### T

#### Should refers to a future act that has not been carried out – that is, the affirmative must defend a world where the current federal government enacts a policy reducing restrictions and/or increase financial incentives for energy production in the squo

Remo Foresi v. The Hudson Coal Co, SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA, 106 Pa. Super. 307; 161 A. 910; 1932 Pa. Super. LEXIS 239 July 14, 1932

As regards the mandatory character of the rule, the word 'should' is not only an auxiliary verb, it is also the preterite of the verb, 'shall' and has for one of its meanings as defined in the Century Dictionary: "Obliged or compelled (to); would have (to); must; ought (to); used with an infinitive (without to) to express obligation, necessity or duty in connection with some act yet to be carried out." We think it clear that it is in that sense that the word 'should' is used in this rule, not merely advisory. When the judge in charging the jury tells them that, unless they find from all the evidence, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty of the offense charged, they should acquit, the word 'should' is not used in an advisory sense but has the force or meaning of 'must', or 'ought to' and carries [\*\*\*8] with it the sense of [\*313] obligation and duty equivalent to compulsion. A natural sense of sympathy for a few unfortunate claimants who have been injured while doing something in direct violation of law must not be so indulged as to fritter away, or nullify, provisions which have been enacted to safeguard and protect the welfare of thousands who are engaged in the hazardous occupation of mining.

#### This is a better interpretation

#### Limits – There are a huge number of past instances where the federal government has interacted with energy policy– each of these is wildly unpredictable for the negative. AND, the abuse of unlimited topics is magnified when debating the past since we can’t have generics – every case occurs in a different timeframe which means our disadvantages and case arguments have to be written to dozens of different contexts. We would literally have to have a tub for every era of American history.

#### Ground – Consensus is generally settled on historical questions which means you can choose ones where the literature is not only slanted but actually indicates such a slanted consensus. Moreover, we know past actions didn’t cause nuclear wars or anything else extreme but the aff still has the opportunity to make counter-factual claims about failure to enact such programs causing nuclear war – this is a losing proposition – they will ALWAYS outweigh

#### Education – Debate trains us to be future policy makers, lawyers and activists. All of these require the ability to make COST-BENEFIT CALCULATIONS relying on PREDICTIVE INFORMATION to be effective. This is a skill that can only and best be taught in policy debates using the assumptions of fiat. If history is valuable and relevant it can be used as empirical examples to prove and disprove future arguments which solves all your offense

### 1NC---CP

#### We thus advocate the following counterfactual counterplan

#### The United States federal government should establish a cap-and-trade system for carbon emissions in the United States. The federal government should reduce the corporate income tax and business capital-gains taxes. The United States federal government should phase out all energy subsidies.

#### Targeting specific industries and technology fails---cap and trade is key to market-based solutions that solve the case better

Morris et al 12 Adele C. Morris, Fellow and Deputy Director of the. Climate and Energy Economics project at Brookings, Pietro S. Nivola, Charles Schultze, Brookings Scholars, "CLEAN ENERGY:REVISITING THE CHALLENGES OF INDUSTRIAL POLICY" June 4 www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/6/04%20clean%20energy%20morris%20nivola%20schultze/04\_clean\_energy\_morris\_nivola\_schultze.pdf

Public investments of these magnitudes, targeted at specific industries, arguably constitute an industrial policy, albeit a sectoral one, unlike the earlier proposals of the 1980's —that is, a government strategy to steer resources toward select producers or technologies. The rationale and efficacy of these clean-energy expenditures call for scrutiny.

Proponents offer numerous reasons for scaling up particular energy technologies at the taxpayer's expense. One set of reasons involves the need to remediate market failures that have not been corrected by other policies. For example, clean-energy technologies are said to emit fewer greenhouse gases than do traditional sources per unit of energy produced. The United States does not have an economy-wide policy to control greenhouse gases, most notably, one that puts a price on C02 that reflects the environmental harm associated with use of fossil fuels.

A far more effective policy than subsidies for clean energy research, development and demonstration would be a tax or a cap-and-trade regime that would put an appropriate price on carbon and other greenhouse gases. Properly implemented, this alternative approach would help level the playing field for greener energy sources, for it would require emitters to pay prices that reflect the costs their emissions impose on society. The enhanced efficiency that would result has been widely recognized by economists.6 True costs would flow to purchasers of goods and services that require energy, suitably inducing conservation. Emitters would have incentives to invest in equipment and new production techniques, use alternative fuels, and seek other methods to reduce emissions. And America's innovators would channel their efforts into inventing, scaling up, and marketing competitive forms of clean energy. However, because existing market signals do not suffice to encourage climate-friendly technologies, carefully targeted federal funding seems warranted. But as we explain later, it is ironically only after incorporating the social costs of energy into market prices that many clean energy subsidies will succeed in deploying new technologies.

#### Subsidy and incentive elimination levels the playing field---allows a free market approach to energy policy

WSJ 12 "The Energy Subsidy Tally" Aug 18 lexis

So for every tax dollar that goes to coal, oil and natural gas, wind gets $88 and solar $1,212. After all the hype and dollars, in 2010 wind and solar combined for 2.3% of electric generation -- 2.3% for wind and 0% and a rounding error for solar. Renewables contributed 10.3% overall, though 6.2% is hydro. Some "investment."

Zooming out for all energy, the Congressional Research Service did its own analysis of tax incentives last year. It found that in 2009 fossil fuels accounted for 78% of U.S. energy production but received only 12.6% of tax incentives. Renewables accounted for 11% of energy production but received 77% of the tax subsidies -- and that understates the figure because it leaves out direct spending.

By the way, these subsidy comparisons don't consider that the coal, oil, and natural gas industries paid more than $10 billion of taxes in 2009. Wind and solar are net drains on the Treasury.

All of this suggests a radical idea. Why not eliminate all federal energy subsidies? This would get the government out of the business of picking winners and losers -- mostly losers.

Mr. Obama's plan to eliminate oil and gas subsidies would lower the budget deficit by less than $3 billion a year, but creating a true level playing field in energy, and allowing markets to determine which energy sources are used, would save $37 billion. That's an energy plan that makes sense.

### Economic Logic K

#### You should prioritize questions of epistemology---in the context of economics the knowledge-production process is more important than the outcomes

Anderson 89 Thomas, Libertarian Alliance, "Economics and Knowledge" Economic Notes No. 21 www.libertarian.co.uk/lapubs/econn/econn021.pdf

Before there can be a substantial or meaningful advance of knowledge in any discipline, there must be a firm foundation laid in a theory of knowledge, an epistemology, and its application to the particular discipline. Obviously, one's conclusions cannot be any sounder than one's method of attaining them. With a few rare and wonderful exceptions, the intellectual leaders of today do not concern themselves publicly with epistemology, let alone with sound epistemology, or understandable epistemology. So there is a large vacuum in this area, and for obvious reasons especially in writings designed as popularizations. Those who hold positions of influence on recognised intellectual establishments may consider these questions when they congregate in little esoteric groups, but the whole field is supposed to be outside the realm of the average student, citizen or voter.

Continued…

A sound theory of knowledge is the only path leading to the rescue of economics. The great free market economists and philosophers are increasingly realising this and are laboring mightily to make up the deficit. All students of economics should join them.Remember to apply sound principles of knowledge theory to anything you study. In all of your writings or speeches, whether highly sublime and original, or merely popularizations, remember to trace back, isolate, present and check your fundamental premises.

#### The affirmative forecloses the ability of markets and human ingenuity to solve the impacts they invoke---fatal conceit in the context of energy policy makes their impacts inevitable and cause policy failure

Robinson 8 Colin, Institute of Economic Affairs “Climate Change Policy: Challenging the Activists,” http://www.iea.org.uk/files/upld-book440pdf?.pdf

There is, however, more to the apocalyptic forecast than that because it always contains a call to action. It comes in two parts. Part one is the ‘conditional’ forecast – what would happen on unchanged policy. Part two is the plan – what should be done to avoid the dire consequences that the forecast reveals. The latter-day apocalyptic forecaster, when turning to the plan, almost invariably recommends centralised solutions carried out by governments and international organisations. It would be unusual, if not unprecedented, for someone, having seen the apocalypse, to recommend leaving solution of the foreseen problems entirely to decentralised market forces. There must be coordinated, centralised national government or international action so that someone is seen to be doing something. Recom- mendations are usually for direct government intervention in the market by targets, regulations, government-controlled investment programmes, taxes or sometimes ‘market instruments’ (of which more later).

But there is a serious problem with the view that centralised action, via governments and international organisations, is required to avoid the apocalypse. This form of action suffers from the same inherent problems as does central planning, which has, wherever it has been tried, failed. Briefly, there are two reasons. First, the information required for centralised action to work – which is information about the future – cannot readily be gathered. Information is not available off the shelf, to be collected together in Whitehall or similar locations, because it is essentially decentralised and much of it is tacit. The production and dissemination of information are primarily market phenomena and the suppression of markets, which is the inevitable consequence of central planning, also suppresses the information that planners would need if they were to operate successfully.

The second problem is that, even if the information were avail- able, the incentives to deal with problems are lacking. There is no Whitehall counterpart to the powerful self-interest motives to solve problems that exist in markets. On the contrary, the pursuit of self-interest by people in organisations that have a monopoly of policy-making is most unlikely to be to the public benefit. Public choice theory has shown the dangers of assuming, as much main- stream economic theory does, that politicians and bureaucrats, domestic and international, are wise, far-sighted and disinterested and will simply identify and then pursue the ‘public good’.

By contrast, the market system is essentially a massive problem- solving mechanism. Markets may appear to operate slowly and ‘imperfectly’ but they do so surely: their existence is the reason why past apocalyptic forecasts have not come true. Competitive markets are powerful adaptive systems which contain strong incentives to solve the problems of the day, whether trivial or apparently serious. Unfortunately, the essence of the market’s functions is often clouded by the mechanistic neoclassical models used by many economists which concentrate on end-states of markets rather than the processes by which they adjust to change. Hayek’s insight – that competition is a process of discovery, quite different from stylised textbook models of competition which show the states of markets once competition has been exhausted – is the key to understanding the problem-solving power of markets (Hayek, 1948). Competitive markets provide the information and the incentives that spark the discovery process in which human ingenuity is exercised to deal with economic, social and technological problems. Marketplace incentives, operating mainly through price signals, induce entrepreneurs to seek out and then exploit market opportunities so as to make profits. Sometimes, entrepreneurial action may result in no more than the discovery of a slightly cheaper way of making a product or a slightly more efficient method of organising a firm. At other times, it may result in a major invention and its subsequent exploitation with global consequences. On a Hayekian view, the apocalyptic forecaster/ planner who believes he or she can see a long way into the future and has the answer to the world’s problems, substituting for and surpassing the problem-solving capabilities of markets, has been misled into the ‘pretence of knowledge’, if not into a ‘fatal conceit’ (Hayek and Bartley, 1988).

Of course, no one can be sure that there will always be an economic or technological fix for every conceivable problem that ever arises. But past history, including the failure of predicted catastrophes to materialise, suggests that market systems act effectively to deal even with predicted global disasters. Russell Lewis’s chapter in this volume gives some examples of past false predictions of catastrophe. One particularly apposite example, on which it is worth dwelling because it is the most recent and the one that bears similarities to the concerns of today, is the ‘energy crisis’ of the 1970s when there was a consensus that rapid depletion of energy resources (especially crude oil), allied with the exploitation of monopoly power by the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), would result in ever-rising energy prices. ‘The days of cheap energy are gone for ever’ was the slogan of many commentators, unwise enough to think they could see ‘for ever’ into the future. Only centralised action by governments and inter- national bodies could, it was argued, avoid a major world energy crisis. In the event, despite the almost total absence of the government and international action that had been deemed so important, energy markets adjusted to the ‘crisis’ so that, within ten years, the world was (by the mid-1980s) awash with oil and OPEC was meeting to try to prop up crude oil prices. Instead of crude oil prices tripling in real terms by the end of the century, as had been the consensus of forecasts in 1980, they began to decline almost as soon as the fore- casts were made and halved by the end of the century. Even in the first half of 2008, despite increases in crude prices in the previous few years, they were still lower in real terms than in 1980.3

#### This is an a priori voting issue---sound economic epistemology is key to the efficacy of all social and political praxes---accesses every impact

Reisman 96 George, Pepperdine University Professor Emeritus of Economics, Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics, http://www.capitalism.net/Capitalism/Economics%20and%20Capitalism.htm

In the absence of a widespread, serious understanding of the principles of economics, the citizens of an advanced, division-of-labor society, such as our own, are in a position analogous to that of a crowd wandering among banks of computers or other highly complex machinery, with no understanding of the functioning or maintenance or safety requirements of the equipment, and randomly pushing buttons and pulling levers. This is no exaggeration. In the absence of a knowledge of economics, our contemporaries feel perfectly free to enact measures such as currency depreciation and price controls. They feel free casually to experiment with the destruction of such fundamental economic institutions as the freedom of contract, inheritance, and private ownership of the means of production itself. In the absence of a knowledge of economics, our civilization is perfectly capable of destroying itself, and, in the view of some observers, is actually in the process of doing so.

Thus, the importance of economics consists in the fact that ultimately our entire modern material civilization depends on its being understood. What rests on modern material civilization is not only the well-being but also the very lives of the great majority of people now living. In the absence of the extensive division of labor we now possess, the production of modern medicines and vaccines, the provision of modern sanitation and hygiene, and the production even of adequate food supplies for our present numbers, would simply be impossible. The territory of the continental United States, for example, counting the deserts, mountains, rivers, and lakes, amounts to less than nine acres per person with its present population—not enough to enable that population to survive as primitive farmers. In Western Europe and Japan, the problem of overpopulation would, of course, be far more severe. Needless to say, the present vast populations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America would be unable to survive in the absence of Western food and medical supplies.

### Coercion K

#### A solar bank destroys the individual liberty through taxes—that’s a D-rule

Bovard 95 James, journalist for the New York Times, Wall Street Journal and Newsweek, Lost Rights: The Destruction of American Liberty, p.162-163

Subsidies mix everyone's paychecks into a common pot and then allow politicians and bureaucrats to decide who will be allowed to help themselves and on what terms. The more things are financed by subsidies, the more activities become dependent on bureaucratic approval and political manipulation. To depend on government subsidies means either to be currently restricted-or to be only one Federal Register notice away from being restricted. To tax oneself in order to subsidize oneself is to transfer one's fate from one's own hands to the hands of the bureaucracy. The one certainty with cross-subsidies is that politicians will be more powerful than they other-wise would be. Cross-subsidies effectively give politicians and bureaucrats an excuse to meddle with almost everyone's life. Few people favor directly taxing themselves in order to directly subsidize themselves; the charade depends on politicians making people think they will get something for nothing. The federal government can change the terms on a subsidy program with the citizenry at any time. Congress exists to bind citizens, not itself. The growth of subsidies is a **Chinese water torture on individual liberty**. The proliferation of subsidies means the proliferation of restrictions on how resources can be used. More and more people are treated as if they are effectively using other people's property, with a host of conditions and restrictions. Subsidies mean trying to be free with somebody else's money. With subsidies, a person can only be as free as the prevailing political winds allow. Government subsidies allow the government to progressively dominate each activity that it sets out to aid. Politicians first assert their sacred duty to help those in need by creating a subsidy program-and then assert their sacred duty to taxpayers to regulate the subsidized in order to protect tax-payers' "investment." With every subsidy it is a question of which strings are attached and when they will be pulled. Government starts out acting generous and soon ends up dictating terms and conditions. Subsidies mean political behavior modification. The more rewards and penalties the government possesses, the more the individual will be influenced in his daily decisions by the preferences and values of the bureaucratic-political rulers. Subsidies inherently represent a transfer of sovereignty from private citizens to politicians and bureaucrats. The citizen whose taxes "subsidize" the government has no effective right to control that government, while the government that subsidizes the citizen has a de facto right to control him. Thus, the more subsidies, the greater the subjugation. The expansion of subsidies guarantees the expansion of political power. **Every subsidy creates a power vacuum**-a vacuum that will eventually be filled by bureaucratic or political ambition. To assume that subsidies do not subvert liberty is to believe that politicians do not like power. It is only a question of time until some politician or some bureaucrat finds it in their interest to exercise the power latent in the subsidy. As soon as a tax dollar enters the Treasury, it becomes political-bureaucratic property, to be used as politicians and bureaucrats please. Subsidies mean politicians taking the citizen's paycheck and then using it to buy his submission.

### Advantage

#### Environmentalism that becomes too radical prompts conservative backlash --- that’s what allowed Regan and the technocrats to dominate

Jim Cassio 7 | Workforce Information Group, Inc., 2007

<http://www.coloradocollege.edu/dotAsset/2392c71d-4ac1-4779-9de4-b54e275ffbb7.pdf>

The modern environmental movement in the United States began to appear following the publication of Silent Spring¶ in 1962 by Rachel Carson. She was a biologist and a former researcher for the Fish and Wildlife Service. Carson had¶ that rare ability to communicate complex issues in a way that most people could understand. Her book, Silent Spring,¶ made people aware of how the indiscriminate use of the insecticide DDT spread throughout the food chain. Its title,¶ “silent spring,” refers to the death of robins from DDT toxicity. Carson effectively presented the widespread harm that¶ pesticides cause to wildlife, as well as the damage that agricultural runoff did to waterways. The realization that new¶ synthetic chemicals widely used in agriculture and industry had potentially disastrous consequences captured the¶ attention of many.¶ Environmentalism was a major part of the social protest movements of the 1960s, and by the beginning of the 1970s,¶ the foundations of the environmental movement were well laid for what would be called the Green Decade.¶ Numerous public and private organizations formed to promote pro-environmental causes. **The result was a collection**¶ **of environmental laws and agencies intended to incorporate environmentalism into government**. Public support for¶ environmentalism blossomed; however, the early success of the environmental movement also created a significant¶ backlash based on economic concerns and a growing criticism that environmentalists were too radical.¶ The 1980s would be a challenging time of transition for **environmentalists as they struggled to maintain their gains**¶ **while their opposition went on the offense**. By the end of the ‘80s, the environmental movement had survived the¶ backlash of the Reagan-Bush era. Despite efforts to deregulate and dismantle environmental protection agencies, a¶ strong legal foundation to promote environmental issues remained.

#### Communicating environmental problem-solving targeted at policy solutions is key to solve extinction---the K is philosophical nonsense that gets trapped in the academy---only the neg’s framework catalyzes effective 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.**

#### Acknowledging current political problems and working within the constraints of the system are the only way to posit change

Bryant 12—professor of philosophy at Collin College (Levi, We’ll Never Do Better Than a Politician: Climate Change and Purity, 5/11/12, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/well-never-do-better-than-a-politician-climate-change-and-purity/) Somewhere or other Latour makes the remark that we’ll never do better than a politician. Here it’s important to remember that for Latour– as for myself –every entity is a “politician”. Latour isn’t referring solely to those persons that we call “politicians”, but to all entities that exist. And if Latour claims that we’ll never do better than a politician, then this is because every entity must navigate a field of relations to other entities that play a role in **what is and is not possible** in that field. In the language of my ontology, this would be articulated as the thesis that the local manifestations of which an entity is capable are, in part, a function of the relations the entity entertains to other entities in a regime of attraction. The world about entities perpetually introduces **resistances and frictions** **that play a key role** in what comes to be actualized**.** ¶ It is this aphorism that occurred to me today after a disturbing discussion with a rather militant Marxist on Facebook. I had posted a very disturbing editorial on climate change by the world renowned climate scientist James Hansen. Not only did this person completely misread the editorial, denouncing Hansen for claiming that Canada is entirely responsible for climate change (clearly he had no familiarity with Hansen or his important work), but he derided Hansen for proposing market-based solutions to climate change on the grounds that “the market is the whole source of the problem!” It’s difficult to know how to respond in this situations.¶ read on! ¶ It is quite true that it is the system of global capitalism or the market that has created our climate problems (though, as Jared Diamond shows in Collapse, **other systems of production have also produced devastating climate problems).** In its insistence on profit and expansion in each economic quarter, markets as currently structured provide no brakes for environmental destructive actions. The system is itself pathological.¶ **However**, pointing this out and **deriding market based solutions doesn’t get us very far**. In fact, such a response to proposed market-based solutions is downright dangerous and irresponsible. The fact of the matter is that **1) we** currently **live in a market based world, 2) there is not**, in the foreseeable future **an alternative system on the horizon, and 3), above all,** we need to do something now**.** **We can’t afford to reject interventions simply** because they don’t meet our ideal conceptions of how things should be. **We have to work with the world that is here, not the one that we would like to be here**. And here it’s crucial to note that pointing this out does not entail that we shouldn’t work for producing that other world. It just means that we have to grapple with the world that is actually there before us.¶ It pains me to write this post because I remember, with great bitterness, the diatribes hardcore Obama supporters leveled against legitimate leftist criticisms on the grounds that these critics were completely unrealistic idealists who, in their demand for “purity”, were asking for “ponies and unicorns”. This rejoinder always seemed to ignore that words have power and that Obama, through his profound power of rhetoric, had, at least **the power to shift public debates and frames, opening a path to making new forms of policy and new priorities possible.** **The tragedy was that he didn’t use that power,** though he has gotten better.¶ I do not wish to denounce others and dismiss their claims on these sorts of grounds. As a Marxist anarchists, I do believe that we should fight for the creation of an alternative hominid ecology or social world. I think that the call to commit and fight, to put alternatives on the table, has been one of the most powerful contributions of thinkers like Zizek and Badiou. If we don’t commit and fight for alternatives those alternatives will never appear in the world. **Nonetheless, we still have to grapple with the world we find ourselves in**. And it is here, in my encounters with some Militant Marxists, that I sometimes find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they are unintentionally **aiding and abetting the very things they claim to be fighting**. **In their refusal to become impure, to work with situations or assemblages as we find them, to sully their hands, they end up** reproducing the very system they wish to topple and change**. Narcissistically they get to sit there, smug in their superiority and purity, while everything continues as it did before because they’ve refused to become politicians or engage in the difficult concrete work of assembling** human and nonhuman **actors to render another world possible.** As a consequence, they occupy the position of Hegel’s beautiful soul that denounces the horrors of the world, celebrate the beauty of their soul, **while depending on those horrors of the world to sustain their own position**. ¶ To engage in politics is to engage in networks or ecologies of relations between humans and nonhumans. To engage in ecologies is to descend into networks of causal relations and feedback loops that you cannot completely master and that will modify your own commitments and actions. But there’s no other way, there’s no way around this, and we do need to act now.

#### Academic debate over green politics is vital to engage the direction of energy policy and overcoming corporate control---the aff 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.

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

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

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

### Solvency

#### Economic consensus against winner picking---we have experts on our side---(only the CP addresses a specific market failure)

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

The final issue of disagreement that remains is the question of market failure. We have argued that government intervention to promote renewable energy only makes sense if market prices for energy are “wrong.” We follow with the contention that, if prices are found to be wrong for some reason (say, by not including the cost of the environmental damages associated with energy consumption), the best and most appropriate remedy is to correct the price and then leave markets alone. Joe responds by arguing that this is hard-line libertarian ideology disconnected from observable reality and that government can indeed make better decisions about what to invest in than can market actors left to their own devices … even when market prices are “correct.”

This, we believe, is the real nub of the disagreement between us and Joe. More accurately, this is the real nub of the disagreement between economists and Joe. Our contention that market actors, as a general matter, outperform government planners and that government cannot improve on market performance unless it is correcting an identifiable market failure is not a matter of hard-line libertarian ideology. It is a matter of broad agreement among economists everywhere. Even Nobel laureate and liberal economist par excellance Paul Krugman would not disagree. Hence, Joe is declaring intellectual war on an entire academic discipline – economics – not on libertarianism (which is, in fact, about other things).

#### Empirics prove picking winners fails

Van Doren and Taylor 8 Peter and Jerry, senior fellows at the Cato Institute, “The Case against Government Support for Alternative Energy” Google Knol, http://knol.google.com/k/jerry-taylor/should-there-be-a-system-of-federal/1adq09v7leuu4/3#

Ever since World War II, Washington has periodically promised that synthetic oil was on the horizon and that government could and should deliver what the market mysteriously would not. Again, a half century later, we’re still confronting claims that yet one more government stab at the synthetic energy wagon will produce affordable energy despite at least four separate mad crash programs coming to naught in the past.

In the 1970s, government preferences for solar energy were sold as a means of delivering us unto a low-cost solar energy economy. Now, solar has a trivial market share and has been all but forgotten in our rush to wind power despite a repeat of the same promises.

People like Joe were once head-over-heals in love with corn ethanol and attested to the need to move heaven-and-earth to deliver that fuel to the market. Today, the evidence has mounted that corn ethanol will never be economically competitive with oil, cannot displace oil in any significant manner, and is almost certainly a worse conventional air and greenhouse gas pollutant than even gasoline.

Over the past two decades, government has launch a dizzying array of frenetic programs to reinvent the car: first, to produce cars run largely upon battery electric power (California’s Zero Emission Vehicle program); then, to produce an auto fleet powered by conventional internal combustion engines that could get 70 or more miles per gallon (Clinton’s “Partnership for a New

Generation of Vehicles); then, to produce an auto fleet run on hydrogen powered fuel cells (Bush’s “Freedom Car” initiative); then, to produce an auto fleet powered by cellulosic ethanol (the so-called switch-grass initiative), and now, to produce an auto fleet made up of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. Every year or two, either the Congress or the President can be reliably expected to come up with some bright new idea to redesign the car and launch a program to translate new wish into new reality. We’re sure more fads will come even while acknowledging that pure chance may eventually prove one of these investment frenzies to be worthwhile.

During the 1990s, state legislatures thought they knew best how to structure electricity markets. The result were game-able systems in California and elsewhere that bear no resemblance to the sort of market that might have arisen had government not dictated politically favored industry blueprints to power companies.

The above list could go on and on, but we must leave a comprehensive exegesis of government energy failure for another day. Suffice it to say that the observation that markets are not always right about what constitutes a “good” investment is correct but insufficient. One must also find that governments can be reliably expected to do better. And there is no evidence in theory or practice that this is the case … particularly in energy markets.