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#### Financial incentives must disburse federal funds for energy production—mandates and regulations are indirect incentive—that crushes limits

#### Webb 93 (Sessional lecture – Faculty of Law @ University of Ottawa, ’93 (Kernaghan, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501)

One of the obstacles to intelligent discussion of this topic is the tremendous potential for confusion about what is meant by several of the key terms involved. In the hopes of contributing to the development of a consistent and precise vocabulary applying to this important but understudied area of regulatory activity, various terms are defined below. In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean **disbursements18** **of** **public** **funds** or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of **grants, contributions**, repayable contributions, **loans, loan guarantees and** insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and **tax expenditures.19** Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration. By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive effects which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as indirect incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, the definition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and ad hoc industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to encourage behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

**For is a term of exclusion – requiring direct action upon**

US CUSTOMS COURT 39 AMERICAN COLORTYPE CO. v. UNITED STATES C. D. 107, Protest 912094-G against the decision of the collector of customs at the port of New York UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT, THIRD DIVISION 2 Cust. Ct. 132; 1939 Cust. Ct. LEXIS 35 The same reasons used by the appellate court may be adopted in construing the language of the statute herein involved. If the words "for industrial use" mean no more than the words "articles of utility," there could be no reason for inserting the additional words "for industrial use" in the paragraph. Therefore, it must be held that the [\*135] new language "for industrial use" was intended to have a different meaning from the words "articles of utility," as construed in the case of Progressive Fine Arts Co. v. United States, [\*\*8] supra. Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "industrial" as follows: Industrial. 1. Relating to industry or labor as an economic factor, or to a branch or the branches of industry; of the nature of, or constituting, an industry or industries \* \* \* . The transferring of the scenes on an oil painting to a printed copy is a branch of industry under the definition above quoted. Some of the meanings of the preposition "for" signify intent, as shown by the following definition in the same dictionary: For. 2. Indicating the end with reference to which anything is, acts, serves, or is done; as: a. As a preparation for; with the object of; in order to be, become, or act as; conducive to. \* \* \*. d. Intending, or in order, to go to or in the direction of. Therefore, the words "articles for industrial use" in paragraph 1807 imply that Congress intended to exclude from that provision articles either purchased or imported with the intention to use the same in industry for manufacturing purposes.

#### Contextually Feed in tariffs are indirect and distinct from financial incentives – prefer this evidence because it is comparative

Joanna **Lewis and** Ryan **Wiser** – Gtown STIA Prof / LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY – November 20**05**, Fostering a Renewable Energy Technology Industry: An International Comparison of Wind Industry Policy Support Mechanisms, <http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/emp/reports/59116.pdf>

Policy measures to support wind industry development can be grouped into two categories: direct and indirect measures. Direct measures refer to policies that specifically target local wind manufacturing industry development, while indirect measures are policies that support wind power utilization in general and therefore indirectly create an environment suitable for a local wind manufacturing industry (by creating sizable, stable markets for wind power). The discussion that follows covers both of these types of measures, and is a summary of the more detailed country case studies provided in Lewis and Wiser (2005). **4.1. Direct Support Mechanisms** Policies that directly support local wind turbine or components manufacturers can be crucial in countries where barriers to entry are high and competition with international leaders is difficult. A variety of policy options exist to directly support local wind power technology manufacturing, and several policy options have proven effective, as demonstrated in a number of countries (Table 4). These various policy mechanisms do not all target the same goal; some provide blanket support for both international and domestic companies to manufacture locally, while others provide differential support to domestically-owned wind turbine or components manufacturers. Most countries have employed a mix of the following policy tools. 13 Table 4. Policy Measures to Support Wind Power, Country Comparison Direct Policies Primary Countries Where Implemented Local content requirements Spain, China, Brazil, Canadian provinces Financial and tax incentives Canada, Australia, China, US states, Spain, China, Germany, Denmark Favorable customs duties Denmark, Germany, Australia, India, China Export credit assistance Denmark, Germany Quality certification Denmark, Germany, USA, Japan, India, China Research and development All countries to varying degrees; notable programs in Denmark, Germany, US, Netherlands Local Content Requirements The most direct way to promote the development of a local wind manufacturing industry is by requiring the use of locally manufactured technology in domestic wind turbine projects. A common form of this policy mandates a certain percentage of local content for wind turbine systems installed in some or all projects within a country. Such policies force wind companies interested in selling to a domestic market to look for ways to shift their manufacturing base to that country or to outsource components used in their turbines to domestic companies. Unless the mandate is specifically targeted to domestically owned companies, it will have the blanket effect of encouraging local manufacturing regardless of company nationality. Local content requirements are currently being used in the wind markets of Spain, Canada, Brazil and China. Spanish government agencies have long mandated the incorporation of local content in wind turbines installed on Spanish soil; the creation of Gamesa in 1995 can be traced in part to these policies. Even today, local content requirements are still being demanded by several of Spain’s autonomous regional governments that “see local wealth in the wind”—in Navarra alone, it is estimated that its 700 MW of wind power has created 4000 jobs (WPM, October 2004:45). Other regions, including Castile and Leon, Galicia and Valencia, insist on local assembly and manufacture of turbines and components before granting development concessions (WPM, October 2004:6). The Spanish government has clearly played a pro-active role in kickstarting a domestic wind industry, and the success of Gamesa and other manufacturers is very likely related to these policies. At least one provincial government in Canada—Quebec—is pursuing aggressive local content requirements in conjunction with wind farms developed in its region. In May 2003, Hydro-Quebec issued a call for tenders for 1000 MW of wind for delivery between 2006 and 2012 which included a local content requirement; this 1000 MW call was twice the size initially planned by the utility, but it was doubled by the Quebec government with the hope of contributing to the economic revival of the Gaspe Peninsula (WPM, May 2003:35; WPM, April 2004:41). The government also insisted that Quebec’s wind power development support the creation of a true provincial industry that included local manufacturing and job creation by requiring that 40% of the total cost of the first 200 MW be spent in the region—a proportion that rises to 50% for the next 100 MW and 60% for the remaining 700 MW (WPM, May 2003:35; April 2004:41). In addition, the government stipulated that the turbine nacelles be assembled in the region, and that project developers include in their project bidding documents a statement from a turbine manufacturer guaranteeing that it will set up assembly facilities in the region (WPM, May 2003:35). GE was selected to provide the turbines for a total of 990 MW of proposed projects 14 upon its agreement to meet a 60% local content requirement, and is currently establishing three manufacturing facilities in Canada (WPM, June 2005:36). In October 2005, another call for tenders was released, this time for 2000 MW to be installed between 2009-2013. This call requires that 30% of the cost of the equipment must be spent in the Gaspe region and 60% of the entire project costs must be spent within Quebec Province (Hydro-Quebec, 2005). The Brazilian government has also pursued policies governing wind farm development that include stringent local content requirements, primarily through the recent Proinfa legislation (the Incentive Program for Alternative Electric Generation Sources) that offers fixed-price electricity purchase contracts to selected wind projects. Starting in January 2005, the Proinfa legislation requires 60% of the total cost of wind plant goods and services to be sourced in Brazil; only companies that can prove their ability to meet these targets can take part in the project selection process. In addition, from 2007 onwards, this percentage increases to 90% (Cavaliero and DaSilva, 2005). China has also been using local content requirements in a variety of policy forms. China’s 1997 “Ride the Wind Program” established two Sino-foreign joint venture enterprises to domestically manufacture wind turbines; the turbines manufactured by these enterprises under technology transfer arrangements started with a 20 percent local content requirement and a goal of an increase to 80 percent as learning on the Chinese side progressed (Lew, 2000). China’s recent large government wind tenders, referred to as wind concessions, have a local content requirement that has been increased to 70% from an initial 50% requirement when the concession program began in 2003. Local content is also required to obtain approval of most other wind projects in the country, with the requirement recently increased from 40% to 70%. Local content requirements require a large market size in order to lure foreign firms to undertake the significant investments required in local manufacturing. If the market is not sufficiently sizable or stable, or if the local content requirements are too stringent, then the advantages of attracting local manufacturing may be offset by the higher cost of wind equipment that results. Some concerns of this nature have already been raised in Brazil, where only one wind turbine manufacturer appears currently able to meet the local content requirements. The potential negative impact of local content requirements on turbine costs has also been raised in Canada and China. These experiences suggest that local content requirements can work, but should generally be applied in a gradual, staged fashion and only in markets with sufficient market potential. Financial and Tax Incentives Preference for local content and local manufacturing can also be encouraged without being mandated through the use of both financial and tax incentives. Financial incentives may include awarding developers that select turbines made locally with low-interest loans for project financing, or providing financial subsidies to wind power generated with locally-made turbines. Tax incentives can be used to encourage local companies to get involved in the wind industry through, for example, tax credits or deductions for investments in wind power technology manufacturing or research and development. Alternatively, a reduction in sales, value-added-tax (VAT), or income tax for buyers or sellers of domestic wind turbine technology (or production) can increase the competitiveness of domestic manufacturers. In addition, a tax deduction could be permitted for labor costs within the local wind industry. Tax or financial incentives can also be applied to certain company types, such as joint ventures between foreign and local companies, in 15 order to promote international cooperation and technology transfer in the wind industry, and to specifically encourage some local ownership of wind turbine manufacturing facilities. Germany’s 100MW/250MW program provided a 10-year federal generation subsidy for projects that helped to raise the technical standard of German wind technology, and over twothirds of the total project funding for this subsidy went to projects using German-built turbines (Johnson and Jacobsson, 2003). Regional support for German industrial efforts with a bias towards local wind manufacturers have been reported as well (Connor, 2004). A further German policy that may have preferentially supported German turbine technology was the large-scale provision of “soft” loans (loans that are available significantly below market rates) for German wind energy projects. Canada has implemented a tax credit on wages paid out to local labor forces in an attempt to encourage large wind turbine manufacturers to shift jobs to Canada. To provide a further incentive for local manufacturing, a Quebec provincial government program also offers a 40% tax credit on labor costs to wind industries located in the region, and a tax exemption for the entire manufacturing sector through 2010 (WPM, June 2003:40). Spain’s production tax credit on windpowered electricity (supplemented by incentives offered in at least one province) is granted only to turbines that meet local content requirements (WPM, February 2001:20). In India, the excise duty is exempted for parts used in the manufacture of electric generators (Rajsekhar et al., 1999). Australia (at the national and provincial levels), China, and a number of US states have also employed a variety of different tax incentives to encourage localization of wind manufacturing. China provides a reduced VAT on joint venture wind companies to encourage technology transfer (NREL, 2004). China has also used financial incentives to promote domestic wind industry development since its 1997 “Ride the Wind Program,” which allocated new technology funds to two government-facilitated joint venture enterprises to domestically manufacture wind turbines. The Danish Government’s Wind Turbine Guarantee also offered long-term financing of large projects using Danish-made turbines and guaranteed the loans for those projects, significantly reducing the risk involved in selecting Danish turbines for a wind plant. Favorable Customs Duties Another way to create incentives for local manufacturing is through the manipulation of customs duties to favor the import of turbine components over the import of entire turbines. This creates a favorable market for firms (regardless of ownership structure) trying to manufacture or assemble wind turbines domestically by allowing them to pay a lower customs duty to import components than companies that are importing full, foreign-manufactured turbines. Customs duties that support local turbine manufacturing by favoring the import of components over full turbines have been used in Denmark, Germany, Australia, India, and China (Rajsekhar et al., 1999; Liu et al., 2002). This type of policy may be challenged in the future, however, as it could be seen to create a trade barrier and therefore be illegal for WTO member countries to use against other member countries. Export Credit Assistance Governments can support the expansion of domestic wind power industries operating in overseas markets through export credit assistance, thereby providing differential support to locally-owned manufacturers. Though such assistance may also come under WTO’s fire, export assistance can be in the form of low-interest loans or “tied-aid” given from the country where the turbine manufacturer is based to countries purchasing technology from that country. Export credit 16 assistance or development aid loans tied to the use of domestic wind power technology have been used by many countries, but most extensively by Germany and Denmark, encouraging the dissemination of Danish and German technology, particularly in the developing world. For example, the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) has offered direct grants and project development loans to qualified importing countries for use of Danish turbines. Quality Certification A fundamental way to promote the quality and credibility of an emerging wind power company’s turbines is through participation in a certification and testing program that meets international standards. There are currently several international standards for wind turbines in use, the most common being the Danish approval system and ISO 9000 certification. Standards help to build consumer confidence in an otherwise unfamiliar product, help with differentiation between superior and inferior products and, if internationally recognizable, are often vital to success in a global market. Denmark was the first country to promote aggressive quality certification and standardization programs in wind turbine technology and is still a world leader in this field; quality certification and standardization programs have since been used in Denmark, Germany, Japan, India, the USA, and elsewhere, and are under development in China. They were particularly valuable to Denmark in the early era of industry development when they essentially mandated the use of Danish-manufactured turbines, since stringent regulations on turbines that could be installed in Denmark made it very difficult for outside manufacturers to enter the market. Research and Development (R&D) Many studies have shown that sustained public research support for wind turbines can be crucial to the success of a domestic wind industry, and such efforts can and typically do differentially support locally owned companies. R&D has often been found to be most effective when there is some degree of coordination between private wind companies and public institutions like national laboratories and universities (Sawin, 2001; Kamp, 2002). For wind turbine technology, demonstration and commercialization programs in particular can play a crucial role in testing the performance and reliability of new domestic wind technology before those turbines go into commercial production. R&D funding has been allocated to wind turbine technology development by every country mentioned in this paper, with the success of R&D programs for wind technology seemingly more related to how the funding was directed than the total quantity of funding. Although the US has put more money into wind power R&D than any other country, for example, an early emphasis on multi-megawatt turbines and funding directed into the aerospace industry are thought (in retrospect) to have rendered US funding less effective in the early years of industry development than the Danish program (the same has been said about early German and Dutch R&D programs). Denmark’s R&D budget, although smaller in magnitude than some other countries, is thought to have been allocated more effectively among smaller wind companies developing varied sizes and designs of turbines in the initial years of industry development (Sawin, 2001; Kamp, 2002). 17 **4.2. Indirect Support Mechanisms** Earlier we demonstrated that success in a domestic market may be an essential foundation for success in the international marketplace, and that fundamental to growing a domestic wind manufacturing industry is a stable and sizable domestic market for wind power. Achieving a sizable, stable local market requires aggressive implementation of wind power support policies. The policies discussed below aim to create a demand for wind power at the domestic level. Feed-in Tariffs Feed-in tariffs, or fixed prices for wind power set to encourage development (Lauber, 2004; Rowlands, 2005; Sijm, 2002; Cerveny and Resch, 1998), have historically offered the most successful foundation for domestic wind manufacturing, as they can most directly provide a stable and profitable market in which to develop wind projects. The level of tariff and its design characteristics vary among countries. If well designed, including a long term reach and sufficient profit margin, feed-in tariffs have been shown to be extremely valuable in creating a signal of future market stability to wind farm investors and firms looking to invest in long-term wind technology innovation (Sawin, 2001; Hvelplund, 2001). As discussed earlier, Germany, Denmark and Spain have been the most successful countries at creating sizable, stable markets for wind power; all three of these countries also have a history of stable and profitable feed-in tariff policies to promote wind power development. The early US wind industry was also supported by a feed-in tariff in the state of California, though this policy was not stable for a lengthy period. Among the twelve countries emphasized in this paper, the Netherlands, Japan, Brazil, and some of the Indian and Chinese provinces have also experimented with feed-in tariffs, with varying levels of success.
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**C. Prefer our interpretation**

**1. Limits - Broad definitions could include 40 different mechanisms**

Moran, 86 **-** non-resident fellow at the Center for Global Development and holds the Marcus Wallenberg Chair at the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University(Theodore, Investing in Development: New Roles for Private Capital?, p. 29 - googlebooks) Guisinger finds that if “incentives” are broadly defined to include tariffs and trade controls along with tax holidays, subsidized loans, cash grants, and other fiscal measures, they comprise more than forty separate kinds of measures. Moreover, the author emphasizes, the value of an incentive package is just one of several means that governments use to lure foreign investors. Other methods—for example, promotional activities (advertising, representative offices) and subsidized government services—also influence investors’ location decisions. The author points out that empirical research so far has been unable to distinguish the relative importance of fundamental economic factors and of government policies in decisions concerning the location of foreign investment—let alone to determine the effectiveness of individual government instruments.

2. **Ground – They do not spend federal money, this eliminates key ground on spending, politics, and trade-off debates – it also allows them to have highly specific evidence about their mechanism – they acquire additional solvency.**

**D. Topicality is a voting issue – if it were not the affirmative could run the same case year after year or unbeatable truths like sexual discrimination is harmful.**

### 2

#### Will pass but it will be a fight

**Hutchinson, 2/16** (sarah, “Next Up in Congress: Immigration Reform?”, , http://www.houghtonstar.com/2013/02/16/next-up-in-congress-immigration-reform/)

During the State of the Union Address on Tuesday, President Obama spoke on the topic of immigration reform, saying, “Send me a comprehensive immigration reform bill in the next few months, and I will sign it right away.” During his speech, Obama mentioned three things that he wishes in an immigration reform package. One, he desires to continue to increase border security; two, he would establish “a responsible pathway to citizenship” for illegal immigrants already here; and three, he would reform the process of legal immigration so that there would be fewer waiting periods and would attract those that would help create jobs and help to grow the economy. This was not merely talk. In recent weeks, comprehensive immigration reform has been steadily approaching legislative reality. A bipartisan group of senators, four Democrats and four Republicans, was formed only a few weeks ago with the task of developing a framework for reform that could possibly develop into a bill. This group has spearheaded the effort to come up with solutions to the many problems of immigration in this country – namely, illegal immigration, undocumented workers, insecure borders, and problems with the process of legal immigration, along with other issues. For once, this seems to be a movement that will receive much, if not total, support in Congress. Both Democrats and Republicans agree that immigration reform makes economic sense as immigrants are a key part of economic growth and development. Given the current economic uncertainty, immigration is a vital issue to address. The GOP also seeks to broaden its base, especially after the last presidential election where most of the Hispanic vote went to President Obama. Offering solutions to the immigration problem and presenting themselves as open to discussion will help develop support for the GOP platforms. The public has also demonstrated consistent support for immigration reform. According to a Gallup poll, more than seven in ten Americans support a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants and more than eight in ten Americans support legislation that would require that all employers verify that their employees are living in the United States legally. Efforts to reach across the aisle and compromise about immigration also seem to be gaining ground, particularly from Senator Marco Rubio (R.-FL) who is quickly becoming a GOP superstar. Rubio, the son of Cuban immigrants, has been consistently leading the effort on behalf of the GOP to get discussion going. However, a hurdle that must cleared for legislation regarding immigration is a pivotal controversy within the Republican Party itself. There are a significant number of GOP members who do not wish a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants, saying that it amounts to amnesty. There are others within the party that disagree. Rubio dodged this issue in his speech in the GOP response to the State of the Union Address on Tuesday evening, but in recent weeks he has shown his support for a process of citizenship for undocumented immigrants. The United States may well be on its way to immigration reform within the coming weeks. As talks and discussions among Congress become more serious and legislation begins to develop, the United States may even be implementing new immigration reform by the next State of the Union Address in 2014.

**FITS unpopular- viewed as tax increases**

**Carus, 12** -- Guardian environmental reporter

[Felicity, "Bill Clinton: fan of solar feed-in-tariffs thinks we should “get” the clean energy tattoo," PV Tech, 8-21-12, www.pv-tech.org/editors\_blog/bill\_clinton\_fan\_of\_solar\_feed\_in\_tariffs\_thinks\_we\_should\_get\_the\_clean\_en, accessed 12-31-12, mss]

Feed-in-tariffs are a controversial subject in the US where the energy industry likes to pretend that free market economics applies to this sector. You might expect clean energy antagonists to baulk: "Let the government set the price for electricity — are you crazy? Let the market decide." But **even** clean energy **protagonists are divided** about the true value of FiTs in sustainable markets: "Set the mandated rate too high and we'll have a Spanish boom and bust scenario on our hands. We don't want that." Set it too low, and nobody will want to invest. Palo Alto's Clean Local Energy Accessible Now (CLEAN) programme still has its full 4MW of capacity available and has extended its deadline. Added to which, tariffs also **sound** a bit **like** the dreaded ‘T’ word — taxes. So attempts to introduce them at the distributed commercial level have required a creative rebranding to the dramatically under-descriptive CLEAN programmes designed by the Clean Coalition.

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor --- spurs relations and economic growth in China and India

Los Angeles **Times**, 11/9/**20**12 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

Schaffer, Spring **200**2 (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 3

#### Text: The United States Supreme Court should rule that states have the ability to set rates of return for feed in tariffs at whatever rate they see fit, effectively removing FERC jurisdiction.  The 50 states and the District of Columbia should establish feed in tariffs for the development of solar power.

#### State action solves

Fulton, 12 -- Deutsche Bank Climate Change advisers

[Mark, and Reid Capalino, “Ramping up Renewables: Leveraging State RPS Programs amid Uncertain Federal Support,” http://uspref.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Ramping-up-Renewables-Leveraging-State-RPS-Programs-amid-Uncertain-Federal-Support-US-PREF-White-Paper1.pdf, accessed 2-7-13, mss]

Don’t forget about wholesale distributed generation: CLEAN and feed-in tariff programs One often neglected market segment is wholesale distributed generation: projects of 1-20 MW in size that – rather than off-setting customer usage (as is the case with residential solar PV) – generate power on the utility-side-of-the-meter and sell at wholesale rates to either a utility or electricity retailer. To the extent that policymakers seek to support growth of this market segment, a promising way to do so is through CLEAN (Clean Local Energy Accessible Now) programs. CLEAN programs (also known as feed-in tariffs) offer standard, fixed price, long-term power purchase agreements; while the offered price in such programs is usually determined up-front, it may then later be adjusted as the market responds. Such programs are particularly promising for promoting the growth of “wholesale distributed generation,” meaning distributed generation of 1-20 MW in size. Following passage of California Senate Bill 32, the CPUC has recently released details of a new CLEAN mechanism in California. The mechanism, known as Renewable Market Adjusting Tariff (Re-MAT) will be available for systems up to 3 MW in size; the Re-MAT programs links payments to owners of renewable energy systems to the weighted average contract price that California’s three investor-owned utilities recorded in their Nov 2011 reverse auction. 39 For more detail on CLEAN programs in general and the specifics of California’s new program in particular, see Appendix VII. In addition, a FERC order in 2011 regarding implementation by the California Public Utilities Commission of a feed-in tariff to support development of combined heat and power generation (134 FERC ¶ 61,044 (2011) (January 20, Order Denying Rehearing) **paves the way** for even greater use of feed-in tariffs to meet state RPS and other policy objectives. In this order FERC found the concept of a multi-tiered avoided cost rate structure to be consistent with the avoided cost rate requirements set forth in the Public Utilities Regulatory Policy Act (PURPA) and its subsequent regulations. 40 **This ruling affords states greater ability to establish feed-in tariff rates at levels that** would **support private investment, including** in **renewable energy generation**.

### 4

#### Civil Society is dominated by walking dildos who have regulated women to the private sphere. The AFF uses energy production to make the system look legitimate while continually dominating women

**Fraser 90**

Nancy Fraser. Rethinking the Public Sphere. Social Text. No 25/26.

Now, let me juxtapose to this sketch of Habermas's account an alternative account that I shall piece together from some recent revisionist historiography. Briefly, scholars like Joan Landes, Mary Ryan, and Geoff Eley contend that Habermas's account idealizes the liberal public sphere. They argue that, despite the rhetoric of publicity and accessibility, that official public sphere rested on, indeed was importantly constituted by, a number of significant exclusions. For Landes, the key axis of exclusion is gender; she argues that the ethos of the new republican public sphere in France was constructed in deliberate opposition to that of a more woman- friendly salon culture that the republicans stigmatized as "artificial," "effeminate," and "aristocratic." Consequently, a new, austere style of public speech and behavior was promoted, a style deemed "rational," "virtuous," and "manly." In this way, masculinist gender constructs were built into the very conception of the republican public sphere, as was a logic that led, at the height of Jacobin rule, to the formal exclusion from political life of women.4 Here the republicans drew on classical traditions that cast femininity and publicity as oxymorons; the depth of such traditions can be gauged in the etymological connection between "public" and "pubic," a graphic trace of the fact that in the ancient world possession of a penis was a requirement for speaking in public. (A similar link is preserved, incidentally, in the etymological connection between "testimony" and "testicle.")5 Extending Landes's argument, Geoff Eley contends that exclusion are operations were essential to liberal public spheres not only in France but also in England and Germany, and that in all these countries gender exclusions were linked to other exclusions rooted in processes of class formation. In all these countries, he claims, the soil that nourished the liberal public sphere was "civil society," the emerging new congeries of voluntary associations that sprung up in what came to be known as "the age of societies." But this network of clubs and associations-philanthropic, civic, professional, and cultural-was anything but accessible to everyone. On the contrary, it was the arena, the training ground, and eventually the power base of a stratum of bourgeois men, who were coming to see themselves as a "universal class" and preparing to assert their fitness to govern. Thus, the elaboration of a distinctive culture of civil society and of an associated public sphere was implicated in the process of bourgeois class formation; its practices and ethos were marker of "distinction" in Pierre Bourdieu's sense,6 ways of defining an emerge elite, setting it off from the older aristocratic elites it was intent on displacing, on the one hand, and from the various popular and plebeian strata it aspired to rule, on the other. This process of distinction, more over, helps explain the exacerbation of sexism characteristic of the liberal public sphere; new gender norms enjoining feminine domesticity and a sharp separation of public and private spheres functioned as key signifier of bourgeois difference from both higher and lower social strata. It is a measure of the eventual success of this bourgeois project that these norms later became hegemonic, sometimes imposed on, sometimes embraced by, broader segments of society.7 Now, there is a remarkable irony here, one that Habermas's account of the rise of the public sphere fails fully to appreciate.s A discourse of publicity touting accessibility, rationality, and the suspension of status hierarchies is itself deployed as a strategy of distinction. Of course, in and of itself, this irony does not fatally compromise the discourse of publicity; that discourse can be, indeed has been, differently deployed in different circumstances and contexts. Nevertheless, it does suggest that the relationship between publicity and status is more complex than Habermas intimates, that declaring a deliberative arena to be a space where extant status distinctions are bracketed and neutralized is not sufficient to make it so.

**The impact is Extinction**

**Warren and Cady 94**—Warren is the Chair of the Philosophy Department at Macalester College and Cady is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (Karen and Duane, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing Connections”, p. 16, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3810167.pdf)

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to "rape the earth," that it is "man's God-given right" to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current" unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with **nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women**, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, **will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible**. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

#### Our Alternative is a castration of the system – separating us from the phallocentric logic of the polis. A method of radical female revolution through a lesbian separatist society refuses male presence.

#### Only Reclaiming the notion of lesbianism beyond mere sexual classification breaks from the norms imposed by Male Hegemony and exposes the dehumanizing understanding of woman as an object to be screwed by man. To reclaim lesbianism is to reject the demands of the male cultural system and to create and celebrate the bonds of the female world.

**Radicalesbians 1970** [Radicalesbians, “The Woman Identified Woman” http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/wlm/womid/]

**What is a lesbian? A lesbian is the rage of all women condensed to the point of explosion. She is the woman who**, often beginning at an extremely early age, acts i**n accordance with her inner compulsion to be a more complete and freer human being than her society** - perhaps then, but certainly later - cares to allow her. These needs and actions, over a period of years, bring her into painful conflict with people, situations, the accepted ways of thinking, feeling and behaving, until she is in a state of continual war with everything around her, and usually with her self. **She may not be fully conscious of the political implications of what for her began as personal necessity, but on some level she has not been able to accept the limitations and** oppression laid on her **by the most basic role of her society--the female role.** The turmoil she experiences tends to induce guilt proportional to the degree to which she feels she is not meeting social expectations, and/or eventually drives her to question and analyze what the rest of her society more or less accepts. She is forced to evolve her own life pattern, often living much of her life alone, learning usually much earlier than her "straight" (heterosexual) sisters about the essential aloneness of life (which the myth of marriage obscures) and about the reality of illusions. **To the extent that she cannot expel the heavy socialization that goes with being female, she can never truly find peace with herself**. For she is caught somewhere between accepting society's view of her - in which case she cannot accept herself - and coming to understand what this sexist society has done to her and why it is functional and necessary for it to do so. Those of us who work that through find ourselves on the other side of a tortuous journey through a night that may have been decades long. **The perspective gained from that journey, the liberation of self, the inner peace, the real love of self and of all women, is something to be shared with all women - because we are all women.** It should first be understood that **lesbianism**, like male homosexuality, **is a category of behavior possible only in a sexist society characterized by rigid sex roles and dominated by male supremacy**. Those sex roles dehumanize women by defining us as a supportive/serving caste in relation to the master caste of men, and emotionally cripple men by demanding that they be alienated from their own bodies and emotions in order to perform their economic/political/military functions effectively. **Homosexuality is a by-product of a particular way of setting up roles** ( or approved patterns of behavior) on the basis of sex; as such it is an inauthentic ( not consonant with "reality") category. In a society in which men do not oppress women, and sexual expression is allowed to follow feelings, the categories of homosexuality and heterosexuality would disappear. But **lesbianism is also different from male homosexuality, and serves a different function in the society. "Dyke" is a different kind of put-down from "faggot",** although both imply you are not playing your socially assigned sex role. . . are not therefore a "real woman" or a "real man. " The grudging admiration felt for the tomboy, and the queasiness felt around a sissy boy point to the same thing: the contempt in which women-or those who play a female role-are held. And the investment in keeping women in that contemptuous role is very great. **Lesbian is a word**, the label, **the condition that holds women in line. When a woman hears this word tossed her way, she knows she is stepping out of line.** She knows that she has crossed the terrible boundary of her sex role. She recoils, she protests, she reshapes her actions to gain approval. Lesbian is a label invented by the Man to throw at any woman who dares to be his equal, who dares to challenge his prerogatives (including that of all women as part of the exchange medium among men), who dares to assert the primacy of her own needs. To have the label applied to people active in women's liberation is just the most recent instance of a long history; older women will recall that not so long ago, any woman who was successful, independent, not orienting her whole life about a man, would hear this word. **For in this sexist society, for a woman to be independent means she can't be a woman - she must be a dyke.** That in itself should tell us where women are at. It says as clearly as can be said: women and person are contradictory terms. For a lesbian is not considered a "real woman. " And yet, **in popular thinking, there is really only one essential difference between a lesbian and other women: that of sexual orientation - which is to say, when you strip off all the packaging, you must finally realize that the essence of being a "woman" is to get fucked by men**. "Lesbian" is one of the sexual categories by which men have divided up humanity.While all women are dehumanized as sex objects, as the objects of men they are given certain compensations: identification with his power, his ego, his status, his protection (from other males), feeling like a "real woman, " finding social acceptance by adhering to her role, etc. **Should a woman confront herself by confronting another woman, there are fewer rationalizations, fewer buffers by which to avoid the** stark **horror of her dehumanized condition.** Herein we find the overriding fear of many women toward being used as a sexual object by a woman, which not only will bring her no male-connected compensations, but also will reveal the void which is woman's real situation. This dehumanization is expressed when a straight woman learns that a sister is a lesbian; she begins to relate to her lesbian sister as her potential sex object, laying a surrogate male role on the lesbian. This reveals her heterosexual conditioning to make herself into an object when sex is potentially involved in a relationship, and it denies the lesbian her full humanity. For women, especially those in the movement, to perceive their lesbian sisters through this male grid of role definitions is to accept this male cultural conditioning and to oppress their sisters much as they themselves have been oppressed by men. Are we going to continue the male classification system of defining all females in sexual relation to some other category of people? **Affixing the label lesbian not only to a woman who aspires to be a person, but also to any situation of real love, real solidarity, real primacy among women, is a primary form of divisiveness among women: it is the condition which keeps women within the confines of the feminine role, and it is the debunking/scare term that keeps women from forming any primary attachments, groups, or associations among ourselves**.

### Econ

#### They have this ME intervention claim – no terminal impact

#### No impact- econ decline doesn’t cause war

**Barnett ‘9** (Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” 8/25/2009)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how **globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape**. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: \* No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); \* The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); \* Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); \* No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); \* A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and \* No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.

#### Economic collapse is inevitable – it forces a transition to sustainable communities – we indict your authors

Brownlee 10 – This essay was adapted from a presentation at Xavier University in Cincinnati on Nov. 7, 2010, as part of a lecture series on Ethics, Religion, and Society (Michael, 11/30, “The Evolution Of Transition In The U.S,” http://countercurrents.org/brownlee301110.htm)

Here, we need to know that economic decline will soon accelerate to inevitable collapse. There will be no long-term economic recovery. The underpinnings of modern human society (and the global economy) as we have known it are fundamentally unsustainable, and they are beginning to unravel before our eyes. This is partly because the entire globalized economy is based on the U.S. dollar, which is based on cheap oil. And now the whole system is beginning to come apart. When you hear predictions of economic recovery, just remember that those economists and politicians who are making these predictions are the very same ones who were predicting not so long ago that there was virtually zero chance that we could slip into an economic recession—and we now understand they were saying this at a time when we were already at least a year into recession. We need to recognize these rosy predictions for what they are, and prepare for the end of economic growth as we have known it. In our lifetime, we will most likely experience roller-coaster periods of global recession followed by weak and partial recoveries; this will ultimately give way to grinding, long-term global depression. In the process, many of the institutions on which we have come to rely as anchors for certainty and normalcy and sanity will surely fail, some of them slowly, some of them suddenly and spectacularly. It will be a chaotic time for the next several decades, and the chaos will prevail long after most of us have left this planet. Over the last few years I’ve noticed that we tend to think of fossil fuel depletion, climate change, and economic decline as three separate global crises. But of course they are all deeply interrelated. When we say this, it seems so obvious. But we’re just beginning to wake up to this reality: Our growth economy is based on cheap fossil fuels, and burning fossil fuels is obviously dramatically altering our climate. Therefore, economic growth as we have known it cannot and will not continue. Our Industrial Growth Society cannot and will not continue. This is what James Howard Kunstler has called The Long Emergency. And this is really what we are preparing ourselves and our communities for. Clearly, we are entering into a prolonged period of profound change, an era of “unintended consequences.” The changes that are coming our way will profoundly alter not only how we live, but even how we conceive of ourselves, how we think about the world, and how we see the future. And not only will we have to learn to cope with severe disruption to our conception of ourselves and the world, but we will also need to forge a new vision of the world that we can live by. Where will that vision come from? The larger context for the Transition movement, of course, is that all communities are in transition, whether we realize it or not, whether there is a formal Transition Initiative present or not—and so are all cultures, all nations, and all institutions. We are in a transition as a species, even as a planet in a larger Universe.

#### Collapse now allows us to survive, but delay risks multiple scenarios for extinction

Barry 8 – Ph.D. in Land Resources from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a Masters of Science in Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development also from Madison, and a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Marquette University (Glen, 01/14, “Economic Collapse And Global Ecology,” http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm)

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

#### Decline doesn’t cause war – it prevents military conflict – the economy was fundamentally different during World War II

**Deudney 91** – Hewlett Fellow in Science, Technology, and Society at the Center for Energy and Environmental Studies at Princeton (Daniel, April, “Environment and Security: Muddled Thinking,” EBSCO)

Poverty Wars. In a second scenario, declining living standards first cause internal turmoil, then war. If groups at all levels of affluence protect their standard of living by pushing deprivation on other groups class war and revolutionary upheavals could result. Faced with these pressures, liberal democracy and free market systems could increasingly be replaced by authoritarian systems capable of maintaining minimum order.9 If authoritarian regimes are more war-prone because they lack democratic control, and if revolutionary regimes are warprone because of their ideological fervor and isolation, then the world is likely to become more violent. The record of previous depressions supports the proposition that widespread economic stagnation and unmet economic expectations contribute to international conflict. Although initially compelling, this scenario has major flaws. One is that it is arguably based on unsound economic theory. Wealth is formed not so much by the availability of cheap natural resources as by capital formation through savings and more efficient production. Many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more extensive resources are poor. Environmental constraints require an end to economic growth based on growing use of raw materials, but not necessarily an end to growth in the production of goods and services. In addition, economic decline does not necessarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modern era, “The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones.”’” The experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant, because such depressions were characterized by under-utilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930 increased military spending stimulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem. Power Wars. A third scenario is that environmental degradation might cause war by altering the relative power of states; that is, newly stronger states may be tempted to prey upon the newly weaker ones, or weakened states may attack and lock in their positions before their power ebbs firther. But such alterations might not lead to war as readily as the lessons of history suggest, because economic power and military power are not as tightly coupled as in the past. The economic power positions of Germany and Japan have changed greatly since World War II, but these changes have not been accompanied by war or threat of war. In the contemporary world, whole industries rise, fall, and relocate, causing substantial fluctuations in the economic well-being of regions and peoples without producing wars. There is no reason to believe that changes in relative wealth and power caused by the uneven impact of environmental degradation would inevitably lead to war. Even if environmental degradation were to destroy the basic social and economic fabric of a country or region, the impact on international order may not be very great. Among the first casualties in such country would be the capacity to wage war. The poor and wretched of the earth may be able to deny an outside aggressor an easy conquest, but they are themselves a minimal threat to other states. Contempora ry offensive military operations require complex organizational skills, specialized industrial products and surplus wealth.

#### Their arguments based on correlation, not causation

**Miller 2k** – economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank (Morris, Winter, “Poverty as a cause of wars?”)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study under- taken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

### Warming

**It’s empirically proven to have little effect on CO2 levels –**

**Marques et al., University of Beira Economics Department, 12**

(António Cardoso Marques and José Alberto Fuinhas, University of Beira Interior, Management and Economics Department and NECE, "Is renewable energy effective in promoting growth?," Energy Policy, Vol. 46, July 2012, p. 434-442, Science Direct)

With regard to the connection between reducing emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) and economic growth, **the literature** also reaches unexpected results. Menyah and Wolde-Rufael (2010) **found no evidence about causality** running **from RE to CO2**, whereas the authors found unidirectional causality from CO2 to RE. Likewise, Apergis et al. (2010) conclude that **the consumption of RE does not contribute to reducing CO2 emissions**. Their explanation is the well-known difficulty of storing energy associated with the intermittency of renewables. Moreover, the inability to store, for example wind or solar energy, implies the simultaneous use of traditional pollutant sources of energy, such as coal and natural gas. This may be at the basis of different effects. On the one hand, it implies the maintenance of productive capacity that becomes idle in most time periods. This fact generates inefficiencies in the economy to the extent that large investments become idle over long periods. On the other hand, this intermittency may not even contribute to the reduction of countries’ energy dependence goals, as suggested by Frondel et al. (2010).

**It can’t solve fast warming**

**Inhaber 5/17/12** (Herbert, “The Impossible Dream? Why Reneawbles won’t Reduce Co2 Emissions by Much”)

The solution to looming global warming? Easy. Reduce man-made emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) by cutting down on the use of fossil fuels -- coal, petroleum and natural gas. Leave them in the ground. The replacement? Renewables such as solar and wind power. If we phase in natural energy sources quickly enough, we may be able to avert catastrophic climate change. Or so the story goes. But new research shows that it is not quite so simple. As the proportion of renewable energy penetrating the electricity grid grows, the reduction of CO2 emissions drops sharply. By the time wind power (and, by analogy, solar) reaches about 20 percent of the grid, the savings in CO2 emissions are negligible, of the order of a few percent. The result seems counter-intuitive -- surely the more renewable energy, the greater the reduction of CO2 emissions, and less threat of global warming. But the reason for this finding can be found on the miles per gallon sticker on the windows of new cars. The mileage for highway driving is always greater than that for city -- stop and go -- driving. When we touch the brake pedal, we change the engine speed. The lower mileage for city driving means less efficiency from the gasoline, and more pollution per mile driven. For example, the Toyota Camry, the best-selling auto in the U.S. for years, has a highway rate of about 32 miles per gallon, and about 22 for city driving. If we plotted these two numbers on a graph, we would see the mpg gradually decreasing as the proportion of city driving increased. In the upper left-hand corner of the graph would be long-distance haulers, who stay on the interstates and don't stop between fill-ups. At the bottom right-hand corner would be taxis, which rarely venture out of town. There would be a smooth curve connecting the two points. In the same way, when back-up electricity (mostly natural gas power plants) -- for the times the wind doesn't blow and the sun doesn't shine -- is ramped up and down, there are more CO2 emissions compared to when the back-up is running full blast. Result -- much of the emissions savings from using wind power or solar is lost.

#### Warming doesn't cause extinction

**Lomborg ‘8** (Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange>

These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren’t for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver Tickell, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a “catastrophe” and the beginning of the “extinction” of the human race. This is simply silly. His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners’ scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell [he] is simply exaggerating by a factor ofup to400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland’s ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world’s coastal infrastructure and much of the world’s farmland – “undoubtedly” causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years’ time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. Tickell’s claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further**, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.**

#### No warming- Newest peer review studies prove

**Taylor ’11** (7/27- senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute (2011, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism,” Forbes, http://blogs.forbes.com/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/)

**NASA satellite data** from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-reviewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “**There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts** that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and **should dramatically alter the** global **warming debate**. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but **real-world data have** long **shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing** as much **atmospheric humidity** and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict. **When objective NASA satellite data, reported in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, show a “huge discrepancy” between alarmist climate models and real-world facts, climate scientists**, the media and our elected officials **would be wise to take notice**. Whether or not they do so will tell us a great deal about how honest the purveyors of global warming alarmism truly are.

**No impact to disease**

**Posner 5** (Richard A, judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, and senior lecturer at the University of Chicago Law School, Winter. “Catastrophe: the dozen most significant catastrophic risks and what we can do about them.” http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_kmske/is\_3\_11/ai\_n29167514/pg\_2?tag=content;col1)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extiinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. The reason is improvements in medical science. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time.

#### No impact to pollution

**Schwartz 03** Adjunct Scholar @ Competitive Enterprise Institute

[Joel Schwartz, “Particulate Air Pollution: weighing the risks” April 2003 <http://cei.org/pdf/3452.pdf/>] Kevin W. Prep ‘11

**Studies** that have attempted to estimate directly when death occurs in relation to increases in pollution by estimating the size of this frail population **have concluded that** acute changes in **pollution levels shorten life expectancy by a matter of days at most**.113 The putative effects of PM based on epidemiologic results are consistent with the harvesting hypothesis. For example, if daily variations in pollution mainly affect an already-frail population, it may be that it’s not so much the type of external stress that is important, but that any modest external stress would be enough to cause death. **This is** consistent with the finding that many different types of pollution—e.g., fine and coarse PM, various gases—appear to have effects on mortality of similar magnitude, as do changes in temperature, atmospheric pressure and other weather variables.114 If PM and other pollutants were shortening healthy people’s lives by months or years, it would be an odd coincidence if several different pollutants, each with a different intrinsic toxicity and each present at different levels in different cities, all happened to exert roughly the same effects, regardless of the pollutant or its ambient concentration. On the other hand, if PM is actually shortening life by months or years in otherwise healthy people, biological plausibility is still an issue. **Various pollutants are always present at some level in ambient air**, and pollution levels vary from day to day. **It is not clear why apparently healthy people would be suddenly killed** on a given day **by** relatively low **PM levels that they have experienced many times in the past**.115 The frailpopulation hypothesis would explain the possible lack of a threshold for the effect of PM on mortality, since changes in pollution, even at low levels, might be enough to cause death in very frail people.116

**Warming doesn’t cause diseases – scientists admit**

**Donnelly ‘7** (John, 12-5, Staff, http://www.boston.com/news/science/articles/2007/12/05/a\_tussle\_over\_link\_of\_warming\_disease/)JFS

Donald S. Burke, dean of Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Public Health, noted that the 2001 study found that weather fluctuation and seasonal variability may influence the spread of infectious disease. But he also noted that such conclusions should be interpreted with caution. "There are no apocalyptic pronouncements," Burke said. "There's an awful lot we don't know." Burke said he is not convinced that climate change can be proven to cause the spread of many diseases, specifically naming dengue fever, influenza, and West Nile virus.

# 2NC

## ECON

### Econ Defense – doesn’t solve conflict

#### Their evidence relies on flawed models – economic collapse forces countries to focus inward – solves risk of conflict

**Bennett and Nordstrom 2k**

-QUESTION THEIR METHOD – the studies suffer from misspecified models which are NOT grounded in reality and proper economic theory – authors only elite corporate producers trying to maintain their economic well being over the expense of others.

p-cant

it is shortsighted to conclude that a leader will uniformly externalize in response to domestic problems at the expense of other possible policy choices (1985, 130). We hope to improve on the study of externalization and behavior within rivalries by considering multiple outcomes in response to domestic conditions.5 In particular, we will focus on the alternative option that instead of externalizing, leaders may internalize when faced with domestic economic troubles. Rather than diverting the attention of the public or relevant elites through military action, leaders may actually work to solve their internal problems internally. Tying internal solutions to the external environment, we focus on the poss ibility that leaders may work to disengage their country from hostile relationships in the international arena to deal with domestic issues. Domestic problems often emerge from the challenges of spreading finite resources across many different issue areas in a manner that satisfies the public and solves real problems. Turning inward for some time may free up resources required to jump-start the domestic economy or may simply provide leaders the time to solve internal distributional issues. In our study, we will focus on the condition of the domestic economy (gross domestic product [GDP] per capita growth) as a source of pressure on leaders to externalize. We do this for a number of reasons. First, when studying rivalries, we need an indicator of potential domestic trouble that is applicable beyond just the United States or just advanced industrialized democracies. In many non-Western states, variables such as election cycles and presidential popularity are irrelevant. Economics are important to all countries at all times. At a purely practical level, GDP data is also more widely available (cross-nationally and historically) than is data on inflation or unemployment. 6 Second, we believe that fundamental economic conditions are a source of potential political problems to which leaders must pay attention. Slowing growth or worsening economic conditions may lead to mass dissatisfaction and protests down the road; economic problems may best be dealt with at an early stage before they turn into outward, potentially violent, conflict. This leads us to a third argument, which is that we in fact believe that it may be more appropriate in general to use indicators of latent conflict rather than manifest conflict as indicators of the potential to divert. Once the citizens of a country are so distressed that they resort to manifest conflict (rioting or engaging in open protest), it may be too late for a leader to satisfy them by engaging in distracting foreign policy actions. If indeed leaders do attempt to distract people's attention, then if protest reaches a high level, that attempt has actually failed and we are looking for correlations between failed externalization attempts and further diversion.

### No WAR

#### Their arguments based on correlation, not causation

**Miller 2k** –

#### Decline doesn’t cause war – it prevents military conflict – the economy was fundamentally different during World War II

**Deudney 91**

#### Even if conflicts occur, they won’t escalate

**Bennett and Nordstrom 2k** – Department of Political Science, Pennsylvania State University (D. Scott, Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 44, No. 1, Feb., pp. 33-61, JSTOR)

When engaging in diversionary actions in response to economic problems, leaders will be most interested in a cheap, quick victory that gives them the benefit of a rally effect without suffering the long-term costs (in both economic and popularity terms) of an extended confrontation or war. This makes weak states particularly inviting targets for diversionary action since they may be less likely to respond than strong states and because any response they make will be less costly to the initiator. \* Following Blainey (1973), a state facing poor economic conditions may in fact be the target of an attack rather than the initiator. This may be even more likely in the context of a rivalry because rival states are likely to be looking for any advantage over their rivals. Leaders may hope to catch an economically challenged rival looking inward in response to a slowing economy. \* Following the strategic application of diversionary conflict theory and states' desire to engage in only cheap conflicts for diversionary purposes, states should avoid conflict initiation against target states experiencing economic problems.

### 2NC OV

#### Now is key – 2016 is the point of no return

**Ulansey 6** – Professor of Philosophy and Religion at the California Institute of Integral Studies in San Francisco. He received his Ph.D. from Princeton University, and has taught at the University of California at Berkeley, Boston University, Barnard College (Columbia University), the University of Vermont, and Princeton University. He is the author of a book published by Oxford University Press (and is now completing a second book which will also be published by Oxford), and has published articles in Scientific American and numerous other scholarly journals (David, April, “Audio: David Ulansey -- The Impending Mass Extinction and How to Stop It,” http://www.energybulletin.net/node/23694)

My talk at the Be-In will be about the fact that the world's biologists and ecologists have reached a consensus that UNLESS humanity immediately halts its dismantling of the natural world-- through habitat destruction, pollution, invasive species, and climate change-- half of all species of life on earth will be extinct in less than 100 years. In fact, as scientists are learning more about climate change, the expected time frame of the mass extinction is rapidly shrinking, and estimates are now coming in that half of all species will be extinct in 35 to 50 years. This means that WE DON'T HAVE 35 YEARS to solve the problem, since by then it will be FAR past the point of no return. The reality is that to prevent the looming mass extinction, a critical mass of humanity must undergo a radical transformation in its behavior within the next 5 TO 10 YEARS. Of course this sounds impossible-- but so in their time did the fall of the Soviet Union, or the birth of new religions like Christianity or Buddhism!

#### Solar still requires heavy fossil fuels for production – curtails its environmental benefit

Underwood 9 (Kristin, Corporate Responsibility Writer, “Dark Side of Solar Panels”)

The [Los Angeles Times](http://www.latimes.com/news/science/environment/la-fi-notsogreen14-2009jan14%2C0%2C1155706.story) reports that we may be trading one evil for another with all of the potential waste generated from the life-cycle of a solar panel. While maybe not as harmful as mountaintop removal from coal or emissions emitted from the millions of cars on the road, the generation of electricity from solar does have its own dark side.Huge amounts of fossil fuels are used in the manufacture of the cells and, just like many other electronics, the waste metals not used in production also present their own disposal problems, [mercury](http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/11/mecury-pollution-coal.php) andchromium being two of the top problem-makers. We've also reported before that the installation of solar panels also includes [toxic materials like the PVC](http://www.treehugger.com/files/2007/06/day_as_solar_installer_2.php)and glues used in the conduit.

### 2NC Growth Unsust/Inev

#### Global economy decreasing- best data

ExpressTribune 2/6 (The Express Tribune, “ACCA survey says outlook on global economy remains dim”, <http://tribune.com.pk/story/503069/acca-survey-says-outlook-on-global-economy-remains-dim/>, February 6, 2013)

About 43% of the professionals who took part in the survey reported decreased levels of business confidence, while only 19% reported improved confidence levels. DESIGN: ESSA MALIK KARACHI: Global business confidence decreased marginally in the fourth quarter of 2012, according to a recent survey of 1,994 finance professionals conducted by the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA) – a global body of accounting professionals. About 43% of the professionals who took part in the survey reported decreased levels of business confidence, while only 19% reported improved confidence levels. In comparison, 41% of the respondents had reported decreased levels of business confidence during the third quarter of 2012. Meanwhile, 30% of the respondents believed that the global economy was on course for a recovery – up from 29% in the third quarter of 2012 – while 65% believed it was either stagnating or deteriorating. The ACCA claims that the Global Economic Conditions Survey, carried out in partnership with the Institute of Management Accountants, is the largest regular economic survey of accountants in the world in terms of the number of respondents and the scope of economic variables it monitors. The survey does not state the number of participating finance professionals country-wise. Instead, it categorises participants region-wise.

#### Here are more warrants –

Even though their tech innovation may delay the collapse – it only makes it occur later which is worse

####  Innovation is unsustainable and only further guarantees collapse

**MacKenzie 8** – science journalist who writes regularly in New Scientist and other publications, cites Joseph Tainter, Head of the Department of Environment and Society at Utah State University, leader at the Rocky Mountain Research Station in the USDA Forest Service, also cites Thomas Homer-Dixon, director of the Waterloo Institute for Complexity and Innovation, CIGI Chair of Global Systems at the Balsillie School of International Affairs (Debora, 04/05, “Are we doomed?” EBSCO)

Homer-Dixon doubts we can stave off collapse completely. He points to what he calls "tectonic" stresses that will shove our rigid, tightly coupled system outside the range of conditions it is becoming ever more finely tuned to. These include population growth, the growing divide between the world's rich and poor, financial instability, weapons proliferation, disappearing forests and fisheries, and climate change. In imposing new complex solutions we will run into the problem of diminishing returns - just as we are running out of cheap and plentiful energy. "This is the fundamental challenge humankind faces. We need to allow for the healthy breakdown in natural function in our societies in a way that doesn't produce catastrophic collapse, but instead leads to healthy renewal," Homer-Dixon says. This is what happens in forests, which are a patchy mix of old growth and newer areas created by disease or fire. If the ecosystem in one patch collapses, it is recolonised and renewed by younger forest elsewhere. We must allow partial breakdown here and there, followed by renewal, he says, rather than trying so hard to avert breakdown by increasing complexity that any resulting crisis is actually worse. Lester Brown thinks we are fast running out of time. "The world can no longer afford to waste a day. We need a Great Mobilisation, as we had in wartime," he says. "There has been tremendous progress in just the past few years. For the first time, I am starting to see how an alternative economy might emerge. But it's now a race between tipping points - which will come first, a switch to sustainable technology, or collapse?" Tainter is not convinced that even new technology will save civilisation in the long run. "I sometimes think of this as a 'faith-based' approach to the future," he says. Even a society reinvigorated by cheap new energy sources will eventually face the problem of diminishing returns once more. Innovation itself might be subject to diminishing returns, or perhaps absolute limits. Studies of the way by Luis Bettencourt of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico, support this idea. His team's work suggests that an ever-faster rate of innovation is required to keep cities growing and prevent stagnation or collapse, and in the long run this cannot be sustainable.

MORE WARRANTS (probs not necessary)

#### 1)The laws of thermodynamics

Martenson 11 – PhD from Duke University (Chris, 10/24, “Oil and the Economy,” http://www.aspousa.org/index.php/2011/10/oil-and-the-economy-by-chris-martenson/)

The critical fact is this: Because all money is loaned into existence, our economy requires perpetual growth to function. The purpose of this article is not to opine on whether this is a good or a bad system, but merely to describe it and the risks it carries by virtue of its design. With constant economic growth, our money system is relatively happy; without growth, it becomes utterly despondent. Without constant economic growth, preferably in the range of 3% (or more!), the collective pile of debts cannot be serviced out of new growth and so they begin to default. This is exactly the dynamic that has been exposed and now is in play in Europe and, if my guesses are correct, will soon visit the very core of the thin-air money machine, the US itself. That’s the difference between growth and shrinkage in our world economy. Night and day. Life and death. If this strikes you as a rather fragile and **unsustainable** way to construct an economy, thenyou are not alone. After all, how can anything grow forever? The key takeaway here is this: Our economy must grow in order to function. When I have the opportunity to present to and interact with people who are one the economic/financial side of the equation, they very rarely understand - truly understand - the energy side of the equation. You know, the not-so-subtle difference between total energy and net energy, and the fact that the first and second laws of thermodynamics have never been broken. And in reverse, I often find that people in the energy camp do not really appreciate how the economy functions, and that it is really a complex system with multiple nested feedback loops predicated upon growth. In my view, each camp would benefit from spending a little bit more time in the other camp because both are really making some very profound assumptions. The economic folks are assuming that energy will somehow be found and brought to market and the energy folks are assuming that the economy will be there to support their capital and technology-intensive efforts. Neither of these assumptions are very helpful if they help us overlook thepotential disruption thatdeclining net energy could unleash within our economy. To return to the idea of our economy as a complex system for a minute. The field of complexity research is pretty robust and understands the basic principles of the coupling between energy flows and complexity. Whether the complex system being studied is a wave encountering the shore, a pile of sand, or an economy; the same fundamental rules seem to apply. Maintaining complexity requires energy while increasing complexity requires more energy. At this point I have to confess that my earlier description of the economy was woefully narrow. Yes, it is a nested system with multiple feedback loops, but those in turn are interconnected with political, social and cultural systems, each of which are themselves complex systems. It is in the largest sense that we must consider the impact of declining net energy on the complexity and behaviors of our most critical systems. To make things even more uncertain, another feature of complex systems is that they are inherently unpredictable. When an event might occur, or how big that event might be, are both unknowable, whether it is the size and timing next earthquake on an overdue fault or the vigor and demands of the social uprising we are talking about. Complex systems are frequently tightly coupled and little events cascade and become larger events; the so-called butterfly effect. My view here is that a decline in net energy will disrupt the economy, and other interlocking systems, in ways that are both unknowable and larger than expected by most. Recently there was a revealing AP story about coal seams in Kentucky being chased that were only six inches thick. Revealing because it tells us a lot about where we are in the net energy story. Those managing pensions with 30 year investment horizons should be thinking really hard about those six inch coal seams. They should ponder what it means that half of all the oil ever burned has been burned over the past 22 years and wonder about where the supplies will come from to fund the next 22 years/. In fact all of us should; what we assume to be the way the world works, and the way all of those interlocking complex systems function, is a very, very recent development historically speaking and can continue if, and only If, the amount of available surplus energy continues to grow. This is not an idle concern, but one that will shape our futures by shaking our monetary and economic systems to the core. Such is the nature of complex systems starved of the requisite amount of energy required to both maintain and advance the current level of complexity. The implications for stocks, bonds, and every other growth-dependent investment class are enormous. In aggregate they will fall in value. Whether dollars, euros or yen are depreciated or inflated in value does not matter, either way stocks and bonds will be worth less than they currently are because the growth premium will be reduced or eliminated. To make things just a little bit darker for equities today is the fact that from a historical perspective dividend yields are quite unattractive and reversion to the mean is the better bet: Historically, truly compelling equity yields are in the vicinity of 10% but even the long term average is more than double the current yield. The two ways to bring the dividend yield back into the historical fold are for prices to fall by half or dividends to be doubled. Unless a massive earnings binge is expected, which rising energy costs render difficult if not impossible, the ‘fall by half’ option is the more likely outcome. How could equities fall by half? One way would be to keep the dollar constant and let the prices fall. This is the more obvious method. The other way is to debase the currency and let the purchasing power of stocks erode by half while holding their nominal prices constant. If that sounds tricky, it is exactly what has happened over the prior thirteen years where the S&P is now trading at the exact same level it was back then. Inflation has been anything but absent over that same period and this is how printing money in the face of declining net energy (and an enormous credit bubble popping) will deliver to us smaller returns even as the tried and formerly true monetary levers are pulled and pulled again in search of a response we can recognize. The bottom line here is that everything we think we know about investing and how the world works is challenged by the pesky reality of energy sources that are dwindling in both quantity and quality. The days of pulling magic monetary and fiscal levers and then having the resources magically appear are over. A new and more complex future has arrived. Unfortunately the experience set of practically everyone currently with their hands on these levers does not extend to energy, physics, the laws of thermodynamics, or anything outside of the tidy but woefully incomplete world of economics.

#### 3). Their evidence ignores the newest and best data

Brown 11 – distinguished professor at the University of New Mexico and external faculty of the Santa Fe Institute (James H., William R. Burnside, William C. Dunn, Jordan G. Okie, and Wenyun Zuo are PhD candidates in the Department of Biology at the University of New Mexico, Ana D. Davidson is a postdoctoral researcher at the National University of Mexico and adjunct professor of biology at the University of New Mexico, John P. DeLong is a postdoctoral associate at Yale University in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Marcus J. Hamilton is an archaeological anthropologist at the University of New Mexico and the Santa Fe Institute, Norman Mercado-Silva is a research specialist with the School of Natural Resources and the Environment, Arizona Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, at the University of Arizona, in Tucson, Jeffrey C. Nekola is an ecologist at the University of New Mexico, William H. Woodruff is a scientist at Los Alamos National Laboratory and external faculty at the Santa Fe Institute, January, “Energetic Limits to Economic Growth,” JSTOR)

We are by no means the first to write about the limits to economic growth and the fundamental energetic constraints that stem directly from the laws of thermodynamics and the principles of ecology. Beginning with Malthus (1798), both ecologists and economists have called attention to the essential dependence of economies on natural resources and have pointed out that near-exponential growth of the human population and economy cannot be sustained indefinitely in a world of finite resources (e.g., Soddy 1922, Odum 1971, Daly 1977, Georgescu-Roegen 1977, Cleveland et al. 1984, Costanza and Daly 1992, Hall et al. 2001, Arrow et al. 2004, Stern 2004, Nel and van Zyl 2010). Some ecological economists and systems ecologists have made similar theoretical arguments for energetic constraints on economic systems (e.g., Odum 1971, Hall et al. 1986). However, these perspectives have not been incorporated into mainstream economic theory, practice, or pedagogy (e.g., Barro and Sala-i-Martin 2003, Mankiw 2006), and they have been downplayed in consensus statements by influential ecologists (e.g., Lubchenco et al. 1991, Palmer et al. 2004, ESA 2009) and sustainability scientists (e.g., NRC 1999, Kates et al. 2001, ICS 2002, Kates and Parris 2003, Parris and Kates 2003, Clark 2007). Our explicitly macroecological and metabolic approach uses new data and analysesto provide quantitative, mechanistic, and practically relevant insights into energetic limits on economic growth. We hope the evidence and interpretations presented here will call the attention of scientists, policymakers, world leaders, and the public to the central but largely underappreciated role of energetic limits to economic growth.

### A2 – moral econ

### Collpase now

#### Turns the case – growth makes all environment impacts and nuclear war inevitable in the short term

**Ehrlich 11** – president of the Centre for Conservation Biology at Stanford University (Paul R., 10/27, “A global population of seven billion - the point of no return?” http://www.publicserviceeurope.com/article/1045/a-global-population-of-seven-billion-the-point-of-no-return)

As the world population passes the seven billion mark - we are seeing climate disruption leading to rising food prices, accelerating loss of biodiversity, deteriorating ecosystem services, increased chances of epidemics and nuclear resource wars as well as a general reduction in the odds of avoiding the first catastrophic collapse of a global civilisation. More people are hungry than in 1968, when I wrote The Population Bomb. There are more poor people now than there were people at that time and we are already beyond the number of people earth can support sustainably. One bright spot has been a cheering reduction in birth rates, but sadly not far enough in rich countries such as the United States - and the decline in fertility has not been sufficiently widespread. If we are unfortunate enough to add two billion more people by 2045, as the United Nations predicts - assuming death rates do not rise - they are likely to do much more environmental damage than the last two billion. People are smart. Farmers did not first till marginal soils where water was scarce - but rather the most productive, well-watered soils they could find. To support two billion more will require farming ever poorer lands, using more dangerous and expensive agricultural inputs, winning metals from ever-poorer ores, drilling wells deeper or tapping increasingly remote or more contaminated sources to obtain water. All this will require vastly more energy than is now used. As a result, the next two billion people probably will do disproportionately much more damage to our crucial life-support systems than did the last two billion. Of course, if humanity got serious about protecting our environment – and, especially, the atmosphere - the next two billion could do less damage. Sadly the idea that overpopulation is just a problem for poor nations still persists. They do suffer from rapid population growth and hunger, but the role of rich countries in worsening their plight is usually overlooked. So is the role of wealthy countries in contributing to the most important population-related problems that are global: climate disruption, toxification of the entire planet, looting of the seas, the possibly insurmountable challenge of transitioning rapidly away from fossil fuels and increasing the risks of pandemics and nuclear war. The most common, and insane, idea that pervades society today is that perpetually increasing gross domestic product is possible and will lead to happiness for all. For, GDP is a lousy measure of a society's health or people's happiness - and economies cannot grow forever at 3.5 percent per year, as ignorant economists still believe. Such growth would actually imply that, in 20 years, the capacity of earth's natural systems to support humanity could be roughly cut in half - because the scale of the now-unsustainable human enterprise will have doubled. It also implies that, in a couple of centuries, that capacity could be reduced to something like one-hundredth of today's capacity. Perpetual growth is the creed of the cancer cell. Most of humanity's environmental problems trace to economic overshoot - too much total consumption.

#### Even if they win their offense, complexity means collapse now is net better for humanity

**Vail 5** – attorney at Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP in Denver, Colorado specializing in litigation and energy issues, former intelligence officer with the US Air Force and energy infrastructure counterterrorism specialist with the US Department of the Interior (Jeff, 04/28, “The Logic of Collapse,” http://www.jeffvail.net/2005/04/logic-of-collapse.html)

But despite the declining marginal returns, society is not capable of reducing expenditure, or even reducing the growth in expenditure. I discuss this at length in A Theory of Power, but the basic fact is that society is—at its very root—an evolutionary development that uses a continual increase in complexity to address social needs—and to ensure its own survival. So, as societies continue to invest more and more in social complexity at lower and lower marginal rates of return, they become more and more inefficient until eventually they are no longer capable of withstanding even commonplace stresses. They collapse. This may seem too deterministic—after all, it suggests that all societies will eventually collapse. While that may cause our inherent sense of hubris to perk up for a moment, we should remember that this equation fits our data quite well—every civilization that has ever existed has, in fact, collapsed. Our present global civilization is, or course, the sole exception. A look back at the contemporary chroniclers of history shows that every “great” civilization thinks that they are somehow different, that history will not repeat with them—and their hubris is shared with gusto by members of the present global civilization. Of course, as discrete empires and societies grow ever more cumbersome they do not always collapse in the spectacular fashion of the Western Roman Empire. If they exist in a “peer-polity” situation—that is, they are surrounded by competitors of similar levels of complexity—then they will tend to be conquered and absorbed. It is only in the case of a power vacuum—like the Chacoans or Western Romans—that we witness such a spectacular loss of complexity. In the “modern” world, we have not witnessed such a collapse as we exist in a global peer-polity continuum. When the Spanish empire grew too cumbersome the British were there to take over, and the mantel has since passed on to America, with the EU, China and others waiting eagerly in the wings. In the modern world there can no longer be an isolated collapse—our next experience with this will be global. In fact, the modern civilization continuum has existed for so long without a global collapse because we have managed to tap new energy sources—coal, then oil—each with a higher energy surplus than the last. This has buoyed the marginal return curve temporarily with each discovery, but has not changed the fundamental dynamics of collapse. Perhaps we should take a step back and look at collapse in general. Our psychological investment in the “goodness” of “high-civilization” leads to the commonly held conclusion that collapse is bad—and that to advocate it would be irrational. But from a purely economic point of view, collapse actually increases the overall benefit that social complexity provides to society for their level of investment. It makes economic sense. In the graph above, C3-B1 and C1-B1 provide the same benefit to society—but for dramatically different support burdens required to maintain their respective levels of complexity. C1-B1 is a much more desirable location for a society than C3-B1, so collapse from C3-B1 to C1-B1 is actually a good thing. With the growing burden of today’s global society, the global inequality and injustice that seems to grow daily, collapse is beginning to make economic sense. In fact, an entire philosophical movement, Primitivism, has sprung up dedicated to convincing the world that a “C1-B1//”, hamlet society is in fact a far better place. Despite the growing logic of collapse, in today’s peer-polity world that option does not exist except on a global scale. Today we have 3 options: 1. Continue business as usual, accepting declining marginal returns on investments in complexity (and very soon declining overall returns) until an eventual, inevitable collapse occurs globally. Continuation of present patterns will continue the escalating environmental damage, and will continue to grow the human population, with population levels in increasing excess of the support capacity of a post-collapse Earth (i.e. more people will die in the collapse). 2. Locate a new, more efficient energy source to subsidize marginal returns on our investments in complexity. This does not mean discover more oil or invent better clean coal technology—these, along with solar or wind power still provide lower marginal returns than oil in the heyday of cheap Saudi oil. Only the development of super-efficient fusion power seems to provide the ability to delay the decline of marginal returns any appreciable amount, and this will still serve to only delay and exacerbate the eventual return to option #1. 3. Precipitate a global collapse now in order to reap the economic benefits of this action while minimizing the costs of the collapse that will continue to increase with the complexity and population of our global civilization. When combined with a strategy to replace hierarchy with rhizome, as outlined in A Theory of Power, Chapter 9, this may even represent a long-term sustainable strategy. Whoa. Am I seriously suggesting the triggering of a global collapse? For the moment I’m just suggesting that we explore the idea. If, after deliberation, we accept the totality of the three options as outlined above, then triggering collapse stands as **the only** responsible choice. It is—admittedly—a choice that is so far outside the realm of consideration of most people (who are strongly invested in the Myth of the West) that they will never take it seriously. But critically, it does not necessarily require their consent… These may seem like the ramblings of a madman. But in the late Western Roman Empire, there is a fact that is simply not taught today because it is too far outside our tolerance for things that run counter to the Myth of the West: The citizens of Rome wanted to end the Empire, to dissolve its cumbersome structure, but could not reverse its pre-programmed course. Many—perhaps most—welcomed the invading barbarians with open arms. So should collapse be triggered now, or should we wait as long as possible? If we accept the inevitability of collapse, then it should be triggered as soon as possible, as the cost of implementing a collapse strategy is continually growing… Throughout history, when collapse has occurred, it has been a blessing. The mainstream continues to cling to the beliefs that collapse will be a terrible loss, and that it is not inevitable. Even with all of our cultural brain-washing, do we really have so much hubris as to hold on to the tired mantra that “this time, in our civilization, things will be different”?

### METHOD

#### Their authors’ methodology has been co-opted

**Beistegui 97** – Professor of Philosophy at the University of Warwick (Miguel D., Heidegger and the Political, p.71)

What monstrousness does Heidegger have in mind here? In what sense can technology be declared “monstrous”? And why associate technology with nihilism? At this stage, nihilism can only be envisaged in the most simple sense, and that is as a phenomenon linked to the effects produced by global technology. Following Junger’s descriptions of the age of the Worker, Heidegger provides his most economic description of the actuality of nihilism in section XXVI of “Overcoming Metaphysics.” Technology defines the way in which the “world,” perceived solely as extended space, is mobilized, ordered, homogenized and used up so as to enhance man’s will to hegemony. The ordering takes the form of a total planning or an equipping (Rüstung), which consists in the division of the whole of being into sectors and areas, and then in the systematic organization and exploitation of such areas. Thus, each domain has its institute of research as well as its ministry, each area is controlled and evaluated with a view to assessing its potential and eventually calibrated for mass consumption. Resources are endlessly extracted, stocked, distributed and transformed, according to a logic which is not that of need, but that of inflated desires and consumption fantasies artificially created by the techniques of our post-industrial era. Beings as a whole have become this “stuff” awaiting consumption. Nothing falls outside of this technological organization: neither politics, which has become the way to organize and optimize the technological seizure of beings at the level of the nation; nor science which, infinitely divided into ultra-specialized sub-sciences, rules over the technical aspect of this seizure, nor the arts (which are now referred to as the “culture industry”); nor even man as such, who has become a commodity and an object of highly sophisticated technological manipulation (whether genetic, cosmetic or cybernetic). The hegemony of technology, which can take various forms according to the domains of being it rules over, seems to be limited only by the power of its own completion. It is, for technology, a question of organizing the conditions of its optimal performance and ultimate plan—whether these be the totalitarian or imperialistic politics of yesterday, the global economics and the new world order of today, or the uniformalized culture and ideology of tomorrow. Yet behind this seemingly ultra-rational organization rules the most nihilistic of all goals: the absence of goals. For why is such an ordering set up? What are all those plans for? For the sole sake of planning. For no other purpose than the artificial creation of needs and desires, which can be fulfilled only by way of an increase in production and further devastation of the earth. Under the sway of technology, man—the man of metaphysics, the rational animal—has become the working animal. For such a man, there is no other truth than the one that produces results, no other reality than that of use and profit. His will, this very will that constitutes his pride and that he erects as an instrument of his domination over the whole of the earth, is nothing but the expression of the will to will. Yet what this man does not realize is that his labor and his will spin in a vacuum, moving him ever more forcefully away from his provenance and his destination, from his position amidst beings and from the relation to being that governs it. Busy as he is at using up and producing, at manipulating and consuming, today’s man no longer has the eyes to see what is essential (namely presence in its epochal configuration) and can no longer greet the discrete echo of presencing which resounds in thinking and poeticizing alone. At best is he in a position to accumulate “experiences” (Erlebnisse), which he flaunts as his “truths.”

### Warming\*

#### Growth causes warming and extinction – scientific consensus

**Li 11** – University of Utah, Department of Economics (Minqi, 01/24, “The 21st Century Crisis : Climate Catastrophe or Socialism,” rrp.sagepub.com/content/43/3/289.full.pdf)

The global average surface temperature is now about 0.8°C (0.8 degrees Celsius) higher than in pre-industrial times. Under the current trend, the world is on track towards a long-term warming between 4°C and 8°C. At this level of global warming, the world would be in an extreme greenhouse state not seen for almost 100 million years, devastating human civilization and destroying nearly all forms of life on Earth (Conner and McCarthy 2009). The scientific community has reached consensus that the current global warming results from the excessive accumulation in the atmosphere of carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gases (such as methane and nitrous oxide) emitted by human economic activities.1 The capitalist historical epoch has been characterized by the explosive growth of material production and consumption. The massive expansion of the world economy has been powered by fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas). Since 1820, the world economy has expanded by about seventy times and the world emissions of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels burning have increased by about sixty times (see Figure 1). At the United Nations Conference on Climate Change concluded in Copenhagen in December 2009, the world’s governments officially committed to the objective of limiting global warming to no more than 2°C. However, according to the “Climate Action Tracker,” despite the official statement, the national governments’ current pledges regarding emission reduction in fact imply a warming of at least 3°C by the end of the 21st century with more warming to come in the following centuries (Climate Action Tracker 2010). In reality, all the major national governments are committed to infinite economic growth and none of them is willing to consider any emission reduction policy that could undermine economic growth. This is not simply because of intellectual ignorance or lack of political will. The pursuit of endless accumulation of capital (and infinite economic growth) is derived from the basic laws of motion of the capitalist economic system. Without fundamental social transformation, human civilization is now on the path to self-destruction. The next section (section 2) reviews the basic scientific facts concerning the climate change crisis. Without an end to economic growth, it is virtually impossible for meaningful climate stabilization to be achieved (section 3).
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 **Even if you avoid case advantages in the short term, it does not resolve WHY those scenarios happened in the first place – only the alternative gets to the root cause. (TECH/SCI)**

**Nhanenge 2007**

(Jytte, Masters @ U South Africa, Accepted Thesis Paper for Development Studies, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT, uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/10500/570/1/dissertation.pdf)

The androcentric premises also have political consequences. They protect the ideological basis of exploitative relationships. Militarism, colonialism, racism, sexism, capitalism and other pathological 'isms' of modernity get legitimacy from the assumption that power relations and hierarchy are inevitably a part of human society, due to man's inherent nature. Because when mankind by nature is autonomous, competitive and violent (i.e. masculine) then coercion and hierarchical structures are necessary to manage conflicts and maintain social order. In this way, the cooperative relationships such as those found among some women and tribal cultures, are by a dualised definition unrealistic and utopian. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This means that power relations are generated by universal scientific truths about human nature, rather than by political and social debate. The consequence is that people cannot challenge the basis of the power structure because they believe it is the scientific truth, so it cannot be otherwise. In this way, militarism is justified as being unavoidable, regardless of its patent irrationality. Likewise, if the scientific "truth" were that humans would always compete for a greater share of resources, then the rational response to the environmental crisis would seem to be "dog-eat-dog" survivalism. This creates a self-fulfilling prophecy in which nature and community simply cannot survive. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This type of social and political power structure is kept in place by social policies. It is based on the assumption that if the scientific method is applied to public policy then social planning can be done free from normative values. However, according to Habermas (Reitzes 1993: 40) the scientific method only conceal pre-existing, unreflected social interests and pre-scientific decisions. Consequently, also social scientists apply the scientific characteristics of objectivity, value-freedom, rationality and quantifiability to social life. In this way, they assume they can unveil universal laws about social relations, which will lead to true knowledge. Based on this, correct social policies can be formulated. Thus, social processes are excluded, while scientific objective facts are included. Society is assumed a static entity, where no changes are possible. By promoting a permanent character, social science legitimizes the existing social order, while obscuring the relations of domination and subordination, which is keeping the existing power relations inaccessible to analysis. The frozen order also makes it impossible to develop alternative explanations about social reality. It prevents a historical and political understanding of reality and denies the possibility for social transformation by human agency. The prevailing condition is seen as an unavoidable fact. This implies that human beings are passive and that domination is a natural force, for which no one is responsible. This permits the state freely to implement laws and policies, which are controlling and coercive. These are seen as being correct, because they are based on scientific facts made by scientific experts. One result is that the state, without consulting the public, engages in a pathological pursuit of economic growth. Technology can be used to dominate societies or to enhance them. Thus both science and technology could have developed in a different direction. But due to patriarchal values infiltrated in science the type of technology developed is meant to dominate, oppress, exploit and kill. One reason is that patriarchal societies identify masculinity with conquest. Thus any technical innovation will continue to be a tool for more effective oppression and exploitation. The highest priority seems to be given to technology that destroys life. Modern societies are dominated by masculine institutions and patriarchal ideologies. Their technologies prevailed in Auschwitz, Dresden, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Vietnam, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and in many other parts of the world. Patriarchal power has brought us acid rain, global warming, military states, poverty and countless cases of suffering. We have seen men whose power has caused them to lose all sense of reality, decency and imagination, and we must fear such power. The ultimate result of unchecked patriarchy will be ecological catastrophe and nuclear holocaust.

### 2NC Framework

**This framework is another link—it’s patriarchal censorship that silencing the feminist worldview—this independently warrants a negative ballot to fight against gendered censorship**

**Mojab 02 (**Shahrzad, director of the Women and Gender Studies Institute and an Associate Professor in the Department of Adult Education and Psychology at University of Toronto, Canada; “Information, Censorship, and Gender Relations in Global Capitalism” Information for Social Change 1)

It is important to know more about the ties that bind censorship to gender. Even when one barrier is removed, others emerge to ensure the reproduction of the status quo**.** For instance, after decades of struggle, beginning in late nineteenth century, legal barriers to women's access to parliament and political office were removed in the West and, later, in many non-Western states. This was achieved, not simply through access to information, but rather due to women's determination to create knowledge and consciousness, and engage in mobilizing and organizing (sit-ins, demonstrations, picketing, leafleting, singing, etc.) in schools, homes, streets, churches, and university campuses. However, states and state-centred politics continue to be male-centred**.** Even when women have a proportionate participation in the parliament, there is no guarantee that they would all advocate feminist alternatives to an androcentric agenda; and this is the case for the simple reason that women can be as patriarchal in their politics as some men are.A more adequate approach to the understanding of censorship is, I believe, to see it not as an irrational practice, as a mischievous attitude, or a technical problem of obstructing channels of communication. Censorship is an integral part of the exercise of gender power, class power, and the powers of the nation, ethnicity, religion and governance. Not only does it deny women access to information, but also limits their participation in the creation of knowledge, and denies them the power to utilize knowledge.If in pre-modern times the church was the major player in creating knowledge, today the market produces, disseminates, and utilizes much of the knowledge, which has achieved the status of a commodity. Knowledge is "intellectual property." Even the knowledge created in public and semi-public institutions such as universities is increasingly geared to the agenda of the market, and serves the promotion of market interests. Moreover, Western states primarily entertain the market as the lifeline of economy, culture and society. They increasingly aim at giving all the power to the market. In dictatorial regimes, however, the state still plays a prominent role in censoring the creation and dissemination of knowledge. From Peru to Turkey, to Iran and to China, states suppress activists, journalists, libraries, bookstores, print and broadcast media, satellite dishes and the Internet**.** They often do so by committing violence against the citizens and the communication systems they use.Although we may find much gender-based subtlety in the techniques of limiting women's access to information, I believe that the subtlest censorship is denying feminist knowledge a visible role in the exercise of power. The state, Western and non-Western, rules through privileging androcentric knowledge as the basis for governance. **///**The conduct of national censuses, for instance, continues to be based on androcentric worldviews in spite of devastating feminist critique. To give another example, women are now recruited into Western armies in combat functions, but states continue to ignore feminist and pacifist knowledge that challenges the very phenomenon of war and violence (Cynthia Enloe, 2000). Women themselves can be and, often, are part of the problem. In the absence of feminist consciousness, they generally act as participants in the reproduction of patriarchal gender relations. In Islamic societies, when men engage in the "honour" killing of their wives, daughters or sisters, sometimes mothers participate in or tolerate the horrendous crime (Mojab, 2002). The democratisation of gender relations is a conscious intervention in a power structure that is closely interlocked with the powers of the state, class, race, ethnicity, religion and tradition. For both women and men, challenging patriarchy means defying one's own values, worldviews, emotions, and traditions. At the same time, it involves risk taking including, in some situations, loss of life. Women's full access to androcentric knowledge will not disturb the status quo. I argue that, in the absence of feminist consciousness, women may even act as ministers of propaganda and censorship. They will not be in a position to exercise the democratic right to revolt against oppressive rule. In the West, feminist knowledge cannot be suppressed through book-burning, jailing, torture, and assassination. Censorship is conducted, much more effectively, by stigmatizing and marginalising feminist knowledge as "special interest," while androcentrism is promoted as the norm, the canon, and "human nature." That is why, I contend, that if we fill all the media institutions with female managers and staff, if we give all educational institutions to women, or hand over all high-rank military positions to women, the androcentric world order with its violence, war, poverty, and degenerating environment will continue to function. Globalization, as it is understood in mainstream media and in state discourses, is nothing new; it emerged with the rise of capitalism; the main engine of globalization is the capitalist market, and it is promoted and planned by capitalist states through various organs such as the G8, World Bank, European Union, World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, etc. The impact of this globalization on women has been largely negative, especially in the developing world. Millions of girls aged 5 to 15 are recruited into the global prostitution market. Millions more leave their families and countries to raise some income as maids. However, other forms of globalization or, rather, internationalization have been in the making. For instance, feminism has evolved as an international movement in spite of the opposition of conservatives in many parts of the world. It has been able to put women's demands on the agenda of states and international organs such as the United Nations. Media are also important actors in globalisation. Women have had more presence in the media both as producers and as targets or sources of entertainment and information programming. There is considerable progress, for instance, in the production of women and feminist press in many developing countries. The Internet and desktop publishing present new opportunities for more media activism. Egypt has a women's television channel. Focusing on the question of censorship, the crucial issue is freedom of speech not only for women but also more significantly, for feminists and feminist knowledge. Feminist knowledge and consciousness is the primary target of censorship. Do the globalizing media allow women of the developing countries to learn about the achievements of Western women in fighting patriarchy? Do women of the West learn from the struggles of women in India, Jamaica or Saudi Arabia? Do the global media allow women everywhere to know about the Beijing Conference and its aftermath? Do they disseminate adequate and accurate information about the World March of Women? My answers are rather in the negative. The cyberspace is much like the realspace that creates it. The fact that many individual women or groups can set up their websites does not change power relations in the realspace. The negative stereotyping of women, for instance, cannot change without the dissemination of feminist consciousness among both men and women. Even if stereotyping is eliminated, gender inequality will persist. "Gender-based censorship" cannot be overcome as long as gender relations remain unequal and oppressive. It can, however, be reduced or made less effective. While the concept "gender-based censorship" is useful, it should be broadened to include "censorship of feminist knowledge." The following are just a few ideas about what we may do:A) Creating theoretical and empirical knowledge about gender-based censorship, and especially the censorship of feminist knowledge and feminist movements. B) Disseminating this knowledge and awareness among citizens. Using this knowledge for the purpose of dismantling patriarchal power. Knowledge makes a difference when it is put into practice. C) Making this knowledge available to policy makers and integrating it into policy making in the institutions of the market, the state, and non-state and non-market forces. These goals will not be achieved in the absence of feminist and women's movements. If censorship is not a mistake, but rather it is an organ for exercising gender and class power, resistance to it, too, should be a part of the struggle for a democratic regime.

### Perm

#### Environmental management is a symptom of the refusal to accept sexual difference - the attempt to unify and control the non-male creates violence

**Stone, 2003**,Alison Stone, December of 2003 Professor at the Centre for Philosophy at Lancaster continental philosophy review 36, 415-432, irigaray and holderlin on the relation between nature and culture <<http://www.springerlink.com/content/k7610803152l2026/fulltext.pdf> >

Besides paraphrasing Heidegger, Irigaray distances herself subtly from him (and, indirectly, from Hölderlin) by highlighting the sexually differentiated nature of the humanity through whom nature enacts violence upon itself. At first, she uses Heidegger’s language of “man” mimetically, but as her essay unfolds, she marks increasingly firmly that male humanity is in question, not humans per se. Thus, she states that the violence of culture “can be explained beginning from a masculine subjectivity” (TBT, 76). She also writ es that: The feminine is not called to carry out the task of constructing a world which is similar to man’s: a violent, uncanny world, which exists through the domination of nature. . . . To . . . cultivate herself without violence or power over what surrounds her – all of these correspond more to feminine being (72). Irigaray suggests that men are violent due to their special difficulty in accepting sexual difference: “man chooses to ignore this irreducible difference . . . Is this not because he feels foreign to this life which lives without him, this life which reproduces itself . . .?” (70) Or, as she states later on, man’s violence is “probably related to man’s relationship with the one who generates him: he will never generate in himself and must fabricate things outside of himself, in order to separate himself from the mother; he must manufacture externally, while she generates internally” (76). For Irigaray (drawing on her earlier analysis in Thinking the Difference), it is men’s difficulty in accepting sexual difference which leads them to turn against women, and, simultaneously, against the nature of which they themselves are part – as when men engineer technologies which damage their own nature. While Irigaray agrees with Hölderlin and Heidegger that nature turns against itself, she holds that only males mediate this turn. Man’s, but not woman’s, nature is to be uncanny and violent. Through men’s activities, women become embroiled in a non-natural mode of life that is fundamentally alien to them. Evidently, Irigaray can only identify men as the sole mediators of nature’s violence because she believes in an original sexual differentiation within nature (against which men, as one pole of this differentiation, react). This contrasts with Hölderlin’s view of nature as original, absolute, unity. Believing in an originary differentiation, Irigaray understands male violence to consist, typically, in the forcible imposition of sameness upon awomen and other natural beings. Hölderlin, on the other hand, conceives humans as separated from nature insofar as their power of judgement leads them to divide, analyse, and reflectively partition natural beings. But for Irigaray, Hölderlin’s conception of nature as primordially unitary instantiates the same disavowal of sexual difference which underpins male hostility to nature. By denying originary difference, Hölderlin’s account of nature becomes complicit with the very separation from nature that he wishes to question.