### 1AC Trade

#### Contention 1 is Trade

#### Recent US anti-dumping tariffs on Chinese Solar cell imports will be upheld and negatively impact trade relations

Zhang 9-18-12, Yuwei, China Daily US, “Obama steps up trade fight with China over autos”, http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2012-09/18/content\_15765633.htm

This year, the US also ordered anti-dumping and countervailing duties against Chinese-made solar panels and wind turbine towers, adding to tensions between the two economic powers.¶ In July, the US Commerce Department announced plans to charge duties of up to 73 percent on wind-turbine towers imported from China. In May, it set preliminary anti-dumping duties of 31 percent to 250 percent on Chinese solar-panel makers to protect US producers and countervailing duties of 14 percent to 26 percent on Chinese-made towers.¶ "The solar-cells case is going to have a very negative impact on trade relations between the US and China," said Perry.¶ He pointed out that a hearing in that case is set for Oct 3 before the US International Trade Commission. "The chances are very high that the ITC will reach an affirmative injury determination and orders will be issued" for imposing the duties," Perry added.

#### Solar barriers spillover internationally and across industries—destroys the economy and causes a new escalating trade war

Tucker 8/27/12, William, work has appeared in Harper’s, the Atlantic Monthly, the American Spectator, the Weekly Standard, National Review, Reason, the New Republic, Reader’s Digest, the Wall Street Journal, and many other publications, “Let’s Just Admit Solar Needs Help and Avoid Trade War”, <http://www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-let%E2%80%99s-just-admit-solar-needs-help-and-avoid-trade-war/>

Although the newspapers haven’t been paying much attention lately, the United States and China seem to be on the verge of a trade war that could have huge implications for the world economy.¶ Let’s not scoff at trade wars. Although they’re easy to initiate, they’re awfully difficult to halt once they get started. People still remember the Stock Market Crash of 1929 as the start of the Great Depression but a couple of years ago, the late Bob Bartley, the great editorial page editor of The Wall Street Journal, ran a series of columns showing clearly that it was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Bill of 1930 that turned what might have been just a cyclical downturn into a decade-long horror. How did Smoot-Hawley get started? A couple of Western Congressman wanted to protect the agricultural crops in their home states. President Herbert Hoover called a special session of Congress and before anybody knew it, every Senator and Representative from every state in the union had added something to the Christmas tree. The stock market nosedived, knowing where all this was leading, and before it was over the Great Depression had begun.¶ Every economist in the world knows right now that we are teetering on the edge of such another conflagration. The world economy is in a slump and threatening to get worse. Japan has been in the doldrums for twenty years. Europe is suffering a meltdown. The U.S. is in a four-year funk. China and India have been the locomotive of the world economy but now China is showing serious signs of slowing down. Will everybody stay calm and try to ride out the storm? Or will the recriminations begin and countries start rocking the boat so that the whole world economy may go under?¶ Well, the rocking has already begun and the boat is being tipped by – wouldn’t you know it – good old solar energy.¶ Ah yes, solar energy, the wave of the future that is sure to arrive soon except that it’s still not economical and so our government has to subsidize it right now because it’s eventually going to be the wave of the future and then we’ll become the solar capital of the world.¶ What government hasn’t fallen for that line? Europe has been practicing “feed-in tariffs” – which is just a fancy name for price supports – for more than a decade. Spain almost bankrupted itself trying to nurture an infant solar industry. Germany thinks it’s going to get rid of nuclear power and run itself on that country’s notoriously weak sunshine. Portugal, Italy, Greece – they all think exporting solar panels will be the cure for their ailing economies.¶ Here in the United States, of course, we have the Production Tax Credit, Renewable Portfolio Mandates, government loan guarantees (a la Solyndra) and all sorts of other gimmicks for trying to promote solar. President Obama recently decided to utilize about 100 square miles of the Mojave Desert for a great solar experiment because “We Can’t Wait” for the market to tell us that solar is practical. And in China? Well, everything in China is pretty much run by the government, so you can imagine how much the industry is being supported there.¶ And so the first shots have been fired. Six months ago President Obama yielded to the solar industry and placed a 31 percent tariff on solar panels from China. The charge was that China was “overproducing” and “dumping” panels on the US. China immediately retaliated by pointing out the many solar subsidies in this country and filed a complaint with the World Trade Organization saying we are dumping polysilicon on them. China too has its domestic industries that want protection.¶ Now Europe has joined the fray. Germany thought by guaranteeing a high price to vendors of solar electricity that it would be fostering a domestic industry. Instead, it found it was subsidizing China. So they have cried “foul” and enlisted 24 other European manufacturers to file their own complaint with the European Trade Commission. Europe now constitutes 60 percent of China’s market and the consequences could be devastating. To top it off, India is now getting into the fray. ¶ So there we have it. The pieces are all in place for an international brawl that could bring down the world economy. Once the barricades have been erected for solar manufacturers, how long will it be before other industries ask for protection as well? Congressmen Smoot and Hawley must be celebrating in their graves. What a wonderful legacy this will make for good old clean-and-green solar power.

#### The tariff makes Chinese reciprocation and global protectionism inevitable

Beebe 12, 4-28, Andrew, chief commercial officer of Suntech, “Inside a U.S.-China Solar Trade War”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303404704577309583348171396.html

The U.S. Department of Commerce announced a ruling last week to raise trade barriers against solar cells produced in China. The preliminary determination calls for tariffs of 2.9% on cells manufactured by my company, Suntech; 4.73% on those made by Trina Solar; and 3.61% on the rest of solar-cell imports from China. Although these initial rates are modest, the department will consider adding more tariffs over the next several months.¶ Doing so would be a mistake. Trade barriers—large or small, at any point in the global solar value chain—are harmful to both America and China.¶ The tariffs arise because a German company with operations in the U.S., SolarWorld, spearheaded a petition claiming that Chinese solar companies are successful because of unfair Chinese subsidies, and also that we sell our products in the U.S. at unfairly low prices.¶ Suntech's success is not based on extraordinary subsidies but on industry-leading technology, quality products and efficient, large-scale manufacturing. Two weeks ago, Suntech set a world record for solar-cell conversion efficiency using standard commercial silicon wafers.¶ To the extent that Chinese firms do receive any subsidies, such subsidies are hardly unique to China. SolarWorld itself has received more than $100 million in support from governments around the world, according to news reports. Many other energy-related firms also enjoy various forms of largess, including ethanol producers and oil companies.¶ Unfortunately, for some in Washington China-bashing has taken priority over the global imperative to rapidly develop more cost-effective and large-scale clean energy. Even if China doesn't retaliate, solar tariffs will be costly for the U.S. economy by pushing up the price of solar energy, reducing demand, threatening millions of dollars in new power projects, and cutting jobs.¶ Only a small proportion of the American solar industry is involved in the kind of manufacturing SolarWorld does, which the antidumping duties are supposed to help save. About 95,000 of the 100,000 solar-industry jobs in the U.S. are either with upstream producers of capital equipment, polysilicon and the like; manufacturers of complementary components such as racks; or downstream services surrounding solar-project construction, installation and engineering.All of those jobs are heavily integrated in the global economy and benefit from global free trade, including with China. For example, over the last decade, Suntech has been primarily a net consumer of solar products in the U.S., as we spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year with U.S.-based producers of machine equipment and material inputs. In 2010, we also opened a solar-panel manufacturing facility in Goodyear, Ariz., which has already doubled employment to more than 100 jobs.¶ The (questionable) benefits of any antidumping tariff for the fewer than 5,000 workers at companies that directly compete with Suntech and our peers need to be weighed against the potential harm to all the other Americans employed by us, our suppliers and customers. That's why many large and small U.S. solar industry leaders—including AES Solar, Dow Corning, Grape Solar, GroSolar, GT Advanced Technologies, MEMC/SunEdison, REC Silicon, Rosendin Electric, SolarCity, Swinerton and Verengo Solar—have banded together in the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy to oppose tariffs and defend free trade. They not only represent American consumers; they represent thousands of American manufacturing jobs and 95% of all American solar-industry jobs.¶ Unfortunately, by law, Commerce Department antidumping investigations don't consider this bigger picture. Commerce also isn't allowed to account for the danger of retaliation by a trading partner targeted by antidumping duties, though some in China now are calling for trade barriers to block U.S. competition.¶ The consequences could be serious. China is the largest customer for many of America's solar products. According to a Brattle Group analysis commissioned by the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy, America could lose 11,000 jobs if Beijing were to impose tariffs on American polysilicon. Trade battles between these two governments could encourage other countries to raise protectionist barriers.¶ The rapid growth of the global solar industry is made possible by competition driving down the price of solar products and therefore solar electricity to parity with fossil fuels. The world's two largest producers and consumers of energy, China and the U.S., must work together to facilitate solar-industry growth and to solve our planet's energy and environmental crisis.

#### An escalated U.S. China trade war results in economic conflicts and devastating protectionism

Wang and Li 11 (Jianhua and Yunlu—Xinhua news agency, citing Ni Feng, Vice President of the Institute of American Studies underthe Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Zhao Jinping, vice director of the Foreign Economic Department of the Development Research Center (DRC) of the State Council “China-US trade war no good for anyone”, October 13, 2011. http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90780/7616581.html

A trade war between the United States and China, each of which is the other's second largest trade partner, will lead to serious consequences, not only hurting both sides but also causing severe turbulence to the world economic system. ¶ Analysts predicted that if the trade war erupts, many exporters of both countries will operate far under their designed production capacity and then go bankrupt. Hundreds of foreign trade-related industries may become sluggish, including the land and water freight industry and the settlement industry, and bad debts may increase substantially. The number of unemployed Americans may rise by tens of thousands even millions in a short time, and the country may face a record-breaking double figure unemployment rate. At the same time, tens of thousands of migrant workers in China may be forced to return home, and household consumption may drop sharply. ¶ A trade war between the world's top two economies will exert a far-reaching impact on the global economy. The exports of Asia and Australia may drop significantly, and the mining industry may shrink rapidly in South America and Africa. The high-end manufacturing sectors of Japan, the European Union, and North America may suffer huge losses, and many Western multinational corporations may have to cut their operations abroad. Global financial markets may be plunged into prolonged turmoil, and the already severe European and U.S. debt crises may escalate rapidly. Furthermore, all countries may turn to protectionism to protect their domestic industries. ¶ Zhao said that given the enormous size of the Chinese and U.S. economies and their tremendous trade volume, a China-U.S. trade war would cause a domino effect, and lead to a sharp drop in global trade. It could cause even more damage to the world economy than the global financial crisis. ¶ The United States alone contributes about 23 percent to global economic growth, and its trade volume accounts for about 10 percent of the world's total. China's economy and trade volume both account for more than 9 percent of the world's total. ¶ The two economies are each other's second largest trading partner. The U.S. exports to China amounted to 100 billion U.S. dollars last year, up 30 percent from the previous year, making China its second largest export destination. The Chinese exports to the United States reached 280 billion U.S. dollars last year, making the United States its second largest export destination. It should be pointed out that processing trade accounts for more than 50 percent of China's total exports, and almost 60 percent of China's exports are produced by foreign-invested enterprises. ¶ "A trade war between the United States and China would be something that shakes the whole world and plunges it into disorder. If it occurs, there will be no safe bystanders in the world at all," said Ni Feng, Vice President of the Institute of American Studies under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.¶ Ni believes that, since the economies of the world are so closely bought, the influence brought by the trade war between the Untied States and China will be like a chain chemical reaction, which will definitely go beyond the borders of the two countries and break the global economic system.¶ In the 1930s, the severe trade protectionism once reduced the global trade volume by two-thirds and led to a great global economic depression. The Untied States was a main trade protection participator at that time. In 2010, affected by the international financial crisis, the global trade volume decreased by 12 percent, a new record after the Second World War ended. ¶ "It has been proven by the history that the trade war between economic giants will be extremely disastrous. I hope that the U.S. politicians will not take the risk for their private interests of political election," said Ni. ¶ Ni believes that if a trade war occurs between the United States and China, it will be much fiercer and destructive than the global economic depression starting in 1929 and will even lead to political and military confrontations in some sensitive regions.

**Causes resource wars, democratic backsliding, and terrorism --- all go nuclear**

**Harris & Burrows 9** Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor of the U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the **harmful effects on fledgling democracies** and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which **the potential for** greater **conflict could grow** would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. **Terrorism**’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any **economically-induced drawdown** of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, **acquire additional weapons**, and consider pursuing their own **nuclear ambitions**. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an **unintended escalation** and **broader conflict** if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential **nuclear rivals** combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on **preemption** rather than defense, potentially leading to **escalating crises**. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in **interstate conflicts** if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

#### Most recent studies provide a direct connection between poor economic relations and military conflict

Royal 10 – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002, p. 89)Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

#### Continued growth of the global trading system is empirically the best incentive for peace

Eiras 4, Ana Isabel Eiras, Senior Policy Analyst for International Economics in the Center for International Trade and Economics at The Heritage Foundation, 2004. “Why America Needs to Support Free Trade”, May 24, 2004, The Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/TradeandForeignAid/bg1761.cfm>.

Free trade fosters an enormous chain of economic activity, the benefits of which culminate in a social desire to be at peace with neighboring and even faraway nations with which trade is conducted or might be conducted in the future. When individuals see how beneficial it is to live in an economically free society; when they see how freedom allows them to improve their lives and those of their families; when they can create new businesses, engage in commerce, or work for a decent salary or wage, adding dignity to their lives, they want peace to preserve all these good things. By contrast, when people live under economic oppression and are at the mercy of a small ruling authority that dictates every aspect of their lives and limits their ability to realize their potential, they resent the life they have and learn to hate better lives elsewhere. If they cannot enjoy the fruits of their efforts and cannot realize their potential; if they cannot feel free to do business, work freely, and trade freely; if they do not have anything to gain or to lose, they begin to feel that any change--even war--might be better. They have no incentive to desire peace with their neighbors. For this reason, the areas of greatest conflict in the world also happen to be those that are economically repressed. (See Map.) The Economic Freedom Map, drawn annually from the Index, shows, for example, that countries that are the most economically repressed have also suffered civil wars and unrest.¶ \* The areas of the Middle East in which civil wars and terrorist havens abound are both economically repressed and mostly unfree.¶ \* North Korea, a country plagued by starvation and poverty, is repressed.¶ \* Brazil, Argentina, parts of Africa, and some former Soviet republics--all mostly unfree--have high levels of poverty and periodically suffer political and economic crises.¶ Free trade and economic **freedom set the process of growth, innovation, and prosperity in motion**. In that process, individuals support the creation of institutions that are conducive to growth and that preserve peace and prosperity. The greater the level of prosperity, **the greater the likelihood of peace**.

#### Overcoming US protectionism is the only way to open rich markets to poor-country products and prevent an aggressive, bullying and bilateralist trade policy that makes demands of the poor but offers NO concessions – the collapse of the multilateral system will cause massive conflict globally

C. Fred Bergsten, Director, Institute for International Economic Affairs, and former Assistant Secretary of Treasury, and member of the National Security Council Foreign Affairs, v.80 n.2 March-April 2001

A more subtle cause of the present crisis is the decline of effective U.S. leadership in the global economic system. This in turn stems from a domestic popular backlash against globalization and the resulting political stalemate in Washington.¶ During the postwar period, the pervasive tension between region alism and multilateralism (mainly as a result of increasing European integration) was generally resolved in favor of multilateralism due to steady American leadership in that direction.The United States insisted on a new round of global trade liberalization after each major step in the European integration process, which otherwise would have created additional trade discrimination and likely emulationaround the world. Thus the primacy of GATT was maintained. a positive dynamic between regional and global trade liberalization remained consistent for more than four decades. Even when the United States itself began to embrace regionalism from bilateral free trade with Canada to the North American Free Trade Agreement to the proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) it was careful to simultaneously pursue new multilateral initiatives to ensure an umbrella of global trade liberalization. Washington's ability to maintain such leadership has been severely curtailed over the past five years, however. Despite the strength of America's economy and the reduction of its unemployment rate to a 30-year low, the popular backlash against globalization has produced a political stalemate on most international economic issues. As a result, the president has had no effective authority to negotiate new trade agreements since 1994. Legislation to replenish the IMF languished for a year in the midst of the Asian crisis, until it was rescued fortuitously by the farm community's interest in restoring its exports to Asia Even relatively straightforward issues such as extending permanent normal trade relations to China or offering enhanced market access to Africa and the Caribbean required lengthy, all-out presidential and business campaigns to persuade Congress. As a result of this domestic standstill, Americas international economic posture has been compromised. The United States' initial refusal in 1997 to contribute to the IMF support package for Thailand largely for fear of further riling Congress, for example, earned lasting enmity in Asia. The main reason for the debacle at Seattle was the United States' inability to propose a new round of trade negotiations that would meet the legitimate interests of other major players. Lacking the domestic authority to lower its own trade barriers, Washington was forced to offer an agenda that sought to reduce pro-tection only in other countries a prospect that was understandably unappealing to the rest of the world. Similarly, in 1997-98 APEC negotiations, the United States unsuccessfully pushed a program of sector-specific liberalization that focused almost wholly on U.S. export interests. And six years after the idea of the FTAA was launched in Miami, little progress has been made toward hemispheric trade liberalization.¶ This international leadership vacuum has had two subtle but profound effects on the world economy. Like a bicycle on a hill, the global trading system tends to slip backwards in the absence of continual progress forward. Now, with no serious multilateral trade negotiations taking place anywhere in the world, the backsliding has come in the form of intensified regionalism (which is inherently discriminatory), as well as mercantilist and protectionist disputes across the Atlantic.¶ An East Asian free trade area and along with it, a three-bloc world will likely emerge if the United States remains on the side lines of international trade for another five years. Such U.S. impotence would also mean that the traditionally positive impact of regional liberalization on the multilateral process would give way to increasing antagonism and even hostility between the regional blocs. The other chief effect of the leadership vacuum is increased international disregard of, or even hostility toward, the United States on the economic front. Because of its weight in the world economy, its dynamic growth, and its traditional leadership role, the United States remains the most important player in the global economic system. The other economic powers generally seek to avoid confronting it directly. The EU, for example, has tried to avoid overt battles, despite its escalating range of disputes with theUnited States. East Asian governments are careful to assure Washington that their new regional initiatives are fully consistent with existing global norms and institutions, a conciliatory stance that is in sharp contrast to Mahathir's shrill rhetoric of a decade ago and Japanese Vice Minister of Finance Eisuke Sakakibara's aggressive 1997 promotion of the AMF. In reality, however, the United States is perceived as wanting to call the shots without putting up much of its own money or making changes in its own laws and practices. These specific economic complaints fuse with and feed on more general anti-American sentiments in the world. Hence, the two other economic superpowers are proceeding on their own. The EU has launched the euro, a new association agreement with Mexico, and negotiations with Mercosur (the trade bloc comprising Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay); East Asia is pursuing the AMF and the East Asian free trade area. The result is a clear and steady erosion of both the United States position on the global economic scene and the multilateral rules and institutions that it has traditionally championed. If not checked soon, this erosion could deteriorate into severe international conflicts and the disintegration of global economic links. 22-4

#### South-to-South cooperation via globalization will transform global politics – the expertise generated from these technical negotiations and the information they circulate are enabling a new process of sharing knowledge that can transcend the legacy of colonialism and save millions from deprivation and death

George Mark Malloch-Brown, Baron Malloch-Brown, KCMG, PC former Minister of State in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the British government with responsibility for Africa, Asia and the United NationsPreviously he was briefly United Nations Deputy Secretary-General 2007 http://www.ipsnews.net/focus/tv\_g77/viewstory.asp?idn=276

Despite these early political aspirations, many practical obstacles bedeviled developing countries, which included shortages of teachers, doctors, lawyers and other professionals sorely needed if South-South cooperation was to address daunting development challenges. More fundamentally, the colonial inheritance continued to tilt international relations, trade and aid towards a North-South axis. The notion of solidarity and interdependence among developing countries remained just that: a notion.¶Today, four decades later, we are at the threshold of a dramatic expansion of South-South cooperation powered by expertise, technology and other endowments in the developing world. A vast stock of expertise and experience has been accumulated in the developing world through years of experimentation and investment in education, health, governance and economic reform. These experiments are beginning to yield rich dividends in many countries, like Botswana, China, Brazil, Costa Rica, India, Malaysia, and South Africa.¶ In the space of two decades, China has freed 400 million people from conditions of extreme poverty. Brazil has turned itself into the primary source of automobiles and other manufactured goods for many of its neighbors in Latin America. Through high investments in education, Cost Rica boasts of having one of the most advanced healthcare systems in the world. India turns out more than 30,000 engineers and programmers a year, creating jobs for its growing outsourcing labour force. Malaysia, has in the space of three decades turned itself into one of the leading hubs of information and communications technology. A leading magazine has recently listed Botswana among the top most globalized countries in the world, in terms of Internet connectivity and other amenities weaving peoples and nations into a seamless global village. South Africa has moved from a racially divided country to an economic powerhouse making promising investments across Africa from Cairo to the Cape.¶ Amazingly, African exports to Asia nearly tripled from US$6.6 billion in 1990 to US$ 17.2 billion in 2000, with the full potential for trade between the two continents yet to be unleashed.¶ In light of this sea change, the international community has within its reach a real opportunity to have "development role-models" of the South as the chief architects of a more peaceful and prosperous South **in** the years ahead. Indeed, cooperation among developing countries has such potential that if harness it could help tip the balance towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) throughout the developing world.¶ What is needed to make this possible? Well, for a start, we need to take full advantage of the greater diversity in the capacities and experiences of countries in the South than was available in the 1970s. Because of this, a growing number of countries in the South can offer increasingly credible and productive solutions to development challenges in other developing countries. The new development role-models that have emerged recently in the South are considered to be the promising new ‘prime movers’ of South-South cooperation.¶ Prime movers are endowed with a wealth of human and material resources ready to be tapped in order to free millions form poverty, increase school enrolments, and combat deadly diseases.

#### The plan is key to getting $1.5 trillion EVERY YEAR to the poorest countries on earth through reducing protectionism

Sally, Razeen is an Associate Professor, International Political Economy, the London School of Economics and Political Science, Director of Trade Policy for the Commonwealth Business Council, 2003 Trade Policy Analysis n.23

Developing countries have noticeably higher average tariffs, tariff peaks, and tariff escalation (higher tariffs on processed goods), as well as high- er nontariff barriers than developed countries, not to mention proliferating antidumping actions. Much of this developing-country protection is aimed at imports from other developing coun- tries.23 Rich-country protection is damaging pre- cisely because it provides developing countries with a pretext not to reduce their own trade barriers; it seriously undermines political efforts to accelerate pro-market reforms in the developing world.24¶ The World Bank estimates an annual gainof $2.8 trillion by 2015 from the elimination of trade barriers and trade-related reforms on all goods and services. Developing countries would gain to the tune of $1.5 trillion, which would lift 320 million people out of poverty. Two-thirds of the gain from cutting tariffs on industrial goods (about $300 billion) would go to developing countries, and they would gain a roughly equivalent amount from the abolition of trade-distorting agricultural subsidies in the OECD. However, the biggest gains by far for developing countries (estimated at about $900 billion, two to three times the gain from liber- alizing goods trade) would come from radical services liberalization in both developed and developing countries. Agriculture. Agricultural protection in high- income countries remains almost as high as it was at the end of the Uruguay Round, and seri- ous distortions continue to plague agriculture in developing countries. The “built-in” WTO negotiations on agriculture, which started in early 2000, made some progress in clearing up outstanding technical and procedural issues and generated a large number of negotiating proposals. However, in the absence of a larger round of multilateral negotiations, govern- ments did not get to the stage of hard bargain- ing over market access. ¶ 14

#### Removing the tariff solves – market forces will correct any “dumping”

Gallaghers 12, 5-22, Kelly and Kevin, Kelly Sims Gallagher is associate professor of energy and environmental policy at The Fletcher School, Tufts University. Kevin P. Gallagher is associate professor of international relations at Boston University, “Guest post: Blinded by the (solar) light”, http://blogs.ft.com/beyond-brics/2012/05/22/guest-post-blinded-by-the-solar-light/?catid=491&SID=google#axzz1vhhMeBo3

The Obama Administration’s preliminary decision to impose a 31 per cent tariff on solar panels imported from China is short sighted. The move could cause a trade war, hurt the US economy, jeopardize US security interests, and put the world further off course in terms of meeting its global climate change goals.¶ The decision opens the US up to a trade war in renewable energy**,** of all things. The US currently has a trade surplus with China in solar energy because of large US exports of poly-silicon to China. Not surprisingly, Li Junfeng, a senior Chinese government official, has already proposed imposing retaliatory tariffs on US polysilicon—and a trade war might not stop there**.**¶ The measure could also hurt one of the few bright spots in the US economy. Jobs in the solar sector grew by 7 per cent last year thanks to the combination of higher demand for solar PV (due to lower prices for the modules) and state and national incentives for renewable energy. Most of the new jobs are in the solar installation business. If the Obama Administration makes solar modules one-third more expensive by imposing these tariffs, US demand for solar PV will certainly fall, and new jobs in this sector will vanish. Chinese solar firms can shift their production to other countries to avoid the tariffs, and will still be more competitive than SolarWorld—the German company whose US subsidiary is behind the complaint.¶ The Obama Administration should be praising, not punishing Chinese support for renewable energy. By supporting renewable energy, China is appropriately correcting for market distortions, which the United States should be doing too. Global fossil fuel subsidies are estimated at $300bn per year. Fossil fuels also damage the environment when they are burned, which imposes costs on public health from air and water pollution. In a 2011 paper, the social cost of carbon dioxide emissions today was estimated by Yale economist William Nordhaus to be between $40 and $288 per ton carbon, depending strongly on one’s choice of discount rate. Fossil fuel imports also account for 59 per cent of the US trade deficit, and the US Navy spends countless dollars defending international shipping lanes for oil and other commodities. Recognizing these problems in the Chinese context, the Chinese government recently announced a modest carbon tax, created domestic feed-in tariffs for both wind and solar energy, and is effectively supporting their clean energy industries.¶ It is in the US’s interest to encourage China to reduce the growth of oil and gas imports, so that the global costs of these fuels will not continue to rise. Wind and solar-derived electricity can directly substitute for Chinese imports of natural gas for power generation. If China succeeds in developing an electric car industry, renewables could power their automotive fleet too.¶ It is also smart for the US to support China’s efforts to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. Given China’s heavy reliance on coal, major investments in renewables and energy efficiency can enable China to reduce the carbon intensity of its economy. If the Chinese don’t make a big shift to renewables, there’s no chance of avoiding severe climate change because China is already the largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world.¶ Finally, the merits of the actual case are dubious. Prices of Chinese-made PV modules in China are lower than they are outside of China, so it’s hard to see how they are “dumping” on the U.S. market. The true problem is overcapacity, which market forces will correct in time. The Chinese government has undoubtedly provided support to its solar industry, but so has the US government with its loan guarantees, investment tax credits, and production tax credits. At the local level, SolarWorld Industries America (the lead filer of the complaint) itself received millions in tax breaks and subsidies in Oregon when it decided to locate its manufacturing facility there. Indeed, the Commerce Department only found evidence of small Chinese subsidies in its March 2012 ruling. SolarWorld only had six co-filers, but more than 100 U.S. firms lined up against it.¶ Chinese government support for solar energy has already benefited the world in terms of improved welfare, climate mitigation, and reduced global energy prices. The rest of us are essentially free-riding on this support. Rather than punish China for its laudable efforts, the Obama Administration should applaud itand do its part to correct market distortions too.

#### While there are no absolute certainties—we use the best supported concepts to make practical decisions

**Parker 96** (Kelly A, assistant professor of philosophy at Grand Valley State University, in Allendale, Michigan, “Pragmatism and Environmental Thought,” *Environmental Pragmatism*, ed: Light and Katz, p. 22)

Although the pragmatists' views are certainly diverse when it comes to particulars, some characteristic themes appear throughout their writings. First, all agree in their rejection of foundationalist epistemology. **There are no innate beliefs, intuitions or other indubitable "givens" upon which our knowledge is built**, or in terms of which the truth or meaning of concepts can be analyzed. To say that a belief is true, according to James, is to say that the belief **succeeds in making sense of the world and is not contradicted in experience**.3 Peirce's version of pragmatism asserts that the meaning of an idea consists entirely in the effects that the idea could in principle have in subsequent thought and experience.4 We have no absolutely indubitable beliefs; only a stock of importantly undoubted ones. We have no absolutely clear, immutable concepts; we do have many **concepts that are sufficiently clear and stable to let us make pretty good sense of experience**. Experience, however, can at any time expose our settled beliefs as false, or reveal an unsatisfactory vagueness or confusion in our concepts. Knowing is thus **an open-ended quest** for greater certainty in our understanding; if we forget that our understanding is fallible, the philosophical quest for wisdom may devolve into a pathological crusade for absolute certainty.

#### The aff is an instance of public deliberation that directly leads to more informed trade policy and prevents violent through ideology

Sungjoon Cho, Assistant Professor of Law, Chicago-Kent College of Law, Illinois Institute of Technology, Doha's Development, 25 Berkeley J. Int'l L. 165, 2007, LN

In this regard, (public) ignorance is not bliss in the making of trade policy. It is under through this ignorance, or neglect, that many protectionist policies are passed without rigorous cost-benefit analyses. n207 They eventually encroach upon the economic health of the nation and deteriorate the income distribution. Therefore, citizens should educate themselves about the hidden cost of protectionism through more participation and deliberation on this issue. They have to diligently attend hearings and debates on trade policies and express their informed views to local representatives. Out of the failure of this political engagement emerged the ill-conceived Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 n208 and soon triggered the global tariff wars that contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War.

### Plan Text

#### The United States federal government should lower antidumping tariffs on crystalline silicon photovoltaic cells from the People’s Republic of China.

### 1AC Clean Tech

#### Contention 3 is Clean Tech Cooperation

#### The solar tariff disputes undermines broader US-China clean-energy cooperation

AP 5/19/12 [“Ruling adds to China trade tension: POSSIBLE U.S. TARIFFS ON SOLAR-PANEL IMPORTS MAY THREATEN CLEAN ENERGY COOPERATION,” <http://www.stltoday.com/business/local/ruling-adds-to-china-trade-tension/article_c7071e82-78b7-5d95-b943-a8c6e5cc93de.html>]

POSSIBLE U.S. TARIFFS ON SOLAR-PANEL IMPORTS MAY THREATEN CLEAN ENERGY COOPERATION¶ BEIJING • China's government on Friday rejected a U.S. antidumping ruling against its makers of solar power equipment, and Chinese manufacturers warned possible higher tariffs might hurt efforts to promote clean energy.¶ The conflict has worsened U.S.-Chinese trade tensions. The two governments have pledged to cooperate in developing renewable energy but accuse each other of violating free-trade pledges by subsidizing their own manufacturers.¶ "The U.S. ruling is unfair, and the Chinese side expresses its extreme dissatisfaction," said a Commerce Ministry spokesman, Shen Danyang, in a statement.¶ Shen warned the ruling might harm clean energy cooperation but gave no indication how Beijing might respond. Some American companies that oppose the trade probe have warned China might retaliate against U.S. suppliers.

#### Clean-energy cooperation causes effective green-tech diffusion

Lin 11 [Justin Yifu Lin, Former World Bank Chief Economist and Senior Vice President, “China, the US and clean energy cooperation,” Jan 21 2011, http://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/china-the-us-and-clean-energy-cooperation]

Second, there are also major long-term global benefits from clean energy cooperation between the U.S. and China. Costs of clean energy investment would fall throughout the world, making such investment more financially sustainable. Clean energy is also a crucial part of providing energy access to better meet basic needs, to enhance growth, and to reduce poverty.

Making clean energy more available and more affordable won’t be easy. It entails making new and improved low-carbon technologies more cost-competitive on a global scale, and supporting developing countries as they strive to expand energy availability. Here, the capacities in both China and the U.S. for innovation and increased diffusion of clean energy technology come to the fore.

Achieving the needed cooperation will take work – in organizing scientific exchanges and shared research ventures, as well as in re-examining national investment and trade policies.

China and U.S. have the means, and I hope the continued will, to take necessary leadership roles in this sphere. The success of China-U.S. clean energy cooperation could mean a win-win for China, the U.S., and the world.

Such joint efforts could also conserve the planet’s resources and safeguard future generations from the damaging effects of climate change.

#### The market cooperation creates is necessary to continued innovation in green-tech that solves warming

Woetzel 9 [Dr. Jonathan Woetzel, Ph.D. in political science from USC, Director in McKinsey & Company’s Greater China Office, August 2009, “China and the US: The potential of a clean-tech partnership,” http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com/China\_and\_the\_US\_The\_potential\_of\_a\_clean-tech\_partnership\_2419]

China and the United States, the world’s dominant producers of carbon emissions, have adopted aggressive programs to reduce oil imports, create new clean-energy industries and jobs, and generally improve the environment. But the environment that will be most critical to making or breaking the two countries’ efforts to curb the dangers of global warming could well be the market that they jointly create in pursuit of their aims. Unless the two work together to provide the scale, standards, and technology transfer necessary to make a handful of promising but expensive new clean-energy technologies successful, momentum to curb global warming could stall and neither country will maximize its gains in terms of green jobs, new companies, and energy security.¶ The risk is real. Electrified vehicles, carbon capture and storage (CCS), and concentrated solar power, among other emerging “green tech” sectors, will need massive investment, infrastructure, and research to get off the ground. While the Chinese and US governments, along with private investors, are pursuing all of these technologies, they cannot achieve separately what they could jointly.

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

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

Yet, constructivist analyses of "nature" favor remaining in the comfort zone of **zestless agnosticism** and **noncommittal meta-discourse**. As David Kidner suggests, this intellectual stance may function as a mechanism against facing the devastation of the biosphere—an undertaking long underway but gathering momentum with the imminent bottlenecking of a triumphant global consumerism and unprecedented population levels. Human-driven extinction—in the ballpark of Wilson's estimated 27,000 species per year—is so unthinkable a fact that choosing to ignore it may well be the psychologically risk-free option.

**Nevertheless, this is the** opportune **historical** moment **for** intellectuals in the humanities and social sciences **to join forces with** conservation **scientists** in order **to** help **create the consciousness shift and** policy changes **to stop this irreversible destruction. Given this outlook, how** students in the human sciences **are** trained **to regard scientific knowledge, and what kind of** messages percolate to the public from the academy **about the nature of scientific findings,** matter immensely. The "agnostic stance" of constructivism toward "scientific claims" about the environment—a stance supposedly mandatory for discerning how scientific knowledge is "socially assembled"[32]—is, to borrow a legendary one-liner, **striving to interpret the world at an hour that is pressingly calling us to change it.**

#### Academic debate over green politics is vital to engage the direction of energy policy and overcoming corporate control---any alternative cedes the policy process to status-quo interests

Torgerson 8 (Douglas, Professor of Politics, Cultural Studies, and Environmental and Resource Studies at Trent University in Canada, Constituting Green Democracy: A Political Project, The Good Society: Volume 17, Number 2, MUSE)

**The administrative sphere is no monolith**, but that complex of—partly conflicting and partly cooperative—formal organizations that is central to the functioning of advanced industrial society. In other words, the administrative sphere is by no means to be equated with the administrative state alone, but is constituted by the full ensemble of modern formal organizations—emphatically including the great corporations, their profound impact upon the shape and direction of public policy, their internal structures and dynamics, and their pervasive influence in propagating the consumerism of mass society. Liberal democracy calls itself democratic by adhering to a self-serving conception of democracy as being strictly a form of government. Here democracy is achieved through the constitutional entrenchment of civil rights and democratic procedures, such as equality before the law, freedom of expression, universal suffrage, and competitive elections. What liberal democracy has largely had to ignore, or discount as irrelevant, is democracy conceived as a form not only of government, but also of society.31 The stark inequalities of wealth in capitalist societies are clearly at odds with such a conception of democracy and thus throw into question the democratic character of liberal democracy. Yet it is in the dynamics of the administrative sphere that oligarchic and authoritarian features of advanced industrial society become especially manifest. Max Weber, who acutely perceived the advent of the administrative sphere, regarded the modern bureaucratic form of organization as an instrument, an administrative machine. He did not, however, say that this instrument was suitable to just any purpose; he saw it, rather, as particularly suited to the advance of rationalization and the promotion of the "iron cage" of the industrial cosmos. He especially did not contemplate what institutional form would be appropriate in dealing with the deleterious and dangerous consequences of industrialism. Green politics now faces this problem.32 Yet **the power and importance of the administrative sphere are too pervasive for it to somehow simply** [End Page 22] **be overthrown,** as the overthrow of the state was once contemplated in certain revolutionary scenarios. Consequently, **the problem posed to green politics by the administrative sphere is one of adaptation,** which might take the form of a "slow boring of hard boards,"33 but **which would**, in any case, require continuous struggles across a range of sites**. Such struggles would not only be part of a project to constitute a green democracy, but would be part of any struggle for the** democratization of advanced industrial society.34 The constitutional features of liberal democracy that allow for political action in civil society provide necessary groundwork for a green politics aiming to constitute a green democracy. In such a project, however, **the green citizen**, conceived as a cooperative community member, **can neither be fully accepted nor rejected**. Such a green citizen is no doubt important, **but emphasizing** the personal responsibility of the individual **risks a moralism that is** part of the problem **because it deflects attention from** systematic patterns of incentives**, structured** principally **through the administrative sphere, that serve to shape and direct the behavior of the possessive individual. Green politics thus cannot rely entirely upon the cooperative green citizen.** Nor can it avoid accepting the importance of the possessive individual as a persistent fixture of the contemporary cultural and historical context. The project of green democracy thus also faces the problem of devising environmentally appropriate incentives for the possessive individual.35 Locke's famous provision for a vast, perhaps unlimited, accumulation of wealth by the individual is one liberal right that has often been criticized in the name of economic and social justice. For a project of constituting a green democracy, however, the principal problem posed by this liberal right would reside not so much in the accumulation of wealth per se as in its impact upon social, economic, and political power**. Constituting a green democracy would mean building upon the rights of citizens in a liberal democracy to engage in politics and**, in doing so, to level the playing field of political action**. Directly curbing the access of the great corporations to the corridors of state power could hardly be achieved as a first step, but this access could be brought more clearly into the open through deliberative institutions where it could be challenged and counteracted**, at least partly, **by groups in civil society**. More generally, green politics would need to challenge the dominance of the administrative sphere in shaping the form and content of public discourse. **The emergence of a green public sphere as an institution that tends to reverse the discursive orientation of industrialism** certainly does not resolve the problem, but does at least indicate its scope. **A political project for a green democracy would mean expanding the spaces of political action**, particularly in the form of public debates among plural perspectives. **This is the work not only of** goal oriented social movements, but also of public spheres in which the quality of debate is itself prized.36 In this context, neither the cooperative community member nor the possessive individual is adequate. **What needs to be encouraged is** the role of the citizen**, conceived as a political actor, who indeed acts with functional and constitutive ends in view, but who also engages in** political performance, **at least in part, for the value that resides in such action**. Industrialism did not contemplate such value, but **the environmentalist challenge opens up its potential in the form of green politics, especially with the** debates that take place in the green public sphere.

#### Warming will cause extinction – taking action against climate change represents an opportunity to rebuild the whole of progressive politics for a more just society, but only if we set aside traditional political differences founded around identity politics in favor of a broad-based coalition against warming. We’re a pre-requisite to their K, and their alt can’t solve our case. Oh, and our card is specific to clean energy innovation

Brendan Smith, co-founder of Labor Network for Sustainability, 11-23-2010, “Fighting Doom: The New Politics of Climate Change,” Common Dreams, http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/11/23-1

I admit I have arrived late to the party. Only recently have I begun to realize what others have known for decades: The climate crisis is not, at its core, an environmental issue. In fact it is not an "issue" at all; it is an existential threat to every human and community on the planet. It threatens every job, every economy in the world. It threatens the health of our children. It threatens our food and water supply. Climate change will continue to alter the world our species has known for the past three thousand years. As an oyster farmer and longtime political activist, the effects of climate change on my life will be neither distant nor impersonal. Rising greenhouse gases and ocean temperatures may well force me to abandon my 60-acre farm within the next forty years. From France to Washington state, oystermen are already seeing massive die-offs of seed oysters and the thinning shells science has long predicted. I can see the storm clouds and they are foretelling doom. But my political alter ego is oddly less pessimistic. Rather than triggering gloom, the climate crisis has surprisingly stirred up more hope than I have felt in twenty years as a progressive activist. After decades of progressive retreat it is a strange feeling. But I am haunted by the suspicion that this coming crisis may be the first opportunity we have had in generations to radically re-shape the political landscape and build a more just and sustainable society. The Power of Doom The modern progressive movement in the U.S. has traditionally grounded its organizing in the politics of identity and altruism. Organize an affected group -- minorities, gays, janitors or women -- and then ask the public at large to support the cause -- prison reform, gay marriage, labor rights, or abortion -- based on some cocktail of good will, liberal guilt, and moral persuasion. This strategy has been effective at times. But we have failed to bring these mini-movements together into a force powerful enough to enact broad-based social reform. It takes a lot of people to change society and our current strategy has left us small in numbers and weak in power. The highlights of my political life -- as opposed to oystering -- have been marked by winning narrow, often temporary, battles, but perennially losing the larger war. I see the results in every direction I look: growing poverty and unemployment, two wars, the rise of the right, declining unionization, the failure of the Senate's climate legislation and of Copenhagen, the wholesale domination of corporate interests. The list goes on and on. We have lost; it's time to admit our strategy has been too tepid and begin charting anew. This time can be different. What is so promising about the climate crisis is that because it is not an "issue" experienced by one disenfranchised segment of the population, it opens the opportunity for a new organizing calculus for progressives. Except for nuclear annihilation, humanity has never faced so universal a threat where all our futures are bound inextricably together. This universality provides the mortar of common interest required for movement building. We could literally knock on every door on the planet and find someone -- whether they know it or not -- who has a vital self-interest in averting the climate crisis by joining a movement for sustainability. With all of humanity facing doom, we can finally gather under one banner and count our future members not in the thousands but in the millions, even billions. But as former White House "Green Jobs Czar" Van Jones told the New Yorker in 2009, "The challenge is making this an everybody movement, so your main icons are Joe Six-Pack, Joe the Plumber, becoming Joe the Solar Guy, or that kid on the street corner putting down his handgun, picking up a caulk gun." The climate crisis is carrying us into uncharted waters and our political strategy needs to be directed toward making the climate movement an "everybody movement." Let me use a personal example. As an oysterman on Long Island Sound my way of life is threatened by rising greenhouse gases and ocean temperatures. If the climate crisis is not averted my oysters will die and my farm will be shuttered. Saving my livelihood requires that I politically engage at some level. Normally I would gather together my fellow oyster farmers to lobby state and federal officials and hold a protest or two. Maybe I would find a few coalitions to join. But we would remain small in number, wield little power, and our complaints about job loss would fall on largely unsympathetic ears in the face of so many suffering in so many ways. And what would we even petition our government to do about the problem? Buyouts and unemployment benefits? Re-training classes? Our oysters will still die and we will still lose our farms. To save our lives and livelihood we need to burrow down to the root of the problem: halting greenhouse gas emissions. And halting emissions requires joining a movement with the requisite power to dismantle the fossil fuel economy while building a green economy. To tackle such a large target requires my support for every nook and cranny effort to halt greenhouse gases and transition to a green economy. I need to gather up my fellow oyster farmers and link arms with students blocking new coal-fired power plants while fighting for just transition for coal workers; I need to join forces with other green workers around the country to demand government funding for green energy jobs, not more bank and corporate bailouts; I need to support labor movement efforts in China and elsewhere to climb out of poverty by going "green not dirty." I have a stake in these disparate battles not out of political altruism, but because my livelihood and community depend on stopping greenhouse gases and climate change. In other words, the hidden jewel of the climate crisis is that I need others and others need me. We are bound together by the same story of crisis and struggle. Some in the sustainability movement have been taking advantage of the "power of doom" by weaving together novel narratives and alliances around climate change. Groups in Kentucky are complementing their anti-mountain top removal efforts by organizing members of rural electrical co-ops into "New Power" campaigns to force a transition from fossil fuels to renewable power -- and create jobs in the process. Police unions in Canada, recognizing their members will be first responders as climate disasters hit, have reached out to unions in New Orleans to ensure the tragedies that followed Katrina are not repeated. Artists, chefs, farmers, bike mechanics, designers, and others are coalescing into a "green artisan movement" focused on building vibrant sustainable communities. Immigrant organizers, worried about the very real possibility of ever-worsening racial tensions triggered by millions of environmental refugees flooding in from neighboring countries, are educating their membership about why the climate crisis matters. My hope is that over the coming years we will be able to catalog increasing numbers of these tributaries of the climate crisis. Our power will not stem from a long list of issue concerns or sponsors at events -- we have tried that as recently as the October 2nd Washington D.C. "One Nation Working Together" march with little impact. Nor, with the rise of do-it-yourself organizing, will our power spring from top-down political parties of decades past. Instead oystermen like me, driven by the need to save our lives and livelihood, will storm the barricades with others facing the effects of the climate crisis. We will merge our mini-movements under a banner of common crisis, common vision and common struggle. We will be in this fight together and emerge as force not to be trifled with. This Time We Have an Alternative I am also guardedly optimistic because this time we have an alternative. My generation came of age after the fall of communism, and as a result, we have been raised in the midst of one-sided debate. We recognize that neoliberalism has ravaged society, but besides nostalgic calls for socialism, what has been the alternative? As globalization swept the globe, we demanded livable wages and better housing for the poorest in our communities; we fought sweatshops in China; we lobbied for new campaign finance and corporate governance laws. But these are mere patchwork reforms that fail to add up to a full-blown alternative to our current anti-government, free-market system. Never being able to fully picture the progressive alternative left me not fully trusting that progressive answers were viable solutions. But when I hear the proposed solutions to the climate crisis, the fog lifts. I can track the logic and envision the machinery of our alternative. And it sounds surprisingly like a common sense rebuttal to the current free-market mayhem: We face a global emergency of catastrophic proportions. Market fundamentalism will worsen rather than solve the crisis. Instead we need to re-direct our institutions and economic resources toward solving the crisis by replacing our carbon-based economy with a green sustainable economy. And by definition, for an economy to be sustainable it must addresses the longstanding suffering ordinary people face in their lives, ranging from unemployment and poverty to housing and healthcare. For years I have tossed from campaign to campaign, but the framework of our new progressive answer to the climate crisis now provides a roadmap for my political strategy. It helps chart my opponents -- coal companies and their political minions, for example -- as well as my diverse range of allies. It lays out my policy agenda, ranging from creating millions of new green jobs to building affordable green housing in low-income communities. I finally feel confident enough in my bearings to set sail. The Era of Crisis Politics While building a new green economy makes sense on paper, it is hard to imagine our entrenched political system yielding even modest progressive reform, let alone the wholesale re-formatting of the carbon economy. But I suspect this will change in the coming years, with our future governed by cascading political crises, rather than political stasis. We are likely entering an era of crisis politics whereby each escalating environmental disaster -- ranging from water shortages and hurricanes to wildfires and disease outbreaks -- will expose the impotence of our existing political institutions and economic system. In the next 40 years alone, scientists predict a state of permanent drought throughout the Southwest US and climate-linked disease deaths to double. As Danny Thompson, secretary-treasurer of the Nevada AFL-CIO, told the Las Vegas Review Journal, the ever-worsening water crisis could be "the end of the world" that could "turn us upside down, and I don't know how you recover from that." As if that is not enough, these crises will be played out in the context of a global economy spiraling out of control. Each hurricane, drought or recession will send opinion polls and politicians lurching from right to left and vice versa. Think of how quickly, however momentarily, the political debate pivoted in the wake of Katrina, the BP disaster, and the financial crisis. As White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel famously said "Never let a serious crisis go to waste...It's an opportunity to do things you couldn't do before." While addressing the climate crisis requires radical solutions that cannot be broached in today's political climate, each disaster opens an opportunity to advance alternative agendas -- both for the left and right. While politicians debate modest technical fixes, ordinary people left desperate by floods, fires, droughts and other disasters will increasingly -- and angrily -- demand more fundamental reforms. While our current policy choices appear limited by polls and election results, in an era of crisis politics what appears unrealistic and radical before a storm may well appear as common sense reform in its wake. My generation has been raised in the politics of eternal dusk. Except for a passing ray of hope during the Obama campaign, our years have been marked by the failure of every political force in society -- whether it be political elites or social movement leaders -- to address the problems we face as a nation and world. They have left us spinning towards disaster. We can forge a better future. Climate-generated disasters will bring our doomed future into focus. The failure of political elites to adequately respond to these cascading crises will transform our political landscape and seed the ground for social movements. And if we prepare for the chaos and long battle ahead, our alternative vision will become a necessity rather than an impossibility. As a friend recently said to me, "God help us, I hope you're right."

#### Apocalyptic warming rhetoric changes disbelief and mobilizes effective public responses

Romm 12 (Joe, Fellow at American Progress and is the editor of Climate Progress, which New York Times columnist Tom Friedman called "the indispensable blog" and Time magazine named one of the 25 “Best Blogs of 2010.″ In 2009, Rolling Stone put Romm #88 on its list of 100 “people who are reinventing America.” Time named him a “Hero of the Environment″ and “The Web’s most influential climate-change blogger.” Romm was acting assistant secretary of energy for energy efficiency and renewable energy in 1997, where he oversaw $1 billion in R&D, demonstration, and deployment of low-carbon technology. He is a Senior Fellow at American Progress and holds a Ph.D. in physics from MIT, 2/26, “Apocalypse Not: The Oscars, The Media And The Myth of ‘Constant Repetition of Doomsday Messages’ on Climate”, <http://thinkprogress.org/romm/2012/02/26/432546/apocalypse-not-oscars-media-myth-of-repetition-of-doomsday-messages-on-climate/#more-432546>)

The two greatest myths about global warming communications are 1) constant repetition of doomsday messages has been a major, ongoing strategy and 2) that strategy doesn’t work and indeed is actually counterproductive!

These myths are so deeply ingrained in the environmental and progressive political community that when we finally had a serious shot at a climate bill, the powers that be decided not to focus on the threat posed by climate change in any serious fashion in their $200 million communications effort (see my 6/10 post “Can you solve global warming without talking about global warming?”). These myths are so deeply ingrained in the mainstream media that such messaging, when it is tried, is routinely attacked and denounced — **and the flimsiest studies are interpreted exactly backwards to drive the erroneous message** home (see “Dire straits: Media blows the story of UC Berkeley study on climate messaging”)

The only time anything approximating this kind of messaging — not “doomsday” but what I’d call blunt, science-based messaging that also makes clear the problem is solvable — was in 2006 and 2007 with the release of An Inconvenient Truth (and the 4 assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and media coverage like the April 2006 cover of Time). The data suggest that strategy measurably moved the public to become more concerned about the threat posed by global warming (see recent study here).

You’d think it would be pretty obvious that the public is not going to be concerned about an issue unless one explains why they should be concerned about an issue. And the social science literature, including the vast literature on advertising and marketing, could not be clearer that only repeated messages have any chance of sinking in and moving the needle.

Because I doubt any serious movement of public opinion or mobilization of political action could possibly occur until these myths are shattered, I’ll do a multipart series on this subject, featuring public opinion analysis, quotes by leading experts, and the latest social science research.

Since this is Oscar night, though, it seems appropriate to start by looking at what messages the public are exposed to in popular culture and the media. It ain’t doomsday. Quite the reverse, climate change has been mostly an invisible issue for several years and the message of conspicuous consumption and business-as-usual reigns supreme.

The motivation for this post actually came up because I received an e-mail from a journalist commenting that the “constant repetition of doomsday messages” doesn’t work as a messaging strategy. I had to demur, for the reasons noted above.

But it did get me thinking about what messages the public are exposed to, especially as I’ve been rushing to see the movies nominated for Best Picture this year. I am a huge movie buff, but as parents of 5-year-olds know, it isn’t easy to stay up with the latest movies.

That said, good luck finding a popular movie in recent years that even touches on climate change, let alone one a popular one that would pass for doomsday messaging. Best Picture nominee The Tree of Life has been billed as an environmental movie — and even shown at environmental film festivals — but while it is certainly depressing, climate-related it ain’t. In fact, if that is truly someone’s idea of environmental movie, count me out.

The closest to a genuine popular climate movie was the dreadfully unscientific The Day After Tomorrow, which is from 2004 (and arguably set back the messaging effort by putting the absurd “global cooling” notion in people’s heads! Even Avatar, the most successful movie of all time and “the most epic piece of environmental advocacy ever captured on celluloid,” as one producer put it, omits the climate doomsday message. One of my favorite eco-movies, “Wall-E, is an eco-dystopian gem and an anti-consumption movie,” but it isn’t a climate movie.

I will be interested to see The Hunger Games, but I’ve read all 3 of the bestselling post-apocalyptic young adult novels — hey, that’s my job! — and they don’t qualify as climate change doomsday messaging (more on that later). So, no, the movies certainly don’t expose the public to constant doomsday messages on climate.

Here are the key points about what repeated messages the American public is exposed to:

The broad American public is exposed to virtually no doomsday messages, let alone constant ones, on climate change in popular culture (TV and the movies and even online). There is not one single TV show on any network devoted to this subject, which is, arguably, more consequential than any other preventable issue we face.

The same goes for the news media, whose coverage of climate change has collapsed (see “Network News Coverage of Climate Change Collapsed in 2011“). When the media do cover climate change in recent years, the overwhelming majority of coverage is devoid of any doomsday messages — and many outlets still feature hard-core deniers. Just imagine what the public’s view of climate would be if it got the same coverage as, say, unemployment, the housing crisis or even the deficit? When was the last time you saw an “employment denier” quoted on TV or in a newspaper?

The public is exposed to constant messages promoting business as usual and indeed idolizing conspicuous consumption. See, for instance, “Breaking: The earth is breaking … but how about that Royal Wedding?

Our political elite and intelligentsia, including MSM pundits and the supposedly “liberal media” like, say, MSNBC, hardly even talk about climate change and when they do, it isn’t doomsday. Indeed, there isn’t even a single national columnist for a major media outlet who writes primarily on climate. Most “liberal” columnists rarely mention it.

At least a quarter of the public chooses media that devote a vast amount of time to the notion that global warming is a hoax and that environmentalists are extremists and that clean energy is a joke. In the MSM, conservative pundits routinely trash climate science and mock clean energy. Just listen to, say, Joe Scarborough on MSNBC’s Morning Joe mock clean energy sometime.

The major energy companies bombard the airwaves with millions and millions of dollars of repetitious pro-fossil-fuel ads. The environmentalists spend far, far less money. As noted above, the one time they did run a major campaign to push a climate bill, they and their political allies including the president explicitly did NOT talk much about climate change, particularly doomsday messaging

Environmentalists when they do appear in popular culture, especially TV, are routinely mocked.

There is very little mass communication of doomsday messages online. Check out the most popular websites. General silence on the subject, and again, what coverage there is ain’t doomsday messaging. Go to the front page of the (moderately trafficked) environmental websites. Where is the doomsday?

If you want to find anything approximating even modest, blunt, science-based messaging built around the scientific literature, interviews with actual climate scientists and a clear statement that we can solve this problem — well, you’ve all found it, of course, but the only people who see it are those who go looking for it.

Of course, this blog is not even aimed at the general public. Probably 99% of Americans haven’t even seen one of my headlines and 99.7% haven’t read one of my climate science posts. And Climate Progress is probably the most widely read, quoted, and reposted climate science blog in the world.

Anyone dropping into America from another country or another planet who started following popular culture and the news the way the overwhelming majority of Americans do would get the distinct impression that nobody who matters is terribly worried about climate change. And, of course, they’d be right — see “The failed presidency of Barack Obama, Part 2.

**It is total BS that somehow the American public has been scared and overwhelmed by repeated doomsday messaging into some sort of climate fatigue**. If the public’s concern has dropped — and public opinion analysis suggests it has dropped several percent (though is bouncing back a tad) — that is primarily due to the conservative media’s disinformation campaign impact on Tea Party conservatives and to the treatment of this as a nonissue by most of the rest of the media, intelligentsia and popular culture.

#### Communicating environmental problem-solving targeted at policy solutions is key to solve extinction---endorsement of critical theories gets trapped in the academy---plan is key to catalyze international action

Wapner 8 (Paul Kevin, Associate Professor and Director of the Global Environmental Politics Program in the School of International Service at American University, February, “The Importance of Critical Environmental Studies in the New Environmentalism,” Global Environmental Politics, Vol. 8, No. 1, p. 6-7)

We are all familiar with the litany of environmental woes. Scientists tell us, for example, that we are now in the midst of the sixth great extinction since life formed on the planet close to a billion years ago. If things don’t change, we will drive one-third to one-half of all species to extinction over the next 50 years.4 **Despite this, there are no policy proposals being advanced at the national or international levels that come even close to addressing the magnitude of biodiversity loss**.5 Likewise, we know that the build-up of greenhouse gases is radically changing the climate, with catastrophic dangers beginning to express themselves and greater ones waiting in the wings. The international community has embarked on significant efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions but no policies are being debated that come even close to promising climate stabilization—including commitments to reduce the amount of carbon emissions per unit of GDP, as advanced by the US government, and to reduce GHG emissions globally by 5 percent below 1990 levels, as specified by the Kyoto Protocol. Scientists tell us that, to really make a difference, we need reductions on the order of 70–80 percent below 1990 levels.6 Such disconnects between high-level policy discussions and the state of the environment are legion. Whether one looks at data on ocean fisheries, fresh water scarcity or any other major environmental dilemma, the news is certainly bad as our most aggressive policies fall short of the minimum required. **What is our role as scholars** in the face of such a predicament?

**Many of us can and should focus on problem-solving theory**. We need to figure out, for example, the mechanisms of cap and trade, the tightening of rules against trafficking in endangered species and the ratcheting up of regulations surrounding issues such as water distribution. We should, in other words, keep our noses to the grindstone and **work out incremental routes forward**. This is important not simply because **we desperately need policy**-level insight and want our work to be taken seriously but also because **it speaks to those who are tone deaf to more radical orientations**. Most of **the public** in the developed world apparently **doesn’t like to reflect** on the deep structures of environmental affairs **and** certainly **doesn’t like** thought that recommends **dramatically changing our lifestyles**. Nonetheless, given the straits that we are in, a different appreciation for relevance and radical thought is due—especially one that takes seriously the normative bedrock of our discipline.

Critical theory self-consciously eschews value-neutrality and, in doing so, is able to ask critical questions about the direction of current policies and orientations. If there ever were a need for critical environmental theory, it is now— when a thaw in political stubbornness is seemingly upon us and the stakes of avoiding dramatic action are so grave. The challenge is to fashion a more strategic and meaningful type of critical theory. **We need** to and ways of speaking that re-shift the boundary between reformist and radical ideas or, put differently, **render radical insights in a language that makes clear what they really are, namely, the most realistic orientations these days**.

Realism in International Relations has always enjoyed a step-up from other schools of thought insofar as it proclaims itself immune from starry-eyed utopianism. By claiming to be realistic rather than idealistic, it has enjoyed a permanent seat at the table (indeed, it usually sits at the head). By analogy, problem-solving theory in Environmental Studies has likewise won legitimacy and appears particularly attractive as a new environmental day is, arguably, beginning to dawn. It has claimed itself to be the most reasonable and policy relevant. But, we must ask ourselves, how realistic is problem-solving theory when the numbers of people currently suffering from environmental degradation—either as mortal victims or environmental refugees—are rising and the gathering evidence that global-scale environmental conditions are being tested as never before is becoming increasingly obvious. We must ask ourselves how realistic problem-solving theory is when most of our actions to date pursue only thin elements of environmental protection with little attention to the wider, deeper and longer-term dimensions. In this context, it becomes clear that our notions of realism must shift. And, the obligation to commence such a shift sits squarely on the shoulders of Environmental Studies scholars. That is**, communicating the realistic relevance of environmental critical theory is our disciplinary responsibility.**

For too long, environmental critical theory has prided itself on its arcane language. As theoreticians, we have scaled the heights of abstraction as we have been enamored with the intricacies of sophisticated theory-building and philosophical reflection. In so doing, we have often adopted a discourse of high theory and somehow felt obligated to **speak in tongues**, as it were. Part of this is simply the difficulty of addressing complex issues in ordinary language. But another part has to do with feeling the scholarly obligation to pay our dues to various thinkers, philosophical orientations and so forth. Indeed, some of it comes down to the impulse to sound unqualifiedly scholarly—as if saying something important demands an intellectual artifice that only the best and brightest can understand. Such practice does little to shift the boundary between problem solving and critical theory, as **it renders critical theory incommunicative to all but the narrowest of audiences.**

In some ways, the key insights of environmentalism are now in place. We recognize the basic dynamic of trying to live ecologically responsible lives. We know, for example, that Homo sapiens cannot populate the earth indefinitely; we understand that our insatiable appetite for resources cannot be given full reign; we know that the earth has a limit to how much waste it can absorb and neutralize. We also understand that our economic, social and political systems are ill-fitted to respect this knowledge and thus, as social thinkers, we must research and prescribe ways of altering the contemporary world order.

While we, as environmental scholars, take these truths to be essentially self-evident, it is clear that many do not. As default critical theorists, **we** thus **need to make our job one of meaningful communicators**. We need to find metaphors, analogies, poetic expressions and a host of other discursive techniques for communicating the very real and present dangers of environmental degradation. We need to do this especially in these challenging and shadowy times.

Resuscitating and refining critical Environmental Studies is not simply a matter of cleaning up our language. **It is** also about **rendering a meaningful relationship between transformational, structural analysis and reformist, policy prescription**. Yes, a realistic environmental agenda must understand itself as one step removed from the day-to-day incrementalism of problem-solving theory. It must retain its ability to step back from contemporary events and analyze the structures of power at work. It must, in other words, preserve its critical edge. Nonetheless, it also must take some responsibility for **fashioning a bridge to contemporary policy initiatives**. It must analyze how to embed practical, contemporary policy proposals (associated with, for example, a cap-and-trade system) into transformative, political scenarios. Contemporary policies, while inadequate themselves to engage the magnitude of environmental challenges, can nevertheless be guided in a range of various directions. Critical Environmental Studies can play a “critical” role by interpreting such policies in ways that render them consonant with longer-range transformative practices or at least explain how such policies can be reformulated to address the root causes of environmental harm. This entails radicalizing incrementalism—specifying the relationship between superstructural policy reforms and structural political transformation.

Until very recently, our environmental vision was dimmed as the boundaries of meaningful scholarship narrowed. As those boundaries now promise to widen, we have some choices to make. We can render ourselves comfortable in the new “center” that has opened up, and engage in policy-relevant theory that will win us wide audiences and give us the impression that we’re making a difference. Or, we can explore the uncharted terrain of critical thought and struggle to ªnd a language to communicate what we see and to relate our vision to what other, more problem-solving scholars are wrestling with. The former offers much but, if we are not extremely careful, threatens to place us in lock-step with a world that seems bent on ignoring the fundamental drivers of environmental dangers. The latter calls on us to leave our comfort zone and disorient ourselves from a world largely tone-deaf to the magnitude and depth of our environmental challenges. Here we risk obscurity but also possibly gain insight that could actually understand the enormity of our environmental woes. If the latter is an option, it would also require us to look deeper into our hearts and minds for clarity and to cultivate a language with which to better communicate and undertake the necessary work of teasing out the radical promise of incrementalism. To me, the latter is clearly the more realistic, politically responsible and promising path.

Environmental Studies has the challenging task of engaging in, and attracting others to engage in, research directed at problems that will frustrate us in our day-to-day endeavors and whose solutions will transcend our lifetimes. What can we offer each other and our reading public? As I see it, we can offer our honesty: our truthfulness about how severe contemporary environmental challenges are and our frankness about what kinds of political transformations will actually make a difference. Critical Environmental Studies has long strived for such a level of intellectual sincerity. To be sure, it has often been sidetracked and has lost its way—especially over the past decade or so. **As the political conditions begin to ripen toward a new era of environmental consciousness and** **governmental commitment, it is time to capitalize on that sincerity and invest ourselves, that much more, in** envisioning and **explicating routes toward a genuinely greener world.**

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic and causes extinction

Flournoy 12 -- Citing Feng Hsu, PhD NASA Scientist @ the Goddard Space Flight Center. Don Flournoy is a PhD and MA from the University of Texas, Former Dean of the University College @ Ohio University, Former Associate Dean @ State University of New York and Case Institute of Technology, Project Manager for University/Industry Experiments for the NASA ACTS Satellite, Currently Professor of Telecommunications @ Scripps College of Communications @ Ohio University (Don, "Solar Power Satellites," January, Springer Briefs in Space Development, Book, p. 10-11

In the Online Journal of Space Communication , Dr. Feng Hsu, a  NASA scientist at Goddard Space Flight Center, a research center in the forefront of science of space and Earth, writes, “The evidence of global warming is alarming,” noting the potential for a catastrophic planetary climate change is real and troubling (Hsu 2010 ) . Hsu and his NASA colleagues were engaged in monitoring and analyzing climate changes on a global scale, through which they received first-hand scientific information and data relating to global warming issues, including the dynamics of polar ice cap melting. After discussing this research with colleagues who were world experts on the subject, he wrote: I now have no doubt global temperatures are rising, and that global warming is a serious problem confronting all of humanity. No matter whether these trends are due to human interference or to the cosmic cycling of our solar system, there are two basic facts that are crystal clear: (a) there is overwhelming scientific evidence showing positive correlations between the level of CO2 concentrations in Earth’s atmosphere with respect to the historical fluctuations of global temperature changes; and (b) the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientific community is in agreement about the risks of a potential catastrophic global climate change. That is, if we humans continue to ignore this problem and do nothing, if we continue dumping huge quantities of greenhouse gases into Earth’s biosphere, humanity will be at dire risk (Hsu 2010 ) . As a technology risk assessment expert, Hsu says he can show with some confidence that the planet will face more risk doing nothing to curb its fossil-based energy addictions than it will in making a fundamental shift in its energy supply. “This,” he writes, “is because the risks of a catastrophic anthropogenic climate change can be potentially the extinction of human species, a risk that is simply too high for us to take any chances” (Hsu 2010 )