### 1st Off

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its financial incentives for Solar Power and locally-owned Wind power produced for on-site demand.

#### The plan is blind to inequalities created in energy production- the offer will be snatched up by large energy corporations to entrench their control

Farrell 11

[John, directs the Energy Self-Reliant States and Communities program at the Institute for Local Self-Reliance, “Democratizing the Electricity System: A Vision for the 21st Century Grid”, June, p. <http://atcscam.homestead.com/democratizing-electricity-system.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

While technology has helped change the economics of electricity production (in favor of renewables and distributed generation), this new dynamic can as easily be controlled by the incumbent utilities as the old paradigm of centralized fossil fuel power generation. The cornerstone of the distributed generation revolution is its potential democratizing influence on the electric grid, the opportunity unlocked for local ownership and the coincident political support for more renewable energy. In no place is that clearer than in the public support for renewable energy. An increasing number of renewable energy projects (primarily wind, but also large-scale solar) have met with resistance from local residents or environmentalists. Centralized, remote generation might seem to avoid NIMBY issues by placing wind turbines or solar power plants far from population centers; but in practice, there have been opponents to these projects as well. Large power plants raise questions about environmental impact from creature habitat to water consumption. Power from distant plants must be transmitted over high-voltage transmission lines to get to load centers without significant losses, and such lines are built only at great ratepayer expense, over many years, and with the taking of land with eminent domain. Some folks just hate the look of power plants, regardless of their sustainable nature. Resistance has been organized enough to win restrictive state siting policies (e.g. wind policy in Wisconsin) or to coordinate environmental advocacy organizations to oppose solar power plants on undeveloped desert lands. In some cases, resistance takes on the strange aspect of “wind turbine syndrome,” or other mysterious illnesses. At the heart of the matter, citizens rightly see renewable energy as different, and find it frustrating to see new, widely available resources like sun and wind developed under the old, centralized paradigm and owned by the usual suspects. In a recent study by the ever-methodical Europeans, they found that opponents to new wind and solar power have two key desires: “people want to avoid environmental and personal harm” and they also want to “share in the economic benefits of their local renewable energy resources.”32 It’s not that people are made physically ill by new renewable energy projects. Rather, they are sick and tired of seeing the economic benefits of their local wind and sun leaving their community. Such opposition is perfectly rational, since investments in renewable energy can be quite lucrative (private developers and their equity partners routinely seek 10% return on investment or higher). And the economic benefits of local ownership far outweigh the economic colonialism of absentee owners profiting from local renewable energy resources. Additionally, when projects are absentee owned, local residents see little to no economic advantage to offset their concerns about health or the environment. It’s not just centralized renewable energy projects facing opposition; distributed generation (DG) can also face resistance. While DG projects are of a more modest scale than centralized power generation, they also reside closer to actual electricity demand; thus, they are closer to population centers. For solar, this is largely a non-issue, because it can be easily installed on rooftops or other existing structures. Similarly, other technologies like geothermal or even natural gas generate little hostility from locals. On the other hand, for wind power there’s little distinction between a 30 MW and 300 MW project, because all the turbines are the same size. A distributed wind project will place very large turbines close to population centers and wind projects of all sizes have met with stiffer resistance. For both centralized and distributed generation, local ownership becomes the key to unlocking local support. For example, the following chart illustrates the local support for wind power in two German towns, Nossen and Zschadraß. With local ownership of the wind project, 45% of residents had a positive view toward more wind energy (Zschadraß). In the town with an absentee-owned project (Nossen), only 16% of residents had a positive view of expanding wind power; a majority had a negative view. By unlocking economic opportunity, distributed generation and local ownership of renewable energy create a positive feedback loop for more investment in renewable energy.

#### This form of corporate colonization turns the aff- makes effective politics impossible and dooms us to ecological and social extinction

O'Leary 08

(Brian, former astronaut, Cornell professor, physics faculty member at Princeton University and visiting faculty member in technology assessment at the University of California Berkeley School of Law, Mo Udall's energy advisor and speechwriter during his 1975 Presidential campaign, author, AAAS Fellow, World Innovation Foundation Fellow, NASA group achievement award recipient, and founder of the New Energy Movement, The Energy Solution Revolution, Chapter 1. “Pigs Can Fly!” October 1, 2008, Pg 18//wyo-mm)

My pessimism is well-founded, because the prospect for an energy solution revolution has been suppressed at every turn by powerful vested interests. The media again passes while mainstream scientists wallow in denial for fear of ridicule ("if it isn't reported or properly vetted by vested money and intellectual interests, it isn't real"). The result is an unwitting alliance between establishment scientists and the corrupting energy barons and their governmental and media mouthpieces. Meanwhile, we continue to be addicted to oil, so much so we don't seem to know a good thing when it comes along. Yet, most of us know, at least at some level, that we need to transform this addiction to chain-smoking our oil and coal and move on to alternatives before it's too late. We must lift the contradictory veil of credibility. From ten years' direct experience at witnessing new energy breakthroughs in laboratories around the world, I can personally vouch for the successes in solution energy research, whether it be cold fusion, advanced hydrogen chemistry or vacuum energy. But, like during the Wrights' first flights, we are not delivering the product yet. We are in the research phase of a research and development cycle. The research, if properly supported, will inevitably lead to the deployment of energy systems that will profoundly change the world. Why can't we perceive the truth hidden beneath the conundrum of credibility? It seems that credibility is simply a fantasy created by media, academe, politicians and corporate interests. In this game of smoke and mirrors, style has usurped substance, moreso than ever in these trying times. Hidden under the radar of the mass culture, we are missing out on concrete solutions, with the truth lying not so far below, but actively suppressed by current powers, who see such developments either as impossible or as a threat to an economy based mostly on polluting, destabilizing and unsustainable energy resources. Politicians rarely see beyond the next elections and corporations rarely see beyond their next earnings report. I am convinced we could have a comprehensive energy policy leading to near-zero emissions by 2020. The research is mature enough to set this goal, just as JFK had done for the Apollo lunar missions. I am also convinced that a publicly funded R&D effort of some hundreds of millions of dollars will catapult us into a sustainable future with many energy choices. On the other hand, we can maintain our cultural "credibility" by doing nothing. Meanwhile the research goes on in scattered locations by inventors in government labs, universities or on their own, with little or no support or acknowledgement from the government or the scientific mainstream. In my opinion, the development phase needs to become transparent and public. It is too important to be left to existing powers whose economic self-interest is suppressing solution energy at every turn. Yet we may need it to avert global disaster from pollution, climate change, prolonged blackouts, and wars over oil.

### 2nd Off

#### The 50 states, Washington D.C., and all relevant territories should substantially increase financial incentives for Wind and Solar Power.

#### State financial incentives solve – generate federal and private investment

EPA, “State Planning and Incentive Structure” In EPA’s, Clean Energy-Environment Guide to Action, April 2006.

States are achieving significant energy and cost sav­ ings through well-designed, targeted funding and incentives for clean energy technologies and services. Key types of financial incentives programs states offer include: • Loans • Tax incentives • Grants, buy-downs, and generation incentives • Nitrogen oxide (NOx) set-asides • Energy performance contracting • Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) States have achieved additional savings by coordinat­ ing financial incentives with other state programs and by leveraging utility-based clean energy programs. Over the past three decades, states have diversified their programs from grants or loans into a broader set of programs targeted at specific markets and customer groups. This diversification has led to port­ folios of programs with greater sectoral coverage, a wider array of partnerships with businesses and com­ munity groups, and an overall reduced risk associated with programmatic investments in energy efficiency and clean supply options. Objective State-provided funding and incentives meet the public purpose objectives of supporting technolo­ gies and products that are new to the market and encouraging and stimulating private sector invest­ ment. Funding and incentives can also reduce mar­ ket barriers by subsidizing higher “first costs,” increasing consumer awareness (the programs are often accompanied by education campaigns and the active promotion of products to help achieve a state’s energy efficiency goals), and encourage or “jump-start” private sector investment. Benefits States provide funding and incentives through a combination of sources (i.e., state and federal funds, utility programs, and ratepayers), to support a broad range of cost-effective clean energy tech­ nologies, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, and combined heat and power (CHP). State funding and incentive programs, some of which are self-sustaining (e.g., revolving loan funds), deliver energy and cost savings for governments, business­ es, and consumers. Program results vary depending on the configuration of funding and incentives used by each state. In Texas, the revolving loan fund has resulted in $152 million in savings since 1989 on an investment of $123 million (DOE 2005). In Oregon, more than 12,000 tax credits worth $243 million have been issued since 1980, which save or generate energy worth about $215 million per year (Oregon DOE 2005b). Providing funding and incentives for clean energy can offer the following environmental, energy, and economic benefits: • Reduces energy costs by supporting cost-effective energy efficiency improvements and onsite gener­ ation projects. • Ensures that clean energy is delivered, specifies which technologies are used, and offers incentives to install technologies. Providing funding and incentives also accelerates the adoption of clean energy technologies by improving the project eco­ nomics and offsets market, institutional, or regula­ tory barriers until those barriers can be removed. • Establishes a clean energy technology or project development infrastructure to continue stimulat­ ing the market after the incentives are no longer in effect. • Leverages federal incentives and stimulates private sector investment by further improving the eco­ nomic attractiveness of clean energy. A small investment may lead to broad support and adop­ tion of a clean energy technology or process. • Stimulates clean energy businesses and job cre­ ation within the state. • Supports environmental protection objectives, such as improving air quality.

### 3rd Off

#### Compromise now but Obama’s pc is key

WSJ Jan. 3rd

[Potomac Watch, the Wall Street Journal, January 3rd, 2013, Strassel: The Debt-Ceiling Fight Will Be Dirty, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323374504578218751518184568.html>, uwyo//amp]

Only the GOP can answer these questions, but the point here is that Republicans had better have answered them—and clearly—before they step into the ring. The president has every intention of playing them exactly as he did in the cliff, and in 2011. Mr. Obama will lay out tax-hike demands, give no quarter on spending, not waver and, as the deadline approaches, use his bully pulpit and the media to cow the GOP into the sort of wrangling that led to this week's defeat. If the Republican strategy isn't crystal clear, if the party is again fractured, then Round Two is already Mr. Obama's. So once again: What, exactly, is the GOP prepared to do?

#### Obama’s leverage is key to new fights over debt ceiling and sequestration

-Political capital high: economy on cusp of revival

-AT: Compromise Bill Disproves: Compromised and merely delayed the big battles

Star Ledger, “Obama's legacy trap”, 1/1/2013. http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_legacy\_trap.html

President Barack Obama hopes -- expects, really -- that '13 will be his lucky number, a year to cement his historical legacy and reap the benefits of an economy on the cusp of real revival.¶ That expectation, as much as anything, explains how Obama approached the fiscal cliff and why he opted for compromise over confrontation. The president, eyes fixed on history, always viewed the fight as an obstacle, not a destination, a thing to be gotten past on his way to breaking the historical pattern of weak, scandal-scarred and anticlimactic second-term presidencies.¶ But the endless battle over the budget -- new fights over the debt ceiling and automatic spending cuts loom in a matter of weeks -- could become a legacy trap for Obama, robbing him of precious leverage to redefine his relationship with Republicans on terms more favorable to an ambitious second-term agenda, scholars of the presidency say.¶ "People don't queue up in lines to see the pens for a budget deal under glass, or 'Hey, I just cut this deal with Boehner,'" says presidential historian Douglas Brinkley.¶ "Presidents are remembered for the big things. FDR did Social Security. Truman created the CIA. There's Eisenhower and the highway system. Kennedy and the moon," Brinkley added. "So, it's going to be Obama and what? Obamacare, that's the big one, and killing Bin Laden. There's room for one more big item. What will it be? Immigration? Climate change? It won't be deficits or the fiscal cliff."¶ The White House is casting the potential fiscal deal as a major victory because it forces Republicans to turn their backs on a two-decade policy of opposing all tax increases, even those on the wealthiest Americans, which is a "big win," in the words of one West Wing adviser.¶ For his part, Obama said Monday, "If we're going to be serious about deficit reduction and debt reduction, then it's going to have to be a matter of shared sacrifice -- at least as long as I'm president. And I'm going to be president for the next four years, I think..." he said with a widening smile on Monday.¶ The challenge for a president unusually attuned to his place in history is how to manage fights like the cliff without being diverted by them, and how to suppress the GOP challenge without it becoming a major drain of his time, popular good will and power.¶ "The question is whether he's willing to use the leverage he has to get a better deal. He has a chance to make history here," said Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, reflecting the mixed emotions of many nervous progressives watching the cliff talks from the sidelines. "Standing up to them would not only be a gift to the country, but a big part of his legacy."¶ One staffer for a senior Senate Democrat, summing up the view of several other aides interviewed by POLITICO, called the potential deal a "cave," and warned that Obama's Monday afternoon campaign-style event ahead of the final deal was a "Leon Lett moment" -- a reference to the Dallas Cowboys lineman who fumbled the ball while celebrating a touchdown short of the goal line.¶ But Obama and his staff believe Americans would have blamed him for taking the country over the cliff, and they emphasize his refusal to negotiate over the looming debt ceiling in a couple of months. Nonetheless, even the president concedes that the smaller cliff deal, while possibly postponing bigger battles, prolongs a fight Obama had hoped to move quickly past.¶ Even if he were to become bogged down, Obama's place in history is already assured. He is the nation's first black president, a controversial Beltway neophyte who managed to ram through landmark health reform (the future of which future remains opaque), an incumbent who won a fresh term despite a sour economy, a commander in chief who ended two unwanted wars -- all the while tallying unprecedented national debt and deficits.

#### Wind drains PC= Growing coalition against wind support

Paul Driessen, senior policy adviser for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and columnist, “We Need to Terminate Big Wind Subsidies” Townhall.com, May 9, 2012.

Unprecedented! As bills to extend seemingly perpetual wind energy subsidies were again introduced by industry lobbyists late last year, taxpayers finally decided they’d had enough. Informed and inspired by a loose but growing national coalition of groups opposed to more giveaways with no scientifically proven net benefits, thousands of citizens called their senators and representatives – and rounded up enough Nay votes to run four different bills aground. For once, democracy worked. A shocked American Wind Energy Association and its allies began even more aggressive recruiting of well-connected Democrat and Republican political operatives and cosponsors – and introducing more proposals like HR 3307 to extend the Production Tax Credit (PTC). Parallel efforts were launched in state legislatures, to maintain mandates, subsidies, feed-in tariffs, renewable energy credits, and other “temporary” ratepayer and taxpayer obligations. This “emerging industry” is “vitally important” to our energy future, supporters insisted. It provides “clean energy” and “over 37,000” jobs that “states can’t afford to lose.” It helps prevent global warming. None of these sales pitches holds up under objective scrutiny, and their growing awareness of this basic reality has finally made many in Congress inclined to eliminate this wasteful spending on wind power.

#### Sequestration kills aerospace – threat of cuts stifles investment essential to the industry.

Kristen Leigh Painter, Denver Post, “Sequestration deal delayed, leaving Colorado aerospace industry up in air”, 1/4/2013

The budget agreement passed by the U.S. Congress and supported by President Barack Obama to avert the "fiscal cliff" provides tax-rate clarity for individual Americans, yet failed to find a solution to the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration — leaving Colorado's large aerospace industry in limbo.¶ Congress pushed back the deadline to March 1 from the Jan. 1 deadline set in place by the Budget Control Act of 2011. This is neither good news nor bad for an industry facing huge cuts should Congress default on a decision.¶ "The plan did add some certainty to citizens, but nothing to industry," said Fred Doyle, vice president and group leader of defense and intelligence at Ball Aerospace & Technologies in Boulder. "If we had clarity on sequestration, we would be hiring more people to meet the demands of our customers."¶ Aerospace leaders applauded Washington's agreement for coming to some semblance of a tax compromise and for temporarily preventing the sequester from occurring. However, they are now pleading for a comprehensive solution that allows certainty for their industry as well.¶ "Until sequestration is permanently eliminated, there will be an overhang on our industry that stifles investment in plant, equipment, people, and future research and development essential to the future health of our industry," said Lockheed Martin in a statement to The Denver Post.¶ Defense Secretary Leon Panetta released a statement regarding the sequestration delay on Wednesday. He began by thanking Congress and the Obama administration for stalling the cuts, but then turned around to warn those same leaders that they "cannot continue to just kick the can down the road."¶ "Congress has prevented the worst possible outcome by delaying sequestration for two months," Panetta said in a news release. "Unfortunately, the cloud of sequestration remains."¶ That cloud includes hiring freezes or slowdowns, budget-planning uncertainty and stalled growth.¶ "As nimble as companies like to be, it is still difficult for them to plan in a federal environment that is not taking a long-term view," said Patty Silverstein, an economist at Colorado-based Development Research Partners.¶ Vicky Lea, aviation and aerospace industry manager at Denver Metro Economic Development Corp., points out that a lack of long-term planning is especially challenging for aerospace businesses that, by nature, must operate on longer planning cycles to accommodate research and development.¶ "From Colorado's perspective, the impacts of sequestration will be on both Department of Defense and non-Department of Defense, and it will be felt across our three pillars of aerospace — civil, commercial and military space," Lea said.¶ Even without sequestration — which would cut $500 billion from the defense budget over the next 10 years — the department has already been ironing out $487 billion in spending reductions.¶ "This department is doing its part to help the country address its deficit problem," Panetta said. "The specter of sequestration has cast a shadow over our efforts."

#### Aerospace industry is key to space exploration

**Thompson 9** (David, President – American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, “The Aerospace Workforce”, Federal News Service, 12-10, Lexis)

Aerospace systems are of considerable importance to U.S. national security, economic prosperity, technological vitality, and global leadership. Aeronautical and space systems protect our citizens, armed forces, and allies abroad. They connect the farthest corners of the world with safe and efficient air transportation and satellite communications, and they monitor the Earth, explore the solar system, and study the wider universe. The U.S. aerospace sector also contributes in major ways to America's economic output and high- technology employment. Aerospace research and development and manufacturing companies generated approximately $240 billion in sales in 2008, or nearly 1.75 percent of our country's gross national product. They currently employ about 650,000 people throughout our country. U.S. government agencies and departments engaged in aerospace research and operations add another 125,000 employees to the sector's workforce, bringing the total to over 775,000 people. Included in this number are more than 200,000 engineers and scientists -- one of the largest concentrations of technical brainpower on Earth.

#### Next, we have to go to space now – famine, scarcity, wars, and ultimate extinction are inevitable. only moving off the rock while we still have the resources prevents our demise and guarantees a peaceful, sustainable life on earth and across the galaxy

Engdahl 2003

[Sylvia, “Space and Human Survival: My Views on the Importance of Colonizing Space,” November 3, 2003, www.sylviaengdahl.com/space/survival.htm//tjc]

A more urgent cause for concern is the need not to “put all our eggs in one basket,” in case the worst happens and we blow up our own planet, or make it uninhabitable by means of nuclear disaster or perhaps biological warfare. We would all like to believe this won’t happen, yet some people are seriously afraid that it will—it’s hardly an irrational fear. Peace with Russia may have drawn attention from it, yet there are other potential troublemakers, even terrorists; the nuclear peril is not mere history. Furthermore, there is the small but all-too-real possibility that Earth might be struck by an asteroid. We all hope and believe our homes won’t burn down, and yet we buy fire insurance. Does not our species as a whole need an insurance policy?¶ Even Carl Sagan, a long-time opponent of using manned spacecraft where robots can serve, came out in support of space colonization near the end of his life, for this reason; see his book Pale Blue Dot. And in an interview with Britain’s newspaper Daily Telegraph, eminent cosmologist Stephen Hawking said, “I don’t think that the human race will survive the next thousand years unless we spread into space. There are too many accidents that can befall life on a single planet.” Hawking is more worried about the possibility of our creating a virus that destroys us than about nuclear disaster. However, he said, “I’m an optimist. We will reach out to the stars.” (For the full article, see the link section below.)¶ My novel The Far Side of Evil (Atheneum, 1971; updated version Walker, 2003) is based on the concept of a “Critical Stage” during which a species has the technology to expand into space, but hasn’t yet implemented it, and in which that same level of technology enables it to wipe itself out. The premise of the book is that each world will do one or the other, but not both. I have believed this since the early 50s, when there was real danger of nuclear war but no sign of space travel. When the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, my reaction was overwhelming joy and relief, because I thought that at last our energies were going to be turned toward space exploration. I felt that way through the era of Apollo. Since Apollo, as public support of the space program has waned, my fears have grown again; because I don’t believe that a world turned in on itself can remain peaceful. A progressive species like ours has a built-in drive to move forward, and that energy has to go somewhere. Historically, when it was not going into mere survival or into the exploration and settlement of new lands—which is the adaptive reason for such a drive—it has gone into war.¶ This is the price we pay for our innate progressiveness. I know that it is now fashionable to deride the concept of progress, and certainly we cannot say that progress is inevitable. It surely doesn’t characterize all change in all areas of human endeavor. Nevertheless, overall, the human race as a whole advances; if it did not we would still be cavemen. This is what distinguishes our species from all others. And like it or not, this drive is inseparable from the drive toward growth and expansion. Many successful species colonize new ecological niches; this is one of the fundamental features of evolution. When a species can’t find a new niche, and the resources of the old one are no longer sufficient, it dies out. If the resources do remain sufficient, it lives, but is unchanging from era to era. There are no cases in biology of progressive evolution unaccompanied by expansion. ¶ Colonies or Settlements?¶ The question of resources raises an even more crucial reason for expansion into space than the danger of Earth’s destruction. It’s obvious that this planet cannot support an expanding population forever. Most people who recognize this fact advocate population control to the extent of “zero population growth.” I do not; I believe it would be fatal not only for the reason explained above, but because if it could be achieved it would result in stagnation. I do not want a world in which there can be no growth; growth leads to intellectual and artistic progress as well as to material survival. Furthermore, I do not believe it could be achieved. The built-in desire for personal descendants is too strong; that is why our species has survived this long, why it has spread throughout the entire world. Moreover, the biological response to threatened survival is to speed up reproduction, as we can see by the number of starving children in the world. If we tried to suppress population growth completely, we would have either immediate violent upheaval or a period of dictatorship followed by bloody revolution. Ultimately, we ¶ starving children in the world. If we tried to suppress population growth completely, we would have either immediate violent upheaval or a period of dictatorship followed by bloody revolution. Ultimately, we ¶ would reduce the population all right; we would decimate it. That may be “survival” but it’s surely not the future we want.¶ We do not want even the present restriction on resources. Currently, some nations live well while others are deprived, and it’s asserted that even those with the best access to resources should stop using them up—the underdeveloped nations, under this philosophy, are not given the hope of a standard of living commensurate with the level our species has achieved. Will the Third World tolerate such a situation forever? I surely wouldn’t blame them for not wanting to. And neither do I want the rest of the world reduced to a lower level of technology. Even if I had no other objection to such a trend, the plain fact is that a low level of technology cannot support the same size population as a high level; so if you want to cut back on technology, you have to either kill people outright or let them starve. And you certainly can’t do anything toward extending the length of the human lifespan. This is the inevitable result of planning based on a single-planet environment.¶ If there is pessimism in Earthbound science fiction (which its most outstanding characteristic), these truths are the source of it. I have not seen any that denies any of them; pop-culture SF reveals that what people grasp mythopoeically about such a future involves catastrophic war, cut-throat human relationships in overcrowded cities, and a general trend toward dehumanization. Apart from the major films with which my course dealt (e.g. Bladerunner), Soylent Green postulates cannibalism and Logan’s Run is based on the premise that everybody is required to die at the age of 30. The destruction of the world’s ecology is a basic assumption—which is natural, since in a contest between a stable biosphere and personal survival, humans will either prevail or they will die.¶ Myths showing these things are indeed part of the response to a new perception of our environment: the perception that as far as Earth is concerned, it is limited. A basic premise of my course was that all myth is a response of a culture to the environment in which it perceives itself to exist.] But at the rational level, people do not want to face them. They tell themselves that if we do our best to conserve resources and give up a lot of the modern conveniences that enable us to spend time expanding our minds, we can avoid such a fate—as indeed we can, for a while. But not forever. And most significantly, not for long enough to establish space settlements, if we don’t start soon enough. Space humanization is not something that can be achieved overnight.¶ I have called this stage in our evolution the “Critical Stage.” Paul Levinson [the Director of Connected Education] uses different terminology for the same concept. He says that we have only a narrow window to get into space, a relatively short time during which we have the capability, but have not yet run out of the resources to do it. I agree with him completely about this. Expansion into space demands high technology and full utilization of our world’s material resources (although not destructive utilization). It also demands financial resources that we will not have if we deplete the material resources of Earth. And it demands human resources, which we will lose if we are reduced to global war or widespread starvation. Finally, it demands spiritual resources, which we are not likely to retain under the sort of dictatorship that would be necessary to maintain a “sustainable” global civilization.¶ Because the window is narrow, then, we not only have to worry about immediate perils. The ultimate, unavoidable danger for our planet, the transformation of our sun, is distant—but ¶ if we don’t expand into space now, we can never do it. Even if I’m wrong and we survive stagnation, it will be too late to escape from this solar system, much less to explore for the sake of exploring.¶ I realize that what I’ve been saying here doesn’t sound like my usual optimism. But the reason it doesn’t, I think, is that most people don’t understand what’s meant by “space humanization.” Some of you are probably thinking that space travel isn’t going to be a big help with these problems, as indeed, the form of it shown in today’s mythology would not. Almost certainly, you’re thinking that it won’t solve the other problems of Earth, and I fear you may be thinking that the other problems should be solved first.¶ One big reason why they should not is the “narrow window” concept. The other is that they could not. I have explained why I believe the problem of war can’t be solved without expansion. The problem of hunger is, or ultimately will be, the direct result of our planet’s limited resources; though it could be solved for the near-term by political reforms, we are not likely to see such reforms while nations are playing a “ zero-sum game” with what resources Earth still has. Widespread poverty, when not politically based, is caused by insufficient access to high technology and by the fact that there aren’t enough resources to go around (if you doubt this, compare the amount of poverty here with the amount in the Third World, and the amount on the Western frontier with the amount in our modern cities). Non-contagious disease, such as cancer, is at least partially the result of stress; and while expansion won’t eliminate stress, overcrowding certainly increases it. The problem of atmospheric pollution is the result of trying to contain the industry necessary to maintain our technology within the biosphere instead of moving it into orbit where it belongs.¶ In short, all the worldwide problems we want to solve, and feel we should have solved, are related to the fact that we’ve outgrown the ecological niche we presently occupy. I view them not as pathologies, but as natural indicators of our evolutionary stage. I would like to believe that they’ll prove spurs to expansion. If they don’t, we’ll be one of evolution’s failures.

### 4th Off

#### OUR INTERPRETATION: The resolution asks a yes/no question as to the desirability of the United States Federal Government action. The role of the ballot should be to affirm or reject the actions and outcomes of the plan.

#### 1. “RESOLVED” EXPRESSES INTENT TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary 2K

[www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved](http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved)

To find a solution to; solve …

To bring to a usually successful conclusion

#### 2. “SHOULD” DENOTES AN EXPECTATION OF ENACTING A PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary – 2K

[www.dictionary.com]

3 Used to express probability or expectation

#### 3. THE U.S.F.G. is the three branches of government

Dictionary.com 2k6 [[http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/united+states+government](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/united%2Bstates%2Bgovernment)]

|  |
| --- |
| noun |
| the executive and legislative and judicial branches of the federal government of the United States  |

#### Violation: Affirmative does not defend the instrumental adoption of the plan text \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

#### D. REASONS TO PREFER –

#### 1. PREDICTABILE LIMITS: the resolution sets the parameters for the debate. Affirmatives would always win if there wasn’t predictable negative ground. CANT TEST THE VERASITY OF THE AFFIRMATIVE TRUTH CLAIMS WITHOUT EQUAL GROUND FOR CONTESTATION MEANS THE ENTIRE AFFIRMATIVE IS SUSPECT IF WE WIN OUR LINK TO FRAMEWORK.

#### 2. SWITCH-SIDE DEBATE SOLVES: topics are meaningless if we don’t debate both sides. This is why topic-specific education outweighs general education.

#### 3. THERE IS NO OFFENSIVE JUSTIFICATION FOR THEM TO READ A PLAN AND THEN NOT INSTRUMENTALLY DEFEND IT. SKEWS PRE-ROUND PREP AND NEGATIVE LINK GROUND.

#### 4. FRAMEWORK IS AN APRIORI THEORETICAL VOTING ISSUE FOR FAIRNESS – COMES BEFORE EDUCATION CLAIMS.

#### Should be evaluated as a question of competing interpretations- reasonability leads judge intervention and shallow standards.

### 5th Off

#### First link: Their appeal to rethink being does not insert themselves ‘into the world of nature’ but rather is a deliberate escape from the social as a coping mechanism to shore up the boundaries of capitalism during its present historical crisis. At best they can win they question some effects of capital, but are INCAPABLE of resolving the system of use-value [Read Blue]

DeFazio 12

[Kimberly DeFazio, Teaches in the English Department at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. Her writings have appeared in such journals as Nature, Society and Thought, and Textual Practice and in the edited collection Confronting Universalities: Aesthetics and Politics under the Sign of Globalisation., “Machine-Thinking and the Romance of Posthumanism”, Journal of Red Critique, Winter Spring of 2012 edition, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/machinethinkingandtheromanceofposthumanism.htm, \\wyo-bb]

Machine-thinkers, in other words, oppose the effects of capitalism by blurring social boundaries and essentializing epistemological distinctions in an effort, not to transform capitalism, but to find a freer mode of life outside of the social (outside the city). It involves, as Wolfe puts it in his annotation of R.L. Rutsky's theory of posthumanism, "participat[ing] in—and find[ing] a mode of thought adequate to—'processes which can never be entirely reduced to patterns or standards, codes or information'" (What is Posthumanism? xviii). This is a (not so distant) echo of Thoreau's romantic desire to "wander far beyond... the narrow limits" of restricting codes and conventions in everyday life, into the realm of what he calls "Extra vagance!": the fulfillment of the "desire to speak somewhere without bounds" (Walden 270).

Not coincidentally, the "nature" that thereby becomes valorized by critics of machine-thinking is, in effect, a rewriting of romantic discourses. As much as theorists locate themselves beyond naïve (humanist) constructions of nature, nature in contemporary theory is ultimately a bio-fantasy of a nature "outside" of and fundamentally disruptive of the social relations of production. In opposition to techne, in other words, machine-thinkers oppose (natural) "life" itself ("bios"). Along these lines, in some contemporary posthumanist discourse, "nature" betrays a "viral" or "mutational logic" that "exceeds and encompasses the boundary between the living or organic and the mechanical or technical" and thus becomes "parasitical" (Wolfe, What is Posthumanism? xviii-xix)—a "natural" logic that is represented as breaking the bounds of existing (social) thought but that ends up being a new species of deconstruction. Leaving aside for the moment posthumanism's updating of deconstruction, one of the key points here is that rather than changing the relations in which life is lived, the new battle cry of the left centers on new ways of thinking about life as excessive of human relations. Machine-thinking is in effect a romantic means of disappearing the social. Life is re-articulated as "machine" and "nature," and as a consequence, what makes both—social labor—becomes a fiction. I argue that such rewritings of capitalism as machine-thinking are part of a long line of romantic writings of the social which emerge with particular force at times of economic crisis. Romanticism, I argue, is not merely a particular historical manifestation of a literary sensibility. It is a broader response (literary, philosophical, cultural and political) in the post-Renaissance West to the contradictions of capitalism: contradictions which romanticism reads in terms of science and technology and, in particular, instrumental rationality. To put this another way, the translation of the material contradictions of capital into the ideal (and in particular "machine thinking") is a structural feature of capitalism. It is rooted in the way that capital, as it develops, increasingly "resolve[s] personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade," one of the central consequences of which is that "for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation" (Marx and Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party). Romanticism has always challenged the effects of capitalist relations (giving it a semblance of radicality) but not its root cause (exploitation). In this vein, Emerson, for instance, argues that "Poetry is the consolation of mortal men," because they "live cabined, cribbed, confined in a narrow and trivial lot—in wants, pains, anxieties and superstitions, in profligate politics, in personal animosities, in mean employments—and victims of these; and the nobler powers untried, unknown" ("Poetry and Imagination" 37). "A poet comes," Emerson continues, "who lifts the veil; gives them glimpses of the laws of the universe" (37-8). And what the poet reveals, according to Emerson, is that reality is only the phenomenal appearance of a higher, spiritual reality. Romantics like Emerson confine their understanding of capitalist conditions to its alienating effects and use of technology in the city (the space of the most developed technology and class divisions). They therefore misread capitalism as primarily a rigid, homogenizing and instrumental way of thinking. Poetry thus "consoles" men, for Emerson, because, through it, the "veil" of phenomenal reality is lifted to reveal a symbolic universe which resists the instrumentality (i.e., the placing of ends before means) of modern life. Which is another way of saying that Emerson reduces capitalism to something that cannot be changed, only thought about differently. The concern, in other words, is with the ways in which, as Heidegger puts it, a technological age "take[s] thinking itself to be a technē, a process of reflection in service to doing and making" ("Letter on Humanism" 218). Nothing—and no one—is meaningful in and of itself, but for something else (a means toward an end). This reading of instrumentality de-historicizes and de-materializes instrumentality. In focusing only on the how of instrumentality—how instrumental thinking equates the valuable with the efficient, with efficaciousness—the reasons why this has become the dominant logic in capitalism fade into the background. In fact, the marginalization of the why in cultural theory has become grounds for treating Heidegger (among others) as a militant against the metaphysics of origin and religious origin in particular. Along these lines, Timothy Clark affirms that, for Heidegger, "Ultimately, like human existence itself, it [Being] is without a 'why' (has nothing we might recognize as a meaning): it happened because it happened" (34). Yet in the name of the destruction of religious and metaphysical origin, Heidegger has been instrumental in updating spiritualism and, in effect, in dismantling the knowledge of material origin.

#### THE DETERMINISM OF CAPITAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTRUMENTALIZATION OF ALL LIFE—IT IS THIS LOGIC THAT MOBILIZES AND ALLOWS FOR THE 1AC’S SCENARIOS IN THE FIRST PLACE

DYER-WITHERFORD (professor of Library and Info. Sciences at the U of Western Ontario) 1999
[Nick. Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism.]

For capitalism, the use of machines as organs of “will over nature” is an imperative. The great insight of the Frankfurt School—an insight subsequently improved and amplified by feminists and ecologists—was that capital’s dual project of dominating both humanity and nature was intimately tied to the cultivation of “instrumental reason” that systematically objectifies, reduces, quantifies and fragments the world for the purposes of technological control. Business’s systemic need to cheapen labor, cut the costs of raw materials, and expand consumer markets gives it an inherent bias toward the piling-up of technological power. This priority—enshrined in phrases such as “progress,” “efficiency,” “productivity,” “modernization,” and “growth”—assumes an automatism that is used to override any objection or alternative, regardless of the environmental and social consequences. Today, we witness global vistas of toxification, deforestation, desertification, dying oceans, disappearing ozone layers, and disintegrating immune systems, all interacting in ways that perhaps threaten the very existence of humanity and are undeniably inflicting social collapse, disease, and immiseration across the planet. The degree to which this project of mastery has backfired is all too obvious.

#### Vote Negative to validate and adopt the method of structural/historical criticism that is the 1NC.

#### Alt solves- our method is the foremost question, and anything otherwise only re-ifies capitalist oppression.

TUMINO (Prof. English @ Pitt) 2001

[Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online //wyo-tjc]

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

# Case

### Warming

#### Warming not real/anthropogenic- IPCC predictions fail and rely on faulty computer models – even if they win that the earth is warming, the rate is too slow to trigger their impacts

Bast & Taylor ‘11

[Joseph and James, CEO of the Heartland Institute, author of Rebuilding America’s Schools, Why We Spend Too Much on Health Care, Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism, Education & Capitalism, Climate Change Reconsidered, and The Patriot’s Toolbox, and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, Senior Fellow for The Heartland Institute, bachelor degree from Dartmouth College and law degree from the Syracuse University College of Law, “Global Warming: Not a Crisis,” The Heartland Institute, 8.2.11., http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis) //wyo-hdm]

How Much Warming? NASA satellite data recorded since 1979 allow us to check the accuracy of claims that the past three decades have been warming at an alarming rate. The data show a warming rate of 0.123 degrees C per decade. This is considerably less than what land-based temperature stations report during the same time period, and which are relied on by the IPCC (Christy, 2009). If the Earth’s temperature continues to rise at the rate of the past three decades, the planet would see only 1.23 degrees C warming over the course of an entire century. Most climate scientists, even “skeptics,” acknowledge that rising CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere would, all other things held constant, cause some small amount of warming. Alarmists claim that small amount will trigger increases in the amount of moisture in the atmosphere, which in turn will cause further warming. But other scientists have found no evidence of rising levels of moisture in those areas of the atmosphere where the models claim it should be found. Without this “amplification,” there is no global warming crisis (Singer, 2011). While the global climate warmed slightly during the 1980s and 1990s, it has not warmed at all since 2000, and there is some evidence that a cooling trend has begun (Taylor, 2007). This contradicts the predictions of the IPCC and poses a challenge to the theory that CO2 concentrations play a major role in global temperature trends. It confirms the views of many less-politicized climate scientists who acknowledge that the global climate is always warming or cooling (Michaels, 2005; Christy, 2006). The scientific community’s lack of certainty about future climate trends is rooted in the shortcomings of computer models. These models are the centerpiece of the IPCC’‘s reports, yet it is widely recognized that they fail to account for changes in precipitation, water vapor, and clouds that are likely to occur in a warmer world. It is a case of “garbage in, garbage out.” If we cannot predict how much warming will occur, how can we claim that continued human emissions of greenhouse gases is harmful?

#### No risk of impact- impacts won’t take hold for several centuries and in order to kill off the planet they would have to occur within one lifespan

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 is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400. 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.

# \*\*\*A2 Warming

### Unconcealing

.

#### Their ethical framework is at loggerheads with itself—considerations for any ethical system necessarily presuppose a human benchmark to refer back to. Two impacts: either human-centric value is inevitable and they don’t solve, or their value schema is a backdoor anthropomorphic method of asserting value without warrant, turns the case\*\*

Hayward 97

[PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

But if the project of overcoming speciesism can be pursued with some expectation of success, this is not the case with the overcoming of anthropocentrism. What makes anthropocentrism unavoidable is a limitation of a quite different sort, one which cannot be overcome even in principle because it involves a non-contingent limitation on moral thinking as such. While overcoming speciesism involves a commitment to the pursuit of knowledge of relevant similarities and differences between humans and other species, the criteria of relevance will always have an ineliminable element of anthropocentrism about them. Speciesism is the arbitrary refusal to extend moral consideration to relevantly similar cases; the ineliminable element of anthropocentrism is marked by the impossibility of giving meaningful moral consideration to cases which bear no similarity to any aspect of human cases. The emphasis is on the ‘meaningful’ here: for in the abstract one could of course declare that some feature of the nonhuman world was morally valuable, despite meeting no determinate criterion of value already recognised by any human, but because the new value is completely unrelated to any existing value it will remain radically indeterminate as a guide to action. If the ultimate point of an ethic is to yield a determinate guide to human action, then, the human reference is ineliminable even when extending moral concern to nonhumans. So my argument is that one cannot know if any judgement is speciesist if one has no benchmark against which to test arbitrariness; and, more specifically, if we are concerned to avoid speciesism of humans then one must have standards of comparison between them and others. Thus features of humans remain the benchmark. As long as the valuer is a human, the very selection of criteria of value will be limited by this fact. It is this fact which precludes the possibility of a radically nonanthropocentric value scheme, if by that is meant the adoption of a set of values which are supposed to be completely unrelated to any existing human values. Any attempt to construct a radically non-anthropocentric value scheme is liable not only to be arbitrary – because founded on no certain knowledge – but also to be more insidiously anthropocentric in projecting certain values, which as a matter of fact are selected by a human, onto nonhuman beings without certain warrant for doing so. This, of course, is the error of anthropomorphism, and will inevitably, I believe, be committed in any attempt to expunge anthropocentrism altogether.

#### Even if ontology is good in the abstract, those who advocate it fail to grapple with real-world problems.

Mulligan et al 06

(Kevin, Peter Simons, and Barry Smith, Springer Science, “What’s wrong with contemporary philosophy?” 2006, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/e6hl522358431760/fulltext.pdf//wyo-mm>)

Another example of the lack of interest in the real world in analytic ontology and metaphysics is provided by the sad story of current work in such ﬁelds as bioinformatics, artiﬁcial intelligence, and the so-called ‘‘Semantic Web’’. Ontology and metaphysics ought surely to be acknowledged as of great importance in ﬁelds such as these. 1 In fact, however, philosophical confusion is the order of the day, because AP-philosophers with some knowledge of ontology, manifesting their horror mundi, have shown little interest in grappling with the problems thrown up by these ﬁelds, leaving it instead to philosophically naı¨ve exponents of other disciplines to wreak ontological havoc. Philosophers, for their part, occupy themselves with in-house puzzles, ignorant of the damage their neglect is wreaking in the wider world.

#### Preventing extinction is the highest ethical priority – we should take action to prevent the Other from dying FIRST, only THEN can we consider questions of value to life

Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### Consequentialism is key to ethical decision making, because it ensures beings are treated as equal—any other approach to ethics is arbitrary because it considers one’s preferences as more important than others

Lillehammer, 2011

[Hallvard, Faculty of Philosophy Cambridge University, “Consequentialism and global ethics.” Forthcoming in M. Boylan, Ed., Global Morality and Justice: A Reader, Westview Press, Online, <http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/teaching_staff/lillehammer/Consequentialism_and_Global_Ethics-1-2.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

Contemporary discussions of consequentialism and global ethics have been marked by a focus on examples such as that of the shallow pond. In this literature, distinctions are drawn and analogies made between different cases about which both the consequentialist and his or her interlocutor are assumed to have a more or less firm view. One assumption in this literature is that progress can be made by making judgements about simple actual or counterfactual examples, and then employing a principle of equity to the effect that like cases be treated alike, in order to work out what to think about more complex actual cases. It is only fair to say that in practice such attempts to rely only on judgements about simple cases have a tendency to produce trenchant stand-offs. It is important to remember, therefore, that for some consequentialists the appeal to simple cases is neither the only, nor the most basic, ground for their criticism of the ethical status quo. For some of the historically most prominent consequentialists the evidential status of judgements about simple cases depends on their derivability from basic ethical principles (plus knowledge of the relevant facts). Thus, in The Methods of Ethics, Henry Sidgwick argues that ethical thought is grounded in a small number of self-evident axioms of practical reason. The first of these is that we ought to promote our own good. The second is that the good of any one individual is objectively of no more importance than the good of any other (or, in Sidgwick’s notorious metaphor, no individual’s good is more important ‘from the point of view of the Universe’ than that of any other). The third is that we ought to treat like cases alike. Taken together, Sidgwick takes these axioms to imply a form of consequentialism. We ought to promote our own good. Yet since our own good is objectively no more important than the good of anyone else, we ought to promote the good of others as well. And in order to treat like cases alike, we have to weigh our own good against the good of others impartially, all other things being equal. iv It follows that the rightness of our actions is fixed by what is best for the entire universe of ethically relevant beings. To claim otherwise is to claim for oneself and one’s preferences a special status they do not possess. When understood along these lines, consequentialism is by definition a global ethics: the good of everyone should count for everyone, no matter their identity, location, or personal and social attachments, now or hereafter. v Some version of this view is also accepted by a number of contemporary consequentialists, including Peter Singer, who writes that it is ‘preferable to proceed as Sidgwick did: search for undeniable fundamental axioms, [and] build up a moral theory from them’ (Singer 1974, 517; Singer 1981). For these philosophers the question of our ethical duties to others is not only a matter of our responses to cases like the shallow pond. It is also a matter of whether these responses cohere with an ethics based on first principles. If you are to reject the consequentialist challenge, therefore, you will have to show what is wrong with those principles.

#### Wind power causes soil erosion that has adverse effect on biodiversity.

Szarka et al 12

(Joseph, Richard Cowell, Geraint Ellis, Peter A. Strachan and Charles Varren, “Learning from Wind Power: Governance, Societal and Policy Perspectives on Sustainable Energy,” pg. 141//wyo-mm)

It would be an overstatement to suggest that the environmental impacts of wind developments are restricted to animals. For example, soil erosion can be a concern at any construction site, and the installation of wind projects is no exception. It can be particularly noticeable during site preparation, especially when turbines are erected on slopes. Scraping, filling, and over-steepening can all produce accelerated erosion, gullying, sediment transfer and land slippage. A 2008 court decision in Derrybrien, Ireland, held wind developers accountable for causing a 2003 landslide that killed 50,000 fish (EU 2008). Similar impacts result in other environments as well. For example, arid areas are notoriously slow to recover from these insults, so scars produced in these locations can be long-lived (Gipe 2002; see Figure 7.3).

#### It is better to accept the inevitability of human-centric value; claims to transcend that system of value do more to reinforce unstated premises of human value, making the challenging of speciesist behavior more difficult

Hayward 97

[PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

The aim of overcoming anthropocentrism is intelligible if it is understood in terms of improving knowledge about the place of humans in the world; and this includes improving our knowledge about what constitutes the good of nonhuman beings. This kind of knowledge is significantly added to by objectivating science. There may also be a role for other kinds of knowledge – for instance, kinds characterised by empathetic imagining of how it might be like to be a member of another species (Cassano,1989); but here one must always be cautious about unwittingly projecting human perceptions on to beings whose actual perceptions may be radically different, since this would be to reintroduce just the sort of error that characterises ontological anthropocentrism. The need for caution is all the clearer when it comes to attempting to gain a non-anthropocentric perspective in ethics. Indeed, it may be that anthropocentrism in ethics, when properly understood, is actually less harmful than harbouring the aim of overcoming it. At any rate, a number of the considerations advanced in this article would tend to suggest this view. I have noted: that the ethical impulse which is expressed as the aim of overcoming anthropocentrism is very imperfectly expressed in such terms; that there are some things about ‘anthropocentrism’ which are unavoidable, and others even to be applauded; furthermore, the things which are to condemned are not appropriately called ‘anthropocentrism’ at all; that the mistaken rejection of anthropocentrism misrepresents the fact that harms to nonhumans, as well as harm to some groups of humans, are caused not by humanity in general but by specific humans with their own vested interests. For these reasons, I suggest that discussions of environmental values would be better conducted without reference to the equivocal notion of anthropocentrism.

#### Their ethical strategy destroys ambiguity while polarizing values towards the ecosystem—this dogmatic ethic not only incorrect, but impedes the creation of coalitions which are capable of creating a new ethic—turns their arg by reinforcing speciesism

Hayward 97

[PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

The argument so far would suggest that the aim of completely overcoming anthropocentrism in ethics is at best of rhetorical value, since all it does is draw attention to problems which are in fact better conceptualised in narrower and more precise terms. I shall now argue, though, that even as rhetoric the critical employment of the term can be unhelpful, and even positively counterproductive. Proposals for the ‘rejection’ of anthropocentrism are unhelpful because they cloud the real problem they think to address. The problem has to do with a lack of concern with nonhumans but the term anthropocentrism can all too plausibly be understood as meaning an excessive concern with humans.4 The latter, however, is not the problem at all. On the contrary, a cursory glance around the world would confirm that humans show a lamentable lack of interest in the wellbeing of other humans. Moreover, even when it is not other humans whose interests are being harmed, but other species or the environment, it would generally be implausible to suggest that those doing the harm are being ‘humancentred’. To see this, one only has to consider some typical practices which are appropriately criticised. Some examples would be: hunting a species to extinction; destroying a forest to build a road and factories; animal experimentation. In the case of hunting a species to extinction, this is not helpfully or appropriately seen as ‘anthropocentrism’ since it typically involves one group of humans who are actually condemned by (probably a majority of) other humans who see the practice not as serving human interests in general, but the interests of one quite narrowly-defined group, such as poachers or whalers. A similar point can be made regarding the destruction of the forest – for those who derive economic benefit from the destruction oppose not only the human interests of indigenous peoples whose environment is thereby destroyed, but also the interests of all humans who depend on the oxygen such forests produce. The case of animal experimentation, however, brings to the fore a feature which looks as if it could more plausibly be said to be anthropocentric: for if we suppose that the benefits of the experimentation are intended to accrue to any and all humans who might need the medicine or technique experimented, then there would seem to be a clear case of humans benefiting as a species from the use and abuse of other species. But the ‘if’ is important here. A reason why I am inclined to resist calling this anthropocentrism is that the benefits may in fact not be intended or destined for humans generally, but only for those who can afford to pay to keep the drug company in profit. As in the other two cases, it is unhelpful to cover over this fundamental point and criticise humanity in general for practices carried out by a limited number of humans when many others may in fact oppose them. There is in any case no need to describe the practice as anthropocentric when it is quite clearly speciesist – it is not the concern with human welfare per se that is the problem here, but the arbitrary privileging of that welfare over the welfare of members of other species. So a reason why critiques of anthropocentrism are unhelpful is that the problems the term is used to highlight do not arise out of a concern of humans with humans, but from a lack of concern for non-humans. I earlier explained why this lack of concern is not appropriately termed anthropocentrism; I now add the further consideration that practices manifesting a lack of concern for nonhumans very often go hand in hand with a lack of concern for other humans too. Taking this line of argument a step further it becomes evident that anti-anthropocentric rhetoric is not only unhelpful, but positively counterproductive. It is not only conceptually mistaken, but also a practical and strategic mistake, to criticise humanity in general for practices of specific groups of humans. If the point of anti-anthropocentric rhetoric is to highlight problems, to make them vivid in order to get action, then misrepresenting the problem is liable to make solutions all the harder. Something particularly to emphasise is that when radical critics of anthropocentrism see themselves as opposed to defenders of human interests they are seriously in error. From what has just been said about the specificity of environmental, ecological or animal harms merely being disguised by putting the blame on humans in general, it should be evident that those who are concerned about such harms in fact make common cause with those concerned with issues of social justice. The real opponents of both sorts of concern are the ideologists who, in defending harmful practices in the name of ‘humans in general’, obscure the real causes of the harms as much as the real incidence of benefits: the harms seldom affect all and only nonhumans; the benefits seldom accrue to all humans.5 Yet by appearing to accept the ideologists’ own premises, anti-anthropocentric rhetoric plays right into their hands: by appearing to endorse the ideological view that ‘humans in general’ benefit from the exploitative activities of some, the anti-anthropocentrists are left vulnerable to ideological rejoinders to the effect that challenging those activities is merely misanthropic. The opposite is in fact nearer the truth, I believe, because it will more often be the case that challenging such practices is in the interests of humans more generally.

#### Anti-anthropocentric rhetoric reinforces a more dominant frame of human value because they reify ideological opposition to respect for non-human life

Hayward 97

[PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

Anthropocentrism, widely used as a term of criticism in environmental ethics and politics, is something of a misnomer: for while anthropocentrism can intelligibly be criticised as an ontological error, attempts to conceive of it as an ethical error often involve conceptual confusion. I point out that there is no need for this confusion because a more appropriate vocabulary to refer to the defects the ethical ‘anti-anthropocentrists’ have in mind already exists. My argument is not just about semantics, though, but engages directly with the politics of environmental concern: blanket condemnations of ‘anthropocentrism’ not only condemn some legitimate human concerns, they also allow ideological retorts to the effect that criticisms of anthropocentrism amount to misanthropy. My argument, therefore, is that a more nuanced understanding of the problem of anthropocentrism allows not only a more coherent conceptualisation of environmental ethics but also a more effective politics. The article has five main sections. The first notes the paradox that the clearest instances of overcoming anthropocentrism involve precisely the sort of objectivating knowledge which many ecological critics see as itself archetypically anthropocentric. The second section then notes some ways in which anthropocentrism is not objectionable. In the third section, the defects associated with anthropocentrism in ethics are then examined: I argue, though, that these are better understood as instances of speciesism and human chauvinism. In order to explain why it is unhelpful to call these defects anthropocentrism, I note in section four that there is an ineliminable element of anthropocentrism in any ethic at all, and in the fifth section that the defects do not typically involve a concern with human interests as such anyway. Because of this last point, I also argue, the rhetoric of anti-anthropocentrism is not only conceptually unsatisfactory, it is counterproductive in practice.

#### Solar plants kill fragile ecosystems—transmission lines, panels—no benefit over fossil fuels

Payne and Dutzik in 8

[Payne, Sarah, and Tony Dutzik: Frontier Group, energy researchers. "On the Rise: Solar Thermal Power and the Fight Against Global Warming." *Environmental America*. (2008): n. page. Web. 5 Sep. 2012. <http://www.environmentamerica.org/sites/environment/files/reports/On-The-Rise.pdf>. //Wyo-BF]

CSP plants consume significant amounts of open space. And since CSP plants are generally located in deserts—which are both ecologically fragile and relatively undisturbed—there is reason for concern about the impact that CSP power plants can have on the broader environment. However, while concentrating solar power does require significant amounts of land, it is actually more land-efficient than some other forms of power generation. For example, a CSP plant the same size as Lake Mead, the 250-square-mile reservoir created by construction of the 2,000 MW Hoover Dam, would produce roughly 13 times more electricity per year.101 America’s current electricity demand could be satisfied with solar thermal power plants on a 100-mile-square area of the desert Southwest (10,000 square miles)—an area equal to 9 percent the size of Nevada.102 By contrast, more than 9,000 square miles of the United States has been disturbed by coal mining over the nation’s history. And at least 1,644 square miles are disturbed by current mining operations (based on an incomplete estimate of impacts in only 19 of 32 coal-mining states and tribal entities).103 In contrast to CSP, the impact of coal mining on land is severe and often irreversible, and includes other environmental impacts—such as water pollution and the disposal of hazardous coal mining wastes—that can occur far from the mine site. CSP plants will have an impact on the environment and wildlife wherever they are sited, and these impacts must be taken into account in siting decisions. Proposed CSP plants should be rigorously evaluated for their environmental impacts—including both the impact on the local environment and the environmental benefits produced from averted emissions of global warming pollutants. Continued technological advances in CSP systems hold the potential to produce more energy from smaller areas of land, and thereby reduce the potential for land-use conflicts in the future. Electricity from concentrating solar power plants is only useful if it can be delivered to consumers. Building large amounts of CSP in the desert Southwest will require access to transmission. New transmission lines are often controversial, both because of their expense and the potential for damage to the environment and wildlife. Moreover, the expansion of transmission lines can also create additional capacity for fossil fuel-fired power plants, undercutting the environmental benefits of adding new renewable capacity.