to the dangers states can pose. It will do so because, as already suggested, the fragile ecology of late capital requires state interventions of several sorts. A refusal to participate in the statetoday cedes too much hegemony to neoliberal markets, eith

er explicitly or by implication. Some drives to fascism, remember, emerged the last time around in capitalist states after a total market meltdown. Most of those movements failed. But a couple became consolidated through a series of resonances (vibrations) back and forth between industrialists, state officials, and vigilante groups in neighborhoods, clubs, churches, the police, the media and pubs. You do not fight the danger of a new kind of neofascism by withdrawing from either micropolitics or state politics. You do so through a multi-sited politics designed to shift systemic interactions and to infuse a new ethos into the fabric of everyday life. Changes in ethos can sometimes open doors to new possibilities of state and interstate action, so that an advance in one domain seeds that in the other.And vice versa.A positive dynamic of mutual amplification might be generated here. Could a series of significant shifts in the routines of state and global capitalism even press the fractured system to a point where it hovers on the edge of capitalism itself? We don’t know. That is one reason it is important to focus on interim goals. Another is that in a world of becoming, replete with periodic and surprising shifts in the course of events, you cannot project far beyond an interim period. Another yet is that activism needs to project concrete, interim possibilities to gain support and propel itself forward. That being said, it does seem unlikely to me, at least, that a positive interim future includes either socialist productivism or the world projected by proponents of deep ecology.23

ecofem bad

**Alt fails—re-entrenches labor divisions, devaluing women**

**Bretherton 1** - MA in Latin American Studies - Charlotte Bretherton “ECOCENTRIC IDENTITY AND TRANSFORMATORY POLITICS,” The International Journal of Peace Studies, Volume 6, Number 2, Autumn/Winter 2001

The implications of ecofeminist ideas for human identity are numerous. For women, particularly those (primarily Western) women who have become alienated from the natural world, there is a need to rediscover their "natural" ecocentric/ecofeminine identification. **Ecofeminism** thus **posits, for women, an essentialist ecocentric identity**. This would involve not a loss or negation of the self but an opportunity to experience the fulfilment of recovering one's true maternal nature and to embrace the responsibilities associated with identification as a saviour of the planet. To some extent women have appeared to take up these responsibilities. In many parts of the world they have undoubtedly contributed significantly to environmental activism. Moreover, a number of women's environmental organisations have espoused overtly ecofeminist principles (Bretherton 1996). Indeed, Mies and Shiva (1993, p.3) claim, from their conversations with women's groups in many parts of the world, "women, worldwide, felt the same anger and anxiety, and the same sense of responsibility to preserve the bases of life, and to end its destruction." However, **this raises the danger that women, who are everywhere the least powerful members of society, might be expected to assume disproportionate responsibility for cleaning up men's messes.** Rather, an ecocentric identification demands that the "feminine" qualities of cooperation and nurturance be valued and embraced by all members of societies. **It demands**, too**, that the "masculine" qualities of competition and dominance be devalued and rejected**. C

onsequently, it must be concluded that, in many societies, the adoption of an ecocentric identity would involve, for men, a change of consciousness very much more fundamental than that required of women. While the major focus of an ecofeminine identity is positive identification with the natural world, **there are implicitly elements of an identity defined negatively against the alien other of unreconstructed "masculine" man.** Because of its implied exclusivity, which reflects a tendency towards maternalist essentialism, **ecofeminism is unlikely to provide the basis for a universal ecocentric identity**. Ecofeminism is important, nevertheless. It provides a trenchant critique of those cultural norms and values which support the power structures of contemporary societies and which have facilitated the development of a dangerously dysfunctional relationship between human collectivities and the ecosystems of which they are a part. In focusing very specifically upon this latter issue, bioregionalists would be well advised to incorporate feminist insights concerning the origin, and persistence, of gendered structures of power (Plumwood 1994; Bretherton 1998).